

The current practice of destroying retired firearms costs taxpayers money when they could be providing a service to their Federal law enforcement and creating some revenue in the process.

Many of our Nation's law enforcement are avid recreation and sports shooters in their free time, and they deserve the added benefit of being allowed to purchase high-quality firearms at a reduced cost.

Americans trust police to protect them with these very firearms every single day. Why should these well-trained officers not have the right to defend their own family with these same weapons.

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

□ 1300

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment expands the types of weapons officers are allowed to purchase to include all retired firearms. The amendment radically extends the bill and runs counter to its original purpose.

This amendment would allow semi-automatic assault weapons, sniper rifles, and military-grade weaponry to be purchased without a background check. While Federal law enforcement has a need for these weapons, they have no place in our communities.

Though the amendment excludes machine guns, it does not exclude other firearms subject to heightened regulation under the National Firearms Act, such as short-barreled rifles and even grenade launchers. The Federal Government should not be selling these dangerous weapons to people operating in their civilian capacity.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it, as well.

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I point to the amendment where it refers to section 921(a)(24) of the title, which is going to keep weapons that are currently not allowed in civilian hands out of civilian hands.

Our law enforcement officials are highly trained. Whether they are using an AR-15 or whether they are using a similar high-powered rifle with a high-intensity scope, they are trained to do such.

I have lots of friends and family who use these weapons on a daily basis for sport shooting and other purposes.

If our law enforcement officers, if they have served their time and are retiring from that duty of protecting the civilians across this Nation, want to purchase a weapon that they have been utilizing for who knows how much time, they should be able to do so.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the provision that the gentleman refers to re-

fers only to machine guns. It does not exclude other firearms, as I mentioned, such as short-barreled rifles and even grenade launchers, and these are too dangerous.

We should not be selling these dangerous weapons to people operating in their civilian capacity. That is why this amendment is dangerous and radically changes the bill.

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, again, I refuse to accept the premise that a grenade launcher is going to be purchased and allowed to be purchased by a former law enforcement official. That is just not realistic. It is not true, and it is very misleading to this body.

When we have people who have risked their lives to defend folks across this country in our communities, then they should be able to purchase these retired weapons.

We have heard them called retired weapons. Because the value has been dramatically reduced, they are going to be put into a stockpile. They are going to be salvaged. They are going to be destroyed.

Allow us to generate some revenue, and allow the people who have used them the longest and the safest to continue their use.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, section 5845, definitions, reads as follows: "(a) Firearm, the term 'firearm' means (1) a shotgun having a barrel or barrels of less than 18 inches in length; (2) a weapon made from a shotgun if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than 26 inches or a barrel or barrels of less than 18 inches in length; (3) a rifle having a barrel or barrels of less than 16 inches in length; (4) a weapon made from a rifle if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than 26 inches or a barrel or barrels of less than 16 inches in length; (5) any other weapon, as defined in subsection (e); (6) a machine gun"—which is the only thing the gentleman excludes from his amendment—" (7) any silencer (as defined . . .); and (8) a destructive device," like a grenade launcher, like a grenade.

Therefore, when I say that this amendment would ban only machine guns but would permit all these other things, including grenades and weapons of destruction, it is right here in the statute. The gentleman's amendment would permit all of these. Those are the kinds of weapons.

Grenade launchers and short-barreled rifles should not be in the possession of civilians, even retired police officers.

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, again, I refuse to accept the premise that you are going to have grenade launchers that are going to be purchased by Federal law enforcement. They are not utilizing those, and they are not going to be purchased by them.

We are talking about the handguns and the rifles that are currently allowed to be possessed by civilians. Those are the only ones that are going to be able to be purchased.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3091) to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROTECT OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT WITH IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2023

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2494.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 398 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2494.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1309

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2494) to make the assault of a law enforcement officer a deportable offense, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOYLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the

chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, as we celebrate National Police Week, it is only appropriate that we pass H.R. 2494, the POLICE Act of 2023.

H.R. 2494 makes an alien removable if they assault a police officer. 43,649—that is the staggering number of law enforcement officers who were assaulted by performing their duties in just 2021. That represents an 11.2 percent increase from 2020.

In both 2021 and 2022, at least 64 law enforcement officers were shot and killed in the line of duty. In my home State of Alabama, five law enforcement officers were shot and killed. That is a 21 percent increase over the number killed from 2010 to 2020.

To make matters worse, many of those incidents involve criminal aliens who take advantage of our immigration system and then turn around and assault the very people who protect us every day.

In a single 2-month operation in 2020, Immigration and Customs Enforcement arrested aliens with criminal histories with 1,500 convictions and charges for assault.

In 2019, ICE arrested aliens who accounted for 45,804 assault convictions and charges.

The reports speak for themselves. Just 2 months ago, an illegal alien violently assaulted a U.S. Border Patrol agent as she attempted to arrest him. In November 2022, two aliens were arrested for pushing, dragging, and punching a Border Patrol agent in another incident.

These acts of violence are not limited to just Border Patrol. Just last fall, a criminal alien was sentenced to 30 years in prison for stabbing a New York Police Department officer, taking his gun and then shooting at other officers.

In 2020, a criminal alien shot and killed a Houston police sergeant as he responded to a domestic violence call.

Despite these acts, the immigration statute does not explicitly make assaulting a law enforcement officer a deportable offense. H.R. 2494 changes that by creating grounds of removability specific to aliens who assault law enforcement officers.

Although many such offenders can be removed based on other grounds, such as an aggravated assault felony or a crime involving moral turpitude, H.R. 2494 ensures that criminal aliens cannot escape the immigration consequences of their actions through legal loopholes.

Determining whether an alien is removable from the country is not as

straightforward as it should be. In a case from last year, a Federal judge observed that the process to determine whether an alien had been convicted of a crime that would make him removable presented “a single legal question about a single conviction.”

Despite seemingly easy questions, the analysis “has spawned, over 11 years and counting: four decisions by the [Board of Immigration Appeals], four decisions by three different immigration judges, approximately six rounds of briefing, and a split opinion by [a Federal] court.”

This bill would avoid those absurd results of that approach to make crystal clear that an alien who assaults a law enforcement officer can be removed from the United States.

Democrats have argued that this bill would encompass too much conduct due to State definitions of assault. That couldn't be further from the truth.

Listen to what the bill requires: first, either an admission or a conviction of an assault or an offense; the assault must have been against a law enforcement officer; and that assault must have been while the law enforcement officer was performing his or her duties, because of the performance of those duties, or because of his or her status as a law enforcement officer.

Democrats' far-fetched hypotheticals make light of assault against law enforcement officers and do not align with reality. If an alien admits to assaulting a law enforcement officer but a far-left prosecutor refuses to prosecute that crime, why should that alien escape immigration consequences?

Make no mistake, criminal aliens who assault dedicated men and women of law enforcement should find no safe harbor under our immigration laws.

H.R. 2494 gives adjudicators a tool to ensure that these criminal aliens can quickly be removed from this country. In doing so, we make America safer, not only for our citizens but also for the hardworking men and women of law enforcement who serve our community every day.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let's be clear: Assaulting a law enforcement officer is a serious offense and cannot be tolerated in the United States. It is also largely already a deportable offense.

□ 1315

Mr. NADLER. If this bill, the so-called Protect Our Law Enforcement with Immigration Control and Enforcement Act, or the POLICE Act of 2023, closed an actual gap in current law and made our country safer, Democrats would gladly support it.

Unfortunately, this bill represents another unserious attempt by my Republican colleagues to target and scapegoat immigrants and to score

cheap, political points for National Police Week while doing nothing to actually protect law enforcement officers.

It is important to remember who this legislation is targeting. This is not about undocumented immigrants who are, of course, already removable, and this is not about people who are seeking to enter the United States. This is about people who have come here the so-called “right way.” We are talking about lawful, permanent residents.

People have put down roots in our communities, many of whom have U.S. citizen spouses and children and have truly established themselves here in the United States. Many of these individuals are eligible to become U.S. citizens today, but this bill would make them deportable without even requiring that they be convicted of a crime, only that the assault or act constituting the assault was committed and that the individual admits to the commission of the act.

That throws our whole notion of due process on its head. That is why it is absolutely critical that we adopt Mr. CORREA's amendment to close this dangerous loophole. Even if we require a conviction, I am still concerned that the bill is so broad and overinclusive that it could lead to truly absurd results and to the deportation of people who had no intention of ever harming a law enforcement officer.

Let me give you three examples of what this bill would do, as drafted:

A person walks into a fire, sees a beam about to fall on a firefighter, and pushes the firefighter out of the way. He has committed an act that is an assault on the firefighter who is a peace officer, and he is deportable.

A person sees two men fighting on the street and he breaks them up. He pushes them aside, not knowing that one of them is an undercover police officer. He has assaulted the police officer.

A Jehovah's Witness is in an ambulance. The EMT reaches over to put a line in to give him a transfusion. The Jehovah's Witness pushes his hand away. He has committed assault on the EMT who is a peace officer and he is, therefore, deportable.

Now, Republicans will say that these are far-fetched, absurd examples. The problem is that under the terms of the bill, this would happen. However far-fetched you may think the example, you have to read the bill.

Mr. CORREA's amendment would correct this. If Mr. CORREA's amendment passes, we can support the bill. If it does not, this is a dangerous bill making lawful permanent residents who have been here for many years deportable for no good reasons.

For years, we have had a bipartisan understanding that individuals should be deported only for a serious offense, but this bill breaks down that understanding. I hope we will fix the bill's most significant flaw through the amendment process, namely, the

Correa amendment. If not, I must recommend that my colleagues oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO).

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Chair, I stand here today during National Police Week to urge the passage of H.R. 2494, the POLICE Act of 2023.

The crisis at our southern border is a clear public safety and national security threat, but it also puts the lives and safety of our law enforcement officers at risk. It is not just Customs and Border Patrol agents who are affected, like the female Border Patrol agent who was violently attacked by an illegal immigrant while attempting to make an arrest in March. Local police departments have also been placed on the front lines as thousands of migrants are relocated to New York and States across the country.

As the border crisis rages on unchecked and violence against law enforcement officers continues to rise, this legislation sends a crystal-clear message that any noncitizen who commits acts of violence against police cannot stay in this country.

The POLICE Act codifies something that is common sense, but under current law remains ambiguous. This bill corrects that by providing clear guidelines for the removal of any migrant who engages in violence against a law enforcement officer. This is about improving officer safety and making it easier to remove migrants who have demonstrated flagrant criminal violence while on U.S. soil.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the POLICE Act to show our brave men and women in law enforcement that we have their backs as they continue to battle the criminal element currently taking advantage of our unsecured southern border.

Now, to address my colleague's concern from the other side of the aisle. This is not mandatory. This bill does not mandate immediate deportation. His admitted far-fetched, absurd examples that we just heard will be taken into account. This just says that an assault on a police officer or a firefighter or an EMT makes it a deportable offense.

Mr. Chairman, I have to go on further. We heard about this possible amendment coming forward about requiring conviction. If our district attorneys in their roles would actually prosecute crimes against police officers, I would be fine requiring conviction, but what we have seen over the past several years where you have progressive, woke district attorneys like our district attorney in Manhattan, when an NYPD police officer is assaulted or firefighter is assaulted, the criminal, the assailant, is not actually prosecuted.

We can't be left to require convictions on something like this when the

district attorneys in certain areas are not doing their job.

With that said, I understand the idea behind the amendment, but requiring a conviction here would tie a lot of people's hands, especially when district attorneys are not doing their jobs and assaults against law enforcement are not getting prosecuted.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this piece of legislation and show that you support members of law enforcement.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from New York referenced our District Attorney Alvin Bragg. As a resident of Manhattan, I must say that I find Alvin Bragg a perfectly fine district attorney, and he is being attacked only because he has secured indictments on 34 counts against Donald Trump, and that is why they are holding him up for criticism.

I am very glad that I supported him in the Democratic primary against a number of opponents 2 years ago, and he is doing a fine job, including the 34 indictments he secured against former President Trump, who it appears is also going to be indicted in Washington and in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2494. Once again, the majority has put forward an extreme and unworkable piece of legislation. No one condones serious assaults against law enforcement officers. However, H.R. 2494 goes well beyond serious crimes to include minor offenses and would even allow people to be deported without an arrest, let alone a conviction.

We hear a lot about the border from my Republican colleagues, but let's remember that this bill has absolutely nothing to do with the border or with undocumented immigrants. All this bill does is add a new way for people who are living here lawfully in the United States to be deported. Most importantly, we are talking about the ability to deport lawful, permanent residents, people with green cards.

My Republican colleagues like to say that they support legal immigration, that these immigrants did things the "right way." Do we really want to be deporting people with lawful status, many of whom are eligible to apply for citizenship for low-level offenses without a conviction, without due process, without a day in court?

Let's remember that convictions for serious assaults on law enforcement are already offenses that make someone deportable under current law. Our immigration laws can be very unforgiving and many times capture actions that we do not intend to include.

Under current law, if an individual is convicted of a crime of violence and sentenced to a year or more in prison, that is an aggravated felony and that person is deportable. The same is true

for someone who is convicted of what is called a crime involving moral turpitude, where the crime is punishable by imprisonment of 1 year or more.

Both of these deportability grounds are already invoked when someone is convicted of a serious, intentional assault on a law enforcement officer, where bodily injury occurs or is intended. Under this bill, no conviction is required at all. Merely committing the "essential elements" of an assault makes someone deportable. Who is to say what an essential element is? This bill certainly doesn't define it.

I just want to give a couple more examples to what the ranking member already gave of what could happen under this bill and the unintended consequences of not requiring a conviction.

Let's say someone gets a parking ticket. They are upset about getting a parking ticket. They crumple up the ticket, they throw it on the ground, and it lands in front of the feet of a police officer. That would actually be considered assault.

Let's say an EMT is on the scene of an accident and they are going to give someone medical care, but that person is in the throes of having just been in a serious situation, they are afraid, they have pushed the hand of that EMT away, and it seems like they are pushing that person away. That action would be an assault against a law enforcement officer, a deportable offense, both of them, under this bill.

Unfortunately, during our markup, which was lengthy, we learned that our Republican colleagues are completely fine deporting people for this kind of conduct. In fact, one Republican colleague even said that he is fine deporting someone if there is no contact at all with law enforcement. They referred to lawful, permanent residents—which I was a lawful, permanent resident, probably one of the few in this body that actually knows what that means—many of whom have lived here for decades as mere "guests" in this country and rejected any attempt to institute any due process or basic parameters around this unworkable piece of legislation.

Instead of attempting to score cheap political points during National Police Week, my colleagues should be working with us on real bipartisan solutions to achieve humane and just immigration reform. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me say this: I think this bill is very important and extremely timely. We know that we have had 5 million encounters on the U.S. southern border since Biden has been President, and in that situation with title 42 expiring, we expect more and more law enforcement is going to have to interact with aliens. Some we know are probably on some watch list somewhere, and they have a criminal history.

I think that it is timely. I think that our friends across the aisle need to join

us in supporting police officers this week and get on board to support this bill, as well.

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member, and I thank the manager on the other side for their work.

This is National Police Week. I started my week in joining a family from Houston whose husband and father had fallen as a police officer in the line of duty, but it was also with the throngs of men and women of law enforcement across America and families at the 42nd Annual National Memory Day for law enforcement officers.

I spent quite a bit of time there, interacting with officers that were not only from Texas or Houston. I respect the service that they have given as we, as Members of Congress and Democrats and my friends on the other side of the aisle, should do.

□ 1330

And as we interacted, the response was an appreciation, as I expressed, an appreciation for their service.

We have done a number of bills on the floor, and I am glad that we had one that honored that day. I proudly managed that bill, as well as a number of others that were on previously.

There are a number of bills that have been on the floor or are on the floor today, at least two. Before I speak of the underlying bill, let me acknowledge my support for H.R. 3091, the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act, which has previously been debated. I would say that this deals with Federal law enforcement officers in good standing.

It is a smart way to deal with guns that have been retired. That will allow—rather than creating dust in the GSA, and as well, who knows, them falling in the wrong hands for whatever reason, you might say—rather than destroying those guns, it would allow Federal agencies to sell the handguns used in the performance of their duties to Federal law enforcement officers in good standing, promoting public safety, reducing waste, and recouping taxpayer dollars.

This is good legislation. I hope as it makes its way that they will add some form of a check—which all officers believe in background checks. Maybe they will take those resources and invest in bringing down gun violence, which we know, as of this week, two law enforcement officers were injured in New Mexico, as a young, underage teenager had an AR-15 and killed three innocent civilians.

Mr. Chair, it would be nice if the legislation would use those resources to help bring down gun violence. H.R. 3091 is a good bill, and I intend to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3091, the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act (in its current form).

When a federal agency has property it no longer needs, such as firearms, the property is declared excess and is reported to GSA to be screened for possible transfer to other Federal agencies with a need for such property.

If no other agencies request the excess property, it is declared surplus—and in the case of firearms, required to be destroyed.

Rather than destroying retired, surplus handguns, H.R. 3091 would allow federal agencies to sell the handguns used in the performance of their duties to federal law enforcement officers in good standing—promoting public safety, reducing waste, and recouping taxpayer funds.

Although I support this legislation, I should point out that the previous version—introduced last Congress by my Democratic colleague—included a requirement that any law enforcement officer making a purchase must pass a background check as part of the transfer. But this version does not.

The previous version also wisely advised via a sense of Congress that proceeds from the sale of these handguns should be used to fund evidence-based gun violence prevention or gun safety programs.

While we might assume that no problems could arise in the sale of a handgun to an officer in good standing, a background check or records check of some kind would ensure that vital information about that officer has not been missed, overlooked, or fallen through a gap in reporting.

That is why I support the Jacobs' amendment that would further define the good standing requirement—ensuring that only responsible, law-abiding officers can purchase these firearms.

However, because we too must be responsible, especially when it comes to setting policy for buying, selling, and trading firearms, I cannot support this bill if the Republican poison pills are adopted.

This trio of amendments would destroy each of the foundational purposes of the bill that brought Republican and Democratic members of the House Judiciary Committee together during the markup of this bill—promoting public safety, reducing waste, and recouping taxpayer funds.

Together, these amendments would allow, not just handguns but military-grade weapons that have no business in civilian homes and communities, to be provided at little to no cost, to retired officers, without any means to determine their suitability for taking possession of these weapons.

I am disappointed that we could lose the opportunity to pass this thoughtful legislation during National Police Week by attaching these reckless amendments.

That is why I implore my colleagues to vote No to the Luttrell, McCormick, and Rosendale amendments.

And I encourage members on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3091 and the Jacobs Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, we are now at a time when we are talking about H.R. 2494. I would say that when interacting with law enforcement officers, I have never heard one person

raise this. I don't think we can condemn prosecutors across America that they are not willing to stand up and be counted when any assault occurs against an officer.

Any such legitimate assault should be both an arrest and prosecution. That is not what we are saying. If it happens to be an LPR or green card holder or whatever status the person has—arrested and prosecuted.

What we are saying is desperate people come to this country and they work hard to get a status, and if it is legitimate, they wind up in jail. That is where they can be. H.R. 2494 ignores that.

One, it is not one that you have heard any officers asking for. Two, that person can be convicted and wind up in jail. I know there is an amendment to say if they are convicted that would be the case. Ordinarily, they would be able to serve their time. I don't think that we should use this hammer to tear families apart.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, this bill has been ill-drafted in harmful measure and does not seek to address a need that people are crying for.

The bill insults prosecutors across America. You can't label them all. In essence, it insults law enforcement officers, who themselves know that somebody who is in distress might respond accordingly. It insults the long time it takes to become a citizen of the United States, and some of these individuals have been waiting and waiting and maybe had an unfortunate circumstance. We are talking about some of the incidents that Ranking Member NADLER cited. It is just unruly.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to consider thoughtfully that we are doing good in a bipartisan way. Let us continue to do that. Police like to see that. They like to see themselves being affirmed in a bipartisan manner. They don't like to see other people being scapegoats.

Mr. Chair, we want them to be safe. We don't want violence. We don't want them to be injured. That is the statement we all should make. Let's find laws that will ensure that that will not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2494, the Protect Our Law Enforcement with Immigration Control and Enforcement (POLICE) Act.

This bill is an incredibly ill drafted and harmful measure that does not seek to address illegal immigration or support for law enforcement—rather it creates punitive deportation penalties to remove individuals who are lawfully here—cruelly scaling back on legal immigration pathways rather than increasing them.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem—essentially seeking to expand the scope of people who can be deported.

It is so broadly drafted that people who pose no real danger to law enforcement could be subject to deportation.

Let's be clear, this is not about undocumented immigrants who are already removable. This is about people who have come lawfully and been admitted to the United States.

We are talking about lawful permanent residents. People who have set down roots and established themselves here in the United States.

Given that my Republican colleagues have been unwilling to add a conviction requirement or a requirement that the offense included the intention to cause harm or use violence, I had hoped they would have been willing to accept an amendment that allows an immigration judge or Department of Homeland Security adjudicator to look at variety of mitigating factors when assessing if someone should be deemed deportable.

During the Judiciary Committee markup and the Rules Committee hearing, offered in the Rules Committee would have allowed for mitigating factors to be taken into account before someone is deported as a result of an assault on a law enforcement officer.

However, my Democratic colleagues and I could not get any Republican to roll back their punitive and damaging intent to harm any and all individuals seeking refuge and citizenship here in the U.S.—no matter the vulnerability of their circumstances.

As has already been discussed, this bill is attempting to add a new avenue to deport people with green cards.

If we are going to deport these people, it should be for a serious offense and there needs to be serious consideration of the circumstances pertaining to the alleged offense.

People who are convicted of serious assaults on law enforcement officers are already deportable.

Under current immigration law, if an individual is convicted of a crime of violence and sentenced to a year or more in prison, that is an aggravated felony and that person is deportable.

The same is true for someone who is convicted of a "crime involving moral turpitude," where the crime is punishable by imprisonment of one year or more.

Both of these deportability grounds are currently invoked when there is a conviction for a serious, intentional assault on a law enforcement officer, where bodily injury occurs or is intended.

This amendment would have allow the official making the final determination on deportation the ability to examine additional mitigating factors as evidence weighing against deportation.

The official would be able to take into account:

- if there was intent to harm;
- the severity of offense;
- if the act resulted in harm;
- the individual's military service (if any);
- how long the individual has been in the United States; and
- the individual's ties to the community.

These factors are vitally important for an immigration judge or other adjudicator to consider in order to ensure that we do not end up with some of the absurd results which have already been outlined today by my colleagues.

We should not be deporting long-term green card holders for minor offenses. Just as a reminder, these examples include:

A green card holder in a fire who pushes a firefighter out of the way of a falling beam.

This person would have committed assault and become deportable.

Likewise, if a foreign student whose religion prohibits blood transfusions is receiving medical care from an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) and she swats the EMT's hand away because she is trying to give him a blood transfusion, that student will have committed assault on a law enforcement officer and become deportable under this bill.

As another example, if a green card holder sees a fight on the street and attempts to intervene by getting between the individuals and pushing them apart. If one of the individuals was an undercover police officer performing his duties, the individual would have committed assault under this bill and become deportable.

In all of these examples, one would hope the individuals would never be charged, let alone convicted of a crime.

However, even without a conviction or intent to harm requirement, by admitting to actions that constitute assault, any of those individuals would have admitted to intentionally assaulting a law enforcement officer and would become deportable under this bill.

We should not be deporting green card holders for such minor offenses.

If the majority insists on doing so, they should at least allow adjudicators to look at mitigating factors to ensure that we are preventing good members of our society from getting swept up in this overbroad bill.

Let me just say that it is truly unfortunate that the Rules Committee did not consider my amendment or that of my colleagues.

We need to stop putting forth harmful and unproductive legislation and work on passing legislation that truly addresses meaningful immigration reform.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR).

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to House Republicans' H.R. 2494, which is not about defending police officers, it is about deporting people. This does nothing to defend against assault. This is about discriminating against immigrants. Let me tell you why.

Under Texas law, an unwanted touch can be considered assault. My Republican colleague, Congressman TROY NEHLS, a former law enforcement officer himself, pointed out during the bill markup that he had "mixed emotions" on that potentially leading to deportation.

This is not theoretical. Just this month we saw this in Texas firsthand. Evan, an Austin resident, was at our State legislature peacefully opposing a bill there. As the bill was being taken up, the speaker of the house ordered the gallery to be cleared.

Hats aren't allowed in the Chamber. As Evan was exiting the gallery, he was carrying his baseball cap in his left hand. An officer grabbed his arm and Evan swung around, surprised. The brim of his basketball cap bumped the officer. Evan was handcuffed and charged with assault by contact, a criminal charge. If Evan wasn't a cit-

izen or had admitted fault, he would be deported under this proposed bill today.

Here is another example from 2019. My constituent, Tania, was in mental health crisis. Her friends, family, and neighbors called 911 for help. The police and an ambulance arrived. The police said they needed to handcuff her to take her to the hospital. She was terrified. She was scared. She kicked as she was being handcuffed.

The police body camera video has on the recording the officers saying: Thank you.

That is now assault on a police officer, a felony charge for kicking. Rather than being taken to the hospital, Tania was booked into the jail. We feared that she would be deported. Because there was time for due process, her lawyers intervened. Members of Congress, such as Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT, intervened, and Tania was able to get out rather than be deported back to a country that she was brought from as a young child.

If this law today had been in place, Tania instead could have been automatically deported. This law undermines due process and radically expands the ability to deport families from the U.S. who have never been charged or convicted of a crime.

This bill would separate families and send people potentially to a country that they have never known, all for the brush of a hat or for the pinch of an arm.

Mr. Chair, I am sick and tired of preposterous bills being heard in this Chamber. I am sick and tired of hearing the Republicans are for due process, freedom, or individual liberty, when we see bills like this that do nothing to reform our immigration system. This does nothing to increase public safety, and only leaves as collateral damage the freedom, due process, and individual liberties of those who are struggling to make this country a better home for themselves and their families.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, this bill would make someone deportable if they assault a law enforcement officer, a fact that is already largely the case, as it should be. This bill would make it a deportable offense for a legal, permanent resident to merely perform the acts that could be described as a felony.

That, as I said before, leads to absurd results. The gentleman may say that that is not the intended result and that wouldn't happen, but you have to read the statute as it reads.

These absurd results that I mentioned before—I am not going to repeat them now—would be real unless the Correa amendment is adopted. Then it would solve the infirmities of the bill and we could recommend passage. If that doesn't happen, we cannot.

Mr. Chair, I hope we will fix this bill's most glaring flaw by requiring

that a person actually be convicted of assault before they are rendered deportable—that is the Correa amendment. If not, I urge all Members to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I urge our colleagues to pass this bill into law and support our policemen and -women in uniform.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-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.

H.R. 2494

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protect Our Law enforcement with Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 2023” or the “POLICE Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. ASSAULT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.

Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) ASSAULT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any alien who has been convicted of, who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of, any offense involving assault of a law enforcement officer is deportable.

“(ii) CIRCUMSTANCES.—The circumstances referred to in clause (i) are that the law enforcement officer was assaulted—

“(I) while he or she was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties;

“(II) because of the performance of his or her official duties; or

“(III) because of his or her status as a law enforcement officer.

“(iii) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘assault’ has the meaning given that term in the jurisdiction where the act occurred; and

“(II) the term ‘law enforcement officer’ is a person authorized by law—

“(aa) to apprehend, arrest, or prosecute an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

“(bb) to be a firefighter or other first responder.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order, except those printed in part A of House Report 118-59. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an oppo-

nent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-59.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON ALIENS DEPORTED FOR ASSAULTING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.

On an annual basis, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Homeland Security a report on the number of aliens who were deported during the previous year under section 237(a)(2)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)(G)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 398, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in favor of my amendment, which will require the Department of Homeland Security to create an annual report on the number of illegal aliens who have been deported for assaulting a law enforcement officer. This report will be made available to Congress and to the public on the DHS website. My amendment will promote accountability and transparency for the removal of these criminal aliens.

The complete and total invasion taking place at our southern border has made America less safe. Biden's border crisis has opened the door to human traffickers, gang members, and other dangerous criminals who enter our country with malicious intent, threatening the safety of our citizens and the police officers who serve as our first line of defense against crime.

Earlier this year, a female Border Patrol agent was violently attacked by a male alien while attempting to make an arrest.

Last year, two law enforcement officers were injured by an illegal alien when responding to a disturbance in New York. One officer suffered a concussion and the other had a broken hand.

We cannot allow these criminals to run rampant in our communities. The American people have the right to know if illegal aliens are attacking law enforcement officers and to what extent. That is why my amendment requires DHS to be accountable and transparent about the removal of these criminals.

Rather than wasting time on the Democrats' agenda to keep our southern border wide open and defund the police, House Republicans are proud to

back the blue, especially this week on National Police Week as we recognize these brave men and women throughout our country for their service.

We, as Republicans, have proposed policy solutions to put an end to Biden's border crisis.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, Representative ANDREW GARBARINO, for his leadership to ensure that we can hold these illegal criminal aliens accountable for violence against law enforcement officers with H.R. 2494.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

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

□ 1345

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Boebert amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to make publicly available on its website an annual report on the number of noncitizens deported for assaulting a law enforcement officer.

It is important for us to take a step back and remember what this bill is all about. This bill is attempting to add a new avenue for people who are living here lawfully in the United States to be deported.

By and large, we are talking about the ability to deport lawful permanent residents, people with green cards. These are people who my Republican colleagues like to say have done things the so-called “right way.” I sincerely hope that this report would not be used to further demonize immigrants.

However, on its face, I do not find this amendment to be objectionable.

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I am glad that we have found some common ground on this.

I thank my colleague for supporting this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 118-59.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, beginning on line 12, strike "convicted of," and all that follows through the end of line 14 and insert "convicted of".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 398, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, as you know, this week is National Police Week. I thank every peace officer and law enforcement officer for doing their service and for protecting our communities day in and day out.

I want to make clear, Mr. Chairman, that no Democrat or Republican condones a serious assault on any peace officer, period. To the contrary, we want to help our police officers do their job.

Yesterday, my local Orange County sheriff was here to testify to address public safety issues. After that meeting, he pulled me aside, and he reminded me of how hard and long we had worked in Orange County to gain the trust of the immigrant community—trust that public safety needs to do their job—to report crimes when they happen and to cooperate with public safety because police officers need the help of the immigrant community to do their job.

That is just the fact. This bill threatens to undo decades of hard work and of building trust between public safety and the immigrant community.

This bill, in fact, is so broad that individuals can be deported for actions they are merely accused of.

Let me repeat: People can be deported for actions that they are merely accused of. We are talking about the ability to deport lawfully permanent residents, people with green cards.

Do we really want to deport these individuals—many of whom are close to becoming U.S. citizens—not based on convictions but simply an accusation?

What about the constitutional notion of innocent until proven guilty?

Mr. Chairman, in this bill a conviction is not required.

One would hope that someone who did not intend or did not cause harm would never be charged let alone convicted of a crime. However, any conduct could be considered an assault under this bill, and by the bill's broad definition, it would make someone deportable even without a charge and even without a conviction.

It is important to remember that convictions for serious assaults on a law enforcement officer are offenses today that make someone deportable under current law. In fact, we have a wide variety of criminal grounds for deportation, almost all of which require a conviction.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple amendment. It is simple. It re-

quires a conviction. My amendment simply requires a court—a judge—to decide on the facts and the law before a green card holder can be deported.

My amendment is simple. It asks for due process under the law.

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CORREA is a good friend of mine, I think one of my closest friends across the aisle, so I am going to have a little debate on his amendment.

H.R. 2494 requires that an alien either be convicted of an offense involving assault of a law enforcement officer or admit to assaulting a law enforcement officer.

Contrary to the Democrats' talking points on the other side, not every ground of removability in the Immigration and Nationality Act requires a conviction.

In fact, here are some of the removable offenses that do not require conviction: smuggling, marriage fraud, drug abuse or drug addiction, trafficking, document fraud, terrorist activities, and participation in violations of religious freedom.

By requiring at least an admission of assault, this bill conforms to the pattern of other grounds of removability even exceeding many of those already listed.

The language of this bill also tracks closely with the language for certain grounds of inadmissibility as well, such as crimes involving moral turpitude and controlled substance offenses.

In a world of increasing threats against law enforcement officers—whom we all support—it makes no sense to require a conviction. If an alien has admitted to assaulting a law enforcement officer, then why can't the alien's own admission be used to show that alien is deportable?

Listen to what the bill requires: an admission or a conviction of an assault offense; the assault must have been against a law enforcement officer; and that assault must have been while the law enforcement officer was performing his or her duties or because of his or her status as a law enforcement officer.

Even then, DHS would have to charge the alien as removable, the immigration judge would have to sustain that charge of removability, and then the alien would be allowed to appear for relief to remain in the United States.

This amendment would strike the reasonable provision that would allow criminal aliens to be removed if they admit to assaulting a law enforcement officer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. CORREA's amendment.

Any conviction requirement would greatly improve this bill. No one in this caucus condones serious assaults against law enforcement officers. As written, however, this bill goes well beyond serious offenses to include minor offenses and even actions for which an individual is never charged or convicted.

That is right. Under this bill, a conviction is not required. This will lead to bizarre consequences in which someone who had no intent of harming a law enforcement officer but nevertheless committed an act that constituted assault would be deemed deportable.

Mr. Chairman, remember the three examples I gave before: pushing a fireman out of the way of a falling beam. That would make the person deportable under this bill.

It is important to remember that convictions for serious assaults on law enforcement are already offenses that make someone deportable under current law. In fact, we have a wide variety of criminal grounds for deportation, nearly all of which require a conviction. That is why adding a requirement that an individual be convicted of assaulting a law enforcement officer to become deportable would significantly improve the bill.

However, it would not fix all the issues associated with this bill. For example, the bill does not require an intent to cause harm or any physical injury which would sweep in very low-level offenses.

Since the bill only impacts people who are here legally, the prospect of deporting longtime members of our communities for very minor offenses is deeply concerning, but the bill would be improved by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Alabama) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2494) to make the assault of a law enforcement officer a deportable offense, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That, pursuant to article I, section 5, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, Representative George Santos, be, and he hereby is, expelled from the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO REFER

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to refer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. D'Esposito of New York moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first Members of this body to call on the subject of this resolution to resign. I am personally in favor of this individual's expulsion from this House.

Regrettably, however, I am of the understanding that we currently do not have the two-thirds support from Members of this House to expel that individual.

I believe that this individual is a stain on this institution, a stain on the State of New York, a stain on Long Island, and a stain on the beloved Nassau County.

With that said, I believe this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Ethics to ensure a thorough and expedient investigation into this matter. I firmly believe this is the quickest way of ridding the House of Representatives of this scourge on government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to refer.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 204, answered “present” 7, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]
YEAS—221

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fry
Fulcher

Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Mollinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rodgers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—204

Adams
Aguilar
Alfred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo

Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
Dingell
Doggett
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs

Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Petterson
Phillips

Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

DeSaulnier
Escobar
Houlahan

Ivey
Perez
Ross

NOT VOTING—3

Clyburn

Malliotakis
Peltola

□ 1734

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BOST, WEBSTER of Florida, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

Ms. PEREZ changed her vote from “yea” to “present.”

So the motion to refer was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SERVICE WEAPON PURCHASE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 398 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on