

Massillon, Ohio. Similar events will happen across the country. Go to one to let our heroes know that they matter.

Veterans in crisis may call 988 and then press 1 if they need immediate support.

To our heroes listening: Please know that we are here for you and that we will never forget your service and sacrifice to our Nation.

May God bless our veterans.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2494, PROTECT OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT WITH IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3091, FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SERVICE WEAPON PURCHASE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 40, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND CONDEMNING EFFORTS TO DEFUND OR DISMANTLE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 398 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 398**

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2494) to make the assault of a law enforcement officer a deportable offense, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-4. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion

of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3091) to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-5. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) expressing support for local law enforcement officers and condemning efforts to defund or dismantle local law enforcement agencies. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, and on any amendment thereto, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1215

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2494, the Protect Our Law Enforcement with Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 2023, or the POLICE Act; H.R. 3091, the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act; and H. Con. Res. 40, expressing support for local law enforcement officers and condemning efforts to defund or dismantle local law enforcement agencies.

It provides for structured rules for all three bills and makes in order Democratic as well as Republican amendments.

Given all that our police officers do for our communities each and every day, I am honored to stand here in defense of this legislation to support them.

According to the FBI, assaults on law enforcement officers increased by 11.2 percent from 2020 to 2021. Many of these violent crimes have been committed by illegal aliens. As this administration continues to let the crisis at the border spiral out of control, these types of assaults will continue to increase.

There are things we can do to deter criminal assaults and protect our officers. The POLICE Act would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clearly state that the assault of a law enforcement officer is a deportable offense. If those who have been given the privilege of coming here cannot respect our laws or those who enforce them,

they should not enjoy the benefit of remaining in our country.

The second bill under consideration today, H.R. 3091, would allow law enforcement officers to buy retired and surplus military service weapons at fair market value, so long as the officer is in good standing with their employed agency. Under current law, Federal law enforcement agencies are required to destroy retired and unneeded firearms. The Fraternal Order of Police estimates that this wastes up to \$8 million a year. This bill is a commonsense solution to save taxpayer dollars and support law enforcement officers.

Finally, H. Con. Res. 40 expresses Congress' support for local law enforcement officers and condemns efforts to defund or dismantle local law enforcement agencies.

Unfortunately, because there are people out there, even some serving in Congress, who want to defund the police and want to continue the anti-law enforcement rhetoric, this bill is necessary.

In a time when police officers are regularly attacked for their profession, 2021 being the deadliest year in two decades for law enforcement officers, according to the FBI, it can never be stated enough that the U.S. Congress supports this country's police officers.

The brave men and women across this Nation who risk their lives every day need to know that we condemn any efforts to defund them, and we support them. They need to know that we stand with them and are here to do everything in our power to protect them in the way they protect and serve our communities. That is why I encourage my colleagues to stand with me and support these pieces of legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I begin today with a story. Once upon a time in Congress, House Republicans put forward their top agenda, a package of bills so crucial, so urgent, that teeing them up for consideration was one of the very first things we did on the floor of this Congress—after, of course, KEVIN MCCARTHY's 15 votes for Speaker.

Tucked into this package was a little bill about supporting the police, H. Con. Res. 5, a simple, nonbinding resolution, really, that didn't do much. It was purely symbolic, but it did express support for our Nation's police, all of our Nation's police.

But something mysterious happened, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will join me in trying to solve that mystery today.

Instead of bringing their bill up right away, Republicans waited, and they waited, and they waited. They waited until this week, and they brought up a bill, but something changed. See, in the original bill, the language read

that Congress expresses support for the Nation's law enforcement agencies.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, "Nation's," "Nation's." It was about all of our police. In their new bill, the one that we are considering today, they only express support for local enforcement officers.

Here is the new bill, Mr. Speaker. We see the word "local," "local"—nothing about our Nation's law enforcement officers, just "local." Huh. That is weird. What a strange change.

It is National Police Week, but they took out all of our national police agencies. Democrats searched and searched and searched for a reason. We looked high and low in the Rules Committee, but we couldn't find an answer.

Not a single person, not one Republican, Mr. Speaker, has been able to articulate to us who made that change, when it was made, or, most importantly, why it was made.

No one was able to explain to us why Republicans edited their bill from saying "any efforts to defund or dismantle law enforcement agencies" to any "efforts to defund or dismantle local law enforcement agencies."

Here is the important thing, and call it the moral of the story, if you will. The change was not without consequence because what the GOP did was cut out every officer at the FBI, ATF, CBP, U.S. Marshals Service, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Federal Protective Service, and Secret Service. They cut out every officer at the United States Capitol Police. They cut out the police who are standing outside these Chamber doors right now, keeping us safe. They cut out all the police who rushed to this building to keep all of my GOP friends safe on January 6, 2021.

Apparently, our Republican colleagues think National Police Week shouldn't include our national police.

I wish I could say that this was an unsolved mystery, I really do, but the answer is obvious, Mr. Speaker. The new Republican position is that they only support some police.

The new Republican position as of 2 weeks ago is that they want to defund police. They voted to cut COPS grants, fire 400 local police officers, defund the FBI, and cut grant funding for State and local law enforcement agencies.

The new Republican position, as put forward by their frontrunner for President, is that we ought to pardon the convicted criminals, white supremacists, and neo-Nazis who beat cops, crushed them in doors, and hit them with fire extinguishers on January 6.

The new Republican position is to give GEORGE SANTOS due process before he is kicked out but to deport legal immigrants who haven't even been charged with a crime.

Here is what I see today, Mr. Speaker. It seems like Republicans back the blue until they realize that laws apply to them, too.

That gets me to my final point because an important change is happening here today, and I want law en-

forcement officers across this country to take note. I know many of them are watching because it is police week, National Police Week, and here is what I want them to know: Democrats want to keep communities safe.

Democrats want to address gun violence in our schools, an issue I hear from police officers about all the time.

Democrats want to invest in programs that keep our communities safe, programs that get to the root causes of crime.

Democrats want to make sure police aren't put in situations they aren't trained to handle.

Democrats have passed bills that protect our communities and support our police, bills to help cops with PTSD and to invest in small police departments.

Republicans want to wrap their arms around the police while they cut funding.

Make sure we don't forget this, Mr. Speaker: 21 Republicans voted against awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the Capitol Police—21.

Republicans changed their bill to deliberately exclude America's national police agencies from National Police Week, which dishonors and disrespects the Capitol Police officers who protect our Capitol Building.

Republicans are using our law enforcement officers like political pawns. They are putting politics over public safety.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that my Republican friends have lost their way on law enforcement today, and it is clear who is in charge. It is not Speaker MCCARTHY. It is the most extreme of the extreme, and once again, the American people lose.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues not to make excuses about this legislation, not to say that it doesn't have this, it has this, or you changed this because they are playing word games.

The public is watching, and law enforcement officers are watching. Today, with your "yes" vote on this legislation, you can show your support for law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER).

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member, Representative FISCHBACH, for the time.

A quick history lesson.

June 2020, Vice President KAMALA HARRIS applauded former L.A. Mayor Eric Garcetti's decision to slash police funding by \$150 million.

Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ has stated, "defunding police means defunding police," an exact quote.

Representative CORI BUSH has said that she would "make sure" she has private security for her protection while simultaneously promising to defund the police that protect you.

Representative TLAIB has said: “No more policing, incarceration, and militarization.”

Representative OMAR has stated: Not only do we need to defund, we need to dismantle police departments.

What has been the result? What has been the result of these attacks on law enforcement? Well, 2021 was the deadliest year in two decades for our law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, 64 officers were shot and killed in the line of duty in 2022. Just to put that in perspective, that is a 40 percent increase from 2020.

At least nine cities, the vast majority of which are Democrat-controlled cities, saw record homicides last year and skyrocketing crime that continues to plague our communities all across the country.

Right here in D.C., for example, we are already seeing a 13 percent rise in violent crime in 2023 compared with 2022 when crime was already at near-historic levels.

Democrats are now trying to deflect responsibility for this rise in crime, but it is their own far-left radical policies that are to blame.

It is essential that we make it clear that Congress, at least this Republican majority, condemns all efforts to dismantle and defund our Nation’s police officers.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying piece of legislation.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota if she could respond to a question that we couldn’t get an answer to in the Rules Committee last night as to why Republicans did not bring up their original bill, H. Con. Res. 5, the one that they made in order with their opening day rules package.

I don’t know whether she can explain it to me. I am happy to yield her some time to do that. The silence is deafening, Mr. Speaker, because the question that we asked in the Rules Committee last night that nobody could answer is, in their original bill we honored our entire Nation’s law enforcement, including the Capitol Police, who protected us on January 6. However, the bill they bring up today changed all that and basically narrowed it down to local police but took out any recognition of our Capitol Police or any of our Federal law enforcement officers.

The gentlewoman will not answer the question. Nobody in the Rules Committee would answer the question.

To the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke, who was talking about defunding the police, I will tell you, when I was the chairman of the Rules Committee, we didn’t bring any resolutions to the floor to defund the police.

Two weeks ago, my Republican friends voted to cut money for local

law enforcement and for our Federal law enforcement agencies. They are the ones who voted to defund the police. Just don’t believe me; you can Google it. Check it out. Two weeks ago, their bill that they brought to the floor will cut law enforcement agencies.

Give me a break, Mr. Speaker.

Again, the idea that my Republican friends made a conscious decision to remove the Capitol Police from a resolution honoring our Nation’s police is beyond the pale.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Justice regarding the cuts proposed within the Republicans’ debt limit bill.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, DC.

Hon. ROSA DELAURIO,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DELAURIO: This responds to your letter to the Department of Justice (Department), dated January 19, 2023, regarding the impact on the Department’s ability to achieve its public safety mission if fiscal year (FY) 2024 discretionary spending is capped at the FY 2022 enacted level. Funding the Department at FY 2022 enacted levels would result in a significant reduction to the Department’s budget calculated to be much as 22% below FY 2023 enacted level and more than \$4 billion below what the Department would require to sustain even its base functions (current services) in FY 2024. A 22% reduction in the Department’s discretionary funding would be a loss of more than \$8 billion that is needed for the Department to accomplish its public safety and national security responsibilities.

A funding reduction of 22% in a single year would result in significant furloughs or reductions in force (RIFs) across many components. In addition, components would need to cancel dozens of contracts (including contracts for investigative and litigation tools and technologies); freeze equipment purchases (resulting in reliance on inferior and/or obsolete equipment); eliminate operational training (which would hinder operations and employee development); and reduce operational travel (which could prolong investigations and limit Department’s efficacy). All this would result in a delay of services and outcomes important to the nation and the American justice system.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) would see an effective reduction of \$2.8 billion were a funding reduction of 22% imposed, which would negate nine years of growth in the FBI’s key programs. The effect on the FBI’s personnel would be the loss of roughly 11,000 positions, or 29.2% of the FBI’s workforce. The FBI would be required to undertake a furlough of 60 days on a staggered basis. The lost work-years due to a hiring freeze and furloughs are the equivalent of the FBI shuttering 11 of its largest field offices (New York City, Washington, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, San Francisco, Newark, Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Houston). The non-personnel costs alone, approximately \$1.0 billion of the reduction, would be the equivalent of eliminating all of the FBI’s Headquarters Divisions in the Criminal Branch, Intelligence Branch, and National Security Branch combined.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) assesses that the 22% cut will result in a hiring freeze that would mean 190 agents, 130 Industry Operations Investigators, and 180 technical and support staff would be lost to attrition. Further, ATF would have to take 36 furlough days for all of its over 5,000 employees, including agents. Such a large reduction would: reduce operational funding (mission-related activity, contracts, vehicle maintenance), normal replacement cycle activity, provision of Emergency Support Function #13 (assistance to local, state, Tribal, territorial, and Federal organizations overwhelmed by the results of an actual or anticipated natural/manmade disaster or an act of terrorism), the K-9 program; eliminate all state and local training at National Center for Explosives Training and Research; start a backlog of regulatory inspections that will take years to clear; and increase trace times by more than two months at the National Tracing Center due to reduced staff. Finally, a funding reduction of 22% would severely hamper ATF’s ability to fully take advantage of the tools provided by the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (BSCA), in addition to substantially diminishing the effectiveness of ATF’s overall mission. The consequential negative effect on public safety would be that fewer ATF Special Agents would be available to assist law enforcement in communities across the country. Without appropriate funding, ATF would be unable to make critical enhancements needed to improve public safety in the fight against firearm related violent crime.

The U.S. Marshals Service’s (USMS) foremost mission is to protect the Federal Judicial process. Due to mandatory requirements for judicial and courthouse security, witness protection, and prisoner detention, a reduction of 22% below the FY 2023 enacted level would cause delays in the judicial system and disproportionately impact the fugitive apprehension mission and the agency’s ability to remove violent offenders from the streets. With a 22% reduction, the USMS would implement a hard hiring freeze, which would result in the inability to replace an estimated 221 Deputy US Marshals (DUSMs) and 135 other employees. The USMS would also have to execute a furlough of 22 days for all employees, and conduct a RIF for 650 employees, including an estimated 214 DUSMs. The USMS would eliminate all performance awards and promotion opportunities and reduce funding to fugitive surveillance, Special Operations, judicial security, and body-worn camera programs. Finally, a 22% reduction would create an insolvency in the Federal Prisoner Detention appropriation of \$467.7 million, an amount that the Department could not legally resolve through transfers from other accounts due to limitations imposed on interappropriation transfers in each year’s appropriations act.

On March 15, 2022, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2022 (VAWA 2022) was enacted. VAWA 2022 authorized multiple new programs for the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), three of which received their first appropriations in the FY 2023 enacted budget: the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) Specific Services Program; the Abby Honold Act (which fund trauma-informed, victim-centered training for law enforcement); and the Tribal Reimbursement Program for Special Tribal Criminal Jurisdiction.

Funding levels of 22% below the FY 2023 enacted level means that programs newly established by VAWA 2022 would not be funded at all or funded only through reductions to existing programs. OVW also calculates that operating at the lower level would mean approximately 40 fewer awards could be made

to grantees in key programs like the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program and the Sexual Assault Services Formula Grant Program that provide key services to states and to victims of sexual violence. For OVW generally, these cuts would result in fewer victims served over subsequent years, disproportionately heavy impacts on vulnerable communities, and threats to the sustainability of crucial programming that holds offenders accountable.

The impacts on other Department grantmaking would be detrimental as well. For example, if the Department's Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office were to operate at a 22% below the FY 2023 enacted level, the COPS Hiring Program would be required to significantly reduce the funding it provides both as to the number of positions it supports and in the number of awards that it makes (reduction of approximately \$50 million). It would also decrease the number of law enforcement positions funded by 300 to 400 positions and only be able to support approximately 1,060 law enforcement positions. Finally, only about 200 awards would be made to support law enforcement agencies, a reduction of 60 awards from FY 2023 enacted.

Additionally, a 22% reduction could lead to significant cuts to the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Operating at a level 22% below FY 2023 enacted levels would be a reduction of almost \$650 million to OJP's discretionary appropriations. If OJP experienced a full 22% reduction, its mission to improve the nation's capacity to prevent and reduce crime, assist victims, and enhance the rule of law by strengthening the criminal and juvenile justice systems would be drastically reduced as further described below.

Byrne Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) Formula awards to local governments would be expected to drop by an average of \$30,000 from \$98,000 to \$68,000 and State awards could decrease on average by \$1.0 million per state from \$3.4 million to \$2.4 million. JAG is the leading source of Federal justice funding to State and local jurisdictions. A 22% cut in assistance would negatively impact a range of program areas including law enforcement, prosecution, indigent defense, courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, as well as drug treatment and enforcement.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title II Formula awards would be projected to be reduced by an average of \$294,000. This would drop the average award from \$843,000 to \$549,000. Cuts from this formula program would reduce critical support to States and localities in their efforts to reform juvenile justice and strengthen prevention, early intervention, and treatment programming for at-risk and delinquent youth. Training and technical assistance that has been shown to reduce racial and ethnic disparities among youth in juvenile justice would be curtailed.

DNA Analysis and Capacity Enhancement for Backlog Reduction (CEBR) Program would see estimated reductions of \$205,000 per award, dropping the average award from \$775,000 to \$570,000. These reductions would negatively impact the capacity of labs across the Nation to process DNA samples that are used by law enforcement to reduce violent crime, support prosecutors in their efforts to meet their mission, and create safer communities.

Comprehensive Opioid, Stimulant, and Substance Use Program (COSSUP) would see a reduction of \$40.7 million, which would be the equivalent of cutting 25 awards (from 86 to 61). COSSUP's purpose is to provide financial and technical assistance to States, units of local government, and Indian tribal governments to develop, implement, or expand

comprehensive efforts to identify, respond to, treat, and support those impacted by illicit opioids, stimulants and other drugs use.

Drug Treatment Courts would see a reduction of \$19.4 million, which would be the equivalent of cutting 27 awards (from 63 to 36). These courts effectively integrate evidence-based substance use disorder treatment, random drug testing, equitable sanctions and incentives, and recovery support services in judicially supervised court settings to reduce recidivism and substance use and misuse, as well as prevent overdoses. These cuts in services to those with substance use disorders would come in the midst of our nation's current overdose crisis.

Victims of Human Trafficking Programs would see a reduction of \$19.4 million, which would be the equivalent of cutting 26 awards (from 99 to 73). These programs are intended to improve outcomes for victims of human trafficking. These resources are a key source of funding for jurisdictions working on coordinated, multidisciplinary, approaches to serving trafficked victims.

To reach an overall budget reduction of 22% from the FY 2023 enacted level, the U.S. Attorneys' Offices (USAOs) would need to identify over \$620 million in reductions in a single year—nearly five times the cut from sequestration in FY 2013. Reductions of this magnitude will have a detrimental and lasting impact on the USAOs' ability to carry out its mission. In order to absorb this shortfall, the USAOs will not only need to implement a complete hiring freeze and the maximum 22-day furlough of the entire direct workforce of approximately 10,000 employees, but also implement a RIF of approximately 2,000 employees. The combined effect of the hiring freeze and the RIF is a 28% reduction of the workforce in a single year. In addition, non-personnel expenses would be reduced by over 30%. These reductions would severely impact the prosecutorial abilities of USAOs nationwide as well as significantly jeopardize the totality of operations, which is critical to maintaining the integrity of criminal and civil casework.

Imposing a 22% reduction would undermine efforts at Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces (OCDETF), the Criminal Division, and the Civil Division to interdict illegal commerce in opioids including fentanyl. The reduced funding level could amplify the supply of illicit drugs and cause a proliferation in the violence associated with the drug trade. The failure to fund the investigation into this criminal activity would undermine public safety throughout the country during the opioid public health emergency. DEA would need to implement rolling furloughs of all employees, including agents, for 78 days. A cut of this magnitude would mean the DEA would absorb \$620 million in reductions to base resources that would negatively affect every aspect of the DEA's global operations and efforts to reduce drug-poisoning deaths and drug-related violence in the United States.

Funding the Department at the FY2022 enacted level would also severely undermine the Department's cybersecurity efforts, both in seeking to interdict and prosecute cybercriminals, and the Department's ability to protect its own information systems and data from unauthorized intrusion. Funding far below the current services level would negate years of investments supported by Congress for cybercrime investigative personnel, tools, and technology. Cybersecurity threats, both domestic and international, evolve continuously that include large-scale security breaches, supply chain attacks, and the rampant spread of ransomware, which underscore a transformational cyber moment. Cybercriminal technologies will continue to

advance at an accelerated and unprecedented pace that's irrespective of funding reductions, and the Department's efforts to ensure the safety and security of the American public from such crimes would be severely hindered.

On August 10, 2022, the Honor Our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics (PACT) Act of 2022 was enacted. Under Section 804—the Camp Lejeune Justice Act (CLJA)—service members and others who were exposed to water at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina between 1953 and 1987 may file suit for injuries caused by the exposure. Given the sheer volume of cases, the complexity of this new litigation, and the fact that the Department's existing appropriated funding in FY 2023 did not contemplate this change, the Department now faces a significant challenge to ensure CLJA is implemented as intended under current funding levels. The Department has consistently explained that the currently allocated resources in FY 2023 will not meet the Civil Division's need for attorneys, support staff, and information technology resources, which are essential to effectively respond to the litigation demands that will result from the CLJA. If funding were reduced by 22% compared to FY 2003, this shortfall would increase significantly. A 22% reduction to the Civil Division would result in a 30-day furlough to all employees and the anticipated RIF of 221 employees which would eliminate 18% of the current workforce.

We are grateful to Congress for providing needed support in the recently enacted FY 2023 omnibus to ensure Department employees are able to uphold the rule of law, keep our country safe, and protect civil rights for all. We have listed only a few of the widespread effects of a 22% funding reduction to the Department. We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may be of further assistance with this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

CARLOS FELIPE URIARTE,  
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. MCGOVERN. My Republican friends are actively cutting funding from Federal law enforcement that work to protect us every day. Their plan would also cut funding for nearly 400 local law enforcement positions. I mean, Republicans cannot be serious about supporting law enforcement when they are actively using their majority to defund them.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I have to mention again, we have legislation in front of us that will honor our law enforcement officers. When we go off on tangents and talk about what words are there and what words are not there, the simple fact is, a "yes" vote on this legislation will show our support for law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN).

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this National Police Week is a special one for me as a new Member of Congress.

I promise to always protect our police officers, just as they protect our communities back home. Regardless of which side of the aisle you are on, on that we should all agree.

It is important that the American people see us supporting law enforcement as we debate a vote on this

week's police bills and throughout the 118th Congress.

The legislation provided for in this rule are commonsense measures including: Allowing law enforcement officers to purchase retiring service weapons, making assaulting a law enforcement officer a deportable offense, and stating clearly that we appreciate the dedication of the men and women of law enforcement.

There is no better message than showing our officers, "We are behind you." I know law enforcement officers in southern Indiana and across the State who are listening right now and would appreciate it.

I am in awe of the incredible work they do to keep us safe, as they agree to take the oath to protect and serve, knowing that does not guarantee them a safe return to their family at the end of the day. I saw the true weight of this when I visited the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial last Thursday. The memorial displayed name after name after name of those who didn't return home. Too many names.

One of those names of fallen officers was Officer Benton Bertram from Charlestown, Indiana. To see his name surrounded by so many selfless, brave heroes puts it in perspective. They didn't run from danger; they ran toward it.

With unwavering gratitude, we won't forget their sacrifice. This is just the start of why it is so important we act this week on the House floor.

As an Indiana State senator, I fought for and secured a pay raise for our State police officers. Many of them thanked me. I always responded; it was the least we could do for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to take advantage of every opportunity to support the police and all law enforcement officers and will actively seek out opportunities to work with anyone willing to provide our officers with the resources and the support they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, my message to the police officers in southern Indiana is: Know you always have a fighter for you here on the House floor, in House committee rooms, and here in Congress. God bless our men and women in blue.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Indiana began her remarks by talking about National Police Week, but the resolution doesn't honor our national police. The Republicans made a conscious decision to remove the Capitol Police, FBI, ATF, CBP, U.S. Marshals Service, Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Federal Protective Service, and the Secret Service. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana to help me understand why the Republicans changed the wording of their resolution. I am happy to yield her any time.

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentlewoman from Minnesota says we are playing word games. No, we are not. The only people playing word games are my Re-

publican friends. They introduced a bill that honored all of our police, and then they changed it. They made a conscious decision to change it because I think they are afraid of the extreme of the extreme of their base that somehow don't want to admit that anything bad happened here on January 6, and they are afraid if they honor the Capitol Police that somehow their extreme base would be offended. That is just sick, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are vital to many of our constituents' economic health security, and yet many of my Republican friends across the aisle have called for major cuts to these critical programs. Once again, I am offering my friends the opportunity to reassure the American people, not just with rhetoric but with their votes, that they will not cut these vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, our residents sent us to Congress to tackle the issues that are affecting every American's ability to thrive. They did not send us here to waste valuable time on messaging bills that are dead on arrival in the Senate and do nothing to improve the lives of working families.

We are weeks, possibly days, away from Republicans hurtling our economy toward a devastating default on our debt for the first time in our Nation's history, and Republicans are heartlessly using the crisis as an opportunity to try to force cruel cuts to the social safety nets for our communities, especially our veterans, who depend on healthcare.

Republicans are putting vital public programs like Social Security and Medicare at risk by playing petty political games to appease their billionaire donors and harm the lives and livelihoods of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, defaulting on our debt would be devastating, if not catastrophic, for all those relying on Social Security and Medicare, as you know, in all of our districts. Social Security recipients would no longer receive checks, risking their ability to pay for groceries, rent, and utilities.

This is exactly the type of chaos many of my Republican colleagues

want to see happen, but Democrats are fully committed to protecting and expanding Social Security. Social Security is the bedrock of our social safety net and a pillar that all of our neighbors rely on, again, to be able to retire with dignity.

Unfortunately, as the cost of things like healthcare, caregiving, and prescription drugs has skyrocketed due to the unchecked corporate greed in our country, our seniors have come to rely even more on Social Security every single day.

Mr. Speaker, now more than ever before is the time to strengthen Social Security. If we defeat the previous question, we will bring to the House floor H. Res. 178, a resolution affirming the House's commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Republicans need to stop wasting our time and playing games with the lives of our people. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can advance this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a much easier way for the other side to deal with the debt ceiling. Instead of the procedural antics we are going through, maybe what they should do is encourage the President and the Senate leaders to get to the table and negotiate.

The House Republicans did their job. We passed a debt ceiling bill with spending cuts and an increase off of this floor. We have done our job. I think the real message here is National Police Week. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about the support and respect for our law enforcement officers.

I just want to maybe bring it back to what we are really talking about. I, unfortunately, have had the unfortunate honor to have three officers lost in the line of duty in my area, and so I would remember those names: Officer Brian Klinefelter, Officer Tommy Decker, and Officer Josh Owen. Officer Owen was just a few weeks ago.

Present in the Capitol yesterday was Officer Arik Matson, who was shot 3 years ago in the line of duty and survived. Let's talk about that. Let's talk about the officers that we are honoring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which provides consideration of important bills that support our Nation's law enforcement officers. This legislation comes at a critical moment when those on the front lines in our communities are being attacked, maligned, and stripped of the resources they need to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, time and again my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that the phrase "defund the police" is a slogan of a very small and

rogue minority that doesn't reflect their party's broader values. Democrats said that even as cities across this country burned in the summer of 2020, to the deafening chant of "defund the police."

Let's take a look at the facts. Since 2021, 25 cities across America defunded their police departments by upwards of \$2 billion. Police department budgets were slashed in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, Austin, and even in my home State of New York, New York City.

What do all these cities have in common? They have Democrat mayors, Democrat city councils, Democrat monopolies on all of the levers of power.

New York City is seeing felony crime skyrocket to levels not seen in 15 years after its Democrat mayor and Democrat-dominated city council embraced the destructive ideals of the defund the police movement. Last year, the city saw a 22.4 percent jump in serious offenses like felony assault, rape, burglary, robberies, and grand larceny.

Let's call it what it is. Defunding the police is not a fringe idea. It is a movement at the heart of the Democratic Party, and it is in practice right now. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly believe that it is a fringe idea, then I look forward to strong bipartisan support for this important pro-law enforcement legislation this week.

Let's show our men and women in blue, the ones on the front lines of our community, of every community, that they aren't alone, and we have their backs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just say to the gentleman, again, the only people who in this Chamber voted to defund the police are my Republican friends. Two weeks ago, you all voted for a bill to cut money for local law enforcement, every one of you.

Let's talk about the police that you are not honoring here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a CNN story about two FBI agents who were shot and killed last week, and yet they have been taken off the list of law enforcement officials that we are honoring.

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

There was no objection.

[From CNN, Feb. 8, 2021]

TWO FBI AGENTS WERE SHOT AND KILLED LAST WEEK. HERE'S WHY THAT'S A RARE TRAGEDY

(By Phil Gast)

The killing of two FBI agents last week at a lake-bordered community in South Florida marked the first time since November 2008 that an FBI agent was fatally shot in the line of duty. During that same interval, 630 police officers from state, local, tribal and other federal agencies died from line-of-duty gunshot wounds, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund.

Why do most shooting deaths of law enforcement officers in the US occur outside of

the FBI, which calls itself "one of the world's premier security and crime-fighting forces"? Some of the answers are expected: Nearly 90% of the nation's law enforcement officers serve on local and state police forces. They make more arrests. They are much more likely to encounter potentially violent suspects on a daily basis—whether it be for a traffic stop, domestic violence call or another emergency.

But there are other factors that might explain why fewer agents die by gunfire, say law enforcement experts and former agents.

FBI agents are more likely to build cases incrementally than respond to a 911 call. They often work in multi-agency task forces and generally have more time to plan search warrants and safe execution of them. They build a case against an individual and weigh the danger he or she might present. All of this reduces the likelihood they will draw a gun or have one pulled on them. Still, the work is dangerous and plans can end in tragedy, as occurred Tuesday when Special Agents Daniel Alfin and Laura Schwartzberger and other agents and local police officers tried to execute a search warrant at a Sunrise, Florida, apartment where the suspect was barricaded. He, too, died, although the circumstances have not been divulged.

The Florida case, according to authorities, involved alleged violent crimes against children—society's most vulnerable. Federal convictions for such crimes can lead to lengthy prison sentences and some suspects may feel they may have a lot to lose, experts say.

"These can be people who think of themselves having big complicated, important lives and they may have a fraudulent exterior," says Andrew McCabe, former deputy director of the FBI and a current CNN senior law enforcement analyst.

#### TAKING A STRATEGIC VERSUS TACTICAL APPROACH

While all law enforcement work is inherently dangerous, there are differences in the scenarios FBI agents and local officers typically face.

The latter's "jobs are more tactical. They often don't have a plan when they get on their shift, and do not know what will be their next call," says James Pasco, executive director of the National Fraternal Order of Police. "The circumstances are often more volatile, and he or she can't control circumstances." They often have to be in a reactive mode.

Federal agents, on the other hand, are often involved in complex cases, including cyberterrorism, domestic terrorism, online fraud and crimes against children, such as pornography and trafficking.

They are proactive as they gather evidence, following leads and tips and reaching out to other law enforcement agencies.

Local police departments have investigators, too, but the FBI's hallmark is deep investigations into individuals that can be anywhere—from down the street to a remote hideaway overseas.

"You have the ability to do your homework in advance of an operation," says Lazaro "Larry" Cosme, national president of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. "It doesn't mean it will be a fool-proof operation."

FBI agents, when they do move in on a suspect, have a precise plan and contingencies, experts say. And they usually get to decide the time and place of the search or arrest. Often, they move in with an overwhelming force.

"They typically control the environment wherever they go," says Josh Campbell, CNN security correspondent and a former FBI

agent. "It is rare for officers to fire their weapons and receive gunfire."

But sometimes an operation encounters the unknown. There never will be a "complete understanding of every threat," McCabe says.

#### AGENTS TRY TO REDUCE RISK OF ARMED CONFRONTATION

Special agents Alfin, 36, and Schwartzberger, 43, are being remembered for their efforts to fight sex crimes against children. They worked at the FBI's Miami office in a unit that investigates online predators, child pornography, sexual abuse, kidnappings and violent attacks. An hour before dawn Tuesday, they and other officers went to an upscale apartment in Sunrise to serve a search warrant.

Such an operation typically involves local police blocking streets and adding legitimacy, says Campbell.

Going that early has its advantages for law enforcement: They generally have the element of surprise. The subject may be groggy. He or she may have had little time to formulate resistance. The aim is to defuse the situation.

"Generally speaking, that will result in a lower number of violent confrontations," says Pasco.

The FBI hasn't said much about the search warrant, other than it was ordered by a federal court relating to a case of violent crimes against children. The FBI Agents Association said it was related to suspected possession of child pornography.

It's not known whether the FBI knew the suspect in Sunrise had weapons. Details about what led to the gunfire, weren't available. The FBI has not released an account of what occurred during the shootout.

The gunman opened fire and Alfin and Schwartzberger were killed; three agents were wounded. Two were taken to a hospital with multiple gunshot wounds and later released. The third agent was treated at the scene.

Usually, experts and the FBI says, the serving of warrants ends without incident. "We do a ton of these warrants in these kinds of cases all around the country, every day," McCabe said.

But with the profusion of child pornography, "We are getting more people who are reacting violently or unpredictably to a search warrant," he says.

#### 1986 FIREFIGHT LED TO MORE FIREPOWER, TRAINING

The Sunrise shooting is similar to a deadly firefight 35 years ago outside Miami that was a turning point in the FBI's history. On April 11, 1986, two violent bank robbers being pursued by FBI agents opened fire with high-powered firearms, killing two agents and wounding five others before the suspects were killed.

The names and photographs of Special Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin P. Grogan are on the FBI's online Wall of Honor. The page lists 81 employees going back to 1925. Some were killed in the 1930s during the gangster age.

The last agent to be shot to death before Alfin and Schwartzberger was Special Agent Samuel S. Hicks, who was killed in 2008 while trying to serve an arrest warrant in a drug trafficking case at a home near Pittsburgh.

Most of those listed toward the end of the Wall of Honor died as a result of illnesses linked to responding to the 9/11 attacks.

Law enforcement officers block off an area near where the agent deaths occurred in Sunrise, Florida.

In the aftermath of the 1986 shootout, the FBI issued special agents with semiautomatic handguns rather than revolvers,

changed its firearms training and studied the psychological impacts of being shot at, former FBI deputy director John S. Pistole said in 2006.

All of this was aimed at protecting the health and lives of agents.

2020 was one of the deadliest years in history for US law enforcement officers, according to a group that tracks officer deaths in the line of duty.

Law enforcement officers died last year of numerous causes, among them vehicle crashes, heart attacks and gunshots. But more died of Covid-19 than all other causes combined, with 145 out of the 264 deaths attributed to the virus, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund.

‘OUR CHOSEN PROFESSION IS FRAUGHT WITH DANGER’

The FBI is conducting an investigation into what happened in Florida. “You owe it to the patriots who gave their lives” to see whether there are lessons to be learned or ways for agents to better protect themselves, says McCabe.

The loss of two dedicated agents has been a gut punch to the bureau. Law enforcement and others are in mourning.

“Our chosen profession is fraught with danger. Today, this grim reality has taken two of our best from our family,” George Piro, special agent in charge of the FBI’s Miami Field Office, said at a news conference hours after the shooting.

William Beller, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association chapter president, told CNN on Wednesday: “We are all brothers and sisters in law enforcement.” Overcome with emotion, he said, “All I know is I was able to hug my kids today,” and walked away in tears.

Services for the fallen agents took place over the weekend at Hard Rock Stadium in Miami Gardens.

It’s important for people to know that while being an FBI agent is exciting, it’s an incredibly hard and perilous job, McCabe says.

“Moments like this bring reality to them in a very visceral way,” he says. “It will not deter them. They will not turn their guns in tomorrow.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the names of the law enforcement officers who died as a result of the Capitol riots: U.S. Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick, U.S. Capitol Police Officer Howard Liebengood, D.C. Police Officer Jeffrey Smith, D.C. Police Officer Gunther Hashida, D.C. Police Officer Kyle DeFreytag.

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

There was no objection.

HOW MANY DIED AS A RESULT OF THE CAPITOL RIOT

U.S. Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick  
U.S. Capitol Police Officer Howard Liebengood

D.C. Police Officer Jeffrey Smith  
D.C. Police Officer Gunther Hashida  
D.C. Police Officer Kyle DeFreytag

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to also include in the RECORD a CNN story about the 21 Republicans who voted “no” on a bill to award Congressional Gold Medals for the January 6 police officers.

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

There was no objection.

[From CNN, June, 16, 2021]

Republicans Vote No on Bill To Award Congressional Gold Medal for January 6 Police Officers

(By Annie Grayer and Kristin Wilson)

Despite the House and Senate coming to an agreement that will award the Congressional Gold Medal to the officers who defended the Capitol, 21 House Republicans voted against the legislation Tuesday, the latest reminder that members of Congress still cannot agree on the facts of the deadly January 6 riot.

The final vote in the House on Tuesday was 406-21. The number of House Republicans voting against the bill nearly doubled since the first time a version of the bill came to the House floor, as the vote when the bill first passed the House in March was 413-12. Republican Rep. Lance Gooden of Texas was the only GOP member to vote no in March and change his vote to yes this time around.

Both the House and the Senate had passed their own resolutions to bestow the medals, but the initial pieces of legislation varied. The revised bills will now award three medals—one to the entire US Capitol Police force, and one to the Metropolitan Police Department, “so that the sacrifices of fallen officers and their families, and the contributions of other law enforcement agencies who answered the call of duty on January 6, 2021, can be recognized and honored in a timely manner.”

A third will be put on display at the Smithsonian Institution, with a plaque that lists all the law enforcement agencies that protected and defended the Capitol.

Republican Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia told reporters that she voted against the Congressional Gold Medal to US Capitol Police Officers and MPD because she does not believe the legislation should refer to January 6 as an insurrection.

“I wouldn’t call it an insurrection,” Greene told reporters.

Greene also said she had issue with the language of the bill that referred to the Capitol complex as “the temple of our American Democracy.”

“This is not a temple. That is for sure,” Greene said.

Republican Rep. Thomas Massie of Kentucky also said his vote against the legislation was because of the language of the bill, specifically the references to the Capitol as a temple and January 6 as an insurrection.

“There are pending cases or trials right now, indictments against people, and I think if we called it an insurrection, it could have a bearing on their case,” he said. “If they just wanted to give the police recognition, they could have done it without trying to make it partisan,” he said.

When asked if he thought what happened on January 6 was an insurrection, he answered, “I think it was a mob but I don’t think it was an insurrection, no.”

Pressed again, he said, “They were protesting and I don’t approve of the way they protested, but it wasn’t an insurrection. My goodness. Can you imagine what a real insurrection would look like?”

Other members such as Rep. Andrew Clyde and Rep. Andy Biggs ignored questions from CNN asking to explain their vote.

Rep. Warren Davidson, an Ohio Republican, explained in a tweet that the reason he voted against the bill but previously voted for an earlier version of the legislation was because the final version of the bill referenced fallen Capitol Police Officer William “Billy” Evans who was killed as the result of an attack on the Capitol on April 2.

“Yes” was the easy vote, but it’s wrong to conflate 4/2 with 1/6. My “no” vote is an effort to make that clear” Davidson tweeted.

“I have already voted to award the Congressional Gold Medal to DC Metro and Capitol Police for their bravery on 1/6. Today’s vote was an attempt to rewrite history and further a Democrat narrative” Davidson added.

Republican Rep. Adam Kinzinger, who has been an outspoken critic of former President Donald Trump and his supporters that remain in the House, publicly criticized his 21 colleagues who voted against the legislation.

“How you can vote no to this is beyond me,” Kinzinger tweeted after the vote. “Then again, denying an insurrection is as well. To the brave Capitol (and DC metro PD) thank you. To the 21: they will continue to defend your right to vote no anyway.”

Republican Rep. Liz Cheney of Wyoming, a frequent Trump critic herself, specifically criticized Rep. Paul Gosar, who, in addition to voting no on the legislation, had referred to the shooting of Capitol rioter Ashli Babbitt as an execution earlier Tuesday.

“On January 6, as the violent mob advanced on the House chamber, I was standing near @RepGosar and helped him open his gas mask. The Capitol Police led us to safety. It is disgusting and despicable to see Gosar lie about that day and smear the men and women who defended us,” tweeted Cheney, who was ousted from GOP leadership last month after she repeatedly rejected Trump’s election lies.

In February, the Senate unanimously voted to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Officer Eugene Goodman, who singlehandedly led a mob of insurrectionists away from the Senate chamber minutes before the chamber doors were sealed with senators still inside. But the House version of the legislation opted to award the medal to the whole of the police force rather than singling out one individual for the medal.

The legislation does name several individual officers, including Goodman, for their valor, saying “Capitol Police Officers Brian Sicknick and Howard Liebengood, Metropolitan Police Department Officer Jeffrey Smith, and those who sustained injuries, and the courage of Capitol Police Officer Eugene Goodman, exemplify the patriotism and the commitment of Capitol Police officers, and those of other law enforcement agencies, to risk their lives in service of our country.”

The 21 Republicans who voted against the bill are:

1. Lauren Boebert of Colorado
2. John Rose of Tennessee
3. Andy Harris of Maryland
4. Thomas Massie of Kentucky
5. Bob Good of Virginia
6. Louie Gohmert of Texas
7. Barry Moore of Alabama
8. Ralph Norman of South Carolina
9. Matt Rosendale of Montana
10. Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia
11. Chip Roy of Texas
12. Paul Gosar of Arizona
13. Andy Biggs of Arizona
14. Warren Davidson of Ohio
15. Scott Perry of Pennsylvania
16. Matt Gaetz of Florida
17. Greg Steube of Florida
18. Andrew Clyde of Georgia
19. Jody Hice of Georgia
20. Mary Miller of Illinois
21. Michael Cloud of Texas

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York whatever time he needs, but I guess he left the floor. I would like somebody to explain to me why Republicans decided to change the wording of the bill that they introduced at the opening day session of Congress to exclude all of our Federal

police officers and exclude our Capitol Police.

I don't quite understand why they did that except I think they are afraid of their base, the extreme element of their base who basically do not want to honor them. I find that really disturbing.

Again, talking about defunding the police, the only people in this Chamber who voted to cut money for the police are on the other side of the aisle.

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

□ 1245

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak to you today in honor of our police force. What better time to honor the brave men and women of law enforcement. They don't do it for the money. They do it because of service.

What you are hearing from the other side is just not true. They are the party of defunding the police. Their own Vice President put up bond money for rioters. I can name you—and I am not going to name them by name—you have got one, two, three—five sitting Congress people whose statements are “defunding police means defunding police,” “efforts to defund the police department,” “no more police.” They are the party of defunding the police.

What better time to celebrate the fact that men and women are willing to do this? They see things we don't see. They go places we don't go. To have 135 officers shot in 2023 is unacceptable. Fifteen officers have been killed by gunfire, and 43 officers were shot in ambush-style attacks. The amount of officers shot in the line of duty is up 52 percent from this time in 2020.

Words are cheap, but it is what we as a party are doing to support the police. The statistics are outrageous. I look forward to considering legislation that supports our police officers and condemns the leftists' efforts to dismantle local law enforcement agencies, which they do.

To all those in law enforcement, Mr. Speaker, I thank them. For those who are willing to go through good times and bad times to protect us, I thank them. God bless every police officer in this country.

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman who just spoke neglected to say is he only wants to honor some of our police officers. They made a conscious decision to, quite frankly, remove our national police, our Capitol Police, from the resolution that they were originally included in.

He said don't believe us. Well, the words are here. This is their original bill: “H. Con. Res. 5, Expressing support for the Nation's law enforcement agencies and condemning any efforts to defund or dismantle law enforcement agencies.” Their new bill was changed to just say “local law enforcement.”

They made a conscious decision to do that. The gentleman keeps on quoting, and there is an old saying that the only thing that really matters around here is votes. Everything else is B.S. We can play this game of quotes versus votes, but the bottom line is the votes are what matter and what matters the most.

My friends on the other side of the aisle 2 weeks ago brought a bill that they all voted for that cut money for law enforcement at every level. They voted for that. That is their record. I hope my friends will appreciate that.

As we honor our Nation's police officers, as we should, I have to say it is disappointing that we are only honoring some, that a conscious, deliberate decision was made to exclude others. I find that really, really disturbing, and, quite frankly, we tried to fix it last night in the Rules Committee. We tried to fix it in the Judiciary Committee, and all the Republicans voted it down.

I urge people to look at the votes. The votes are what matters.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, “It wasn't an accident. Policing in our country is inherently and intentionally racist. Daunte Wright was met with aggression and violence. I am done with those who condone government-funded murder. No more policing, incarceration, and militarization. It can't be reformed.” Thus said Congresswoman TLAB who was just down here talking about this.

Congresswoman OMAR: “You can't really reform a department that is rotten to the root.”

That is the truth of what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think about law enforcement. The gentleman from Massachusetts is down here besmirching the 21 Members of our body who said no to the politicization of the Capitol Police.

You want to know why it is not in here? It is because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to turn the Capitol Police into political pawns. That is the truth.

We had a resolution in the last Congress, H.R. 1085—I voted for it—giving a Congressional Gold Medal to the brave men and women of the Capitol Police who stood here on January 6.

Then my colleagues on the other side of the aisle didn't want to leave it there. They then added another resolution a mere 2 months later when they wanted to play politics. They are playing political games.

Instead of honoring our men and women of law enforcement, Democrats played political games on a different tragedy, April 2, 2021, when Officer Billy Evans was killed and Officer Kenneth Shaver was injured by a man obsessed with the Nation of Islam who slammed his vehicle into the north bar-

ricade of the U.S. Capitol complex. That didn't fit the narrative. That didn't fit the narrative of my Democratic colleagues, seeing they want to be able to come down here and make claims that they are not defunding the police, that we are. Because we dare to stand up and say we should have fiscal responsibility and set a top-line cap, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to besmirch Republicans for cutting all manners of programs.

Yet, they bring no solutions to the American people about ending the \$32 trillion in debt, destroying the dollar, causing inflation, undermining jobs, and destroying our country. They know exactly what they are doing, and they are doing it on purpose.

We are going to stand with the men and women in blue across this country. That is what this resolution is about. It is about standing with them, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent every waking moment undermining them, saying we should defund them when there were riots on the streets and our cities were burning to the ground. My Democratic colleagues didn't care. They allowed it to happen. They knew exactly what they were doing. That is what this is about.

I would add this: My father carries a card around with him. He is 80 years old. That card was given to him by his father, a chief of police of a small west Texas town. It is called: “Jackie: ‘The Son of a Hard Boiled Cop.’”

You think I'm a hard-boiled copper  
For writing a mere “forty-three”;  
Well perhaps I'm thinking of Jackie  
And all the lad meant to me.  
How's that? Tell you all about it?  
Well, stranger, the boy was my son.

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

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, and I continue:

God! What I'd give to hear, “Daddy,”  
Once more when the day's work is done.  
The driver was just in a hurry,  
He didn't intend any harm,  
But the Sun and stars quit shining,  
When I picked up my boy's lifeless form.  
Well, mister, I'll tear up this ticket;  
I don't want to “pinch” anyone;  
But I'd ride this motor through hell-fires  
To protect another man's son.  
So the next time you feel like speeding  
Or passing a boulevard stop,  
Just pause and remember my Jackie—  
The son of a hard-boiled cop.

My dad carries that with him to this day, and he is 80 years old. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to play politics with cops, they can do it on somebody else's dime.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman runs out, I will just say you can yell all you want, but it doesn't change the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle, including the gentleman, voted to cut money for local law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, what they did is they voted to cut a million dollars per State

in Federal money for our local law enforcement. They would fire, lay off, 400 local police officers. That is what would happen if their bill that they voted on 2 weeks ago became law. It could cut COPS grants. It would cut other DOJ funding for our local police.

The gentleman who just had a meltdown on the floor, screaming and yelling, comes on the floor all the time to talk about our border. I mean, my Republican friends made a conscious decision to remove Customs and Border Protection from the bill honoring our law enforcement.

I would like somebody to answer why. They removed the Capitol Police. They removed the FBI. They also removed CBP.

Mr. Speaker, their bill, according to the Department of Justice, if it became a law, the reduction in support for our police and Federal law enforcement would result in a reduction in our operations equivalent to the following: 154,000 pounds of cocaine not seized, 859 pounds of fentanyl and 1,948 pounds of heroin not seized, 17,148 pounds of methamphetamine not seized, \$9 million in currency not seized, 561 criminals not arrested, 57,594 apprehensions not made, and 361 people not rescued. The gentleman says he is being fiscally responsible, and that is why they voted for these cuts? Enough.

Again, can somebody please explain to me from the party that voted to defund the police why the omission, why were the words of the Republican bill changed to omit all of these other brave men and women who are protecting people all across this country and the Capitol Police who protect us every single day?

By the way, the gentleman who just spoke was among those who voted not to give a Congressional Gold Medal to the Capitol Police. Thank goodness 400 Members, Democrats and Republicans, disagreed with him.

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

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we move into National Police Week, I rise in support of two bills that will help make our officers safer out on the street. The first is H.R. 2494, commonly called the POLICE Act, which simply states that an illegal alien that assaults a police officer will be deported. Not might be; will be.

Currently, the situation is they can be arrested for assaulting, and in 2021 we had 43,000 law enforcement officers assaulted. I am sure many of those were by illegal aliens. Those numbers are just going to go up. They can be arrested, placed in a 287(g) jail facility where they are held for ICE, convicted of the crime of assault, but they still may not be deported. They have to go through a long legal analysis after

their conviction to ensure that they are deported out of this country.

H.R. 2494, the POLICE Act, simply says if you assault one of our officers, we are kicking you out of this country. I can't imagine why anyone across the aisle would vote against that.

The other bill is H.R. 3091, the Federal Law Enforcement Service Weapon Purchase Act. Mr. Speaker, we have several of our Federal law enforcement agencies right now who are about to go through rearming their agencies to the tune of about 20,000 weapons. They are going to destroy these weapons if officers are not allowed to purchase their service weapon as it is being retired or as the officer may retire.

This bill simply says that we are going to take these officers that are retiring, and if they want to purchase their service weapon, they will be allowed to. Currently, they are precluded from doing that. All of these weapons are going to be destroyed; about \$8 million worth. We are just going to destroy them, and the taxpayers are going to have to buy more.

As a 40-year law enforcement officer, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, your sidearm is not just any old sidearm. There is a special relationship that you develop, and we need to allow these officers to purchase their firearms.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from MSNBC titled: "The list of Republicans open to 'defunding' the FBI keeps growing."

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

There was no objection.

[From MSNBC, Mar. 6, 2023]

THE LIST OF REPUBLICANS OPEN TO  
'DEFUNDING' THE FBI KEEPS GROWING  
(By Steve Benen)

Even before the FBI executed a search warrant at Mar-a-Lago, the public would occasionally hear some Republican officials talk about cutting off funds to federal law enforcement. At an event last year, for example, Republican Rep. Andy Biggs, the former chair of the right-wing House Freedom Caucus, talked up possible priorities if the GOP took control of the House.

"There are things you can do," the Arizona said, reflecting on Congress' power. "You start defunding some of these bad agencies. The FBI. The DOJ."

After the search at Donald Trump's glorified country club, however, similar talk became much louder. Republican Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia, for example, became a leading proponent of "defunding" the FBI.

On Friday, Rep. Matt Gaetz capped off a difficult week with an appearance at the Conservative Political Action Conference, where attendees heard the Florida Republican join the defunding brigade. USA Today reported:

"I don't care if it takes every second of our time and every ounce of our energy," he said. "We either get this government back on our side or we defund and get rid of, abolish the FBI, the CDC, ATF, DOJ, every last one of them if they do not come to heel." The CDC is the Centers for Disease Control

and Prevention. The audience, made up of far-right activists, loudly applauded Gaetz's condemnation, nearly drowning him out.

He did not elaborate on how, exactly, federal agencies should "come to heel," or to whose heel officials should come, but the GOP congressman is apparently ready to "defund," "get rid of" or "abolish" the departments anyway.

In the not-too-distant past, Republicans were hysterical about the idea that Democrats might try to "defund the police." It's against that backdrop that a growing number of GOP voices feel quite comfortable talking about defunding the FBI.

It's worth noting for context that Republican leaders recently appointed Gaetz to the party's "weaponization" panel, putting him in a position to help target federal agencies and determine whether or not they're on the GOP's "side."

Rep. Jim Jordan didn't go quite that far during a Sunday appearance on Fox News, but the Ohio Republican—who chairs both the House Judiciary Committee and the select "weaponization" panel—did say GOP lawmakers intend to use the "weaponization" panel to investigate assorted partisan conspiracy theories related to the FBI.

I continue to believe there's a degree of irony to these circumstances: As we've discussed, the FBI has earned a reputation as one of the single most conservative institutions in the federal government.

Indeed, it was just last week when The Washington Post published a fascinating behind-the-scenes report on the disagreements within federal law enforcement ahead of the search at Mar-a-Lago, including details about how FBI officials wanted to give Trump special treatment, and even pushed the idea that the bureau should get the former president's permission before executing a court-approved search warrant.

The Post's article added that some FBI field agents tried to "slow" the investigation, with some calling for the investigation to simply end altogether in early June, taking Team Trump's lies about cooperation at face value.

Gaetz is desperate to get "this government" back on conservatives' "side." Isn't much of the FBI already there?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I am concerned because, on the one hand, my Republican colleagues say they support the police. On the other hand, their own Members are calling on Congress to defund Federal law enforcement.

They want to defund the FBI. They want to defund ATF. They want to defund DOJ.

I guess it just shows that Republicans support only some of the police. In fact, there is a Member on the other side of the aisle who is selling "Defund the FBI" T-shirts on her web page.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked over and over and over again why the Republican bill was changed to exclude a whole bunch of law enforcement officers on the Federal level, including the Capitol Police. As those who are watching this debate saw, every time I wanted to yield to get an answer, there was silence.

Nobody can explain why this happened. Nobody will help us solve this mystery as to why they decided not to honor a whole bunch of our brave men

and women who protect us in so many ways all across this country. It is baffling to me that this is where we are.

I began by telling a story, and let me end with telling a story.

Mr. Speaker, I was here on January 6. I was in the Speaker's chair on January 6. I was the last person off the House floor. I saw everybody who was here in this Chamber, including some of my colleagues on the Republican side, cowering behind Capitol Police officers because they were afraid for their lives. It was a terrible, terrible day.

Luckily, nobody here was injured, none of us, none of the Members of Congress or our staff. The Capitol Police protected us that day. I mean, we owe them our lives.

Today, as we honor our national police, my Republican friends thought it was appropriate to remove them from the list of people being honored. I find that disgraceful.

I can't even imagine what the thinking was to make that kind of decision. It is so insulting and so offensive to the people who protected us that day and protect us each and every day. I don't understand that.

I can't get a response, but we know what is going on here. We know that they removed the Capitol Police and that they removed some of these Federal law enforcement agencies because they were afraid they were going to lose votes on their side, that some of their Members would not vote to honor all of our law enforcement officials. Let that sink in for a minute.

This should have been a day of unity. This should have been a truly bipartisan endeavor to get us legislation to the floor that everybody could support, that we could all say thank you to our police. But, no, it is politicized.

They get up here and start quoting people on defund the police, but they don't tell anybody that they voted to defund the police 2 weeks ago. It is public record. Every one of them did, including the gentleman who was down here screaming.

He gets on the floor all the time and talks about the need that we have to better protect our border, yet the people who are charged with protecting our border were removed from the list of people we were honoring.

This is not right by any measure. It is not right. I am so disappointed that my Republican friends have decided to politicize this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can protect Social Security and Medicare, and I urge them to vote "no" on this rule.

This is beneath this institution. This is not honoring our police. This is politicizing our police. This is saying to some of our police that we don't value their service. It is saying to the Capitol Police that we don't value their service.

How dare anybody on the other side suggest that? How dare you bring a bill

to the floor that does just that? This is sickening.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am honored to be here today to support this rule and this legislation to make sure we honor our law enforcement and that we are moving forward.

This is a completely different agenda from the legislation that my Democratic colleagues were advancing at this time in the 117th Congress last year. By this time 2 years ago, Democrats had already passed legislation that would have removed qualified immunity for police officers acting in good faith, voted to restrict policing methods that keep officers safe, and supported investigations into departments that insinuated that police officers are racists and white supremacists.

Today, House Republicans are changing the narrative and standing up for law and order and for those who enforce it. If my Democratic colleagues don't think this matters, then they clearly are still not listening to what the law enforcement community needs.

Today, they have the opportunity to show their support for law enforcement.

The defund the police movement has been disastrous in the areas that have tried it, emboldening criminals. Cities like Minneapolis and San Francisco have seen dramatic increases in crime, and residents and businesses alike are fleeing in droves.

Crime is skyrocketing throughout the country, and the lack of respect for law enforcement in this country also means fewer people are willing to enter the profession. This needs to change, and we in Congress can pass legislation like the bills today that support our police officers and show them their sacrifices and services are appreciated.

It is time for leaders to stand up for law enforcement and stop the anti-police rhetoric. I ask my colleagues on the other side to join with us in supporting and honoring law enforcement by voting for this rule today and supporting the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying legislation, and I urge all Members to do so.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as the long-time co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I am a staunch advocate for our law enforcement community.

How the House is recognizing this Police Week is a disappointment. Before us are partisan messaging bills instead of measures that support our men and women in blue.

This rule makes in order a pathetic resolution that ignores the service of federal law enforcement officers, including our Capitol Police.

These brave men and women protected us when Donald Trump incited a mob of armed insurrectionists to attack our Capitol.

The attack resulted in the death of five Capitol Police and MPD officers, and the injury of 150 officers.

The resolution ignores the Republicans currently seeking to defund federal law enforcement agencies, like the FBI, ATF, and Homeland Security.

And the resolution is silent on increasing funding for the Byrne JAG and the COPS Hiring programs.

I offered 5 specific amendments to add these crucial elements to this resolution. But the Republicans did not make them in order. What are they afraid of?

Armed officers can enhance public safety. But an officer in good standing is not defined in the Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act.

We know an officer could be in good standing with their department but ineligible to carry a handgun.

I offered two amendments to align this bill with New Jersey's interpretation of current law. Again, neither were made in order.

Next Police Week let us take up actually make a difference for officers and their families. Not this partisan approach.

God bless our police and God bless America.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 398 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 are postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro