

he opposed, appropriated money for police. This bill complements it by appropriating money for antiviolence intervention.

Mr. Speaker, our communities have seen enough violence and bloodshed. The Break the Cycle of Violence Act gives us the opportunity to prevent violence before it starts and to provide critical support to our most impacted communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this crucial legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1377, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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 proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1377, I call up the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, 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, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 117-62, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 117-483, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5768

*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 “Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2022” or “VICTIM Act of 2022”.*

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds the following:*

(1) Research indicates that law enforcement agencies can increase clearance rates by improving—

- (A) investigative processes;
- (B) detective capacities; and
- (C) organizational oversight and supervision of investigations.

(2) When a law enforcement agency expends additional investigative effort, the law enforcement agency improves its success in gaining cooperation of key witnesses and increases the amount of forensic evidence collected.

(3) Effective investigation of shootings can prevent subsequent related violence by—

- (A) deterring retaliation; and
- (B) providing interventions to individuals who may continue to commit crimes or become victims of retaliatory violence.

(4) Law enforcement agencies that demonstrate higher rates of clearance for violent crimes committed against a person—

- (A) have more structured oversight and formal interactions between investigative units and agency leadership;

(B) are more likely to have investigative units that have collaborative relationships and robust information sharing with other units of the law enforcement agency;

(C) have investigative units that have specific goals and performance metrics for both the unit and for investigators within the unit;

(D) have investigators who more frequently respond to the initial crime scene shortly after crimes have been reported to collect evidence and interview witnesses;

(E) have investigators who either have specialized experience before joining investigative units or are trained in investigations once they join those units;

(F) often have standard operating procedures for investigations that establish policies and evidence-based best practices for conducting and completing homicide investigations; and

(G) have better relationships with the communities they serve, even if no specific community-oriented campaign or initiative exists between investigative units and community groups.

(5) Criminal justice agencies should collaborate with each other and share best practices for solving violent crimes committed against a person.

(6) A comprehensive community engagement strategy concerning gun violence is essential to improving clearance rates for violent crimes committed against a person.

#### SEC. 3. GRANT PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLEARANCE BY ARREST.—The term “clearance by arrest”, with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

- (A) has—
- (i) arrested not less than 1 person for the offense;

(ii) charged the person described in subparagraph (A) with the commission of the offense; and

(iii) referred the person described in subparagraph (A) for prosecution for the offense; or

(B) has cited an individual under the age of 18 to appear in juvenile court or before another juvenile authority with respect to the offense, regardless of whether a physical arrest occurred.

(2) CLEARANCE BY EXCEPTION.—The term “clearance by exception”, with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

(A) has identified not less than 1 person suspected of the offense; and

(B) with respect to the suspect described in subparagraph (A), has—

- (i) gathered enough evidence to—
- (I) support an arrest of the suspect;
- (II) make a charge against the suspect; and
- (III) refer the suspect for prosecution;
- (ii) identified the exact location of the suspect so that the suspect could be taken into custody immediately; and
- (iii) encountered a circumstance outside the control of the law enforcement agency that prohibits the agency from arresting the suspect,

charging the suspect, or referring the suspect for prosecution, including—

- (I) the death of the suspect;
- (II) the refusal of the victim to cooperate with the prosecution after the suspect has been identified; or

(III) the denial of extradition because the suspect committed an offense in another jurisdiction and is being prosecuted for that offense.

(3) CLEARANCE RATE.—The term “clearance rate”, with respect to a law enforcement agency, means—

(A) the number of offenses cleared by the law enforcement agency, including through clearance by arrest and clearance by exception, divided by

(B) the total number of offenses reported to the law enforcement agency.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means a State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency or prosecuting office, or a group of Tribal law enforcement agencies or Tribal prosecuting offices.

(5) GRANT RECIPIENT.—The term “grant recipient” means a recipient of a grant under the Program.

(6) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term “law enforcement agency” means a public agency charged with policing functions, including any component bureau of the agency (such as a governmental victim services program or village public safety officer program), including an agency composed of officers or persons referred to in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 2(10) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C. 2801(10)).

(7) PROGRAM.—The term “Program” means the grant program established under subsection (b)(1).

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a grant program within the Office of Justice Programs under which the Attorney General awards grants to eligible entities to establish, implement, and administer violent incident clearance and technological investigative methods.

(2) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible entity seeking a grant under the Program shall submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by—

(A) such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require; and

(B) a description of each eligible project under paragraph (4) that the grant will fund.

(3) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—The Attorney General, in selecting a recipient of a grant under the Program, shall consider the specific plan and activities proposed by the applicant to improve clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings.

(4) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—A grant recipient shall use the grant for activities with the specific objective of improving clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including—

(A) ensuring the retention of detectives who are assigned to investigate homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings as of the date of receipt of the grant;

(B) hiring and training additional detectives who will be dedicated to investigating homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings;

(C) developing policies, procedures, and training to improve the ability of detectives to effectively investigate and solve homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including implementing best practices relating to—

(i) improving internal agency cooperation, organizational oversight and accountability, and supervision of investigations;

(ii) developing specific goals and performance metrics for both investigators and investigative units;

(iii) establishing or improving relationships with the communities the agency serves; and  
(iv) collaboration with and among other law enforcement agencies and criminal justice organizations;

(D) training personnel to address the needs of victims and family members of victims of homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, or non-fatal shootings or collaborating with trained victim advocates and specialists to better meet victims' needs;

(E) acquiring, upgrading, or replacing investigative, evidence processing, or forensic testing technology or equipment;

(F) development and implementation of policies that safeguard civil rights and civil liberties during the collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(G) hiring or training personnel for collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(H) hiring and training of personnel to analyze violent crime and the temporal and geographic trends among homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and nonfatal shootings;

(I) retaining experts to conduct a detailed analysis of homicides and shootings using Gun Violence Problem Analysis (commonly known as "GVPA") or a similar research methodology;

(J) ensuring victims have appropriate access to emergency food, housing, clothing, travel, and transportation;

(K) developing competitive and evidence-based programs to improve homicide and non-fatal shooting clearance rates;

(L) developing best practices for improving access to and acceptance of victim services, including victim services that promote medical and psychological wellness, ongoing counseling, legal advice, and financial compensation;

(M) training investigators and detectives in trauma-informed interview techniques;

(N) establishing programs to support officers who experience stress or trauma as a result of responding to or investigating shootings or other violent crime incidents; or

(O) ensuring language and disability access supports are provided to victims, survivors, and their families so that victims can exercise their rights and participate in the criminal justice process.

(c) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with a grant under the Program shall not exceed—

(A) 100 percent if the grant is awarded on or before December 31, 2032; or

(B) subject to paragraph (2), 50 percent if the grant is awarded after December 31, 2032.

(2) **WAIVER.**—With respect to a grant awarded under the Program after December 31, 2032, the Attorney General may determine that the Federal share of the cost of a project assisted with the grant shall not exceed 100 percent.

(d) **REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENT.**—Not later than 1 year after receiving a grant under the Program, and each year thereafter, a grant recipient shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the activities carried out using the grant, including, if applicable—

(1) the number of homicide and non-fatal shooting detectives hired by the grant recipient;

(2) the number of evidence processing personnel hired by the grant recipient;

(3) a description of any training that is—

(A) provided to existing (as of the date on which the grant was awarded) or newly hired homicide and non-fatal shooting detectives; and

(B) designed to assist in the solving of crimes and improve clearance rates;

(4) any new evidence processing technology or equipment purchased or any upgrades made to existing (as of the date on which the grant was awarded) evidence technology or equipment, and the associated cost;

(5) any assessments of evidence processing technology or equipment purchased with grant funds to determine whether such technology or equipment satisfies the objectives of the use of

the technology or equipment in increasing clearance rates, and any policies in place to govern the use of the technology or equipment;

(6) the internal policies and oversight used to ensure that any technology purchased through the grant for the purposes of improving clearance rates does not violate the civil rights and civil liberties of individuals;

(7) data regarding clearance rates for homicides, rapes, other aggravated felonies, and non-fatal shootings, including the rate of clearances by arrest and clearances by exception, and crime trends from within each jurisdiction in which the grant recipient carried out activities supported by the grant;

(8) whether the grant recipient has provided grant funds to any victim services organizations, and if so, which organizations;

(9) the demographic information for victims of homicides, rapes, other aggravated felonies, and non-fatal shootings, and the length and outcomes of each investigation, including whether the investigation was cleared by arrest or exception;

(10) the demographic information for each victim or family member of a victim who received victim-related services provided by the grant recipient; and

(11) identification of the services most used by victims and their families and identification of additional services needed.

(e) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE EVALUATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **EVALUATION.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall conduct an evaluation of—

(A) the practices deployed by grant recipients to identify policies and procedures that have successfully improved clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings; and

(B) the efficacy of any services provided to victims and family members of victims of homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after completion of an evaluation by the National Institute of Justice under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report including—

(A) the results of the evaluation; and

(B) information reported by each grant recipient under subsection (d).

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2032.

(2) **PERCENT FOR CERTAIN ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—The Attorney General shall use 10 percent of the amount made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year to award grants under the Program to Tribal law enforcement agencies or prosecuting offices, or groups of such agencies or offices.

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 (Mr. NADLER).

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. 5768.

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. 5768, the VICTIM Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would help law enforcement improve clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and nonfatal shootings.

As communities continue to face increased gun violence and violent crime, this bill is a vital step toward improving public safety.

Again, let me be clear: Democrats have always stood for equitable funding for law enforcement. In fact, Democratic-led cities and States have consistently funded law enforcement at much higher per capita rates than Republican-led cities, while also recognizing the need for law enforcement accountability and improving public trust.

To address the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing, this bill would provide funding and support for agencies to hire and train detectives and investigators to improve case clearance rates.

Low clearance rates not only prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust in law enforcement. By investing in the personnel and technology needed to solve cases of homicide and other serious crimes, agencies can help build public confidence and improve community safety.

In providing State, local, and Tribal agencies with additional resources, the VICTIM Act will equip agencies to better respond to and investigate these serious crimes, bringing justice for victims and keeping our communities safe.

I thank Representative VAL DEMINGS and her bipartisan cosponsors for their leadership on this issue and for introducing this important legislation.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, for reasons we have articulated on the previous bills, we oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, real life is quite different from television or political buffoonery. Half of gun murders in the United States go unsolved. Victims are too often left with no justice and their families with little support.

Who amongst us believes that murderers or violent criminals should not be arrested and prosecuted to the full extent of the law? I pray, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this Chamber really believes that.

But, today, we will witness with our own eyes who actually wants to fund the police. I learned a long time ago, don't just listen to what they say but watch what they do.

As a former law enforcement officer, I vividly recall being on the scene of young people dead as a result of violence, knowing that their families would soon receive devastating news. We all know that there will be more families who receive those calls. I want to make sure that there are experts, trained and ready, who can help them through those horrible moments.

Mr. Speaker, I saw as a detective, a detective sergeant, and a chief of police that violent crimes require a coordinated and professional response to ensure a word that we really need to get familiar with in this Chamber, and that word is "justice."

We know that far too many police departments just do not have the resources they need to solve these heinous crimes. That is why I introduced the VICTIM Act.

I have even heard one of my former law enforcement colleagues suggest that the Department of Justice has already provided enough resources.

Let me be clear about what this bill does. This legislation provides additional Federal resources for State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to make sure that our men and women in blue—remember, back the blue—have the support they need to do their jobs, that survivors of violent crime have the support they need to try, Mr. Speaker, to rebuild.

But this is not a blank check. This funding must specifically be used for the hiring and training of detectives and victim support specialists.

Further, recipients would be required to regularly report how the money was spent and how it affected clearance rates for homicides and nonfatal shootings.

The National Institute of Justice will evaluate these reports and see what works and see what did not work. We are demanding results, or at least we should be because our communities are demanding results.

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

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. As the chief of police in Orlando, we were laser-focused on reducing violent crimes. I ask my colleagues who like to talk about violent crime to join us in reducing violent crime. We were able to do so because we had the resources to do so.

This legislation is supported by the FOP, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the National Policing Institute, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in backing the blue.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 2020, mobs of radical leftists burned our cities, preyed on innocent citizens, attacked our police officers, and occupied business districts during what one leftist Democrat mayor called the summer of love. At least 25 people were killed.

Republicans called for law and order. Democrats called for defunding our police departments and releasing dangerous criminals onto our streets, often within hours of their arrests. In the cities they controlled, they did just that.

In those cities, crime has skyrocketed, including the fastest increase in homicides ever recorded in our Nation. Ironically, the greatest victims are their own constituents, who are now turning on them.

Crime doesn't concern House Democrats, but losing political support before an election, that scares them to death, so we have these bills brought hurriedly to the floor today.

Let me point out the obvious. Republican communities have backed their police departments with the local funds and the moral support they need to do their jobs. Democratic cities have defunded and demonized their police departments.

The Democrats' response is to take the taxes paid by the citizens who fully funded their police departments and give them to those Democratic cities that have cut them, and still virtually none of the money they propose to spend is for actual law enforcement. It is, rather, for intervention, de-escalation, training, public health, and social work training, all administered by the increasingly corrupt and politicized Department of Justice.

We have watched the Democrats utterly destroy the cities that they have dominated for decades. Do we really want to let them do the same thing to our country?

Americans need to ask themselves how much farther down this dismal road they are willing to go. We can restore safety to all of our communities the moment we summon the political will to do so.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a victims' act. So many of us have worked with our law enforcement and victims.

The VICTIM Act would provide \$100 million annually in grant funding to law enforcement agencies and prosecuting officers to bolster their ability to investigate and clear cases of homicide, rape, sexual assault, kidnapping, and nonfatal shootings. All have family members that are left wondering and in pain. This VICTIM Act, as someone who has always worked with victims, ensures that they are not left empty.

Homicide clearance rates, in particular, have dropped consistently since the 1960s, leaving many unsolved cases and many victims and their families still searching. I want my colleagues to have a heart. They are still searching for justice.

This legislation by Congresswoman DEMINGS addresses the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing in solving homicides and other violent crimes in red States and blue States. This critical funding would help agencies improve their clearance rates through various means. It helps retain detectives. It helps in training personnel.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides for low clearance rates, which disproportionately affect victims and families of victims of marginalized communities. Not only do they prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust.

I have given money to help victims, and victims say: "Do you know what? We are left alone," the victims or families. "We are left alone to address this disparity."

This bill will help not leave them alone, keep pressure on finding that culprit, that individual who violated them, that criminal who has violated them, and also by providing agencies with additional resources.

This \$100 million is to help victims. Is there anybody on the floor that wants to join in a bipartisan manner to help victims or to work with law enforcement who are on the job, who are saying: We need help because victims need help, and we certainly need to solve the crimes for these families who are longing to understand about their loved ones who have been raped, assaulted, and those who have lost their lives.

I remind my colleagues of the father and baby in my community who were found dead. They need help.

Support the VICTIM Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5768, Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2022" or the "VICTIM Act," that would provide \$100 million annually in grant funding to law enforcement agencies and prosecuting offices to bolster their ability to investigate and clear cases of homicide, rape, sexual assault, kidnapping, and non-fatal shootings.

As someone who has always supported law enforcement, let me state plainly—this bill is about funding law enforcement agencies—not defunding them.

Homicide clearance rates, in particular, have dropped consistently since the 1960's leaving many unsolved cases and many victims and their families still searching for justice. In 2020, the clearance rate for homicides fell to roughly 50 percent while pressure on law enforcement officials increased—leading to calls for more funding for overburdened departments with sizable caseloads and depleted resources.

To address the challenges our law enforcement agencies are facing in solving homicides and other violent crime—in red states and blue states—this critical funding would help agencies improve their clearance rates through various means, including:

ensuring retention of detectives assigned to violent crimes;

hiring and training additional detectives and investigators dedicated specifically to investigating homicides and other violent crimes;

hiring and training personnel for collecting, processing, and testing forensic evidence; and hiring and training personnel to analyze violent crime trends.

Low clearance rates—which disproportionately affect victims and families of victims of marginalized communities—not only prevent victims from accessing justice, but they also damage the public's trust in law enforcement.

To address this disparity, funding in the bill could be used to train personnel to address the needs of victims and family members and develop competitive and evidence-based programs and practices to improve both clearance rates and victim services—thereby rebuilding public confidence and improving community safety.

The bill would also ensure victim services programs are funded, staffed, and trained, and that they provide restorative support to victims and their families.

Investing in personnel as well as the technology needed to solve cases of homicide and other violent crime, also helps build public confidence and improve community safety.

That is why H.R. 5768's funding can be used to acquire, upgrade, or replace investigative or evidence processing technology or equipment.

By providing agencies with additional resources—drawing from an authorized amount of \$100 million dollars—the VICTIM Act would equip agencies to better respond to and investigate serious crimes—delivering justice to victims and making our communities safer.

I commend Representative Val Demings for championing this thoughtful, bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated November 1, 2021, from the Major Cities Chiefs Association and an article from Third Way titled “The Red City Defund Police Problem.”

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,  
November 1, 2021.

Hon. VAL DEMINGS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. DEMINGS: I write on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) to register our strong support for H.R. 5768, the VICTIM Act. The MCCA is a professional organization of police executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada.

Nearly every major city in the United States is contending with a rise in violent crime. According to the MCCA's most recent Violent Crime Survey, comparing midyear 2020 with midyear 2021, homicides are up roughly 20 percent in major cities. In addition, most MCCA members have reported significant increases in gun violence, evidenced by the uptick in aggravated assaults.

The grants authorized in the VICTIM Act will help law enforcement agencies overcome some of the challenges associated with responding to the current increase in violent crime. More specifically, this bill will provide law enforcement with critical resources

to address staffing challenges, enhance their forensics capabilities, further deploy investigative technologies, and provide services to victims of violent crime and their families.

Thank you for your continued leadership and support for our brave law enforcement officers. The MCCA stands ready to help advance this legislation.

Sincerely,

JERI WILLIAMS,  
Chief, Phoenix Police Department,  
President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

[From Third Way, June 8, 2022]

#### THE RED CITY DEFUND POLICE PROBLEM

(By Jim Kessler, Executive Vice President for Policy, and Kylie Murdock, Executive Coordinator)

In recent years, Republicans have tagged Democrats as the party of “defund the police.” This political charge has at its roots an unfortunate choice of sloganeering and policy from a small number of progressive activists frustrated and fed up with long-standing police violence and abuse directed toward minorities. However intentioned, the defund charge proved damaging to Democrats. Republicans ran myriad attack ads in 2020 and the attack was credited with Republican upsets in swing districts that narrowed Democratic majorities in the House. This attack was so successful that during his 2022 State of the Union address, President Biden felt compelled to say, “We should all agree: The answer is not to defund the police. The answer is to fund the police. Fund them. Fund them. The President also dedicated \$10 billion from the American Rescue Plan for public safety, including \$6.5 billion in crime-fighting aid to state and local communities.

But is the Republican charge even remotely true? It has been taken as a given by much of the media just as Democrats have been pigeon-holed as soft on crime and being responsible for rampant crime across the country. Yet as our March 2022 report showed, the 25 states that voted for Donald Trump had a murder rate 40% higher than the 25 states that voted for Joe Biden. And 8 of the 10 states with the highest murder rates not only voted for Donald Trump, they voted Republican in every presidential election this century. Is the Democrats’ defund the police portrait as inaccurate as its soft on crime portrait?

To answer this question, we compared the police budgets of the 25 largest Democrat-run cities and the 25 largest Republican-run cities. We pulled FY2021 and FY2022 funding data directly from city operating budgets, as well as police force data from a mixture of police department websites, city budgets, and local news sources. Using this, we calculated several key metrics—the number of police officers, police officers per capita, police funding per capita, and percent change in police budgets from FY2021 to FY2022. Per capita data allows us to control for population and compare cities like New York City and Fort Worth.

We found that despite conventional wisdom to the contrary, Democrat-run cities employ far more police officers and spend far more money on policing per capita than Republican-run cities. In fact, police forces in Dem cities are 75 percent larger than police forces in GOP cities. And Democrats spend about 38 percent more per person on policing than Republicans do. On average, Democrat- and Republican-run cities all saw an increase in police funding in 2022, with Democrats actually increasing police budgets by slightly more.

The data make clear—Republicans may talk about funding the police, but they trail badly as compared to Democrats.

#### DEM CITIES EMPLOY MORE POLICE OFFICERS PER CAPITA THAN GOP CITIES

The size of a city's police force is often seen as indicative of its support for law enforcement. Democrats have been accused of defunding the police and cutting police funding and staff. We compared the 25 most populous cities run by each party as defined by the political affiliation of its mayor to see if this potent political charge is true.

The 25 most populous Democratic cities run from New York City with 8,177,025 inhabitants to Memphis with 650,980. The 25 most populous Republican cities run from Jacksonville with a population of 949,611 to Glendale in Arizona with 248,325 residents. In total, the 25 most populous Democratic cities are home to 37,470,584 people, while the commensurate 25 Republican cities have a combined total of 10,415,763.

We found that in the aggregate:

Democrat-run cities employ 288.2 officers per 100,000 residents, compared to Republican-run cities with only 164.6 officers per 100,000 residents.

Police forces in cities with Democratic mayors are 75.1% larger than police forces in GOP cities.

Of the ten cities with the largest per capita police forces, nine are run by Democrats—Washington DC, Chicago, Las Vegas, New York City, Detroit, Philadelphia, Memphis, Boston, and Los Angeles. Miami, coming in at ninth, is the only Republican-run city in the top ten.

We also compared the median per capita police force average since larger cities like New York and Los Angeles can skew results. Among these same cities, those with Democratic mayors had a median of 195.3 officers per 100,000 residents, or 23.1 percent more than the 158.7 median for Republican run cities.

The size of a city didn't seem to be a determining factor in the per capita rate of police officers. For example, Phoenix, San Antonio, and San Diego ranked 5th, 6th, and 8th in population, but ranked 34th, 40th, and 42nd in police per capita. Meanwhile, Las Vegas, Detroit, Memphis, and Miami ranked 25th, 27th, 28th and 33rd in population, but ranked 3rd, 5th, 7th, and 9th in police per capita. Oklahoma City and Las Vegas have nearly identical populations (676,492 versus 675,592), but Republican-led Oklahoma City had a police force roughly one-third the size of Las Vegas with its Democratic mayor (162.6 officers compared to 444.1 per 100,000 residents).

#### DEM CITIES SPEND MORE MONEY ON POLICING THAN GOP CITIES

Republicans have decried Democrats, attempts to cut police budgets in liberal cities across the country. But we found that Democrats spend more on policing than Republicans do.

Republican-run cities spend \$361 per resident on police. Democrat-run cities spend \$498 per resident, about 38 percent more than Republicans. Because aggregate police budgets can be skewed by larger cities, we also looked at the median per capita police budgets for these sets of 25 cities. Once again, Democrat-run cities had median police budgets 31 percent greater than Republican-run cities, \$423.55 to \$323.40 per resident.

Of the ten cities that spent the most on policing per capita, six of them are Democrat-run and four are Republican-run. Cities often criticized by Republicans for being “soft-on-crime”—New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, Seattle—are all in the top 15 on police funding per person. Republican strongholds like Bakersfield and Oklahoma City spend less than half of what New York City and Chicago spend on their police.

#### DEM CITIES SAW SLIGHTLY LARGER POLICE BUDGET INCREASES THAN GOP CITIES IN 2022

Defund the police may exist as a slogan, but it does not exist as a policy—at least in

the 50 cities that we reviewed. Between FY2021 to FY2022, Democrat-run cities saw a 4.34 percent increase in police funding—from \$17.89 billion to \$18.67 billion, or about 775 million in the aggregate. Republican-run cities saw a 4.11 percent increase—from \$3.62 billion to \$3.76 billion, \$148 million in the aggregate.

Twenty-one of 25 Democratic cities and 21 of 25 Republican cities showed budget increases in FY2022. Cities like New York and Los Angeles are often mentioned in defund the police attacks—both cities increased their police budgets in 2022. In fact, the ten largest Democrat-run cities increased their police budgets in 2022, though Philadelphia's held fairly constant with a 0.28 percent increase. New York City's increase of 3.75 percent added \$196 million. Chicago, Portland, and Seattle—cities often accused of defunding the police—all saw increases in their 2022 police budgets. Paradoxically, Washington DC had the largest budget cut of 3.98 percent but also the largest police budget per resident at \$751.62.

#### CONCLUSION

Democrats have been accused of defunding the police as a larger “soft on crime” message from Republican officeholders and conservative media. In a previous report, we found that homicide rates were significantly higher in the 25 states that voted for Trump compared to the 25 states that voted for Biden.

In this report, we find that police funding and police personnel levels are far higher in the 25 largest Democrat-run cities compared to the 25 largest Republican-run cities. In the most recent funding cycle, these same Democratic cities increased their police budgets to a greater degree than cities with Republican mayors.

Our conclusion is that the defund the police charge against Democrats may be politically damaging, but it is factually inaccurate. If anything, Republican mayors have a defund problem.

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

□ 1500

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman, and the whole time I have been here I have been talking about crime and the rise in crime and how the Republican Party has supported the police.

Down South, we use a lot of common sense sometimes to solve issues, and the biggest issue we have right now in the country is the border. So what happens is that the drugs and the human trafficking follow through and goes to these cities. That is why we are seeing a rise in fentanyl.

One of the things I have observed is they use backpacks for the heroin and cocaine and fentanyl to pay their passage to the drug cartel.

So now the Democrats are panicked because we have an open border. We also have a rise in crime. It is just curious to me that now, all of sudden, we want to address these issues.

If you just look at the record across the country, Republican cities seem to manage crime so much better. So I don't think that more money is always a solution. Very often it is more management and local control.

I encourage a “no” on this, and I am honored to speak on this.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the VICTIM Act is bipartisan legislation that would increase public safety and improve law enforcement practices. The rise in violent crime affects every community across the country, not just Democratic communities.

But we 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.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for introducing this important legislation, which is supported by a wide range of law enforcement associations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 6448;

H.R. 8542;

H.R. 4118; and

H.R. 5768.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 64, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

#### YEAS—360

Adams	DeGette	Johnson (TX)
Aderholt	DeLauro	Jones
Aguilar	DelBene	Joyce (OH)
Allred	Demings	Joyce (PA)
Amodei	DeSaulnier	Kahele
Armstrong	Deutch	Kaptur
Auchincloss	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Axne	Dingell	Keating
Bacon	Doggett	Keller
Baird	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)
Balderson	F.	Kelly (MS)
Banks	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Ellzey	Khanna
Barragán	Emmer	Kildee
Bass	Escobar	Kilmer
Beatty	Eshoo	Kim (CA)
Bentz	Espallat	Kim (NJ)
Bera	Evans	Kind
Bergman	Feenstra	Kinziger
Beyer	Ferguson	Kirkpatrick
Bice (OK)	Finstad	Krishnamoorthi
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Fitzgerald	Kustoff
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Blunt Rochester	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bonamici	Fletcher	Lamb
Bost	Flood	Lamborn
Bourdeaux	Flores	Larsen (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Larson (CT)
F.	Fox	Latta
Brady	Frankel, Lois	LaTurner
Brown (MD)	Franklin, C.	Lawrence
Brown (OH)	Scott	Lawson (FL)
Brownley	Fulcher	Lee (CA)
Buchanan	Gallagher	Lee (NV)
Bucshon	Gallego	Leger Fernandez
Budd	Garamendi	Lesko
Burgess	Garbarino	Letlow
Bustos	Garcia (CA)	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Garcia (TX)	Lieu
Calvert	Gibbs	Lofgren
Carbajal	Gimenez	Long
Cárdenas	Golden	Lowenthal
Carey	Gonzales, Tony	Lucas
Carl	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer
Carson	Gonzalez,	Luria
Carter (LA)	Vicente	Lynch
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Mace
Cartwright	Granger	Malinowski
Case	Graves (LA)	Malliotakis
Casten	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Maloney, Sean
Chabot	Grijalva	Mann
Cheney	Guest	Manning
Cherfilus-	Guthrie	Matsui
McCormick	Harder (CA)	McBath
Chu	Harris	McCauley
Ciulline	Harshbarger	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Hartzler	McEachin
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	McGovern
Cleaver	Herrell	McHenry
Cline	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Cohen	Hill	Meeks
Cole	Himes	Meijer
Comer	Hinson	Meng
Connolly	Hollingsworth	Meuser
Conway	Horsford	Mfume
Cooper	Houlahan	Miller (WV)
Correa	Hoyer	Miller-Meeks
Costa	Hudson	Moolenaar
Courtney	Huffman	Mooney
Craig	Huizenga	Moore (UT)
Crawford	Issa	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Morelle
Crow	Jacobs (CA)	Moulton
Cuellar	Jacobs (NY)	Mrvan
Curtis	Jayapal	Mullin
Davids (KS)	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (NC)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Nadler
Dean	Johnson (OH)	Napolitano
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Neal