

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6899. An act to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation of Belarus.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 516) "An Act to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes."

□ 1400

INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-65 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6448

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) DE-ESCALATION TRAINING.—The term "de-escalation training" means training relating to taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to minimize the need for the use of force and increase the likelihood of voluntary compliance, including persuasion, warnings, creating space, use of physical barriers, slowing down the pace of an incident, and requesting additional resources.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office.

(3) ELIGIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "eligible local government" means—

(A) a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general

government below the State level that employs fewer than 125 law enforcement officers; or

(B) a Tribal government that employs fewer than 125 law enforcement officers.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term "law enforcement officer" has the meaning given the term "career law enforcement officer" in section 1709 of title I the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).

(5) OFFICE.—The term "Office" means the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office a grant program to—

(1) provide training and access to mental health resources to local law enforcement officers; and

(2) improve the recruitment and retention of local law enforcement officers.

(c) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall award grants to eligible local governments as a part of the grant program established under subsection (b).

(d) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) BARRIERS.—The Attorney General shall determine what barriers exist to establishing a streamlined application process for grants under this section.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that includes a plan to execute a streamlined application process for grants under this section under which an eligible local government seeking a grant under this section can reasonably complete the application in not more than 2 hours.

(B) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required under subparagraph (A) may include a plan for—

(i) proactively providing eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section with information on the data such eligible local governments will need to prepare before beginning the grant application; and

(ii) ensuring technical assistance is available for eligible local governments seeking a grant under this section before and during the grant application process, including through dedicated liaisons within the Office.

(3) APPLICATIONS.—In selecting eligible local governments to receive grants under this section, the Director shall use the streamlined application process described in paragraph (2)(A).

(4) PREFERENCE.—The Attorney General may give preference to applicants who specify in their applications that grant amounts will be used for the eligible activities set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (9), and (10) of subsection (e).

(e) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible local government that receives a grant under this section may use amounts from the grant only for—

(1) de-escalation training for law enforcement officers;

(2) victim-centered training for law enforcement officers in handling situations of domestic violence;

(3) evidence-based law enforcement safety training for response to calls for service involving—

(A) persons with substance use disorders;

(B) persons with mental health needs;

(C) veterans;

(D) persons with disabilities;

(E) vulnerable youth;

(F) persons who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or trafficking; and

(G) persons experiencing homelessness or living in poverty;

(4) the offsetting of overtime costs associated with scheduling issues relating to the participation of a law enforcement officer in the training described in paragraphs (1) through (3), (9) and (10);

(5) a signing bonus for a law enforcement officer in an amount determined by the eligible local government;

(6) a retention bonus for a law enforcement officer—

(A) in an amount determined by the eligible local government that does not exceed 20 percent of the salary of the law enforcement officer; and

(B) who—

(i) has been employed at the law enforcement agency for not fewer than 5 years;

(ii) has not been found by an internal investigation to have engaged in serious misconduct; and

(iii) commits to remain with the law enforcement agency for a minimum 3 years from the time of receipt of the bonus;

(7) a stipend for the graduate education of law enforcement officers in the area of mental health, public health, or social work, which shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) \$10,000; or

(B) the amount the law enforcement officer pays towards such graduate education;

(8) providing access to patient-centered behavioral health services for law enforcement officers, which may include resources for risk assessments, evidence-based, trauma-informed care to treat post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, peer support and counselor services and family supports, and the promotion of improved access to high quality mental health care through telehealth;

(9) implementation of evidence-based best practices and training on the use of lethal and nonlethal force;

(10) implementation of evidence-based best practices and training on the duty of care and the duty to intervene; and

(11) data collection for police practices regarding officer and community safety.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish reporting requirements for eligible local government that receive a grant under this section in order to assist with the evaluation by the Office of the program established under this section.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing any requirements under paragraph (1), the Director shall consider the capacity of law enforcement agencies with fewer than 125 officers to collect and report information.

(g) DISCLOSURE OF OFFICER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION BONUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an eligible local government that receives a grant under this section awards a signing or retention bonus described in paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (e), the eligible local government shall disclose to the Director and make publicly available on a website of the eligible local government the amount of such bonus.

(2) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that includes each signing or retention bonus disclosed under paragraph (1) during the preceding year.

(h) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Director under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term "unresolved audit finding" means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants

under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 3 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an eligible local government is awarded grant funds under this section during the 3-fiscal-year period during which the eligible local government is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the fiscal year during which audits commence under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General 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 an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(i) **PROGRAM EVALUATION.**—The Attorney General shall, on an annual basis, conduct analyses of the information provided by grant recipients pursuant to subsection (f) to evaluate the efficacy of training programs funded through the grant program established by this Act in reducing the incidence of use of force by the law enforcement agency.

(j) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Director awards a grant to an eligible local government under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded by the Attorney General to determine if grant awards are or have been awarded for a similar purpose.

(2) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose, whether through the grant program established by this Act or other grant programs provided by the Department of Justice, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(A) a list of all such grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded multiple grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose.

(k) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the grant program under this section.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—In carrying out this section for a fiscal year, if the amounts made available in appropriations Acts for that fiscal year is not less than the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), the Director shall use not less than 20 percent of such amounts in

that fiscal year for grants under this section to eligible local governments that will use the grants to carry out one or more of the eligible activities set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (9), and (10) of subsection (e).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 15 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 H.R. 6448.

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, H.R. 6448, the Invest to Protect Act, is bipartisan legislation to bolster law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and mental health resources.

Let me be clear, Democrats have always stood for equitable funding for law enforcement. Contrary to what some of my colleagues might say, the issue of violent crime is not a red State or blue State issue. The rise in violent crime affects every community across the country.

Democrats also know that public safety and respect for civil rights can coexist. Building healthy and strong communities does not require us to choose between our rights and our safety.

This legislation would establish a grant program focused on improving recruitment and retention of officers and providing additional training and access to mental health resources for small law enforcement agencies.

When police departments are unable to recruit, retain, and adequately resource qualified officers, communities suffer a clear threat to public safety. These officer staffing shortages can cause longer wait times for emergency calls, fewer crimes cleared, and more overworked officers, which can threaten both officer health and the quality of life in our communities.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional Federal resources to small agencies to recruit and retain qualified officers, as well as provide additional training and support for these agencies.

I thank Representative JOSH GOTTHEIMER for his leadership on this issue and for introducing this important legislation along with his bipartisan cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman just said that the Democrats have always been for—I think the direct quote was: “equitable funding for law enforcement.” That is interesting because, just 2 years ago, here is what the chairman said in June 2020:

There should be substantial cuts to police budgets.

I don't know how you can say you have always been for something when 2 years ago you said that you weren't, but that just seems what Democrats are up to today.

Let's call this package of bills before us today exactly what it is: It is an election year ploy from Democrats to look like they care about funding law enforcement.

In the wake of radical leftwing efforts to defund the police, it is no surprise that violent crime is on the rise in America. Every major urban area has seen a huge uptick in violent crime. It should also be no surprise that Democrats are now trying to run and hide from their radical ideas and dangerous rhetoric.

For more than 2 years, we have seen violent crime surge all across the country, particularly in Democrat-run cities while many of those same Democrats not only advocated for defunding police departments, but they did it. They cut them.

Now, the Democrats want to use Federal tax dollars to paper over the problems they created in their local Democrat-run cities.

These bills do nothing to solve the underlying problem. They simply create more grant programs within the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

Under current law, there are already grants available to law enforcement to hire personnel. In fact, last year, the Justice Department awarded more than \$139 million in grant dollars through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. That money provided funds to 183 law enforcement agencies and allowed them to hire more than 1,000 additional officers.

We don't need more Federal grants so Democrat-run cities can then divert taxpayer money to fund their woke agenda. What we need are prosecutors who are willing to prosecute crimes and jurisdictions with laws that actually keep violent criminals in prison.

Nothing in these bills prevents jurisdictions that choose to defund their police from receiving these grant funds. In fact, when Judiciary Republicans offered an amendment to preclude jurisdictions that defunded their police from receiving grant funds, the Democrats rejected it, and they rejected it unanimously.

Faced with an election just over a month away, House Democrats now want to pretend they actually support law enforcement. The timing of this bill should tell you all you need to know about where Democrat priorities are.

Democrats who are in full control of this body have had 2 years to show their support for law enforcement. Only now, when faced with an impending election, are Democrats beginning to feign support for our men and women in blue.

Democrats could have shown their support for law enforcement. Instead, Democrats passed bills to infringe on Americans' Second Amendment rights, legalize marijuana, and further empower the Biden Justice Department to spy on concerned parents.

These bills are just another admission by Democrats that the defund the police movement is wrong and irresponsible. Perhaps, if the Democrats weren't in a cleanup mode after their irresponsible embrace of defund the police rhetoric, the Judiciary Committee could have had an opportunity to consider and improve most of these bills before they came to the floor. But we didn't. Instead, Democrats are rushing to consider these bills to give themselves some pretense that they support funding the police.

No one is fooled. Americans know where Democrats really stand. Americans aren't buying the Democrats' revisionist history. They have seen years of Democrats embracing and supporting the radical defund the police movement. Americans know that the Democrats are the party of soaring crime and defunding the police.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Invest to Protect Act, to invest in good policing, to fight crime, and to protect our families and officers.

We must ensure that local police departments across our country have what they need to recruit and retain the finest officers, provide necessary training, and invest in providing mental health resources for our officers.

Across our country, we have seen a rise in crime, and this is at a time when it is harder than ever to hire, recruit, and retain officers. In fact, last year, public reports found a 44 percent increase in retirements and an 18 percent increase in resignations of law enforcement.

It is clear: If you want to make something better, you don't get there by cutting or defunding. You need to make smart, targeted investments. We must fund, not defund, law enforcement.

That is why I introduced the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act to make critical investments in local police departments and protect our communities.

Work on Invest to Protect started more than a year ago through bipartisan police reform talks with Demo-

crats and Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the States, including with members of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, who have overwhelmingly endorsed this legislation.

I helped craft the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act with Republican Congressman, former sheriff, and my friend, JOHN RUTHERFORD, and it was developed through conversations with both sides in both Chambers, and with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. I, again, thank the sheriff for his work and leadership.

I am appreciative of the support and input from the National Association of Police Organizations; the Fraternal Order of Police; our New Jersey law enforcement organizations and departments, including the New Jersey State PBA and the New Jersey State Fraternal Order of Police; and my Senate colleagues.

This bill would not be where it is today without the support of Congressional Black Caucus Chairwoman JOYCE BEATTY, whose leadership and friendship have been critical. I also thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for their constructive engagement in this process. I thank Caucus Chairman JEFFRIES and Speaker PELOSI for their work, as well.

The Invest to Protect Act will invest in small and mid-sized police departments with fewer than 125 sworn officers, which make up more than 96 percent of local departments.

First, it will invest in officer safety, de-escalation, and domestic violence response training, and it will offset overtime pay for officers who are training.

Second, it will provide grants for departments to recruit new officers. It will also provide retention bonuses to help them keep their best officers on the job.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Finally, it will help departments provide mental health resources for their officers and include strong accountability measures.

These are critical steps we must take.

Going forward, I will continue to fight for additional equipment and training our officers need to protect our communities.

The bottom line: You can't cut or defund your way to safer communities and better police departments. It is about investing to protect. We must always get the backs of those who risk their lives every day to protect us.

Again, I thank Sheriff Rutherford for his leadership, law enforcement unions for working so hard on this legislation, and all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for putting country first and getting this legislation to the floor.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

I was very fortunate during my 40-year law enforcement career to work for a large and growing law enforcement agency. We had the resources to go after Federal grants to help keep our community safe, to bring those Federal dollars back home to protect my community.

I know that many agencies that I worked with did not have that benefit, and that is why, on many of the projects that came from Federal participation, we often partnered with much smaller agencies to help them out.

This bill is all about helping those agencies with 125 officers or less to be able to access those Federal grants that they cannot access right now for training, retention, and hiring. That is what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker.

That is why I worked with my good friend across the aisle, JOSH GOTTHEIMER. I appreciate him working on this, getting to the language that we could all agree with. It has been back and forth quite a bit, but we got it here to the floor, and I congratulate him on that.

This is a bipartisan issue. This is for our law enforcement men and women. These are for those small agencies. We need to be able to help them out.

I can tell you the last 2½ years have left law enforcement demoralized like never before. I have seen it. They need this assistance as they have officers that are leaving in droves.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and vote for this bill, which is going to help small law enforcement agencies join with the National Fraternal Order of Police, which supports this bill, and other law enforcement organizations. NAPO is another.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to vote "yes" on this bill. I believe these small law enforcement agencies absolutely need our assistance.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that this bill, H.R. 6448, the Invest to Protect Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

It was Democrats who spent 2 years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of community in which law enforcement interests engage. I worked on that.

□ 1415

I worked on that. That is why I tried to make this bill better by adding

three additional purposes for grant funding which include issues dealing with use of lethal force, excessive force, and duty of care.

I am glad that they were added, and grantees who choose these activities will be required to do this under this particular provision.

We can do this together. And let me be very clear: this is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022,"—bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

First, let's be clear—This is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement.

We have been accused of spending the last two years bashing the police. Yet, it was Democrats who spent two years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive "George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021"—which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of the community with law enforcement interests.

H.R. 6448 would establish a grant program within the Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS, program focused on improving recruitment and retention of officers and providing additional training and access to mental health resources for small law enforcement agencies.

When police departments are unable to recruit, retain or provide suitable resources to qualified officers, communities suffer a clear threat to public safety. A June 2021 national survey by the Police Executive Research Forum found that, on average, police departments around the country were filling only 93 percent of their available budgeted positions.

These officer staffing shortages can cause longer wait times for emergency calls, fewer crimes cleared, and more overworked officers, which can threaten both officer health and the quality of life in our communities.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional federal resources to small agencies—that often have the most trouble accessing federal grant funding—to recruit and retain qualified officers as well as provide additional training and support.

A 2016 study by the Department of Justice (DOJ) found that of the 12,261 local police departments in the country, 11,638 of them had less than 100 full-time sworn officers. That is 11,638 police departments that would be eligible to access much-needed funding as authorized by H.R. 6448.

Importantly, H.R. 6448 includes limitations on the use of grant funds for hiring and retention to ensure that the funds are not misused, and gives preference to applicants that plan to use grant funds for certain training purposes, including:

de-escalation; the use of lethal and non-lethal force; the duty of care and the duty to intervene—as well as—

victim-centered training on handling domestic violence situations; and

safety training for officers responding to calls involving persons with substance use dis-

orders, mental health needs, disabilities, and vulnerable youth.

This bill would also allow departments to use funds to provide mental health services and treatment to officers and collect data on policing practices that focus on officer and community safety.

In its totality, H.R. 6448 provides critical funding to law enforcement agencies that need it while encouraging improvement among their ranks. This bill makes clear that Democrats will continue to uplift and support law enforcement—as we always have—and we will do so in a manner that ensures officers are well-trained to keep themselves safe as well as the people and communities they serve.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement along with our civil rights friends, and we have put in firewalls to insist that we work together with law enforcement and large and small entities and that we work with on behalf of justice for our constituents and for providing wellness to our police officers, providing intervention of violence, and as well to ensure that we assist in cases that are backlogged. Democrats have been at the forefront. I am very glad to say that we don't ask to defund the FBI, we ask to be supportive of our community.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear. The Democrats want to go from COPS to community organizers, and they want the American taxpayer to pay for it. That is what they want to do in Democrat-run cities.

Mr. Speaker, read the bill. It talks about stipends to be used for graduate education or social work. That is what the bill is for. It is not about putting cops on the street. It is about transferring wealth from the people who funded their police and communities around the country, who funded their police, and giving American tax dollars to cities who didn't fund their police so they can use it for community organizers.

That is what this bill is about. That is why we are against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with Mr. JORDAN's sentiments, and I might even take an even stronger and more critical opposition to these so-called law enforcement bills. I certainly don't want to impugn the motive of every colleague on the other side of the aisle, but here are my strong views, and this is my position on behalf of west Texas:

Since the riots of 2020, I have been warning my Democratic colleagues that we get what we tolerate. After 2 years of Democrats' amplifying defund the police rhetoric, failing to hold

criminals accountable, and refusing to condemn the lawlessness that is running rampant in our cities across the country, crime is absolutely out of control.

Last year, a record number of police officers were killed. Seventy-three American heroes lost their lives. Law enforcement has experienced a staggering 115 percent increase in ambush-style attacks. Further evidence of the left's war on law enforcement is that police have seen a 45 percent increase in retirements and a 20 percent increase in resignations, leaving the most vulnerable Americans even more susceptible to being victimized by criminals.

Now the party of defund the police wants to push through some face-saving bills just ahead of the election in November. Call me cynical, but that is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation would expand the Federal bureaucracy unnecessarily, take over the responsibility of local governments, and add even more strings to Federal funding for the Biden administration or future administrations to impose their woke agenda and unrelated progressive policies on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, these are not real solutions to the crime epidemic in America. These are political machinations to give the appearance of being supportive of law enforcement. These are a Texas-sized fig leaf to cover the Democrat left's reckless policies and dangerous rhetoric that have encouraged crime, have only coddled criminals, and have created a culture of lawlessness in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn all of that, and I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote "no" on this bill and the whole lot of these bills that are really just political window dressing.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, in follow-up to my colleague from Texas' comment, I would also say that we get what we pay for, which is why I rise to support the bipartisan Invest to Protect Act which is legislation I was proud to cosponsor. This legislation follows our prior increases of funding to the community-oriented policing program through the appropriations process.

The Invest to Protect Act would help get the job done of ensuring that police departments—particularly those like I represent in smaller and rural communities—have the ability to recruit and retain officers.

This legislation invests in officer safety, it invests in domestic violence response training, and it invests in funding the police departments like those I represent.

Throughout Virginia's Seventh District, I hear directly from local police departments about the need for stronger investments in training, equipment, recruitment, and retention. And as a

former law enforcement officer, I greatly admire and am thankful for the dedication of the men and women who work every day to keep our communities safe.

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

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman GOTTHEIMER and Congressman RUTHERFORD, for their leadership on this legislation. I thank CBC Chair BEATTY for her partnership on these important issues of public safety and public trust. And I appreciate that this bill has the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Officers.

This is a smart investment, smart policy, and at this moment we should have the common commitment to keeping America's communities safe.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6448, the so-called Invest to Protect Act.

All of the bills that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rushed to the floor today are nothing more than kind of last-minute political items, obviously, a few weeks out from election day. They will use these bills to claim that they support funding the police.

However, the American people are not fooled. They saw Democrats across the country call for defunding of the police. There is video that continues to run ad nauseam with examples of that, and it was all in the wake of George Floyd's death.

We only need to look at the House Judiciary Committee Democrats' refusal to take up these bills in regular order. For further evidence that these bills are a political stunt, just this week, Judiciary Committee Democrats postponed a hearing on organized retail theft until after the election.

The simple truth is Democrats have no interest in putting forth a serious effort to reduce crime. All the money in these grant programs don't mean a thing if leftwing prosecutors continue to let violent criminals out with little or no bail.

That is why yesterday my colleagues and I introduced the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act after last year's horrific attack in my district at the Waukesha Christmas parade.

This bill takes three steps to push back on radical leftwing bail laws. It conditions the Byrne grant program funding on meeting the Federal pretrial release factors as a floor. It reduces grant funding by 75 percent unless State and local jurisdictions develop and maintain a public safety report.

The problem in Waukesha was that later on the DA said, boy, we didn't know what was going on in other

States. We didn't know that there were any other crimes committed there. And then judges did not have enough information prior to setting bail.

We can't let people off the hook just by saying that we just didn't have enough information. Six people died in the Waukesha Christmas parade because no one took the time to figure out that this individual who was before them was absolutely one of the most dangerous people living in Wisconsin.

States would be further incentivized to report this information to the National Crime Information Center. It would bring transparency, and it would change the bail system.

Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to these issues; but, unfortunately, there is a faction of the Democratic Party that simply continues to run the opposite way. I don't know if it is to assure their constituencies that they are with them, but that time is over.

Unfortunately, as we are in the middle of September right before the November elections, the Democrats finally woke up.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that Mr. FITZGERALD would admit that the Republicans want to defund the police by 75 percent. That is what he just said. After all the Republican rhetoric about the Democrats wanting to defund the police—which, of course, is not true—Mr. FITZGERALD just got up and told us the Republicans want to defund the police by 75 percent.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what my distinguished colleague and chairman of the committee was referring to there, but I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I would just add this: One of the phrases we heard from the Democrats over the last couple of years is "reimagined policing."

Well, now we know what they mean. Now we get it. They want to take money from communities who funded their police and give it to communities who didn't, so they can get past this whole defund the police that has been their mantra for the last couple years.

In fact, as I said before, I am surprised by some of the statements I have heard from the chairman of the committee, because as I said, in June of 2020—and it is a direct quote—"There should be substantial cuts to the police budget. . . ."—by Mr. NADLER.

Now he has got a bill that supposedly, they are saying, funds the police, but we know it doesn't. It takes money from communities I get the privilege of representing in west central Ohio who never, never defunded their police. They made sure the men and women in blue got the resources they needed to protect their communities.

And now the Democrats are saying: We want to take taxpayer dollars from

those communities and set up these grant programs so we can give it to social workers. This is straight from the bill, so we can give "a stipend to be used for graduate education in the area of mental health, public health, or social work. . . ."

That is what they want the money to be used for, not for the people who are stopping the crime that is happening in every major urban area around the country.

That is why we are opposed to this legislation. I hope it goes down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would bolster law enforcement across the country and improve public safety. I think it is telling that people like Mr. RUTHERFORD on the Republican side of the aisle helped craft this bill with people like Mr. GOTTHEIMER on this side of the aisle.

On the other hand, there are, obviously, a lot of Republicans like Mr. JORDAN who want to defund the police or at least defund small town America police by opposing this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support small town America and to support policing in small town America by supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act of 2022,"—bipartisan legislation that would bolster small law enforcement agencies' ability to address staffing shortages and improve community safety through de-escalation training and other resources.

It was Democrats who spent two years negotiating and working with law enforcement to introduce and pass the comprehensive "George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021"—which recognized the necessity of balancing the needs and safety of the community with law enforcement interests.

That is why I tried to make this bill better by adding three additional purposes for the use of grant funding.

Development and implementation of best practices and training on the use of lethal and nonlethal force;

Development and implementation of best practices and training to eliminate the use of excessive force;

Development and implementation of best practices and training on the duty of care and the duty to intervene.

I am glad those provisions were added where grantees who choose to implement those activities will be given preference.

This bill seeks to address these challenges by providing additional federal resources to small agencies—that often have the most trouble accessing federal grant funding—to recruit and retain qualified officers as well as provide additional training and support.

A 2016 study by the Department of Justice (DOJ) found that of the 12,261 local police departments in the country, 11,638 of them had less than 100 full-time sworn officers. That is 11,638 police departments that would be eligible to access much-needed funding as authorized by H.R. 6448.

Importantly, H.R. 6448 includes limitations on the use of grant funds for hiring and retention to ensure that the funds are not misused, and gives preference to applicants that plan to use grant funds for certain training purposes, including:

de-escalation; the use of lethal and non-lethal force; the duty of care and the duty to intervene—as well as—

victim-centered training on handling domestic violence situations; and

safety training for officers responding to calls involving persons with substance use disorders, mental health needs, disabilities, and vulnerable youth.

This bill would also allow departments to use funds to provide mental health services and treatment to officers and collect data on policing practices that focus on officer and community safety.

In its totality, H.R. 6448 provides critical funding to law enforcement agencies that need it while encouraging improvement among their ranks. This bill makes clear that Democrats will continue to uplift and support law enforcement—as we always have—and we will do so in a manner that ensures officers are well-trained to keep themselves safe as well as the people and communities they serve.

Let's be clear—This is not a last-ditch effort by Democrats to distance ourselves from efforts to defund the police. Democrats have always been supportive of law enforcement.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter of support of H.R. 6448, Invest to Protect Act, from the Fraternal Order of Police.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2022.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEPHEN J. SCALISE,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, HOYER AND SCALISE: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to urge the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support the passage of H.R. 5768, the "Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act," and H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act," which could be considered on the floor of the House as early as today.

Homicide cases can be very difficult to clear—especially those committed via firearm—and non-fatal shootings even more so. Closing these types of crimes requires diligence, manpower, and a sustained investigative effort. Given the limited resources of law enforcement agencies, it's important to provide the significant, dedicated resources that clearing these crimes requires, especially given their oftentimes heinous nature, and the need to get justice for the victims and their families.

The "VICTIM Act" would establish a grant program to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides, non-fatal shootings and other violent crimes. Agencies can use these grant funds to train, hire, or retain additional detectives, investigators, or other police personnel to investigate, solve, and respond to these crimes. The grants can also be

used to improve training for agency personnel to address the needs of victims and family members impacted by these crimes. By providing those important resources to law enforcement agencies across the country, we can improve the chances that murders, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings get cleared. This means ensuring punishment for the perpetrators, securing justice for the victims and their families, and providing peace of mind for the communities our members work so hard to protect.

The FOP also urges Members of the House to support H.R. 6448, the "Invest to Protect Act." Over the last few years, law enforcement officers have faced many challenges and threats to their well-being that have created a dangerous environment for those sworn to protect the public. These challenges have ranged from violence against officers, an increase in violent rhetoric against them, lagging technology, recruitment and retention issues, and mental health concerns. Smaller municipalities are experiencing increased strain on the men and women in blue. We believe that the "Invest to Protect Act" can help our nation's smaller agencies and departments combat these issues that plague law enforcement officers in smaller municipalities.

This legislation would establish a grant program that would be used for training of officers from police departments and municipalities that employ less than 125 law enforcement officers. The funding appropriated would be \$60 million over a five-year period. These trainings would include de-escalation, domestic violence response, and response calls to vulnerable populations like those involving persons with disabilities, mental health issues, or substance abuse disorders.

This legislation is also designed to help these smaller agencies recruit new officers and to help address the retention issue of current officers. The funding could also be used by officers from eligible departments who are pursuing further education in mental health, public health, or social work. These officers could receive up to \$10,000 in aid towards their tuition. Lastly, the funding could also be used for mental health services, treatments, and therapies for active police officers.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I urge the Members of the House to pass these two bills to support our nation's small departments and the communities they serve. If I can provide any additional information about this bill, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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 yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Resolution 1377, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4118

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Break the Cycle of Violence Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Sec. 101. Community-based violence intervention program grants.

Sec. 102. Office of Community Violence Intervention.

Sec. 103. Community Violence Intervention Advisory Committee.

Sec. 104. Creation of a National Community Violence Response Center.

Sec. 105. Sense of Congress regarding services for victims of violent crime.

Sec. 106. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Sec. 201. Improving approaches for communities to thrive (IMPACT) grants.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Community violence is a significant public health, public safety, and community infrastructure concern nationwide and is a leading cause of death, injury, and trauma for people in the United States that disrupts employment and hinders a community's social and economic development.

(2) From 2010 to 2019, over 175,000 people were murdered in the United States. Hundreds of thousands more were hospitalized or treated in emergency departments after surviving life-changing gunshot injuries and other violent assaults.

(3) In 2020, the Nation suffered the largest single-year spike in homicides on record, driven largely by record spikes in fatal shootings. Nationwide, 75 percent of all homicides are committed with a gun.

(4) Communities across the Nation experience enormous disparities in safety that are driven by inequitable social and structural determinants of health. Interpersonal shootings are disproportionately concentrated in neighborhoods harmed by past and present racial discrimination, segregation, redlining, disinvestment, mass incarceration, and concentrated poverty, and this violence's toll falls overwhelmingly on people of color, especially young Black and brown men and boys and their loved ones. From 2015 to 2019, Black children and teens were 14 times as