

June 30, 2022, millions of children face the possibility of losing access to healthy meals.

CLASP is pleased to see the inclusion of the waiver ensuring all family child care homes qualify for the highest reimbursement rate under the Child and Adult Food Care (CACFP) program. This waiver eliminates the usual area eligibility requirement that limits this rate to providers in areas meeting a 50 percent low-income threshold. This threshold excludes many providers serving children in families with low incomes, especially in rural and suburban areas, where poverty is often less concentrated than in urban areas. In addition, the area eligibility test completely neglects providers and families struggling in areas with a high cost-of-living. CLASP recommends permanently eliminating the area eligibility test permanent. This change would bring more child care providers who serve low-income children into CACFP, ensuring many more children in need would receive healthy CACFP meals and snacks.

The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated child hunger in the U.S., but did not create it. Prior to the pandemic, almost 1 in every 7 households struggled with food security, a rate that spiked to 1 in 3 with the onset of the pandemic. The policies enacted through the FFCRA, namely the nationwide waiver authority and expanded reimbursement rates, has enabled schools to meet the immense challenge of heightened demand and costs. As long as pandemic-related economic pressures remain, these flexibilities should as well. Many children in this country rely on meals through schools and child care programs as a source of reliable and nutritious food. These meals can support their development and represent a wise investment from policymakers. CLASP encourages Congress in the future to support universal school meals so that all students can receive the nutrition they need without stigma or burdensome paperwork.

CLASP thanks Sens. Stabenow and Boozman and Reps. Scott and Foxx for their bipartisan work on this important piece of legislation. CLASP urges swift passage and looks forward to working with your office on legislative matters reducing poverty in this country. For more information, or to help answer any questions, please contact Tralonne Shorter, Director of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

INDIVAR DUTTA-GUPTA,  
Executive Director.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, long overdue legislation to address gun violence in our schools and neighborhoods. Although this legislation is far from perfect, it is an important step forward in solving the epidemic of gun violence that has gripped our nation for decades.

In the weeks following the tragedy in Uvalde at Robb Elementary and the racist attack at a grocery store in Buffalo, I spoke with many constituents who continue to urge action. Teachers, parents, and concerned community members from Northwest Oregon shared pleas for Congress to follow through on our responsibility to our children and our nation by immediately passing bold policies to implement gun safety reform. An educator I know told me that after Uvalde, she sat down with her students and told them she would take a bullet for them. Conversations like this are happening in classrooms across the country, but they shouldn't have to. Congress must provide all students with safe learning environments free from the threat of gun violence.

The House already passed a comprehensive slate of gun violence prevention legislation, and I look forward to building on that by voting for this legislation that came out of the bipartisan Senate negotiations.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help to protect Americans and make gun sales safer. The most effective way to protect communities from gun violence is to keep guns out of the hands of individuals who are a danger to themselves and others. This legislation will incentivize states to establish extreme risk protection order laws, enhance background checks for people under the age of 21, end straw purchasing, and penalize gun traffickers. It will also safeguard survivors of domestic violence by closing the so called "boyfriend loophole," prohibiting people convicted of domestic violence crimes from possessing firearms.

Additionally, this bill makes a robust investment in under Title IV-A of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Fully funding this important grant program will help to close the opportunity and resource gaps in our nation's public schools, and I'm pleased this bill recognizes the importance of this program in providing students of all backgrounds with a well-rounded, safe, and healthy education.

Although these actions to address gun violence in our communities and fund critical school improvement programs are important, I am concerned about how various provisions in the bill could harm Black and brown students and students with disabilities in our nation's schools. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act increases funding for school resource officers (SROs) and codifies further involvement of the Department of Homeland Security in education through threat assessments. Research and practice show that both SROs and threat assessments are ineffective in keeping students safe in schools. As Chair of the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, I remain committed to protecting students' civil rights and delivering on the promise of an equitable, world-class public education for each and every student in this country. I will closely monitor the implementation of this legislation to make sure our most marginalized and vulnerable students are not subject to further disproportionate discipline and discriminatory targeting in schools.

As a member of the Gun Violence Prevention Taskforce, I again want to recognize how crucial the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is to our schools, communities, and country. This bill will be the first substantive action on gun violence prevention since the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act in 1994. In the last 30 years, our nation has been devastated over and over again by horrific tragedies like we saw in recent weeks at Robb Elementary in Uvalde, Texas. We cannot bring back those who have been murdered, but we can enact meaningful laws that will prevent more senseless deaths.

I urge swift passage of the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The motion to concur was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT  
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE  
AND FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1204, I call up the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

Senate amendments to House amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

**SECTION 1. JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Courthouse and Federal Building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

**SEC. 2. LYNN C. WOOLSEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 4th Street in Petaluma, California, shall be known and designated as the "Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building".

**SEC. 3. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Safer Communities Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building.  
Sec. 2. Lynn C. Woolsey Post Office Building.  
Sec. 3. Short title; table of contents.

**DIVISION A—MENTAL HEALTH AND FIREARMS PROVISIONS**

**TITLE I—CHILDREN AND FAMILY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

Sec. 11001. Expansion of community mental health services demonstration program.  
Sec. 11002. Medicaid and telehealth.  
Sec. 11003. Supporting access to health care services in schools.  
Sec. 11004. Review of State implementation of early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services.  
Sec. 11005. Pediatric mental health care access grants.

**TITLE II—FIREARMS**

Sec. 12001. Juvenile records.  
Sec. 12002. Defining "engaged in the business".  
Sec. 12003. Use of Byrne grants for implementation of State crisis intervention programs.  
Sec. 12004. Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act.

Sec. 12005. Misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.

**TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS**

**Subtitle A—Extension of Moratorium**

Sec. 13101. Extension of moratorium on implementation of rule relating to eliminating the anti-kickback statute safe harbor protection for prescription drug rebates.

**Subtitle B—Medicare Improvement Fund**

Sec. 13201. Medicare Improvement Fund.

**Subtitle C—Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022**

Sec. 13301. Short title.

Sec. 13302. Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices.

Sec. 13303. Notification of clearinghouse.

Sec. 13304. Grant program review.

Sec. 13305. Rules of construction.

**Subtitle D—Amendment on ESEA Funding**

Sec. 13401. Amendment on ESEA funding.

**DIVISION B—APPROPRIATIONS**

**DIVISION A—MENTAL HEALTH AND FIREARMS PROVISIONS**

**TITLE I—CHILDREN AND FAMILY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**SEC. 11001. EXPANSION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

Section 223 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL PLANNING GRANTS FOR STATES.**—In addition to the planning grants awarded under paragraph (1), as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall award planning grants to States (other than States selected to conduct demonstration programs under paragraph (1) or (8) of subsection (d)) to develop proposals to participate in time-limited demonstration programs described in subsection (d) so that, beginning July 1, 2024, and every 2 years thereafter, up to 10 additional States may participate in the demonstration programs described in subsection (d) in accordance with paragraph (9) of that subsection.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(ii) by striking “Subject to paragraph (8)” and inserting “Subject to paragraphs (8) and (9)”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “that is furnished” and inserting “that is furnished by a State participating in an ongoing demonstration program under this subsection”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(iii)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking “September 30, 2023; and” and inserting “September 30, 2025.”;

(II) in subclause (II), by striking “under paragraph (8)” and all that follows through the period and inserting “under paragraph (8), during the first 24 fiscal quarter period (or any portion of such period) that the State participates in the demonstration program; and”;

(III) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) in the case of a State selected to participate in the demonstration program under paragraph (9), during the first 16 fiscal quarter period (or any portion of such period) that the State participates in the demonstration program.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting a State that participated in a demonstration program under this subsection that has ended from receiving Federal financial participation under title XIX of the Social Security Act for amounts

expended by the State under a State plan under such title (or a waiver of such plan) for providing medical assistance for items and services, and carrying out activities, including continuing to pay for services under the prospective payment system established under subsection (c), that were provided or carried out by the State under the demonstration program, to the extent such financial participation is otherwise available under such title.”;

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “through the year in which the last demonstration under this section ends” after “annually thereafter”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “December 31, 2021” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such recommendations shall include data collected after 2019, where feasible.”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **FINAL EVALUATION.**—Not later than 24 months after all demonstration programs under this section have ended, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final evaluation of such programs.”;

(D) in paragraph (8)(A), by striking “2 years” and all that follows through the period and inserting “6 years.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) **FURTHER ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the States selected under paragraphs (1) and (8), the Secretary shall select any State that meets the requirements described in subparagraph (B) to conduct a demonstration program that meets the requirements of this subsection for 4 years.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The requirements described in this subparagraph with respect to a State are that the State—

“(i) was awarded a planning grant under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (c); and

“(ii) submits an application (in addition to any application that the State may have previously submitted under this section) that includes the information described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(C) **REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTED STATES.**—The requirements applicable to States selected under paragraph (8) pursuant to subparagraph (C) of such paragraph shall apply in the same manner to States selected under this paragraph.

“(D) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary shall not select more than 10 States to conduct a demonstration program under this paragraph for each 2 fiscal year period.”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for purposes of awarding planning grants under subsection (c)(3), providing technical assistance to States applying for grants under such subsection, and carrying out demonstration programs under subsection (d), \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2023, to remain available until expended.”.

**SEC. 11002. MEDICAID AND TELEHEALTH.**

(a) **GUIDANCE TO STATES ON FURNISHING SERVICES THROUGH TELEHEALTH UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance and issue guidance to States on improving access to telehealth for services covered under Medicaid and CHIP, including with respect to:

(1) How States can adopt flexibilities under Medicaid and CHIP to expand access to covered services via telehealth, including when States may adopt such flexibilities without the need for approval of a State plan amendment or waiver.

(2) Best practices regarding billing for services, including recommended voluntary billing

codes, modifiers, and place of service designations and how such billing codes, modifiers, and designations can be used to create consistent data sets.

(3) Strategies for integrating telehealth services into value-based care models.

(4) Best practices from States that have used Medicaid waivers and other Medicaid authorities to expand access to telehealth, including during the COVID-19 public health emergency declared by the Secretary pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act on January 31, 2020, entitled “Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists Nationwide as the Result of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus”, including any renewal of such declaration.

(5) Strategies to promote the delivery of accessible and culturally competent care via telehealth, including addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities, medically underserved urban and rural communities, racial and ethnic minorities such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals of different age groups including children, young adults, and seniors;

(6) Strategies for training and providing resources to providers and patients on the use of telehealth, including working with interpreters to furnish health services and providing resources in multiple languages.

(7) Integrating the use of existing video platforms that enable multi-person video calls.

(8) Best practices to support the delivery of covered services under Medicaid and CHIP via telehealth in schools, including specifically for the provision of mental health and substance use disorder services in such settings.

(9) Strategies for evaluating how the delivery of health services via telehealth affects quality, outcomes, and cost under Medicaid and CHIP.

(10) Best practices for conveying information to beneficiaries regarding the availability of telehealth as an option to receive services covered under Medicaid and CHIP, including the availability of audio-only telehealth, the ability to receive such services from a patient’s home, and requirements related to in-person visits.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CHIP.**—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(2) **MEDICAID.**—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

**SEC. 11003. SUPPORTING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE SERVICES IN SCHOOLS.**

(a) **GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **GUIDANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall issue guidance to State Medicaid agencies, local educational agencies, and school-based entities to support the delivery of medical assistance to Medicaid and CHIP beneficiaries in school-based settings.

(B) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.**—The guidance issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) include updates to the May 2003 Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming Guide, the 1997 Medicaid and Schools Technical Assistance Guide, and other relevant guidance in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) clarify that payments may be made to school-based entities under Medicaid for delivering assistance under Medicaid, including any such assistance provided in accordance with an individualized education program or under the policy described in the State Medicaid Director letter on payment for services issued on December 15, 2014 (#14-006);

(iii) outline strategies and tools to reduce administrative burdens on, and simplify billing for, local educational agencies, in particular small and rural local educational agencies, and support compliance with Federal requirements regarding billing, payment, and recordkeeping, including by aligning direct service billing and school-based administrative claiming payment systems;

(iv) include a comprehensive list of best practices and examples of approved methods that State Medicaid agencies and local educational agencies have used to pay for, and increase the availability of, assistance under Medicaid, including expanding State programs to include all Medicaid-enrolled students, providing early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment (EPSDT) services in schools, utilizing telehealth, coordinating with community-based mental health and substance use disorder treatment providers and organizations, coordinating with managed care entities, and supporting the provision of culturally competent and trauma-informed care in school settings; and

(v) provide examples of the types of providers (which may include qualified school health personnel) that States may choose to enroll, deem, or otherwise treat as participating providers for purposes of school-based programs under Medicaid and best practices related to helping such providers enroll in Medicaid for purposes of participating in school-based programs under Medicaid.

(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall establish a technical assistance center to—

(i) assist and expand the capacity of State Medicaid agencies and local educational agencies and school-based entities to provide assistance under Medicaid;

(ii) reduce administrative burdens for such agencies and health centers or entities;

(iii) support State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and school-based entities in obtaining payment for the provision of assistance under Medicaid;

(iv) ensure ongoing coordination and collaboration between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education with respect to the provision of, and payment for, assistance under Medicaid by local educational agencies; and

(v) provide information to State and local educational agencies and States on how to utilize funding from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, and other Federal agencies to ensure payment under Medicaid for assistance provided in school-based settings.

(B) SMALL AND RURAL SCHOOLS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the technical assistance center includes resources which are specifically designed to help support small and rural local educational agencies in obtaining payment for the provision of assistance under Medicaid.

(C) REPORTING.—The technical assistance center shall, on a biennial basis, submit to the Secretary a report on the work of the center that identifies the areas where the most assistance was requested.

(3) FUNDING.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection, \$8,000,000, for fiscal year 2022, to remain available until expended.

(b) GRANTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 for the Secretary to award grants to States for the purpose of implementing, enhancing, or expanding the provision of assistance through school-based entities under Medicaid or CHIP. A State shall not use any grant funds to provide medical assistance, child health assistance, or other health services.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) CHIP.—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(2) INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term “individualized education program” has the meaning given such term in section 602(14) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401(14)).

(3) MEDICAID.—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(4) SCHOOL-BASED ENTITY.—The term “school-based entity” means—

(A) a school-based health center, as that term is defined in section 2110(c)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397jj(c)(9)); and

(B) an entity that provides medical assistance in a school-based setting for which Federal financial participation is allowed under Medicaid.

(5) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

(7) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The terms “State educational agency” and “local educational agency” have the meaning given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

**SEC. 11004. REVIEW OF STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF EARLY AND PERIODIC SCREENING, DIAGNOSTIC, AND TREATMENT SERVICES.**

(a) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall—

(A) review State implementation of the requirements for providing early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services under Medicaid in accordance with sections 1902(a)(43), 1905(a)(4)(B), and 1905(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(43), 1396d(a)(4)(B), 1396d(r)), including with respect to the provision of such services by managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers;

(B) identify gaps and deficiencies with respect to State compliance with such requirements;

(C) provide technical assistance to States to address such gaps and deficiencies; and

(D) issue guidance to States on the Medicaid coverage requirements for such services that includes best practices for ensuring children have access to comprehensive health care services, including children without a mental health or substance use disorder diagnosis.

(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after each date on which the Secretary completes the activities described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the most recent activities completed for purposes of such paragraph that includes the findings made, and descriptions of actions taken by the Secretary or by States as a result of such activities, and any additional actions the Secretary plans to carry out or that States are required to carry out as a result of such activities.

(3) FUNDING.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection, to remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, for each of fiscal years 2023 and 2024, and \$1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this subsection referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study evaluating State implementation under

Medicaid of the early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services benefit required for children by section 1905(a)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(4)(B)) and as defined in section 1905(r) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(r)) and provided in accordance with the requirements of section 1902(a)(43) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(43)), specifically with respect to State oversight of managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers, and shall provide recommendations as appropriate to improve State compliance with the requirements for providing such benefit, State oversight of managed care organizations, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, and primary care case managers, and oversight of State programs under Medicaid by the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) that includes the recommendations required by such paragraph, as well as recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MEDICAID.—The term “Medicaid” means the program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(2) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) for purposes of titles XIX and XXI of such Act.

**SEC. 11005. PEDIATRIC MENTAL HEALTH CARE ACCESS GRANTS.**

Section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–19) is amended—

(1) in the section enumerator, by striking “330M” and inserting “330M.”;

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or cooperative agreements” after “award grants”; and

(B) by striking “Indian tribes and tribal organizations” and inserting “Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a grant” and inserting “an award”;

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by inserting “developmental-behavioral pediatricians,” after “psychiatrists.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “provide information to pediatric health care providers about available mental health services for children in the community and” before “assist”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (I), by striking “problems” and inserting “conditions”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS AND EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the activities required under paragraph (1), a pediatric mental health care access program referred to in subsection (a), with respect to which an award under such subsection may be used, may provide information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance to—

“(i) emergency departments; and

“(ii) State educational agencies, local educational agencies, Tribal educational agencies, and elementary and secondary schools.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN RECIPIENTS.—An entity receiving information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall operate in a

manner consistent with, and shall ensure consistency with, the requirements of subsections (a) and (c) of section 4001 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with respect to such information, consultative support, training, and technical assistance.”; and

(D) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting “, and which may include a developmental-behavioral pediatrician” before the period at the end of the first sentence;

(4) in subsections (c), (d), and (f), by striking “Indian tribe, or tribal organization” each place it appears and inserting “Indian Tribe, or Tribal organization”;

(5) in subsections (c) and (d)—

(A) by striking “a grant” each place it appears and inserting “an award”; and

(B) by striking “such grant” each place it appears and inserting “such award”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “grants” and inserting “awards”;

(7) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “award a grant” and inserting “make an award”; and

(B) by striking “the grant” and inserting “the award”;

(8) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h);

(9) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may—

“(1) provide, or continue to provide, technical assistance to recipients of awards under subsection (a); and

“(2) award a grant or contract to an eligible public or nonprofit private entity (as determined by the Secretary) for the purpose of providing such technical assistance pursuant to this subsection.”; and

(10) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking “\$9,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022” and inserting “\$31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027”.

#### TITLE II—FIREARMS

##### SEC. 12001. JUVENILE RECORDS.

(a) IMPROVING NICS EXAMINATION OF JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, including as a juvenile” after “such person.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “at 16 years of age or older” after “institution”; and

(B) in subsection (t)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(aa) by inserting “subject to subparagraph (C),” before “3 business days”; and

(bb) by striking “and” at the end;

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(III) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) in the case of a person less than 21 years of age, in addition to all other requirements of this chapter—

“(i) the system provides the licensee with a unique identification number;

“(ii) 3 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d); or

“(iii) in the case of such a person with respect to whom the system notifies the licensee in accordance with clause (ii) that cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d), 10 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that—

“(I) transferring the firearm to the other person would violate subsection (d) of this section; or

“(II) receipt of a firearm by the other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section, or State, local, or Tribal law; and”;

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by inserting “transfer or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”;

(iii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by inserting “transfer of a firearm to or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”;

(iv) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting “transfer of a firearm to or” before “receipt”; and

(II) by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d), (g), or (n) (as applicable)”.

(2) NICS REQUIREMENTS.—Section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR PERSONS UNDER AGE 21.—If a licensee contacts the system established under this section regarding a proposed transfer of a firearm to a person less than 21 years of age in accordance with subsection (t) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, the system shall—

“(A) immediately contact—

“(A) the criminal history repository or juvenile justice information system, as appropriate, of the State in which the person resides for the purpose of determining whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922;

“(B) the appropriate State custodian of mental health adjudication records in the State in which the person resides to determine whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922; and

“(C) a local law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction in which the person resides for the purpose of determining whether the person has a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922;

“(2) as soon as possible, but in no case more than 3 business days, after the licensee contacts the system, notify the licensee whether cause exists to further investigate a possibly disqualifying juvenile record under subsection (d) of such section 922; and

“(3) if there is cause for further investigation, as soon as possible, but in no case more than 10 business days, after the licensee contacts the system, notify the licensee whether—

“(A) transfer of a firearm to the person would violate subsection (d) of such section 922; or

“(B) receipt of a firearm by the person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of such section 922, or State, local, or Tribal law.”.

(3) SUNSET OF REQUIREMENTS TO CONTACT STATE AND LOCAL ENTITIES.—Effective on September 30, 2032, paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended by those paragraphs are restored as if those paragraphs had not been enacted.

(b) REPORT ON REMOVING OUTDATED, EXPIRED, OR ERRONEOUS RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On an annual basis for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2032, each State and Federal agency responsible for the submission of disqualifying records under subsection (d), (g), or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, to the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report detailing the removal from the system of records that no longer prohibit an individual from lawfully acquiring or possessing a firearm under such subsection (d), (g), or (n).

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted by a State or Federal agency under paragraph (1) shall include pertinent information on—

(A) the number of records that the State or Federal agency removed from the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) during the reporting period;

(B) why the records were removed; and

(C) for each record removed, the nature of the disqualifying characteristic outlined in subsection (d), (g), or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, that caused the State or Federal agency to originally submit the record to the system.

##### SEC. 12002. DEFINING “ENGAGED IN THE BUSINESS”.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (21)(C), by striking “with the principal objective of livelihood and profit” and inserting “to predominantly earn a profit”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (22) through (29) as paragraphs (23) through (30), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

“(22) The term ‘to predominantly earn a profit’ means that the intent underlying the sale or disposition of firearms is predominantly one of obtaining pecuniary gain, as opposed to other intents, such as improving or liquidating a personal firearms collection: Provided, That proof of profit shall not be required as to a person who engages in the regular and repetitive purchase and disposition of firearms for criminal purposes or terrorism. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘terrorism’ means activity, directed against United States persons, which—

“(A) is committed by an individual who is not a national or permanent resident alien of the United States;

“(B) involves violent acts or acts dangerous to human life which would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States; and

“(C) is intended—

“(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

“(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

“(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.”.

##### SEC. 12003. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or civil proceedings” after “criminal justice”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) Implementation of State crisis intervention court proceedings and related programs or initiatives, including but not limited to—

“(i) mental health courts;

“(ii) drug courts;

“(iii) veterans courts; and

“(iv) extreme risk protection order programs, which must include, at a minimum—

“(I) pre-deprivation and post-deprivation due process rights that prevent any violation or infringement of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive or procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). Such programs must include, at the appropriate phase to prevent any violation of constitutional rights, at minimum, notice, the right to an in-person hearing, an unbiased adjudicator, the right to know opposing evidence, the right to present evidence, and the right to confront adverse witnesses;

“(II) the right to be represented by counsel at no expense to the government;

“(III) pre-deprivation and post-deprivation heightened evidentiary standards and proof which mean not less than the protections afforded to a similarly situated litigant in Federal court or promulgated by the State’s evidentiary body, and sufficient to ensure the full protections of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive and procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). The heightened evidentiary standards and proof under such programs must, at all appropriate phases to prevent any violation of any constitutional right, at minimum, prevent reliance upon evidence that is unsworn or unaffirmed, irrelevant, based on inadmissible hearsay, unreliable, vague, speculative, and lacking a foundation; and

“(IV) penalties for abuse of the program.”.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.—Section 501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) ANNUAL REPORT ON CRISIS INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.—The Attorney General shall publish an annual report with respect to grants awarded for crisis intervention programs or initiatives under subsection (a)(1)(I) that contains—

“(1) a description of the grants awarded and the crisis intervention programs or initiatives funded by the grants, broken down by grant recipient;

“(2) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the crisis intervention programs or initiatives in preventing violence and suicide;

“(3) measures that have been taken by each grant recipient to safeguard the constitutional rights of an individual subject to a crisis intervention program or initiative; and

“(4) efforts that the Attorney General is making, in coordination with the grant recipients, to protect the constitutional rights of individuals subject to the crisis intervention programs or initiatives.”.

**SEC. 12004. STOP ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS ACT.**

(a) ANTI-STRAW PURCHASING AND FIREARMS TRAFFICKING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§932. Straw purchasing of firearms**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘drug trafficking crime’—

“(A) has the meaning given that term in section 924(c)(2); and

“(B) includes a felony punishable under the law of a State for which the conduct constituting the offense would constitute a felony punishable under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

“(2) the term ‘Federal crime of terrorism’ has the meaning given that term in section 2332b(g)(5); and

“(3) the term ‘felony’ means any offense under Federal or State law punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

“(b) VIOLATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly purchase, or conspire to purchase, any firearm in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce for, on behalf of, or at the request or demand of any other person, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such other person—

“(1) meets the criteria of 1 or more paragraphs of section 922(d);

“(2) intends to use, carry, possess, or sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm in furtherance of a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime; or

“(3) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm to a person described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(c) PENALTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) USE IN FELONIES, CRIMES OF TERRORISM, OR DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIMES.—If a violation of subsection (b) is committed knowing or with reasonable cause to believe that any firearm involved will be used to commit a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime, the person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not more than 25 years.

**“§933. Trafficking in firearms**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

“(1) ship, transport, transfer, cause to be transported, or otherwise dispose of any firearm to another person in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if such person knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the use, carrying, or possession of a firearm by the recipient would constitute a felony (as defined in section 932(a));

“(2) receive from another person any firearm in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the recipient knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such receipt would constitute a felony; or

“(3) attempt or conspire to commit the conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

**“§934. Forfeiture and fines**

“(a) FORFEITURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933 shall forfeit to the United States, irrespective of any provision of State law—

“(A) any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of such violation; and

“(B) any of the person’s property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation, except that for any forfeiture of any firearm or ammunition pursuant to this section, section 924(d) shall apply.

“(2) IMPOSITION.—The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of a violation of section 932 or 933, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed pursuant to section 932 or 933, that the person forfeit to the United States all property described in paragraph (1).

“(b) FINES.—A defendant who derives profits or other proceeds from an offense under section 932 or 933 may be fined not more than the greater of—

“(1) the fine otherwise authorized by this part; or

“(2) the amount equal to twice the gross profits or other proceeds of the offense under section 932 or 933.”.

(2) TITLE III AUTHORIZATION.—Section 2516(1)(n) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 922 and 924” and inserting “section 922, 924, 932, or 933”.

(3) RACKETEERING AMENDMENT.—Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “section 932 (relating to straw purchasing), section 933 (relating to trafficking in firearms),” before “section 1028”.

(4) MONEY LAUNDERING AMENDMENT.—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 924(n)” and inserting “section 924(n), 932, or 933”.

(5) DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to ensure that persons convicted of an offense under section

932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, and other offenses applicable to the straw purchases and trafficking of firearms are subject to increased penalties in comparison to those currently provided by the guidelines and policy statements for such straw purchasing and trafficking of firearms offenses. In its review, the Commission shall consider, in particular, an appropriate amendment to reflect the intent of Congress that straw purchasers without significant criminal histories receive sentences that are sufficient to deter participation in such activities and reflect the defendant’s role and culpability, and any coercion, domestic violence survivor history, or other mitigating factors. The Commission shall also review and amend its guidelines and policy statements to reflect the intent of Congress that a person convicted of an offense under section 932 or 933 of title 18, United States Code, who is affiliated with a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise should be subject to higher penalties than an otherwise unaffiliated individual.

(6) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“932. Straw purchasing of firearms.

“933. Trafficking in firearms.

“934. Forfeiture and fines.”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 922(d).—Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by striking the matter following paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

“(10) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition in furtherance of a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking offense (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)); or

“(11) intends to sell or otherwise dispose of the firearm or ammunition to a person described in any of paragraphs (1) through (10).

This subsection shall not apply with respect to the sale or disposition of a firearm or ammunition to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector who pursuant to subsection (b) of section 925 is not precluded from dealing in firearms or ammunition, or to a person who has been granted relief from disabilities pursuant to subsection (c) of section 925.”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(a).—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “(d), (g),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (d) or (g) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(d).—Section 924(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “932, or 933,” after “section 924.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) any offense under section 932 or 933.”.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(h).—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) Whoever knowingly receives or transfers a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearm or ammunition will be used to commit a felony, a Federal

crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)), or a crime under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), or the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”

(f) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 924(k).—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

“(k)(1) A person who smuggles or knowingly brings into the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

“(A) is punishable under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46; or

“(B) constitutes a felony, a Federal crime of terrorism, or a drug trafficking crime (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) A person who smuggles or knowingly takes out of the United States a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, with intent to engage in or to promote conduct that—

“(A) would be punishable under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46, if the conduct had occurred within the United States; or

“(B) would constitute a felony or a Federal crime of terrorism (as such terms are defined in section 932(a)) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, if the conduct had occurred within the United States, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.”

(g) PROHIBITION ON FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION TRANSFERS TO AGENTS OF DRUG CARTELS.—The Department of Justice, and any of its law enforcement coordinate agencies, shall not conduct or otherwise facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm or ammunition to an individual if any law enforcement officer employed by the Department of Justice involved with the transfer knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the recipient of the firearm or ammunition is an agent of a drug cartel, unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm or ammunition at all times.

(h) FFL ACCESS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901(b)), is amended—

(A) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) VOLUNTARY BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing licensees to use the national instant criminal background check system established under this section for purposes of voluntarily conducting an employment background check relating to a current or prospective employee. The Attorney General may not collect a fee for an employment background check under this subparagraph.

“(B) NOTICE.—Before conducting an employment background check relating to a current or prospective employee under subparagraph (A), a licensee shall—

“(i) provide written notice to the current or prospective employee that the licensee intends to conduct the background check; and

“(ii) obtain consent to conduct the background check from the current or prospective employee in writing.

“(C) EXEMPTION.—An employment background check conducted by a licensee under

subparagraph (A) shall not be governed by the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

“(D) APPEAL.—Any individual who is the subject of an employment background check conducted by a licensee under subparagraph (A) the result of which indicates that the individual is prohibited from possessing a firearm or ammunition pursuant to subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, may appeal the results of the background check in the same manner and to the same extent as if the individual had been the subject of a background check relating to the transfer of a firearm.”

(2) ACQUISITION, PRESERVATION, AND EXCHANGE OF IDENTIFICATION RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) provide a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18 with information necessary to verify whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “, except for dissemination authorized under subsection (a)(5) of this section” before the period.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and without regard to chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to receive access to records of stolen firearms maintained by the National Crime Information Center operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, solely for the purpose of voluntarily verifying whether firearms offered for sale to such licensees have been stolen.

(4) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION; EVIDENCE.—

(A) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection shall be construed—

(i) to create a cause of action against any person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, or any other person for any civil liability; or

(ii) to establish any standard of care.

(B) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, evidence regarding the use or non-use by a person licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, of the systems, information, or records made available under this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity.

(i) FUNDING FOR EXISTING ATF ANTI-STRAW PURCHASING CAMPAIGN.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to continue and expand current efforts with existing partners to educate persons licensed as an importer, manufacturer, or dealer of firearms under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, and the public to combat illegal straw purchases of firearms.

(j) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT REIMBURSEMENT FOR ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO DHS-HSI TO PREVENT ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING.—Section 432(d)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 240(d)(2)) is amended by inserting “salary reimbursement,” after “administrative.”

(k) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or an amendment made by this section, shall be construed to allow the establishment of a Federal system of registration of firearms, firearms owners, or firearms transactions or dispositions.

## SEC. 12005. MISDEMEANOR CRIME OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINING “DATING RELATIONSHIP”.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (33)(A)(ii)—

(A) by striking “or by a person” and inserting “by a person”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or by a person who has a current or recent former dating relationship with the victim”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(37)(A) The term ‘dating relationship’ means a relationship between individuals who have or have recently had a continuing serious relationship of a romantic or intimate nature.

“(B) Whether a relationship constitutes a dating relationship under subparagraph (A) shall be determined based on consideration of—

“(i) the length of the relationship;

“(ii) the nature of the relationship; and

“(iii) the frequency and type of interaction between the individuals involved in the relationship.

“(C) A casual acquaintanceship or ordinary fraternization in a business or social context does not constitute a dating relationship under subparagraph (A).”

(b) NO RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any conviction of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence entered before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON CONVICTIONS OF CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WITH RESPECT TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.—Section 921(a)(33) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C)”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “State,,” and inserting “State,;” and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against an individual in a dating relationship for purposes of this chapter if the conviction has been expunged or set aside, or is an offense for which the person has been pardoned or has had firearm rights restored unless the expungement, pardon, or restoration of rights expressly provides that the person may not ship, transport, possess, or receive firearms: Provided, That, in the case of a person who has not more than 1 conviction of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against an individual in a dating relationship, and is not otherwise prohibited under this chapter, the person shall not be disqualified from shipping, transport, possession, receipt, or purchase of a firearm under this chapter if 5 years have elapsed from the later of the judgment of conviction or the completion of the person’s custodial or supervisory sentence, if any, and the person has not subsequently been convicted of another such offense, a misdemeanor under Federal, State, Tribal, or local law which has, as an element, the use or attempted use of physical force, or the threatened use of a deadly weapon, or any other offense that would disqualify the person under section 922(g). The national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) shall be updated to reflect the status of the person. Restoration under this subparagraph is not available for a current or former spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim, a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, parent, or guardian, or a person similarly situated to a spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim.”

## TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

## Subtitle A—Extension of Moratorium

**SEC. 13101. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RULE RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE SAFE HARBOR PROTECTION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG REBATES.**

Section 90006 of division I of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7b note) is amended by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2027”.

## Subtitle B—Medicare Improvement Fund

**SEC. 13201. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.**

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2021, \$5,000,000” and inserting “fiscal year 2022, \$7,500,000,000”.

## Subtitle C—Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022

**SEC. 13301. SHORT TITLE.**

This subtitle may be cited as the “Luke and Alex School Safety Act of 2022”.

**SEC. 13302. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SCHOOL SAFETY EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XXII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 2220D. FEDERAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON SCHOOL SAFETY EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall establish a Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices (in this section referred to as the ‘Clearinghouse’) within the Department.

“(2) PURPOSE.—The Clearinghouse shall serve as a Federal resource to identify and publish online through SchoolSafety.gov, or any successor website, evidence-based practices and recommendations to improve school safety for use by State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, State and local law enforcement agencies, health professionals, and the general public.

“(3) PERSONNEL.—

“(A) ASSIGNMENTS.—The Clearinghouse shall be assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(B) DETAILEES.—The Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services may detail personnel to the Clearinghouse.

“(4) EXEMPTIONS.—

“(A) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act’), shall not apply to any rulemaking or information collection required under this section.

“(B) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply for the purposes of carrying out this section.

“(b) CLEARINGHOUSE CONTENTS.—

“(1) CONSULTATION.—In identifying the evidence-based practices and recommendations for the Clearinghouse, the Secretary shall—

“(A) consult with appropriate Federal, State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations, including civil rights and disability rights organizations; and

“(B) consult with the Secretary of Education to ensure that evidence-based practices published by the Clearinghouse are aligned with evidence-based practices to support a positive and safe learning environment for all students.

“(2) CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse shall—

“(A) include comprehensive evidence-based school safety measures;

“(B) include the evidence or research rationale supporting the determination of the Clearinghouse that the evidence-based practice or recommendation under subparagraph (A) has been shown to have a significant effect on improving the health, safety, and welfare of persons in school settings, including—

“(i) relevant research that is evidence-based, as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801), supporting the evidence-based practice or recommendation;

“(ii) findings and data from previous Federal or State commissions recommending improvements to the safety posture of a school; or

“(iii) other supportive evidence or findings relied upon by the Clearinghouse in determining evidence-based practices and recommendations, as determined in consultation with the officers described in subsection (a)(3)(B);

“(C) include information on Federal programs for which implementation of each evidence-based practice or recommendation is an eligible use for the program;

“(D) be consistent with Federal civil rights laws, including title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.); and

“(E) include options for developmentally appropriate recommendations for use in educational settings with respect to children’s ages and physical, social, sensory, and emotionally developmental statuses.

“(3) PAST COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Clearinghouse shall present, as determined in consultation with the officers described in subsection (a)(3)(B), Federal, State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organization issued best practices and recommendations and identify any best practice or recommendation of the Clearinghouse that was previously issued by any such organization or commission.

“(c) ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Secretary may produce and publish materials on the Clearinghouse to assist and train educational agencies and law enforcement agencies on the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations.

“(d) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) collect for the purpose of continuous improvement of the Clearinghouse—

“(A) Clearinghouse data analytics;

“(B) user feedback on the implementation of resources, evidence-based practices, and recommendations identified by the Clearinghouse; and

“(C) any evaluations conducted on implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(2) in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Attorney General—

“(A) regularly assess and identify Clearinghouse evidence-based practices and recommendations for which there are no resources available through Federal Government programs for implementation; and

“(B) establish an external advisory board, which shall be comprised of appropriate State, local, Tribal, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations, including organizations representing parents of elementary and secondary school students, representative from civil rights organizations, representatives of disability rights organizations, representatives of educators, representatives of law enforcement, and nonprofit school safety and security organizations, to—

“(i) provide feedback on the implementation of evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

“(ii) propose additional recommendations for evidence-based practices for inclusion in the

Clearinghouse that meet the requirements described in subsection (b)(2)(B).

“(e) PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The Clearinghouse shall produce materials in accessible formats to assist parents and legal guardians of students with identifying relevant Clearinghouse resources related to supporting the implementation of Clearinghouse evidence-based practices and recommendations.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Sec. 2220D. Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices.”.

**SEC. 13303. NOTIFICATION OF CLEARINGHOUSE.**

(a) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.—The Secretary of Education shall provide written notification of the publication of the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Evidence-based Practices (referred to in this section and section 13304 as the ‘Clearinghouse’), as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State and local educational agency; and

(2) other Department of Education partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Education.

(b) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State homeland security advisor;

(2) every State department of homeland security; and

(3) other Department of Homeland Security partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State department of public health; and

(2) other Department of Health and Human Services partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(d) NOTIFICATION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide written notification of the publication of the Clearinghouse, as required to be established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 13302 of this Act, to—

(1) every State department of justice; and

(2) other Department of Justice partners in the implementation of the evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General.

**SEC. 13304. GRANT PROGRAM REVIEW.**

(a) FEDERAL GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Clearinghouse or the external advisory board established under section 2220D of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by this subtitle, shall—

(1) review grant programs and identify any grant program that may be used to implement evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse;

(2) identify any evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse for which there is not a Federal grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing the evidence-based practice or recommendation as applicable to the agency; and

(3) periodically report any findings under paragraph (2) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(b) STATE GRANTS AND RESOURCES.—The Clearinghouse shall, to the extent practicable, identify, for each State—

(1) each agency responsible for school safety in the State, or any State that does not have such an agency designated;

(2) any grant program that may be used for the purposes of implementing evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse; and

(3) any resources other than grant programs that may be used to assist in implementation of evidence-based practices and recommendations of the Clearinghouse.

#### SEC. 13305. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed to create, satisfy, or waive any requirement under—

(1) title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.);

(2) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.);

(3) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(4) title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.); or

(5) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(b) PROHIBITION ON FEDERALLY DEVELOPED, MANDATED, OR ENDORSED CURRICULUM.—Nothing in this subtitle or the amendments made by this subtitle shall be construed to authorize any officer or employee of the Federal Government to engage in an activity otherwise prohibited under section 103(b) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3403(b)).

#### Subtitle D—Amendment on ESEA Funding

#### SEC. 13401. AMENDMENT ON ESEA FUNDING.

Section 8526 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7906) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) for the provision to any person of a dangerous weapon, as defined in section 930(g)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or training in the use of a dangerous weapon.”.

#### DIVISION B—APPROPRIATIONS

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

##### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, to meet additional resource needs of the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

##### STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

##### OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

##### STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance”, \$1,400,000,000, to remain available until expended, for grants to be administered by the Office of Justice Programs: Provided, That \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended,

shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026—

(1) \$750,000,000 shall be awarded pursuant to the formula allocation (adjusted in proportion to the relative amounts statutorily designated therefor) that was used in the fiscal year prior to the year for which funds are provided for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program, as authorized by subpart I of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts of 1968 (Public Law 90–351) (the “1968 Act”), and shall be for the purposes described in section 501(a)(1)(I) of title I of the 1968 Act, as amended by title II of division A of this Act: Provided further, That the allocation provisions under sections 505(a) through (e), the special rules for Puerto Rico under section 505(g), and section 1001(c) of title I of the 1968 Act shall not apply to the amount described in this paragraph;

(2) \$200,000,000 shall be for grants administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance for purposes authorized under the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115–141);

(3) \$200,000,000 shall be for grants to the States to upgrade criminal and mental health records for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, including grants to assist States in providing disqualifying juvenile records under subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code: Provided further, That the grants described in this paragraph shall be available to State criminal record repositories and State court systems; and

(4) \$250,000,000 shall be for a community violence intervention and prevention initiative.

##### COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

##### COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Community Oriented Policing Services Programs”, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for competitive grants to be administered by the Community Oriented Policing Services Office for purposes authorized under the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115–141): Provided, That \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026.

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 21001. None of the funds made available by this title may be transferred in this or any future fiscal year pursuant to the authority in section 205 of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022, or any successor provision in a subsequently enacted appropriations Act.

SEC. 21002. (a) The Department of Justice shall provide a detailed spend plan for the fiscal year 2022 and 2023 funds made available in this title to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the enactment of this Act and, for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026, as part of the annual budget submission of the President

under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Attorney General shall submit a detailed spend plan for the funds made available in this title in that fiscal year.

(b) The spend plan described in subsection (a) shall include a specific and detailed description of the intended administration, review processes, allowable purposes, eligibility requirements, and priority areas or weightings for the grant programs funded in this title.

##### TITLE II

##### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

##### HEALTH SURVEILLANCE AND PROGRAM SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Health Surveillance and Program Support”, \$800,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025: Provided, That \$312,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 2022, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, and \$162,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, unless stated otherwise—

(1) \$250,000,000 shall be for grants for the community mental health services block grant program under subpart I of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act;

(2) \$40,000,000 shall be for National Child Traumatic Stress Network;

(3) \$240,000,000 shall be for activities and services under Project AWARE, of which no less than \$28,000,000 shall be for activities described in section 7134 of Public Law 115–271;

(4) \$120,000,000 shall be for Mental Health Awareness Training; and

(5) \$150,000,000 shall be for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline for fiscal year 2022.

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$190,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026: Provided, That \$82,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2022, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$32,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$12,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, unless stated otherwise—

(1) \$60,000,000 shall be for primary care training and enhancement under section 747 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293k) to provide mental and behavioral health care training as part of the training of pediatricians and other primary care clinicians who plan to provide care for pediatric populations and other vulnerable populations, such as victims of abuse or trauma, and individuals with mental health or substance use disorders: Provided further, That section 747(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 293k(c)(2)) shall not apply to funding made available in this paragraph: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to “Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Workforce”;



(2) \$80,000,000 shall be for pediatric mental health care access under section 330M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-19), in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to “Health Resources and Services Administration—Maternal and Child Health”;

(3) \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for carrying out subsection (b) of section 11003 of division A of this Act for fiscal year 2022: Provided further, That such funds shall be transferred to “Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—Grants to States for Medicaid”.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “School Improvement Programs”, \$1,050,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2025, for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV and part B of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “ESEA”), in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: Provided, That \$50,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2023, shall be for carrying out part B of title IV of the ESEA: Provided further, That the Secretary shall increase support for the implementation of evidence-based practices intended to increase attendance and engagement of students in the middle grades and high school in community learning centers using funds in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That \$1,000,000,000 shall be for activities under section 4108 of the ESEA and, notwithstanding section 4105 of such Act, States shall make awards on a competitive basis to high-need local educational agencies as determined by the State.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For an additional amount for “Safe Schools and Citizenship Education”, \$1,000,000,000, to remain available through December 31, 2026: Provided, That \$200,000,000, to remain available until March 31, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2022, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2023, shall be made available for fiscal year 2023, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, shall be made available for fiscal year 2024, \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2025, shall be made available for fiscal year 2025, and \$200,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2026, shall be made available for fiscal year 2026: Provided further, That not more than two percent of each of such amounts may be used for program administration, technical assistance, data collection, and dissemination of best practices: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, the following amounts shall be available for the following purposes in equal amounts for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026—

(1) \$500,000,000 shall be for carrying out School Based Mental Health Services Grants, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes; and

(2) \$500,000,000 shall be for carrying out Mental Health Services Professional Demonstration Grants, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 22001. None of the funds made available by this title may be transferred in this or any future fiscal year pursuant to the authority in section 205 or section 302 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022 (division H of Public Law 117-103), or any successor provision in a subsequently enacted appropriations Act, or section 241(a) of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 22002. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education shall each provide a detailed spend plan of an-

anticipated uses of funds made available to their respective Departments in this title, including estimated personnel and administrative costs, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That such plans shall be updated and submitted to such Committees every 60 days until all funds are expended: Provided further, That the spend plans shall be accompanied by a listing of each contract obligation incurred that exceeds \$5,000,000 which has not previously been reported, including the amount of each such obligation: Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be briefed on obligations quarterly until all funds are expended.

SEC. 22003. Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Education shall each provide biweekly obligation reports for funds made available to their respective Departments in this title, including anticipated uses of funds made available in this title, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That such reports shall be updated and submitted biweekly to the Committees until all funds are expended.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS DIVISION

SEC. 23001. Each amount appropriated or made available by this division is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 23002. No part of any appropriation contained in this division shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 23003. Unless otherwise provided for by this division, the additional amounts appropriated by this division to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 23004. Each amount provided by this division is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 23005. (a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of each division of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of each division of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this division shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4001 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

This division may be cited as the “Bipartisan Safer Communities Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022”.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to make our communities safer.”.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. NADLER moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 2938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 2938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not comment on the decision of the Supreme Court, just minutes ago, to revoke the constitutional right to abortion, a right that millions of Americans have relied upon for half a century.

Worse, Justice Thomas has indicated that this is merely the beginning of a radical, rightwing effort to roll back other rights, including the right to contraception, the right to marry whomever we choose, and the fundamental right to privacy.

We should observe that the same Justices telling us today that questions about reproductive rights must be left to the States, told us just yesterday that the States cannot be trusted to regulate modern firearms, weapons that were never dreamed of by the Framers of the Second Amendment. History will prove these activists wrong on both counts.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we take a historic first step toward ending the epidemic of gun violence in this Nation, the only developed Nation with this problem.

We come to this moment after the tragic loss of so many innocent lives: 10 African Americans in Buffalo, targeted because of their race; 19 young students and 2 teachers in Uvalde, just a few days short of their summer vacations; scores more lost in other mass shootings too numerous to mention; and over 100 more Americans killed every day in gun violence that never makes the headlines.

No piece of legislation can ever bring these lives back. No legislation can make their families or their communities whole. But we can act to keep others from facing the same trauma they have endured.

A few weeks ago, I was proud to bring forth the Protecting Our Kids Act,

which took a bipartisan and comprehensive approach to ending gun violence. I am pleased that the Senate incorporated portions of that bill into their own legislation.

I wish there was more. I wish we could say we were doing everything we could to prevent another parent from losing their child to gun violence, but I am proud to be making an important start today.

This cannot be the last step, but we also cannot let another day go by without taking action to make our communities safer and to keep even one more family whole.

Recently, I have turned to a particular teaching in the Talmud:

Whoever takes one life, it is as if he kills the entire world; and whoever saves one life, it is as if he saves the entire world.

This legislation includes provisions that will save many lives. Like the Protecting Our Kids Act, it includes funding to implement extreme risk protection laws and the prohibition on straw purchasing. It also strengthens background checks for those under 21, makes more sellers responsible for conducting background checks, takes steps to address the boyfriend loophole, and provides significant funding for programs that will make our communities safer.

Today, we will send legislation to the President's desk, for the first time in decades, that will make progress toward ending the scourge of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say, God bless the United States Supreme Court. And God bless President Trump for the people he selected for our highest court. Today's decision is a win for the Constitution and a win for the sanctity of human life. June 24, 2022, a date that will be remembered as a win for the sacredness of human life.

Now this bill. Mr. Speaker, the rights spelled out in the First Amendment and protected by the Second Amendment are why the United States is different than every other country. It is why we are special. It is why we are the greatest Nation in history.

For 18 months, the Democrats have attacked our First Amendment liberties. Today, they are coming after our Second Amendment liberties. And who knows what it will be tomorrow. I can only imagine.

My guess is, in light of the decision yesterday from Justice Thomas, the decision today from the Court, my guess is they are going to look to pack the Court. The Democrat chair of the Committee on the Judiciary has already introduced legislation to pack the Court.

It might be amnesty for the 2 million illegal immigrants who have come into

our country in the Biden administration. They told us they want to end the electoral college and the filibuster—and who knows what it will be tomorrow. But today, they are coming after law-abiding American citizens' Second Amendment liberties.

Understand what this legislation does. This legislation tells States: Someone who doesn't like you can report you to law enforcement or to a judge. There will be a hearing, a hearing where you can't be at, your lawyer can't be at, you can't confront your accuser. You didn't commit any crime, but they can take your property. They can take your guns. They can take away your Second Amendment rights. And then you have to petition to have a subsequent hearing where you get them back. That is what this legislation does.

And understand this, and this is so important. This is not being done in a vacuum. Understand what we have seen from the left and how they have weaponized a government against their political enemies.

Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago, it was the IRS targeting conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, it was the FBI spying on President Trump's campaign.

More recently, it was the Department of Justice using counterterrorism measures against moms and dads.

Just a few weeks ago, the Department of Homeland Security set up the Disinformation Governance Board; going to chill everyone's speech. Today, they are coming after your Second Amendment liberties.

Here is the good news: Yesterday, the Supreme Court got it right. They got it right when it came to the Second Amendment. We should celebrate that. I hope that this bill doesn't pass. It seems like it is going to, but I hope it doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his extraordinary leadership in bringing this very important legislation to the floor. I commend the chairman, as well as Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, the chair of our Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, and so many others who have participated in so many elements of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, a strong step forward to combat America's epidemic of gun violence and to protect our precious children.

As lawmakers, we share a sacred responsibility to keep our kids safe from harm. But according to new data from the CDC, guns are the number one killer of children in America; more than car accidents or cancer. Our hearts remain shattered by the rampage at Robb Elementary School in Uvalde, as

they do from the massacre at Sandy Hook, and countless other communities across the Nation.

Indeed, we know these schools could have been in any one of our districts—and have been in some, those families could have been any one of our neighbors—and have been, and those children could have been our own.

All of us who have met with survivors in the wake of the tragedies have heard their message loud and clear. We must do something.

Today, in their honor, we heed their powerful cry, sending a major gun violence prevention legislation to President Biden's desk for signature. We send it to the President for his signature, with gratitude for his leadership on this important issue. He was the author of the Brady Law in 1994 and has been a champion ever since.

This legislation, the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, includes several strong steps to save lives not only from horrific mass shootings, but also from the daily massacre of gun crime, suicide, and tragic accidents.

Included in this package are two major provisions which we have championed here in the House:

First, this bill includes significant investments to help States establish Extreme Risk Protection Order Laws, otherwise known as red flag laws.

Thanks to the leadership of Representative LUCY MCBATH, who has been our inspirational leader on this subject in our caucus and this Congress, and SALUD CARBAJAL, these provisions will keep deadly weapons away from those who pose a threat to themselves and to others.

Secondly, this bill takes strong action to combat straw purchases, a cause Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY spearheaded in our Chamber. Although we hear about the notorious mass murders every day on our streets and in our country, murders take place. Doing so will make it illegal to buy guns on behalf of those who cannot legally purchase.

If I can pass the test, I buy the gun. And then I sell it to you because you can't pass the test.

Straw purchase. Very dangerous. This bill addresses that. That is a giant step.

This package also includes additional initiatives that will help reduce the danger of gun violence across our country. We are moving toward closing the boyfriend loophole: a victory to help protect survivors of domestic violence and to stop known abusers from acquiring a gun. This has long been a priority.

We are strengthening background checks for potential buyers under 21, which would have applied to the 18-year-old gunman at Uvalde. And we are making enormous investments in mental health programs, school safety programs, and community-based violence prevention initiatives.

I mention all these, Mr. Speaker, because, of course, I have to say that this

bill doesn't do everything we would like to do. We need to do more on background checks. There is some other language that we would like to do in terms of background checks not only on guns, but perhaps on high-capacity armament.

I say to my colleagues, as I frequently do—but it applies here now more than ever: Let us not judge this legislation for what is not in it but respect it for what it does. And what it does is save lives. And we are very, very proud of that.

Again, I thank Chairman NADLER and Gun Violence Protection Task Force chairman, MIKE THOMPSON, for their determined leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. This package represents the most significant action to prevent gun violence in nearly three decades and is a necessary step to honor our solemn duty as lawmakers to protect and defend the American people.

Importantly, the bipartisan Safer Communities Act has earned strong support from gun owners, gun survivors, and law enforcement alike.

Gun Owners for Responsible Ownership endorse our bill saying: "We write today as responsible gun owners; but above all else, we are proud parents and grandparents of toddlers, students, and young teachers. We want them to be safe."

Everytown for Gun Safety wrote that this "commonsense legislation addresses every form of gun violence."

And the Fraternal Order of Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police applauded our bipartisan agreement, calling it a giant step forward and one that will save lives. I repeat: A giant step forward and one that will save lives. The statements are from the Fraternal Order of Police and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Indeed, keeping our children safe is a unifying issue for our country, and it must be a unifying issue in this Congress.

Yesterday, our Nation watched in horror as a radical partisan supermajority of the Supreme Court ruled to flood America's streets with even more deadly weapons.

It is unconscionable that as America reaches a fever pitch of gun violence, the Court has chosen to create a new right to bring guns into public spaces, while hindering the ability of States to stop the bloodshed. In doing so, the GOP supermajority, Trump-McConnell Court, is implicitly endorsing the tragedy of mass shootings and daily gun deaths plaguing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, with this bipartisan package, we take the first steps to fight back on behalf of the American people who desperately want new measures to keep communities safe in the high numbers in the polling.

Our Democratic House majority has again and again passed landmark legislation that would combat the scourge of gun violence, and we will never give up in our fight to save lives

Mr. Speaker, our fight to prevent gun violence is of, by, and for the children.

Of the children, because they are suffering. It is heartbreaking that in America more children die from guns than any other cause.

By the children, because they are leading. We see the children marching in the streets, testifying before Congress, demanding action.

And always for the children, building a future where every child can reach his or her fulfillment, free from the fear of gun violence.

To the Members who lack the courage to join in this work—to those who lack the courage to join in this work—I say your political survival is insignificant compared to the survival of our children. Today, we will prevail for the children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan "aye" vote for this lifesaving legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what saves lives. The decision we got from the Supreme Court today saves lives. This bill takes rights away from law-abiding citizens, their Second Amendment liberties. That is the key distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Speaker PELOSI just lectured us. She said guns are the number one killer of children in America.

That is not true. Abortion violence is the number one killer of children in America, until today. There is no right to abortion in the Constitution. And, thankfully, the Supreme Court finally said that decisively. Thanks be to God.

There is a right, however, a crystal-clear right in the Constitution to keep and bear arms. But here we are today. Congress is moving full steam ahead to restrict the right to self-defense for law-abiding gun owners and the right to due process for all Americans.

This legislation is the wrong approach, and we ought to oppose it.

In our Judiciary markup several days ago, some of our Democrat colleagues here on the floor today openly said they don't care about the Constitution. They don't care about its protections. They want to overlook that. This bill does that. It is the perfect example of Members of Congress simply ignoring the Constitution.

President Biden and his administration are already disobeying laws that we have on the books to revoke firearm dealer licenses over simple clerical errors. This legislation is going to make that worse. This is not going to help anything. It is going to lead to more errors, more false flags, more backlogs in the NICS system. There is nothing in this bill to fix that. There is nothing in this bill to increase school safety.

Mr. Speaker, we want real solutions. We think that we ought to harden the schools; real, physical improvements to help protect children, but that is not here. They didn't have time for that.

Two weeks ago, I had a very moving conversation with Pastor YJ Jimenez. He is a pastor on the ground ministering to the people of the Uvalde community who have suffered such an unspeakable loss. He said something that was really clear, and I think it is echoed throughout America. People paid a lot of attention to it.

He said, You know what, we need to address the root causes of all this bloodshed. He said America's problem is not guns. America's problem is a heart problem. And he is exactly right.

Today we are seeing the results of decades of decline in the secularization of American society and the open assault on our institutions: family, religion, morality, the breakdown of law and order.

We see the results of all this on young people—in clinical settings, in schools, and everywhere else.

We want to do things that matter. It is not more gun control. It is not more Federal laws. It is not more intrusive government. We need to address the root causes.

□ 1145

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in the name of Mr. Garza, whose daughter in Uvalde bled out, Buffalo, Tulsa, Parkland, Santa Fe, and Sandy Hook. I stand here with the recognition of my chairman, Mr. NADLER, and the years and decades—mine, over two decades—of fighting for gun laws.

As I hold up the number of gun laws that I introduced over 27 years—pages and pages—I can say to the Senate that in this bill, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, they have built on our legislation.

My bill, the Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act, which will increase access to mental health treatment, is in this bill. The Violence Against Women Act, the boyfriend loophole, is in this bill. The Protecting Our Kids Act and the issues dealing with raising the age, bump stocks, and ghost guns are yet to be done, but we can stand on this because it was bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of gun violence prevention legislation.

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

117TH CONGRESS

H.R. 127—Sabika Sheikh Firearm Licensing and Registration Act

H.R. 2585, "Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act"

H.R. 121—Grin Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2021

H.R. 125, Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2021

H.R. 130, Kimberly Vaughan Firearm Safe Storage Act

H.R. 135, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2021

H.R. 137, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2021

H.R. 133, David Ray Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2021

## 116TH CONGRESS

H.R. 49, Santa Fe High School Victims Act  
H.R. 4080, Kimberly Vaughan Firearm Safe Storage Act

H.R. 4081, Sabika Sheikh Firearm Licensing and Registration Act

H.R. 4082, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2019

## 115TH CONGRESS

H.R. 57, Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2017

H.R. 62, Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2017

H.R. 1982, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2017

H.R. 1983, David Ray Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2017

H.R. 4268, Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2017

H.R. 5088, No More Atrocities with Guns Act or the No MAGA Act

H.R. 7016, Protect Lives and Stop the Imminent Chaos Act of 2019—the PLASTIC Act

## 114TH CONGRESS

H.R. 4315—Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act

H.R. 4316—Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act

H.R. 47—Gun Storage and Safety Devices for All Firearms Act

H.R. 3125—Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act

H.R. 5470—Stopping Mass Killings by Violent Terrorists Act

H. Amndt. 48 to H.R. 5 Student Success Act

H.R. 68—Tiffany Joslyn Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2016

## 113TH CONGRESS

H.R. 65, Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013

H.R. 2665, To ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices

H.R. 2585—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2013

## 112TH CONGRESS

H.R. 4315, Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act of 2016

H.R. 4316, Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2016

H.R. 65, Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013

H.R. 2665, To ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices.

H.R. 227—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2011

H.R. 83—Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2011

H.R. 5770—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act

H.R. 6019—Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2012

## 111TH CONGRESS

H.R. 257—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2009

H.R. 6542—Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2010

## 110TH CONGRESS

H.R. 256—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2007

## 109TH CONGRESS

H.R. 246—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2005

## 108TH CONGRESS

H.R. 76—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2003

## 107TH CONGRESS

H.R. 70—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2001

H. Amndt. 187—107th Congress

## 106TH CONGRESS

H.R. 3987—Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2000

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, people are dying every day, and it is obvious that through the legislation—The New York Times said here are the shootings, pages and pages, that could have been stopped by stricter gun laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this article has the mass shootings where stricter gun laws might have made a difference.

We understand that this legislation is only the concrete beginning. My friends are going to attack that, but the American people are 70 percent for banning various weapons that are assault weapons. They are 70 percent and more for extreme risk protection. They are 70 percent and more for understanding that we need an extended time for purchase of these guns. And, yes, they are supporters of the Kimberly Vaughn Safe Storage Act, which is a storage bill that says that we need to get people to prevent suicide and to store their guns.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2938, the “Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.”

America is experiencing a crisis of gun violence.

In America, gun violence threatens our sense of safety and security everywhere we go: where we shop for groceries; where we worship with our families; and where we enjoy movies, dancing, outdoor festivals, and concerts with friends.

I and many other members of Congress have introduced commonsense gun safety legislation to make communities safer—over and over, year after year, Congress after Congress. Until now, we have been unable to pass any meaningful legislation.

After more than twenty years of drafting and repeatedly introducing gun safety legislation, like my bill, the Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act to increase access to mental health treatment and promote reporting of mental health information to the background check system, I am encouraged by the steps we are taking today but wish we did not have to lose so many lives to reach this point.

For years, I fought to close the boyfriend loophole—most recently in the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization of 2021, which passed the House last year.

Finally, through the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, we will ensure abusive dating partners convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence offenses are prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms for at least five years.

Two weeks ago, this body proved to the American people that a compromise could be reached on sensible gun safety measures when we passed the “Protecting Our Kids Act.” That legislation, which I introduced along

with Chairman JERRY NADLER and Representative MIKE THOMPSON, encompassed decades of our hard work and proved to be the catalyst for the bill we are considering today.

Like the Protecting Our Kids Act, this bill would establish new federal offenses that specifically prohibit gun trafficking and straw purchasing to thwart guns moving through the iron pipeline, keeping them off the street and out of the hands of criminals.

While our bill would have raised the age at which a person could purchase a semiautomatic rifle from 18 to 21—a concept I proposed in my No More Atrocities with Guns Act of 2018—this bill would enhance the background check process and investigative period for purchases of rifles by anyone under the age of 21 and further strengthen the background check process by clarifying who is engaged in the business of selling firearms and, as a result, is required to run background checks.

We also passed the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2021 recently that would give loved ones the ability to seek an extreme risk protection order before our federal court when an individual presents a serious threat to themselves or others by use of a firearm and provide funding to enhance, promote, and implement similar laws at the state-level, which Safer Communities will do.

With the passage of this bill, we make a significant step forward in the fight to end gun violence. But we must keep working to find reasonable solutions to other problems that contribute to gun violence in this country that are not addressed in this bill.

We must ban deadly bump stocks, ghost guns, and high-capacity magazines as we endeavored to do in the Protecting Our Kids Act. We must ban assault weapons.

We must institute a seven-day waiting period for purchases of the deadliest of instrumentalities such as silencers and body armor, which I have pressed for in my own bill, the Gun Safety: Not Sorry Act of 2017 and 2021, and assault weapons if we do not ban them.

We must pass legislation that encourages safe firearm storage practices, like my bill the Kimberly Vaughn Firearm Safe Storage Act that was included in the Protecting Our Kids Act to expand the requirement that safe storage devices be made available at the point of sale, which will train new gun owners on the value of safe storage and remind seasoned gun owners that safe storage goes hand-in-hand with responsible gun ownership.

23 years after Columbine when I first began introducing gun safety legislation, and hundreds of thousands of gun deaths later, we continue to mourn the unnecessary loss of life. Enough is enough.

While this bill may not solve all the problems that contribute to the epidemic of gun violence, we must pass it without delay. Far too many lives have been lost for us to wait any longer.

I support this meaningful, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same. Let us save lives and protect the children of America—together.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act would inject \$4.5 billion in critical funding into various state agencies and programs through the Department of Justice, Department of Health and Human Services, and Department of Education to:

Expand community mental health services for children and families, and fund school-based mental health services and supports;

Implement evidence-based school violence prevention efforts; and

Encourage and support evidence-based, community violence intervention programs and crisis intervention services, including the implementation of vital Red Flag Laws—which have been proven to reduce the firearm suicide rates in states that have already enacted such laws.

In America, gun violence is the leading cause of death among children. In America, an average of 70 women are shot and killed by an intimate partner every month. In America, mass shootings occur increasingly each year—and every day, 316 people on average are shot. In America, 45,979 deaths were by suicide in 2020—more than half of those deaths were by firearm.

Each day parents send their children off to school, from elementary age to college, praying now more than ever that they will return to them safe and sound.

19 elementary school-aged children and two teachers in Uvalde, Texas; 10 people going about their daily lives at a market in Buffalo, New York, all killed by 18-year-olds wielding AR-15-style weapons of war. And 4 people murdered at a hospital in Tulsa, Oklahoma with another assault weapon purchased only hours earlier.

In my home state of Texas, the El Paso Walmart shooting—22 dead; Sutherland Springs—26 dead; Santa Fe High School—10 dead; Fort Hood in 2009—13 dead; and the Dallas shooting of police—5 officers dead and nine others injured.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank God for the decision that stops the heinous practice that has taken more than 60 million lives in this country over the last 50 years. I thank God that those voices that have been lost, we will not see that anymore. I hope and pray that that is the case. I thank them for that.

There is no right to take that life, but there is a right to defend yourself. We have a God-given, constitutionally protected right to protect ourselves, and the Supreme Court reaffirmed that yesterday.

This bill infringes on the constitutionally protected rights of law-abiding Americans, and it provides funding for States to infringe on Americans' Second Amendment rights and violate their due process rights.

It treats 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old Americans as second-class citizens. The Ninth Circuit recently held that the Second Amendment applies to 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old Americans just like it does to Americans over the age of 21.

This bill criminalizes routine gun transactions between law-abiding Americans.

Justice Alito, in his concurrence, highlighted the flawed logic used by the supporters of this bill. Alito said: "Does the dissent think that laws like New York's prevent or deter such atrocities? Will a person bent on carrying out a mass shooting be stopped if he knows that it is illegal to carry a handgun outside the home? And how does the dissent account for the fact

that one of the mass shootings near the top of its list took place in Buffalo? The New York law at issue in this case obviously did not stop that perpetrator."

The essence of this is gun controls do not stop criminals because criminals have no regard for the law. That is the definition of a criminal.

This bill will restrict law-abiding Americans' ability to purchase firearms and protect themselves and their families. It violates a basic God-given right.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

My State of California has several provisions in law that are included in this bill, but it doesn't work as a patchwork because individuals can cross State lines and endanger people.

Everything in this bill is consistent with the Second Amendment. That is why it got such bipartisan support in the Senate.

In the last 3 years alone, my district has had two cities added to the long list of communities that have experienced mass shootings.

America doesn't have to be the only country in the world where mass shootings are a near-daily occurrence. There is broad support in the country for reform that will prevent this epidemic of gun violence.

This bill doesn't do everything that I think should happen, but it does something. It will make people safer. I strongly urge its support.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, instead of treating law-abiding citizens as if they were criminals, maybe we should start treating criminals as if they were criminals. Stop the plea bargains, put gun predators behind bars until they are old and gray, and execute the murderers.

Those measures worked until a generation of soft-on-crime judges, woke district attorneys, and politically correct police commissioners made a mockery of our laws.

If someone is dangerously mentally ill, then, of course, they should not have access to firearms. They shouldn't have access to any kind of weapons. We once confined them so we could treat them and prevent them from doing harm during the course of their illness. We had a commitment process that respected due process. They could come before a judge to challenge the findings in open court, submit evidence on their behalf, and face their accuser, but not under the red flag laws this bill proposes.

An anonymous accuser can trigger a secret proceeding against you that you don't even know is happening until the

police bang on your door in the dead of night, ransack your house, and strip you of your right of self-defense. The burden then falls on you to try to restore it.

This bill also targets young adults for special restrictions. We trust them to vote, to start families, to enter into legally binding agreements, but we don't trust them with firearms because of what some criminal or madman their age did?

Just laws hold people accountable for their own actions; unjust laws hold them accountable for other people's actions. This is an unjust law.

These atrocities will go on until we get the criminals and madmen off our streets. How many more tragedies do we need to go through before the Congress understands this self-evident truth?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for years, the gun violence epidemic in our country has forced us to cope with immeasurable grief and loss.

Throughout America, many communities have begun to erect memorials to remember those they have lost through gun violence. These monuments are not much different than those right outside The National Mall that honor Americans killed in war.

Just last week, people in San Bernardino, California, unveiled the Curtain of Courage made of steel and bronze to pay tribute to the 16 people who were murdered at a mass shooting there in 2015.

In Newtown, Connecticut, a planned memorial will feature a spiral of granite inscribed with the names of 20 children and 6 teachers killed at Sandy Hook Elementary in 2012.

Memorials are being built or planned, as well, to honor those who died in shootings in Charleston, Orlando, Las Vegas, El Paso, Buffalo, Uvalde, and many others.

The best way to honor those we have lost to gun violence, however, is not with bronze, steel, or granite. Rather, it is with meaningful action to prevent others from suffering the same fate.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which was overwhelmingly passed by the United States Senate, and which I am pleased to bring to the floor today, is a step in the right direction to take action.

This legislation includes measures that will reduce the threat of gun violence and save lives across the country. It will help implement red flag laws that empower law enforcement officers to keep guns out of the hands of people at risk of using them to harm themselves or others. Closing the so-called boyfriend loophole in this bill will prevent people convicted of domestic abuse in a dating relationship from possessing deadly firearms. If they have displayed violence, they ought to be prohibited from getting weapons

that will make mass violence more probable and possible. It will also require more thorough background checks for Americans under the age of 21 who seek to purchase a gun.

We passed expanded background checks through this House, and 85 percent of the American people say they are for that—and that is the minimum—but no action has been taken in the United States Senate. They have taken some action, and some action is better than no action.

Additionally, this legislation includes \$250 million in funding for community-based violence prevention programs.

Do we not want to see community violence diminished?

It will also crack down on those who make straw purchases, purchases of guns that otherwise, under the existing system, could not be purchased by the ultimate user of those guns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator MURPHY, Judiciary Committee Chairman JERRY NADLER, Representative LUCY MCBATH, Representative ROBIN KELLY, Chairman MIKE THOMPSON of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, and those Republicans who said that “NRA” does not stand for “no Republican action.” They took action. They stood up, even in the face of boos from their own party.

This legislation, as I said, is a step forward. That is how we make progress in America, a step at a time.

None of us have had the opportunity ever to vote on a perfect bill in this House. We vote on good bills that we feel will move our country forward. This is that kind of bill, a step forward but not enough.

Many of us feel that we need to do more. We need to do comprehensive background checks. We need to close the Charleston loophole. We sent those bills to the Senate.

We can and must do more.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court issued a ruling that will weaken common-sense gun safety laws all over the country. Yes, we can return to the O.K. Corral and everybody having a six-shooter on their hip. Anybody who thinks that would make us a safer, more civil community I think is sadly mistaken. That fact ought to disturb all of us very deeply.

The Court’s decision to make it even easier for bad actors to carry dangerous concealed guns without restrictions should serve as a reminder that we need to take additional active steps to protect our communities and our kids, actions that are supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

If we fail to do that, if we allow this legislation to be the end instead of the beginning, parents will continue to receive that dreaded, unfathomable call that they will never see their children again, and new monuments honoring victims will continue to pop up in communities across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my House colleagues, Republicans and Democrats,

conservatives and liberals, we don’t need additional memorials. We need action, and we need new laws.

If we can follow today’s legislation with action on comprehensive background checks and further gun safety measures, however, future generations—perhaps it is not guaranteed, but it is certainly worth the effort to reduce the gun violence and to reduce the need for memorials.

□ 1200

If we do not, then those who come after will wonder why their forebears allowed such violence to be perpetrated uniquely in America.

Mr. Speaker, you don’t find this in other countries—democratic countries and free countries—that protect individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, today, in just a few minutes, let us begin to end the cycle of tragedy and inaction. Let us pass this bill and say: No more.

Let us pass it and then do more. Vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Today, the United States Supreme Court stood up in defense of the Constitution in recognizing that it is the people—the people—who should be able to come together and make decisions about life and to be able to stand up and protect the God-given right to life.

Here today on the floor of this body, the people’s House—the so-called people’s House—is taking up legislation that is in direct conflict with the United States Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and the right to keep and bear arms. It is purposeful.

Do you know what?

When our colleagues say things like what the President said, that whether it is a 9-millimeter pistol or a rifle, I am going to continue to push to eliminate the sale of those things. When it is Representative MONDAIRE JONES saying that semi-automatic weapons would qualify as assault weapons and these things should be banned. Or when the Democrats tweeted that semi-automatic rifles are weapons of war, then we should believe you.

We should believe you that you want to take those weapons. That is what you are saying. That is what my colleagues are saying.

Here is the thing: my colleagues say, oh, don’t worry, this is just money for mental health.

Do you know what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and some academics say?

They have put out stories talking about how supposedly conservatives are suffering from mental health issues and that Republicans have become the cult of the mentally ill.

“Is political conservatism a mild form of insanity?” writes Psychology Today.

You get article after article.

What do you think you want to do with the mental health money? What do you think you want to do?

You want to come after our ability to defend ourselves against the very tyranny you want to undermine by taking away the weapons we can use to defend ourselves against that tyranny. That is the purpose.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle—the handful who are going along with it—should be ashamed of themselves because right now, today, we have a duty to stand up here and defend our right to defend ourselves against the very tyranny that you ignore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, when the previous speaker refers to using guns to protect tyranny, he is talking—whether he realizes it or not—about stopping tyranny by turning those weapons against American troops.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the chairman of the Gun Violence Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

While the tragic loss of 19 precious children and 2 teachers in Uvalde, Texas, and the disgusting racially motivated slaughter in Buffalo, New York, captured the Nation’s attention, we know that gun violence survivors and their allies across our country have been working every day to prevent the gun violence that kills 30 people every day and over 100 when you factor in accidents and suicides.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act passes three important tests. It is legal, it has the votes, and it saves lives. This bill saves lives by targeting convicted domestic abusers and felons coercing someone to illegally purchase a gun for them. This bill saves lives by strengthening school safety and mental health resources.

This bill and the millions of gun violence victims and gun violence survivors deserve a “yes” vote today from every Member in this Chamber. A majority of Americans and responsible gun owners know this bill is important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 2018, my community hit the depths of despair when 17 innocent people were slaughtered at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. The families from Stoneman Douglas who lost loved ones have committed themselves in so many ways since to help get us to this moment. For them, the families of Uvalde, Buffalo, Newtown,

and so many families that we all have had the opportunity to get to know, this day is about them.

But I finish with this: on the day after Parkland, there was a rally in the park near the school. The field was covered with high school kids who came to express themselves. One of them came up to me, still with a look of shock in her eyes. She grabbed my arm, and she said: Congressman, my best friend bled out on me. You have to do something.

Today, we do.

Mr. Speaker, vote “yes” to support this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what a great day for the babies and—as the Speaker described it—the Trump-McConnell Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House amendment to S. 2938. This bill could have had strong bipartisan support if it had focused solely on mental health and school safety. The Supreme Court made it clear yesterday that the Second Amendment includes the right to carry a gun for self-defense purposes outside the home.

This bill flies in the face of that ruling. Specifically, the bill fails to define what constitutes a willful violation that would warrant a revocation of a Federal firearm license. This is especially important given the Department of Justice’s zero tolerance policy and the over 500 percent increase in license revocation proceedings that have occurred under this administration.

Current extreme risk protective orders that exist in 19 States do not come close to providing adequate due process protections. We cannot support the use of taxpayer funds to implement more such unconstitutional laws without specific and ironclad assurances that due process rights will be protected.

In the wake of the tragic shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in February 2018, I worked with my colleagues in the Wisconsin legislature to protect against school shootings. We worked to pass Act 143 which appropriated \$100 million in school safety grants. That is where this bill should be going.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to focus on bipartisan solutions that will not infringe on our constitutional rights.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans are not the same. While Democrats are working to pass this gun safety legislation for the people, Republicans have whipped their Members to oppose it.

Democrats and Republicans are not the same. With the Supreme Court handing down radical decisions, you have extreme MAGA Republicans working to eliminate gun safety laws,

while Democrats are working to expand gun safety laws.

You have extreme MAGA Republicans calling for a nationwide criminal abortion ban while Democrats are working to preserve *Roe v. Wade*.

Democrats and Republicans are not the same. I urge all Americans to remember that this November.

Mr. JORDAN. We sure aren’t the same, Mr. Speaker. We actually think you should protect the sanctity of human life, and we so appreciate the decision from the Court today. We don’t think you should take away rights from law-abiding American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, America does not have a gun problem. America has a crime problem.

Mr. Speaker, law-abiding Americans do not want more laws chipping away at the Second Amendment. They do not want to see their right to bear arms eliminated on the installment plan. They want prosecutors to prosecute. They want the police to police. They want dangerous criminals off the streets and behind bars.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, in Uvalde, Texas, children were killed in an elementary school. This is one of 128—128—mass shootings in America over the last 40 years.

It is time to act. This is not perfect legislation. But if we can save one, two, three or more lives, then it is our responsibility to pass this legislation. Our communities are depending on us.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman who has done so much on this issue for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

More than 15 years ago, I was chairman of Fairfax County when the Virginia Tech tragedy occurred. We buried six young people in my community that week—six. I am still in touch with those families, and the emptiness in their souls will never go away.

Today, we have an opportunity to choose: will we protect our children, or will we continue to persist in an abstract ideological commitment to an absolute reading of the Second Amendment which is false, and a false reading of the Constitution.

We can do something finally. America demands we do something. We need to disentrail ourselves from the gun mythology and do the right thing: protecting our communities and our children.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW).

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as a father, a combat veteran, a gun owner, and the Representative of a community devastated by gun violence.

My constituents are family and friends of those who were killed at Columbine, at the Aurora Theater, at STEM School Highlands Ranch, and at the Boulder King Soopers. As a community, we consoled each other after each one of these terrible shootings, and we demanded commonsense reform, but for too long our Nation’s leaders refused to act.

When I came to Congress I promised my constituents that I would fight to protect our community from gun violence.

Today, I am proud to vote for the first comprehensive gun violence package in 30 years. This bill is a first step. It doesn’t have everything we would hope for, but it is a step in the right direction.

Today’s success belongs to every Coloradan who turned their hurt into action. This long overdue progress is theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with my colleagues for a “yes” vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. It is past time that Congress take action to end the gun violence epidemic that is harming communities across the Nation. We need to protect all people who are vulnerable to gun violence, and this includes survivors of domestic abuse.

Existing Federal laws allow abusive dating partners to access firearms. Known as the “dating partner loophole,” this dangerous gap in Federal law puts survivors of domestic abuse at risk every day.

I thank people for including this and acknowledging that this is an issue. However, it is critical that the Department of Justice swiftly issue regulations and definitions pertaining to the implementation of the dating partner provisions.

The definition of “dating relationship” in this act is not intended to be overly restrictive, and the definition should be broadly constructed to cover dating relationships as commonly understood in the Violence Against Women Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, intimate partner violence is a serious issue, and 50 percent of domestic violence fatalities are caused by their intimate partner. I understand this. I lived in it.

Let's be clear: this is a significant bill. We have made progress, but we have more work to do.

□ 1215

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that legal guns save 162,000 lives annually and prevent 2.5 million crimes a year, or 6,849 crimes every day. By their own admission, criminals fear armed citizens more than they fear the police.

Up to 90 percent of criminals who commit crimes with a gun do not acquire that firearm legally.

We have serious problems in this country involving family, drugs, and mental health. Those issues have been going in the wrong direction for decades. Instead of addressing these issues head-on, the bill will instead jeopardize the right to bear arms for millions of law-abiding citizens.

Decades of Supreme Court precedent prevent the government from exercising prior restraint on our First Amendment rights to free speech. We should not treat the Second Amendment differently.

The Court just spoke forcefully in favor of this right. This body should do the same. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

As we speak, our Nation is being wracked by an epidemic of gun violence. Every year, 40,000 Americans die from guns, more than 110 every single day, many of them children. We have the power to prevent this carnage, but for decades, Congress refused to act. Well, no more.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect. No bill is. But this legislation will save lives. Once signed into law, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help keep guns out of the wrong hands. It will protect survivors of domestic abuse by closing the boyfriend loophole. It will crack down on straw purchases and improve background checks for people under 21. It will deliver hundreds of millions of dollars for improved mental health services, community-based violence prevention initiatives, and school safety.

The issue of gun safety is personal to me. It is about time that Congress takes action. Let us pass this historic, bipartisan bill and send it to the President's desk today.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this fla-

grantly unconstitutional gun control act. This bill is yet another attack on our God-given rights to self-defense.

For instance, the bill would provide taxpayer dollars for State-level gun confiscations without due process.

We constantly hear this constant theme from the left on how you can't be pro-life and pro-gun, which I think is poignant to point out today. For those who say you can't be pro-life and pro-gun, why did you send billions of dollars of guns to Ukraine to help them save their lives against the Russians?

You sent billions of dollars of guns over there so that our soldiers wouldn't have to go over there and fight a war to save their lives. Guns save lives, or you wouldn't have been sending the money over there.

Our Founding Father, George Mason, who wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights on which our Constitution's Bill of Rights is based, once said: To disarm the people is the most effectual way to enslave them.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

We are here today to protect our constituents and save lives. We have waited far too long for this day.

Elements of my bill, the Prevent Gun Trafficking Act, are included in this legislation to crack down on the illegal gun trafficking and straw purchasing that is bringing guns into communities across the country.

I know just how detrimental trafficking can be to a community. Last year, in Chicago, a single stolen gun was linked to at least 27 separate shootings before it was taken off the street. Two dozen people were shot during its use and two of them killed.

More than half of guns used in Chicago shootings are brought into the city by trafficking. Thank you, Wisconsin and Indiana.

We have lost so many people and traumatized countless others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to help make Chicagoland a safer place.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in defense of our Constitution today, in defense of law-abiding American citizens, and against this Senate gun control bill.

This legislation takes the wrong approach in attempting to curb violent crimes. It turns our system of due process on its head. You will now be found guilty and your guns taken away until you can prove your innocence.

It has vague language containing insufficient guardrails to keep guns out of the hands of criminals or prevent mass violence.

It creates a de facto waiting period for up to 10 business days for legal,

law-abiding citizens' firearm purchases and the consideration of whether an adult purchaser's juvenile record should prohibit an individual from buying a firearm.

We are committed to identifying and solving the causes of violent crimes and mental health crises, putting officers in our schools, and reinforcing our school buildings, but we must not infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens while doing so.

I cannot support this misguided legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, today has been a tough day as we watch an extremist and politicized Supreme Court roll back protections Americans have relied on for decades. But there is good news coming out of Congress. We have come together to pass the most comprehensive gun safety package in almost three decades.

In New Jersey, we have already passed a large number of these proposals, including extreme risk protections, assault weapons safeguards, and high-capacity magazine prohibitions, and we have seen the results.

New Jersey has made major progress in combating gun violence. As of 2020, my State has the third lowest level of firearm mortality, according to the CDC. Think about that. The most densely populated State in the Nation has one of the lowest levels of gun violence in the Nation. As the rate of gun deaths has increased by 33 percent nationwide, in New Jersey, it actually fell by 10 percent.

Of course, as a mother, I am focused on keeping our kids safe. This law would have prevented the shooter in Uvalde from getting a firearm without an enhanced background check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Ms. SHERRILL. This law gives States the support they need to act when a mom worries that her child is contemplating suicide.

It is why everyone from the American Society of Pediatrics to the Fraternal Order of Police has endorsed this bipartisan bill.

It is time for my Republican colleagues to put our Nation's kids ahead of the gun lobby.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio, soon to be the Judiciary chair, for yielding.

First, thank you to the Supreme Court for removing the curse of abortion sanctioned by a Federal Court ruling back in 1973. Six Supreme Court Justices have stood for life, and that is a beautiful thing.



Now, regarding this gun control bill before us today, this bill would have done nothing to curb the actions of illegal-minded criminals intent on harming our children. But it will harm the law-abiding citizens of this great Nation by violating their Second, Fourth, Fifth, and 14th Amendments, specifically, their due process rights. Let me refresh our collective memories.

The Fourth Amendment: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.”

The Fifth Amendment: “No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

The 14th Amendment: “Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

Then, of course, my favorite, the Second Amendment: “The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.”

These red flag laws enable one-sided *ex parte* hearings, and though they don't take some of the guns from all of the people, they take all of the guns from some of the people. This is completely unacceptable.

I stand against it, and I encourage all Members of the House to vote against it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 24, 2022, marks 30 years to the day that my father was shot and killed by senseless gun violence. So, I stand here emotional as I prepare to cast a vote in favor of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, historic legislation that will reduce crime and break the cycle of violence that so many people throughout our country have unfortunately experienced.

One of the most important provisions in this bill is \$2 billion in funding for antiviolence programs, including \$250 million for community violence intervention from my Break the Cycle of Violence legislation.

Every day, 110 Americans are killed with guns, and over 200 are shot and wounded. Amid the global pandemic, homicides by gun increased by 35 percent.

Today, gun violence remains the leading cause of premature death for Black men, as well as the number two cause of premature death for Latino men and Black women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Today, I am casting my vote for my father; the 58 victims who lost their lives during the 1 October shooting in Las Vegas; Sean Jerrion Coleman, a constituent and a Las Vegas youth leader; and so many other Americans who are victims and survivors of gun violence.

I urge this body to pass the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in Dobbs earlier this great morning, and in the New York State RPA decision yesterday, the Supreme Court declared something astonishing, which has electrified the country and left radicals seething: The Constitution means what it says.

In New York State RPA, the Court reiterated what Heller decided in 2008. To paraphrase, the decision said: Like we told you the first time, the Second Amendment protects an individual, fundamental right weighed and decided upon by the people at the founding.

But just as most of the courts of appeals flouted Heller by reweighing that right over and over for more than a decade, the Senate again flouts the new decision before the ink is dry.

What is the historical analog from the founding era under which the right to bear arms could be targeted for complete deprivation upon less than complete process rights? Name it. Name the historical analog. That is Congress' burden.

The renewed assault on the Second Amendment is more than sufficient grounds to oppose this bill, but even the constitutionally permissible components repeat the terrible misjudgment that has afflicted this type of legislation for far too long.

I have said before that you are not grappling with the issue: 60 years of targeted destruction of the American culture by the secular and postmodernist left. Foremost in that destruction has been the unrelenting assault on the family.

So what does this “do something” bill do?

It displaces families further by building a massive new mental health delivery bureaucracy into public school agencies; it connects Medicaid and CHIP directly to schools for early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services in schools; and it supports the provision of culturally competent and trauma-informed care in school settings.

□ 1230

Americans who have been watching will hear a familiar refrain in that jargon. It means beyond the reach of parents and the reach of common sense.

Who is it that is delivering this double down on woke to your child at school? Republican Senators.

Moms and dads across the country, if you thought that Washington has heard you loud and clear, you are sorely mistaken.

Washington has yet to recognize that it is the author of the devastation we confront, and Washington is still failing to grapple with the core issue. They are taking another step down the long path we have trod that has transformed America just as they want.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill is, at the same time, an attack on constitutional rights and a dangerous, poorly thought out, ill-defined improvisation.

Wringing your hands and doing something instead of the right thing will continue having the same result it has had since the 1960s.

Show that honesty and courage does not reside only in the Supreme Court building across the street. Defeat this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), from the great Empire State.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud New Yorker deeply troubled by the epidemic of gun violence that has plagued our Nation for too long, leaving a wake of sorrow and grief that extends from generation to generation.

I cannot overstate how yesterday's reckless and detrimental Supreme Court ruling that struck down a 100-year-old New York State law puts innocent Brooklynite lives at risk.

What is more, there are no gun manufacturers in New York City. Yet, despite removing thousands of guns from our streets, illegal guns are arriving by car, train, and bus every single day through the Iron Pipeline.

That is why today's vote on the Safer Communities Act is an imperative. It addresses the issue of straw purchasing and the gun trafficking that is prevalent across New York City.

Let me take this opportunity to thank and give honorable mention to Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY and Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH for their courageous and unwavering fight to stop this sea of gun violence in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass common-sense gun legislation, and I am proud to vote “yes.”

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. JORDAN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this anti-Second Amendment legislation. I know firsthand how important firearm ownership and the Second Amendment are for self-defense.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I was in the batter's box at a baseball field in Virginia, practicing for our Congressional Baseball Game, when a deranged gunman tried to kill us because we were Republicans.

The attack would have been a massacre if not for the armed U.S. Capitol Police Officers, my heroes, David Bailey and Crystal Griner, who were there.

The actions on that field that day solidified my support for the Second Amendment. Remember, Mr. Speaker,

this gunman wanted to settle his political differences with us, who were trying to fix a broken healthcare system, with bullets on a baseball field.

It is not what we do in the United States of America, but that day, my thought was, I wish I had my firearm to protect myself.

We don't need more laws and restrictions that make it more difficult for law-abiding, gun-owning citizens to exercise their constitutional rights and protect their families.

We need to support law enforcement and get tough on criminals who steal guns and commit violent crimes and further improve mental health programs.

I am a proud gun owner. I am a concealed carry licensee and a strong supporter of our Second Amendment. I always have and always will work to preserve the Second Amendment for law-abiding, American citizens. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this attack to undermine the Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 7 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this gun bill today. After decades of inaction and too many innocent lives lost to senseless gun violence, this is a step we must all take.

It will provide needed resources for violence intervention, school safety, mental health funding, community violence intervention and prevention initiatives, school safety, and yes, enhanced background checks to make it harder for 18- to 21-year-olds to get guns, and it will close the boyfriend loop.

To everybody who is saying no, go tell that to the children and families that lost lives. This bill will keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of people. Go tell your "no" vote to the families and the children who lost lives.

The compromise bill today, it is not perfect, but it will help us save lives. I am proud that the Congressional Black Caucus had a large role to play in this. I thank Congresswomen MCBATH and KELLY and Congressman HORSFORD for their support. Our power, our message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, no one on that side of the aisle cares more about the lives lost than the people on this side of the aisle. We are as heartbroken as anyone is. We are trying to find a balance between the thing that we have all agreed and swore an oath to uphold and defend, the rights granted by God enshrined in our Constitution

and weigh that—and weigh that—with keeping our community safe.

Ladies and gentlemen, our society has a sickness. That is for sure. The laws passed in this House to restrict people from their constitutional, God-given rights that criminals disobey is not going to change that. It is not going to change that.

We can do something great here today. We could. We could do something great in this body, Mr. Speaker, but we are not going to.

We are going to infringe on the rights of the law-abiding who want to defend themselves for the sake of the criminals who refuse to follow the law.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am prayerful today, and finally today, that I can come on the floor of the House and say to the victims of gun violence and say to those who lost their lives, and to their families, that I can be on the floor of the House today, not just saying, I give you my thoughts and my prayers; not just saying, I want to send to you my sympathies.

I can't tell you how tired I have been coming to the floor, feeling hurt in my heart, and all I could say is thoughts and prayers.

Today I can vote on something that is going to make a meaningful difference to each and every one of them.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Across this country, we shed tears for the children who are killed, for the parents who are killed, for the girlfriends who are killed.

In this Chamber, we shed tears for the parents and the fathers who are killed, for the children and the sons who are killed.

But we cannot only grieve. We cannot only give our tears. We must act, and today we get to act. Today is the first step toward addressing the pandemic of violence and suffering at the loss of life to guns, to gun violence.

New Mexico already has passed similar laws. We believe in protecting our children. We believe in protecting our women. Those who oppose this law clearly do not.

The Congressional Hispanic Caucus understands that Latinos are too often killed by guns, but today, today, we act. I stand up in support of this action because not acting is an insult to the vast majority of our constituents who want this.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the leading cause of death of kids in America is now gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, 110 Americans die every day in America because of gun violence.

Five weeks ago, ten people from my community of Buffalo, New York, were shot dead by a white supremacist who planned an attack, drove 300 miles to Buffalo and a Black community of our city.

There was a retired police officer by the name of Aaron Salter. A 30-year veteran of the Buffalo Police Department, he was working security that day.

Someone once said that the best way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. Officer Aaron Salter was a good guy with a gun, but he didn't stand a chance. He didn't stand a chance because he was outgunned and outequipped.

Our police officers in America, in Buffalo, and throughout the country are outgunned by the bad guys. They are outprotected by the bad guys.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, when I first took office in March of 2008, one of my first official acts was to attend memorial services for the 17 students killed and injured in the mass shootings at Northern Illinois University.

In the 14 years since, I have attempted to comfort families in my communities again and again, suffering from gun violence like incidents of the shooting at Henry Pratt.

But until today, we had nothing to offer them but our thoughts and prayers. What we are going to pass today may not be enough, but it is a start.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), the co-chair of the Second Amendment Caucus.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time.

The Democrats today describe this Senate bill as a step forward. If you are saving lives, it is a step backward, folks. If you are banning guns, it is a small step forward. Yes, in fact, it is.

Almost everybody on the other side of the aisle today said, it doesn't go far enough. What do they mean? Well, it is a red flag law bill, and they want to take all of the guns from some of the people.

It doesn't go far enough for them because it doesn't yet take all of the guns from all of the people. That is their goal.

Who has taken a step forward, which institution, which branch of government? Well, actually, if you are counting how many lives are going to be saved, you have to consider that the Supreme Court is the institution, the branch of government, that has taken two steps forward in the last 48 hours to save lives.

One of those steps was to reaffirm the Heller decision that men and

women in this country have the right to defend their own lives.

The second step taken today was to affirm that the State legislatures have the right to defend the lives of the unborn.

This bill is ineffective, unconstitutional, and ill-conceived without consideration for the dangerous unintended consequences.

Did the drafters consider that changing the definition of “gun dealer” to be more ambiguous is going to make every American a gun dealer when they transfer a gun to a friend or a family member?

Did the Senators consider in their sleep deprivation when they drafted this bill hurriedly, late at night, that using childhood mental health records as a basis for denying adults their basic rights to self-defense is going to discourage many parents from seeking mental health care for their children?

If children who need it go without mental health care and early intervention, their conditions will grow worse. We will see more suicides, and we will see more mass shootings. Unfortunately and inevitably, this bill will cost more lives than it will save.

Red flag laws are going to have the same effect that considering mental health care for children will have. People will not seek mental health care, and we will see more damage to the American public.

If politicians here were serious—and they are not serious. They are going to come back. They will be back.

You will be back here in 6 months, a year. You will want another bite at the apple to ban guns because this bill won't do it. This bill won't do what you say.

If you were serious, you would acknowledge that 96 percent of mass public shootings happen in an area where guns are banned, and they would repeal the prohibitions that keep law-abiding citizens from exercising their God-given rights enshrined in the Second Amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1245

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act in honor and memory of one of my constituents who was killed in the Las Vegas mass shooting in October 2017, Michelle Vo.

I also rise in the memory of the kids who were killed in Uvalde, Texas, in Parkland, in Sandy Hook.

I rise in their memories, and I also rise due to the fact that I will have a newborn child on August 8. That child, in a few years, will be going off to school, and I will be worried about that child being put in danger because he is going off to school when there are mass shootings across this country.

I rise in support of this because it is a small step forward to prevent the loss of life.

In the end, it comes down to one simple question, as my colleague from northern California posed: Are you with the kids, or are you with the killers? Are you with the victims, or are you with the killers?

I choose the victims; I choose the kids; and I choose the countless lives we will save because we will pass this law.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, let's start with the beginning of the Constitution: “We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare . . .”

That is how our Constitution starts, to uphold the premise of the Declaration of Independence, of freedom to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This bill helps us move forward because it helps us with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

My friend complains about the red flag rule. It helps us with those individuals who suffer from domestic violence and who have suicidal ideation, but it also helps the families destroyed at Columbine in my area and at the Aurora movie theater.

This bill that I am so happy to advance today is pro-Constitution, pro-freedom, and pro-liberty.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, experience has taught me when you have to say a bill is constitutional, it is probably not. When you have to say a bill adheres to due process, it probably doesn't. And this bill certainly doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in strong support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

It was just 1 year ago when a young man went into the store, bought a gun, and, just hours later, went to an Asian spa in the Atlanta, Georgia area to murder Asian women. Then, he drove 27 miles away to two more Asian spas to kill more Asian women. In all, he killed eight people, including six Asian women.

They were mothers, grandmothers, daughters, and I will never forget the tears and sobs of their loved ones when we went down to Georgia to visit.

To see that again in Buffalo and Uvalde, where families had their lives ripped apart in an instant, is more heartache than our country can bear.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is an important step forward. There will be enhanced background

checks for gun purchasers under 21. It provides funds for States for red flag laws. It closes the boyfriend loophole.

This bill will save lives.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a “no” vote on this legislation.

Proponents say that this bill doesn't violate due process. Nothing could be further from the truth.

You haven't been charged with a crime, but there is a hearing, a hearing that you are not allowed to be at. You can't be present at a hearing where you don't have a lawyer and a hearing where a judge can take your property.

Again, just to underscore this, you haven't been charged with a crime, but there is a hearing where your property and your rights are at stake.

You are not allowed to be there; your lawyer is not allowed to be there; and you can't confront your accuser. But they can take your gun; they can take your property; and they can take your Second Amendment liberty.

Here is the scariest part of all: As my friend from Kentucky just pointed out, the Democrats say this is just the first step, that this doesn't go far enough. Holy cow. So that kind of proceeding doesn't go far enough when it comes to your Second Amendment liberties?

One of the key things that separates this great Nation from all other countries is how we have due process in our justice system. This bill takes it away. No other way to put it.

You can say all day long that it doesn't violate due process, but as I said just a few minutes ago, every time I hear that, experience has taught me that it most certainly does. When you have to say it, it probably does. In this case, it is certainly violating due process. There are other problems, but for that reason alone, we should vote “no.”

Again, the scariest thing of all is that they are saying: “Oh, this is just the first step. This doesn't go far enough.” Imagine where they want to take us.

Their beef is with the Second Amendment. They want it to go away. Don't let it happen. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between this country and other countries is only that in this country do we have mass shootings and mass murders of children. No other country has them.

We know from the experience in New Jersey, as Ms. SHERRILL told us, that when we pass strong gun control legislation, we can greatly reduce the number of children and adults shot.

We hear from the other side of the aisle, “No, we don't want to do that.” They are right: This legislation is the beginning.

This legislation is not perfect. It is a bipartisan compromise. It is not nearly what we should do. It is not nearly what the House did, but it is a beginning. It is a beginning in saving lives in this country.

Anyone who stands in its way is standing in the way of saving lives in this country. I will not allow myself or anyone I associate with to stand in the way of saving lives, many lives.

Again, I remind you, this is the only country that has it, and it is not because we have more mentally ill than other countries. It is because we do not have the gun control laws that other countries do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote for this bill as a good beginning, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, long overdue legislation to address gun violence in our schools and neighborhoods. Although this legislation is far from perfect, it is an important step forward in solving the epidemic of gun violence that has gripped our Nation for decades.

In the weeks following the tragedy in Uvalde at Robb Elementary and the racist attack at a grocery store in Buffalo, I spoke with many constituents who continue to urge action. Teachers, parents, and concerned community members from Northwest Oregon shared pleas for Congress to follow through on our responsibility to our children and our Nation by immediately passing bold policies to implement gun safety reform. An educator I know told me that after Uvalde, she sat down with her students and told them she would take a bullet for them. Conversations like this are happening in classrooms across the country, but they shouldn't have to. Congress must provide all students with safe learning environments free from the threat of gun violence. The House already passed a comprehensive slate of gun violence prevention legislation, and I look forward to building on that by voting for this legislation that came out of the bipartisan Senate negotiations.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will help to protect Americans and make gun sales safer. The most effective way to protect communities from gun violence is to keep guns out of the hands of individuals who are a danger to themselves and others. This legislation will incentivize states to establish extreme risk protection order laws, enhance background checks for people under the age of 21, end straw purchasing, and penalize gun traffickers. It will also safeguard survivors of domestic violence by closing the so-called "boyfriend loophole," prohibiting people convicted of domestic violence crimes from possessing firearms.

Additionally, this bill makes a robust investment in Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants under Title IV–A of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Fully funding this important grant program will help to close the opportunity and resource gaps in our Nation's public schools, and I'm pleased this bill recognizes the importance of this program in providing students of all backgrounds with a well-rounded, safe, and healthy education.

Although these actions to address gun violence in our communities and fund critical school improvement programs are important, I am concerned about how various provisions in the bill could harm Black and brown students and students with disabilities in our Nation's schools. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act increases funding for school resource officers (SROs) and codifies further involvement of the Department of Homeland Security in

education through threat assessments. Research and practice show that both SROs and threat assessments are ineffective in keeping students safe in schools. As Chair of the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, I remain committed to protecting students' civil rights and delivering on the promise of an equitable, world-class public education for each and every student in this country. I will closely monitor the implementation of this legislation to make sure our most marginalized and vulnerable students are not subject to further disproportionate discipline and discriminatory targeting in schools.

As a member of the Gun Violence Prevention Taskforce, I again want to recognize how crucial the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act is to our schools, communities, and country. This bill will be the first substantive action on gun violence prevention since the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act in 1994. In the last 30 years, our Nation has been devastated over and over again by horrific tragedies like we saw in recent weeks at Robb Elementary in Uvalde, Texas. We cannot bring back those who have been murdered, but we can enact meaningful laws that will prevent more senseless deaths.

I urge swift passage of the legislation.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my esteemed colleague from California, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, regarding the S. 2938, Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Mr. THOMPSON, is it your understanding and intent in supporting this bill that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations pertaining to Section 12005?

Is it further your understanding and intent in supporting this bill that the Department of Justice in those regulations define the meaning of the terms 'serious,' 'continuing,' 'recent,' and 'recently'?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Michigan, DEBBIE DINGELL, is correct. It is the intent that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations to govern the application of Section 12005, including defining the terms 'serious,' 'continuing,' 'recent,' and 'recently.' It is the intent that this law capture dating relationships in the way they happen in the lives of victims of dating violence.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the clarification from the gentleman from California and pleased to know it is the legislative intent that the Department of Justice promulgate regulations to govern the application of section 12005, including defining the terms 'serious,' 'recent,' and 'recently.' A consistent and authoritative interpretation of these terms that is reflective of the lived experiences of survivors of dating violence is critical to the successful implementation of this section.

Rulemaking is necessary to both ensure that in its application, the law actually protects victims of dating violence and to stave off chaos. A lack of clearly defined terms will encourage trial level litigation into the specifics of the intimate relationship. State judges who are adjudicating these cases will be determining the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator based on the laws of their state. The introduction of 'serious,' 'continuing,' and 'recent' should not be read to require judges to include specific findings of seriousness or continuity. Instead, the existence of a dating relationship must be determined based on the

enumerated factors set forth in subparagraph (B) of this section, with the acknowledgment that a finding of a dating relationship under a state law with a definition that is substantially similar to federal law constitutes a finding of 'dating relationship' for the purpose of this section.

For example, in my state of Michigan, the term 'dating relationship' means 'frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affectional involvement. This term does not include a casual relationship or an ordinary fraternization between two individuals in a business or social context.' This very clearly parallels the definition of 'dating relationship' in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and a finding of a 'dating relationship' under Michigan law must constitute a finding of a 'dating relationship' for the purposes of this section.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act shrinks the dating loophole, but it does not eliminate it. I will keep leading the fight to fully close it in future legislation. No dating abuser who has shown by his actions that he poses a danger to his victim, whose actions led to the issuance of a protective order after a hearing, should be legally allowed to possess firearms for the duration of the order.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the comments of my esteemed colleague from Michigan. Under California law, 'dating relationship' means frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affectional or sexual involvement independent of financial considerations. Similar to the law in Michigan, the law in California very clearly parallels the definition of 'dating relationship' in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and it is my intent and understand in voting for this bill that a conviction for a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence against a dating partner under California law is sufficient to trigger the expanded dating violence prohibitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1204, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 193, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—234

Adams	Bowman	Casten
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Allred	F.	Castro (TX)
Auchincloss	Brown (MD)	Chabot
Axne	Brown (OH)	Cheney
Barragán	Brownley	Cherfilus-
Bass	Bush	McCormick
Beatty	Bustos	Chu
Bera	Butterfield	Cioccine
Beyer	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carson	Cleaver
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cohen
Bourdeaux	Case	Connolly

Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel, Lois  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Kahle  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)

**NAYS—193**

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)

Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan

Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz

Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Salazar  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozzi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Neal  
Trone  
Turner  
Underwood  
Upton  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

**NOT VOTING—3**

Conway  
Pence  
Zeldin

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I was not in Washington, D.C. and not present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 299.

**MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS**

Allred (Gomez)	Duncan	Krishnamoorthi
Auchincloss	(Norman)	(Neguse)
(Beyer)	Espallat	LaMalfa (Van
Babin (Weber	(Correa)	Duynes)
(TX)	Fletcher	Lamborn (Wilson
Barr (McHenry)	(Pallone)	(SC))
Barragan	Frankel, Lois	Lawson (FL)
(Correa)	(Kuster)	(Soto)
Boebert (Bishop	Garcia (IL)	Manning (Bera)
(NC)	(Beyer)	McEachin
Bonamici (Beyer)	Gibbs (Bucshon)	(Beyer)
Bourdeaux	Gimenez (Waltz)	Moore (WI)
(Correa)	Gohmert (Weber	(Beyer)
Bowman (Chu)	(TX)	Moulton
Brown (OH)	Gottheimer	(Stevens)
(Stevens)	(Neguse)	Newman (Beyer)
Good (VA)	Guest	Palazzo
Gooden (TX)	(Fleischmann)	(Fleischmann)
Gosar	Cárdenas	Pascrell
Granger	(Gomez)	(Pallone)
Graves (LA)	Hayes (Neguse)	Payne (Pallone)
Graves (MO)	Hice (GA)	Porter (Neguse)
Green (TN)	(Bishop (NC))	Pressley
Greene (GA)	Jackson Lee	(Trahan)
Griffith	(Cicilline)	Price (NC)
Grothman	Jacobs (NY)	(DeLauro)
Guest	(Smucker)	Rice (SC)
Guthrie	Jayapal (Gomez)	(Meijer)
(Donalds)	Jeffries (Neguse)	(Rogers (KY)
Cherfilus-	Johnson (GA)	(Reschenthaler)
Williams	(Williams)	Rush (Neguse)
(Gomez)	(Gomez)	Salazar (Diaz-
Johnson (TX)	(Stevens)	Balart)
(Stevens)	Katko (Meijer)	Sires (Pallone)
Cohen (Beyer)	Keating (Neguse)	Spartz
Costa (Correa)	Khanna (Ocasio-	(Harshbarger)
Crist (Soto)	Cortez)	Stansbury
Davis, Danny K.	Kinzinger	(Stevens)
(Gomez)	(Meijer)	Steube
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick	(Franklin, C.
(Beyer)	(Pallone)	Scott)
Doyle, Michael		
F. (Pallone)		

Strickland  
(Neguse)  
Suozzi (Neguse)  
Takano (Chu)  
Taylor (Nehls)  
Timmons  
(Wilson (SC))  
Tlaib (Gomez)

Turner (Gonzalez  
(OH))  
Underwood  
(Neguse)  
Van Drew  
(Reschenthaler)  
Walorski (Baird)  
Wasserman  
Schultz (Soto)

Watson Coleman  
(Pallone)  
Wenstrup  
(LaHood)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Williams  
(GA))  
Wittman (Carl)

□ 1330

**RECOGNIZING ART COMPETITION WINNER LIERA BERTOLSIO**

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I welcome Liera Bertolsio and her family to Washington, D.C. to celebrate her great accomplishment.

Liera is the 2022 winner of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District Congressional Art Contest.

The annual art competition, organized by the Congressional Institute, showcases the creative talents of high school students from across every congressional district in the country.

Liera has just finished her sophomore year at Forest Hills High School located in Sidman, Pennsylvania. Her work "Girl with Pearl Earring" is an acrylic painting on canvas.

This year, 81 students entered Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District art competition. Liera's work was selected by a panel of independent judges. The 2022 competition had our largest number of entries to date.

All the winning pieces from around the country will be displayed for the year in the Cannon tunnel where they will be viewed by Members of Congress, staff, and those who visit the Capitol every day.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate Liera on her remarkable achievement.

**ISSUES OF THE DAY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to have a dear friend and colleague on the floor with me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are here today and today is a very heavy day for so many of us across the country.

Every single one of us woke up today with less rights than we had yesterday. Pregnant people, in particular, are in more danger in the United States today than we were yesterday as a result of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade.