

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

tempore (Mr. BOST) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RELATING TO "PROCEDURES COVERING SUSPENSION OF LIQUIDATION, DUTIES AND ESTIMATED DUTIES IN ACCORD WITH PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 10414"—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-41)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.J. Res. 39, a resolution that would disapprove the Department of Commerce's rule titled "Procedures Covering Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Estimated Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414."

For too long, because of unfair trade practices and underinvestment in domestic manufacturing, the United States has been reliant on China for solar energy products. From day one, my Administration has bet on America to create a strong solar supply chain. We have worked to create good-paying jobs and build manufacturing facilities in the United States for solar energy and other important global industries—and our plan is working.

Thanks to my Investing in America agenda, 51 new and expanded solar equipment manufacturing plants have been announced since I took office. Since the passage of Public Law 117-169, commonly referred to as the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, last August, private companies have announced commitments to build enough solar panel manufacturing capacity to power nearly six million homes.

America is now on track to increase domestic solar panel manufacturing capacity eight-fold by the end of my first term. But that production will not come online overnight. The Department of Commerce's rule supports American businesses and workers in the solar industry and helps provide sufficient, clean, and reliable electricity to American families, while continuing to hold our trading partners accountable.

The rule implements a temporary, 24-month bridge to make sure that when these new factories are operational, we have a thriving solar installation industry ready to deploy American-made solar products to homes, businesses, and communities across the Nation. Given the progress we are making on American solar, I do not intend to extend the tariff suspension at the conclusion of the 2-year period in June 2024.

Passage of this resolution bets against American innovation. It would undermine these efforts and create deep uncertainty for American busi-

nesses and workers in the solar industry.

Therefore, I am vetoing this resolution.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the joint resolution will be printed as a House document.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 39, be postponed until the legislative day of May 24, 2023.

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

There was no objection.

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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 398; and

Adoption of House Resolution 398, if ordered.

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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 398) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2494) to make the assault of a law enforcement officer a deportable offense, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of (H.R. 3091) to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes; 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Gallagher	Mills
Allen	Garbarino	Molinaro
Amodei	Garcia, Mike	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gimenez	Mooney
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Baird	Gosar	Murphy
Balderson	Granger	Nehls
Banks	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barr	Graves (MO)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Oberholte
Bergman	Griffith	Ogles
Bice	Grothman	Owens
Biggs	Guest	Palmer
Billirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Hagaman	Perry
Boebert	Harris	Pfluger
Bost	Harshbarger	Posey
Brecheen	Hern	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hinson	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Houchin	Rose
Burgess	Hudson	Rosendale
Burlison	Huizenga	Rouzer
Calvert	Hunt	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Salazar
Carl	James	Santos
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Jordan	Self
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Sessions
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smucker
Crane	Kiley	Spartz
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Stauber
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Steel
Curtis	LaHood	Stefanik
D'Esposito	LaLota	Steil
Davidson	LaMalfa	Steube
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Stewart
DesJarlais	Langworthy	Strong
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Tenney
Donalds	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Duarte	Lawler	Tiffany
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Timmons
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Turner
Edwards	Letlow	Valadao
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Duyne
Estes	Luna	Van Orden
Ezell	Luttrell	Wagner
Fallon	Mace	Walberg
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Waltz
Ferguson	Mann	Weber (TX)
Finstad	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fischbach	Mast	Wenstrup
Fitzgerald	McCauley	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McClain	Williams (NY)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Flood	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	McHenry	Wittman
Franklin, C.	Meuser	Womack
Scott	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fry	Miller (OH)	Zinke
Fulcher	Miller (WV)	

NAYS—209

Adams	Bowman	Casar
Aguilar	Boyle (PA)	Case
Allred	Brown	Casten
Balint	Brownley	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Budzinski	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Bush	Cherfilus-
Bera	Caraveo	McCormick
Beyer	Carbajal	Chu
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Carson	Clark (MA)
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cleaver