

within the range of the rockets which are becoming more and more wide-ranging over the territory of Israel.

If a terror organization in Mexico, for example, were firing rockets into cities in Texas and Arizona, the United States would certainly be expected to retaliate with military force. This is the case with Israel, it must protect its citizens from indiscriminate rocket attacks. Israel is not to blame for the civilian casualties caused in this conflict.

Indeed, the blame lies squarely at the feet of Hamas and other terror organizations who believe in the use of violence to achieve their goals.

Israel, in good faith, gave over the Gaza in a land-for-peace deal. Yet, the ink wasn't even dry, and they started stacking rockets in Gaza and launching them at Israel.

The United States must continue to support Israel's right to exist and defend itself from aggression. As our most powerful partner in the Middle East, we owe it to them.

□ 0915

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND CONDEMNING EFFORTS TO DEFUND OR DISMANTLE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 398, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 398, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas our brave men and women in local law enforcement work tirelessly to protect the communities they serve;

Whereas local law enforcement officers are tasked with upholding the rule of law and ensuring public safety;

Whereas local law enforcement officers selflessly put themselves in harm's way to fight crime, get drugs off our streets, and protect the innocent;

Whereas, in the summer of 2020, looting, rioting, and violence in major cities caused the destruction of many shops, restaurants, and businesses;

Whereas, in 2020, the United States tallied more than 21,000 murders—the highest total since 1995 and 4,900 more than in 2019;

Whereas leftist activists and progressive politicians called for the defunding and dismantling of local police departments across the country and actively encouraged resentment toward local law enforcement;

Whereas the defund the police movement vilifies and demonizes local law enforcement officers and puts them at greater risk of danger;

Whereas many local jurisdictions defunded their police departments and saw a subsequent increase in violent crime;

Whereas violent leftist extremists have repeatedly attacked and assaulted local law enforcement officers; and

Whereas local law enforcement officers deserve our respect and profound gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes and appreciates the dedication and devotion demonstrated by the men and women of local law enforcement who keep our communities safe; and

(2) condemns calls to defund, disband, dismantle, or abolish the police.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part C of House Report 118-59, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered 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 a division of the question.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 40.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 40 expresses our support for the brave men and women who serve in law enforcement across our great Nation. These individuals put their lives on the line every single day to protect our communities and keep us safe, and it is time that we acknowledged their selflessness and dedication.

Law enforcement officers are the backbone of our justice system. They are the first line of defense against crime, and they work tirelessly to ensure that our neighborhoods are safe places to live, work, and raise families.

While most people fear danger and flee, police officers rush toward the threat, and they do so without hesitation or reservation. They are truly the embodiment of courage and bravery.

Unfortunately, over the past several years, we have seen an unprecedented level of hostility toward law enforcement in this country. The defund the police movement greatly fueled this hostility.

We have seen police officers subjected to unwarranted scrutiny, harass-

ment, and even violence. We have seen protests turn into riots with law enforcement officers becoming targets of angry mobs. This kind of behavior is not only unacceptable, but it is also dangerous and destructive. It undermines the very fabric of our society and puts innocent lives at risk.

As a former prosecutor, I am acutely aware of the vital role that law enforcement plays in keeping our communities safe. I have seen firsthand the sacrifices that these men and women make, and I am truly grateful for their service.

That is why I am committed to doing everything in my power to support our law enforcement officers and to ensure that they have the resources and tools they need to do their jobs effectively. They are the unsung heroes of our communities, and we owe them a debt of gratitude that could never truly be repaid.

Let us work together to ensure that they have the support they need to continue their important work and to keep our neighborhoods safe for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is nothing more than empty rhetoric designed to score political points. It does nothing to help our law enforcement officers do their jobs. It does nothing to solve crimes or promote justice. It does nothing to take deadly weapons like those used to target law enforcement off our streets, and it does nothing to make our communities safer.

It is also wildly misleading and full of incendiary rhetoric that does not match reality. Very conspicuously, it even fails to recognize the service or contributions of Federal, State, or Tribal law enforcement officers.

It is worth remembering that when the Republicans passed their rules package at the beginning of the Congress, it included several supposedly "ready to go on day one" bills.

An earlier version of this resolution was included in that list, but it never made it to the floor. Now we know why. The problem is that the original version praised all law enforcement, not just local law enforcement, as this resolution does.

Why was that a problem?

Because as we have learned in recent months, House Republicans now support defunding the police at the Federal level. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Chairman JORDAN told FOX News that he wants to "look at the appropriations process and limit funds going to some of these agencies."

He later made clear he was referring to the FBI and the Department of Justice.

Mr. BIGGS has called directly for defunding those agencies, and Mr. GAETZ has introduced a bill that would eliminate the ATF altogether.

Limiting the resolution to local law enforcement also helps Republicans paper over an embarrassing split in their caucus over whether even to recognize the contributions of our brave Capitol Police officers who protected us on January 6.

I remind Members that 41 Republicans voted against awarding Congressional Gold Medals to the Capitol Police officers and the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department in recognition of their service on January 6.

That must be why the resolution states that violent leftist extremists have attacked law enforcement, but it makes no mention of the violent mob of far-right extremists and white supremacists who stormed the Capitol that day injuring 140 police officers with five officers losing their lives in the days after.

H. Con. Res. 40 is a hopelessly misleading resolution that omits crucial context and ignores crime trends in the country, including the disturbing rise in gun violence and the higher per capita murder rate in States won by Donald Trump.

While Republicans want to talk tough with nonbinding resolutions about funding the police—local police that is—it was Democrats who passed bill after bill last Congress to actually fund and support the police.

So where were Republicans when Democrats went about the serious work of legislating?

When given the opportunity to put action behind their cheap rhetoric, time and again, Republicans voted “no.” For example, last Congress Democrats advanced the Invest to Protect Act which would have authorized \$300 million in grants to law enforcement agencies with fewer than 125 officers to smaller localities.

This legislation passed with bipartisan support, but 55 Republican Members voted against it.

Democrats also advanced the VICTIM Act led by Congresswoman and former police chief Val Demings which would have provided grants totaling up to \$100 million per year to law enforcement agencies to help them solve violent crimes and close outstanding cases.

Mr. Speaker, 178 Republicans voted against it.

Democrats advanced the assault weapons ban which was supported by the Major Cities Chiefs Association and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives because they know that these weapons of war are used to murder law enforcement officers and to terrorize their communities.

Nearly every Republican voted “no.” House Democrats worked with Republican Senator JOHN CORNYN—who is not someone known to be soft on crime—to pass the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act, a bill that increases safety for law enforcement and community members alike.

This bipartisan bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, but when it

came to the House, 159 Republicans voted against it.

This is not and never has been a serious approach to legislating.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 40 is a wasted opportunity to advance meaningful legislation that would support the men and women of law enforcement who put their lives on the line every day to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will mention in response to the gentleman from New York's remarks about empty rhetoric, that this resolution says that Congress recognizes and appreciates the dedication and devotion demonstrated by the men and women of local law enforcement who keep our communities safe and condemns calls to defund, disband, dismantle, or abolish the police.

This is hardly empty rhetoric when we are thanking America's finest for the work that they do to protect us.

I also appreciate the distinction that the gentleman tried to make and the great difference that we have when Democrats across this country called for defunding local police departments, they did so in the face of rising crime.

What was the congressional response to the colleagues in various parts of the country embarrassing Democrat Members in the House?

Of course, they did what Democrats do so well. They threw money at a problem. They tried to cover up the embarrassment of defunding police at a time when rising crime was occurring by throwing money at a problem.

We are now faced with \$31.5 trillion of debt because of strategies like that, and we have to recognize that that no longer works.

Yes, there were Republicans who stepped up and voted knowing that the vote might cause some commercials and some other issues about how they don't support police, when the reality is that an overwhelming percentage of police funding comes from local government—as it should.

Finally, the ranking member talks about how there have been efforts with some of my colleagues to hold Federal agencies responsible for their actions to make sure that Federal agencies don't overstep their authority.

At one point in time, the civil libertarians in this country were on that side of the aisle. Now it appears that the ATF, the FBI, and other agencies can overstep their authority and not be held accountable. It is a sad day when we can't come together and agree that this country is stronger and better when we don't allow the Federal Government to spy on our citizens, to interfere with political campaigns, and to otherwise disrupt our normal life outside of their law enforcement functions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this issue today. It is an important issue.

I remember my first townhall after I was elected to Congress. We had 1,000 people show up. Many of them were wearing resistance T-shirts. The radical left was busing people in actually from California to protest my townhall. That was fine. That is what it is about.

What wasn't fine was the ridiculous number of threats to me, my family, and my staff.

That is when I remembered from days in my legal practice my gratitude for the police who came and made sure that the crowd was protected and my staff was protected. They even placed two undercover police officers flanking my wife because she had been threatened, as well.

Thank you. Thank you to the men and women of law enforcement.

I thank the police chiefs and the rank and file in Apache Junction, in Mesa, in Chandler, in Gilbert, in Queen Creek, and in Maricopa County. The sheriff is a Democrat, but I think he does a pretty good job; not like some of the other folks that I will be talking about in just a minute.

I thank the sheriffs and their departments in local law enforcement in the border communities in Yuma County, Cochise County, and Pinal County who are having to take up the slack because of what is going on on the border. The Biden administration is allowing people to just run rampant across our border. It is unbelievable.

I thank them. They don't run away. They run toward, to save us. They run toward the people who would harm us, and they provide the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, you can't have freedom if you don't have respect and rule of law.

Now let's talk about the Federal agencies for just a second. A story just came out last weekend about the bomber who put the bombs over at the NRCC and DCCC on January 6. Those were inert bombs. It turns out the FBI had surveillance and film of that person placing those inert bombs. They had video of them moving around on the Metro, moving on out to the suburban D.C. area getting into a car.

They have the license plate of the car, they have the tracking, and they have the credit card that paid for the Metro that that bomber used.

When they went to try to investigate, the leadership in the FBI halted that investigation. The Durham report has come out. I urge you to read it, Mr. Speaker.

I heard some of you talk about it. I am not sure you read it.

Any objective analysis of that report will tell you that the Department of Justice and the FBI were working with the Clinton campaign to create a false criminal allegation. We are still talking about the Russian hoax.

□ 0930

It is unbelievable. As some have said, the DOJ and the FBI abandoned their standards from the start. They had no predicate for that investigation. They knew it at the time. I think we should hold them accountable.

You want to keep funding them? Fine. You keep funding them, but you are going to have to reform them somehow, somehow.

I, like my friend from Colorado, remember the time when it was the Democrats who often called for civil liberties and the protection of civil liberties from the Federal police apparatus. That is where I am. We have now come to a point where we have to protect our citizens from our own Federal police apparatus.

I will also get into this notion of federalizing the police. You can't simply always throw Federal grant money at local law enforcement.

At least in Arizona, when I talk to our friends in policing there, they will tell you: We take this money with trepidation because the Feds always want to take over.

They don't understand. I will just tell you, we don't understand Seattle. Why would you come to Congress and say you control policing in Seattle, you control it in Phoenix, or you control it in the town of Gilbert? Why would we turn that over to the Feds? That is too much.

Now, I want to share some comments that we have heard over the last couple of years from some of my colleagues across the aisle.

From the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), with reducing the NYPD budget, stating: "There should be substantial cuts to the police budget and a reallocation of those funds to where we need them."

The minority leader, asked on CNN, expressed his openness to defunding the police when he said: "You have to look at that on a case-by-case basis."

CORI BUSH was the vice chair of the Crime and Federal Government Surveillance Subcommittee. She said: "It is not a slogan." "Defunding the police" is not a slogan. She said: "It is not a slogan. It is a mandate for keeping our people alive. Defund the police."

When she was challenged about that, she further said: "'Defund the police' is not the problem." She continues to always double down on that.

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) also said: "This is what happens when leaders sign blank check after blank check to militarize police, CBP, et cetera, while letting violence go unchecked. We need answers. And we need to defund."

When New York decided to cut a billion dollars from their police force, Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ thought the cuts did not go far enough, stating: "Defunding police means defunding police."

Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN said: "We don't need police with lethal

weapons carrying out routine traffic stops. Reallocate police funding to unarmed traffic forces to remove even the possibility of state-sanctioned manslaughter."

Representative JAYAPAL said it is completely reasonable for us to "shift significant sums of money from police" and invest in people.

Representative ILHAN OMAR said: "We need to completely dismantle the Minneapolis Police Department because here is the thing. There is a cancer. . . . The Minneapolis Police Department is rotten to the root, and so when we dismantle, we get rid of that cancer."

Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY said: "The defund movement isn't new. Folks are just finally listening."

Representative RASHIDA TLAIB said: "When we say #DefundPolice, what we mean is people are dying, and we need to invest in people's livelihoods instead."

So don't tell me now that you can't vote for this resolution, which honors local police enforcement and condemns the defund police movement.

Don't tell me that is idle rhetoric. That is real. That is sincere, and that ought to be what the position of this body is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker referred to some remarks I made, and they are accurate.

What I said was that substantial resources should be taken from the police and given to mental health services, and that was done. About a billion dollars was taken from the police department in New York City by the city council and the mayor and given to mental health services.

That made sense. Why? Because when someone is acting out on the subway, when someone is threatening on the subway, what you usually need is a mental health professional there, not a policeman who doesn't know how to handle it.

Since a lot of resources were devoted to mental health, the situation in the subways generally and on the streets has gotten much better. It has worked.

I can't speak for anybody else, but I can say that when the gentleman says we should honor local police, he is also saying we should not honor Federal police.

This resolution does not honor Federal police. It does not honor the ATF, the FBI, or thousands of Federal law enforcement officers, the law enforcement officers who protected us on January 6 from a far-right attack.

It talks about leftist violence, but it refuses to talk about rightwing violence. It is not a balanced or fair resolution.

It seeks to give a distorted picture of what is going on in this country, and that is why we cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER for the time.

I served the first 3½ years of my legal career in the police department. I had a badge and a gun. I know policemen as well, if not better, than almost anybody in this body.

I tried to give them a gun yesterday because there was a bill on the floor to let them take their revolvers with them when they retired in good standing, but the Republicans had it amended to where they could also take automatic weapons and didn't have to be in good standing. We can't do things purely for the police.

In this situation, I offered an amendment to advocate the positions of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and other police organizations to say that we should have limits on weapons on the streets, on armor-piercing bullets, and on assault weapons.

Police don't want those on the streets against them. Yet, it wasn't allowed to be heard. It was offered twice again by Mr. CICILLINE. It wasn't allowed to be heard.

Just like when children are killed, when people are killed in clubs, when people are killed in churches, when people are killed in Las Vegas on the streets, this is thoughts and prayers because the NRA and the concern of people having guns and bullets comes before police and their protection.

This is thoughts and prayers, and it is police memorial week lite.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, before recognizing the next speaker, let me also point out that this resolution also claims that progressive politicians actively encourage resentment toward local law enforcement.

When we tried to remove such misleading claims during the markup, Republicans said no. We tried to unite behind what should have been the point of this resolution, support of all law enforcement without language that shamed or demonized Members and misled Americans, but Republicans refused. That is another reason we have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, and I do so sadly because there are many things that my good colleague across the aisle from Colorado and I agree on and work on. This is unequivocally not one of them.

The reason I am so distraught by this resolution is because I am the proud chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We are a caucus of 102 Members in this body. We have done many wonderful things for our constituents and people across the country.

In fact, we have even worked with the Freedom Caucus, the gentleman from Arizona, to take on some things around accountability of law enforcement, surveillance, privacy rights—many issues that we agree on.

The characterization of progressives within this resolution makes it absolutely impossible to support the resolution.

I think, unfortunately, that is the point that my friends are trying to make. They are trying to make us vote against a resolution that supports law enforcement by inserting these provisions that are characterizations that are absolutely harmful and encourage hate against us as progressives representing our constituents.

Now, we already passed a resolution honoring law enforcement this week, but this resolution literally makes it impossible for us to support.

I want to raise a couple of points about this. My colleague from Arizona said we want to hold Federal law enforcement accountable. Well, that is exactly what Democrats sought to do when we passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which not a single Republican voted for.

We need accountability of all of our agencies at all levels. That doesn't mean we don't appreciate the work that those agencies do. We absolutely do.

As somebody who experienced violent threats against my life and my family's life from a man showing up with a gun at my house, I was defended by our local law enforcement, and I am incredibly grateful to them.

I resent the characterization that somehow we progressives do not support law enforcement just because we want to have accountability in our communities so that Black and Brown people can walk down the streets and feel safe.

In addition, this is not about honoring law enforcement because, last week, I tried to introduce an amendment in committee that said if we are going to honor law enforcement, then let's honor the brave men and women of the United States Capitol Police and all levels of local, State, and Federal law enforcement that defended us in this body on January 6, 2021, when a violent group of rightwing MAGA extremists came and launched an insurrection against this body.

I was trapped in the gallery right there, right there in those seats.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, long after other people were evacuated from the gallery, some of my friends and I were trapped there. We saw everything happen.

I introduced an amendment to honor those Federal law enforcement people, and do you know what? Republicans could have taken it and voted against it if they wanted to show where they stand, but they didn't. They hid behind a ridiculous assertion of germaneness and essentially silenced our voices.

I think we have to be real about what this resolution is, and with great re-

spect to my friend from Colorado, we want accountability of all agencies.

They want to defend Federal law enforcement. We want to honor all law enforcement, including those who defended us here at the Capitol on January 6.

Let my Republican colleagues call out that it was an insurrection on January 6 and that our Federal law enforcement and local law enforcement that defended us here deserve the same honor that they are planning to give to local law enforcement.

Let's honor all law enforcement, and let's take out the references to progressives, which I take great offense to.

Mr. Speaker, I vote "no" on this resolution, and I call on my colleagues to vote "no" on this partisan and, frankly, hypocritical resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I quote my good friend from the State of Washington. "Law enforcement as a whole has a culture of brutality that you cannot deny if you look at all of these incidents. . . . Most of the protesters are calling for a complete transformation of policing?"

To paraphrase, this reporter writes, Jayapal said that governments should "shift significant sums of money from police" and put it in other community-based programs.

I am happy to work with my friend and cosponsor a January 6 resolution of some type thanking the police officers.

Outside the door of my office in the Rayburn Building, there is a "Thank You, Capitol Police" sign. There is a flag representing the dedication that police officers have flying outside my door. I absolutely thank the Capitol Police for their hard work.

□ 0945

Mr. Speaker, I do think we need to look at what the FBI, ATF, and some other agencies have done in a fair, responsible, nonpartisan way and address some of those issues. I actually think I probably will work with my friend on this, also.

Some of my colleagues have started that process with an appropriations angle. That is something I will look at. I may support it. I may not. You may probably not. However, we have other ways to deal with Federal law enforcement that have overstepped.

I also agree with my friend that an overwhelming percentage of Federal law enforcement agents are great, hardworking people who protect us from foreign terrorists and all sorts of violence in this country, organized crime, other things that aren't dealt with as well at the local level, and I appreciate what they have done.

The leadership in some of those agencies has gone astray, in my opinion, and that is why we need to take a serious look at them, but I thank my friend for her comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear that the gentleman from

Colorado wants to honor Federal law enforcement personnel who defended us on January 6 and otherwise, which leads me to the question of why the Republicans refused to let us have an amendment to that effect in committee.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER for yielding, my longtime friend and distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the thousands of brave men and women of Federal, State, and Tribal law enforcement that were intentionally left out of the resolution before the House, H. Con. Res. 40, by the Republican majority. That includes, as has been described, omitting the United States Capitol Police, who heroically defended this very Chamber on January 6 from armed insurrectionists intent on disrupting the peaceful transfer of power in this Nation, who gave life and limb to defend the American democratic experiment. That to me is worthy of recognition in this resolution. It is the very least we should and could do.

I am privileged to serve as the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the committee charged with ensuring the safety and security of all who work and visit here.

This week, my committee heard testimony from the chief of the United States Capitol Police. The chief testified about the enduring impact that January 6 has had on the force and the physical and mental scars the officers still carry.

How did the committee's majority respond?

They blamed the department.

They didn't blame the former President who urged his supporters to come to Washington, claiming that he would march to the Capitol with them.

They didn't blame the insurrectionists that came armed with guns, knives, tasers, and used poles bearing the American flag to viciously beat Capitol Police officers.

They didn't blame the elected officials that were complicit in the former President's corrupt scheme to retain power.

No, they blamed the department.

Since my colleagues across the aisle won't do it, allow me to do it: To every one of the nearly 2,000 sworn Capitol Police officers, thank you. You deserve to be in this resolution. We thank you not just for your actions on that day, but for every single day. We have your backs, just as you always have ours.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about what this resolution is really about. No, it is not just about supporting local law enforcement. It is also about trying to attack and vilify

the Black Lives Matter movement and the activism that has helped shape our Nation and helped our Nation more clearly see the injustices carried out in our communities.

In 2020, I myself was on the forefront of this movement. Alongside the world, I watched online, outraged over the killing and lynching of George Floyd, a man who did not deserve to die at the hands of a police choke hold while he called out for his mother.

Alongside the world, I was outraged over the loss of Breonna Taylor, a young woman who did not deserve to be shot dead in her own home.

Like millions across this country, I marched for change, marched to fight for our voices to be heard, marched to fight for a world where that injustice does not exist, and marched in a non-violent way alongside my community in central Florida.

I saw the pain and the hurt of so many who had spent their lives living in a nation where they feared their well-being every time they stepped outside of their home due to negative interactions with law enforcement. Not every interaction, but many interactions.

We fought for public safety that centers the community so we can truly tackle crime and conditions that breed it.

I believed then what I believe now: The color of your skin and how much money you have in the bank should not determine the treatment you get in the eyes of the law.

The color of your skin and how much money you have in the bank should not be the determining factor of whether you live or die.

No one deserves to die because they are Black. No one deserves to die because they are poor.

Yet, today, we are voting on a resolution that does nothing but to divide us as a country.

It has nothing to do with really supporting police. It has everything to do with vilifying a movement of people and everything to do with trying to rewrite history to make what was a global, mainly nonviolent protest seem evil.

You can pass all the sham resolutions you want, but you cannot take away our stories. I remember being tear-gassed, maced, arrested, and jailed on the streets of my own hometown. Today, I get to represent those same streets in the United States Congress.

You cannot whitewash this history. These stories live on in Black Lives Matter.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this resolution, a deeply partisan, messaging tactic from House Republicans who are more focused on inflaming di-

visions in our country than on working for the American people.

If Republicans cared about public safety, they would work to address the gun violence epidemic in our Nation, which even law enforcement says is out of control.

If they really cared about law enforcement, they would not try to defund agencies like the ATF and FBI.

This resolution is harmful and misleading. Violent leftist extremists and progressive politicians do not want to defund law enforcement. This characterization is a corrupt narrative that runs counter to the real conversations that Americans want to have about the issues their communities face.

The true irony here is that in the same breath that they denounce these so-called violent leftist extremists, they stay silent on the extremists from their own party that stormed the Capitol and attacked the United States Capitol Police, men and women still working here today, disrespected every single day by my colleagues.

Silence on this issue.

Republicans are wasting time with empty bills and malignant rhetoric.

Yes, absolutely, we should be investing in people's livelihoods. Why is that wrong?

How come we cannot support good public safety and work to keep people alive, all people?

A study just came out yesterday that said Black people are twice as likely to die than anyone else just because we are Black, and that includes interacting with law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that we vote "no" on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing absolutely clear. There is not a single Republican in the United States House of Representatives, to my knowledge, that does not condemn the violent acts on January 6; period, end of story.

If somebody wants to work on a resolution condemning the violence on January 6, I welcome that and will work with them, but let's not talk about January 6 when we are talking about a bill that is designated and intended to compliment and uplift those who have been the targets of really destructive action in terms of the defund the police movement.

I have heard my good friend from Washington—one of the leaders of the Progressive Caucus here in the House—say that Progressives in the House who we have quoted were not involved in that. That is fine. However, certainly the leftists in this country moved to defund the police. They succeeded.

As a result, we have seen rising crime, we have seen more victims, and nobody on their side—nobody—takes accountability for the fact that there are more murder victims, there are more robbery victims, there are more people getting their cars hijacked, there are more crimes being committed

in this country as a result of failed leftist policies.

If you want to talk about January 6, let's work together and thank the Capitol Police. You want to talk about defunding the police, you want to talk about how we need to uplift the police for their great work, then we need to pass this resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Colorado say he is interested in a resolution praising the Capitol Police and so forth, which makes it all the more puzzling why the Republicans refused to let us consider an amendment to that effect to this resolution in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for being so eloquent on where we are today.

Let me read the headline of this legislation, H. Con. Res. 40, expressing support for local law enforcement officers. Broadly supported all across America.

Every day we are supporting our local law enforcement, but as well we are supporting our Federal law enforcement that are right in my district today holding a meeting, men and women who put their lives on the line.

I don't know why we couldn't on this last day of National Police Week, as we began the week, as I indicated, and repeat over and over again, that I was there for this ceremony that I have gone to every year, which has honored those who have fallen in battle.

They had everyone represented. Everyone was in brotherhood and sisterhood. Everyone was embracing families and those in law enforcement. No one asked for your Democratic ticket or your Republican ticket. All they were grateful for is you had come to honor and recognize the importance of the work that they do.

This could have been a place where we showed to the Nation the reasoning of our hearts and our minds.

I offered an amendment to include Federal law enforcement. How dare we ignore them on this day?

We cannot ignore January 6. We cannot ignore the Capitol Police, along with those who came to help, who will always have the scars of that horrific day.

Why? Because we have never seen in our modern-day eyes an attack on the United States Capitol that was not in war.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say, yes, I support local law enforcement. Never have my lips ever said the words that would take dollars away from those personnel, their salaries, and all that they need to do.

I don't know why in a resolution that speaks about honor that we have to mix not even apples and oranges but apples and stench. There is no reason to attack anyone in this. Put a resolution about how much you hate the folks on the other side of the aisle; we will debate that. I don't hate them.

What we tried to do in committee is to say let us make this a resolution, Federal, State and local folk, and let us not talk about folk who are dismantling anything because I don't know Democrats who stood outside of a DA's office and tried to dismantle them. They have an independent decision, right, to make. They are elected by the people. If they are not at the level that the people want, they are gone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to amend this from the floor. Let this be an amendment that we can all vote for. This is my last word: I support local and Federal law enforcement.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I support Federal, State and local law enforcement. I support those that are in my district right now.

I would offer to say, aren't we examples for young people?

Don't we want our children to raise up and support law enforcement and see all of us standing together and not dividing?

Don't we want good policing, good police relationships?

None of that is a divide. It is a unity, and it represents the Constitution of the United States of America.

I tell you that the officers that I engage with believe in it. I ask my colleagues to decide to do something better than this legislation.

□ 1000

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is highly disingenuous for my colleagues to suggest that because this resolution doesn't thank all sorts of other groups that we can't thank local law enforcement.

This resolution doesn't thank Governors. It doesn't thank Lieutenant Governors. It doesn't thank secretaries of State. It doesn't thank State attorneys general. It doesn't thank the generals and admirals at the Pentagon. It doesn't thank the folks who are working so hard in the cafeteria to provide us with food today. It doesn't thank a lot of people.

It does thank local law enforcement, and for that we should unite. For that, we should come together. For that, we should overcome these ridiculous arguments and pat someone on the back.

Then let's work toward another resolution. Let's make sure we thank those FBI agents who are working in the field, not the ones who planned to dismantle our political system, but the ones who are working in the field to

protect us. Let's thank those ATF agents who are arresting convicted felons who are in possession of a firearm. Let's thank them. Let's thank Federal law enforcement. Let's thank the Capitol Police for their great work on January 6.

Don't vote against this resolution thanking local police officers just because it is not broad enough and doesn't include every single category you can think of.

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

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

Again, if the gentleman wanted to support our Federal police, the ATF, the FBI, the Capitol Police, he had the opportunity in committee, and the Republicans refused to let us consider that.

We have all of these statements from people like the chairman of the committee saying defund the FBI, defend the ATF. This is being a little, shall we say—I don't want to use the word “hypocritical,” but I can't think of a different word.

We should oppose this resolution because it is blatantly one-sided, it blames leftist agitators improperly, and it does not deal with Federal law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, police week ought to be a unifying event, a time when we can all come together in a bipartisan fashion to recognize and support the men and women of law enforcement who risk their lives to keep us and our communities safe.

Instead of offering serious legislation, Republicans have brought forward misleading and incendiary political talking points that will neither protect law enforcement nor enhance public safety.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my colleague from New York, but I reiterate what this resolution is about and what it says.

Congress recognizes and appreciates the dedication and devotion demonstrated by the men and women of local law enforcement who keep our communities safe and condemns calls to defund, disband, dismantle, or abolish the police.

It is absolutely correct that this resolution doesn't include everybody and everything. There will be time in this Congress where we can work together to do that. To not pass this resolution, to not vote for this resolution during police week is a slap in the face to local law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all the people who are watching today and all Americans to tune in to the weaponization committee as they listen to witnesses, whistleblowers from Federal agencies, talking about the abuses in those Federal agencies.

It would be inappropriate, until we reach conclusions, until we pass legis-

lation protecting Americans and protecting our political process, for us to take that extra step with Federal law enforcement.

I have said over and over, I absolutely respect the men and women who are on the streets in Federal law enforcement protecting us. It is the leadership that we have issues with at times. That is not in this resolution. This resolution is a unifying resolution, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle can join us in thanking local law enforcement.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 40.

I want to start by thanking law enforcement for all the work they do to keep our communities safe. Officers consistently put their lives on the line. Each year during National Police Week, I place a poster outside of my office honoring Minnesota's fallen law enforcement officers.

In my work as an appropriator, you know that I strongly support funding for Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants and Byrne JAG Justice Assistance grants. These are funds that directly support local law enforcement. Law enforcement entities were prioritized in my FY22, FY23, and FY24 Community Project Funding requests, with \$4,500,000 secured for Ramsey and Washington County law enforcement projects that are improving public safety in my home district.

Unfortunately, the House Republican majority's resolution does not simply express support for our law enforcement. It also includes language explicitly polarizing and misleading in nature, referring only to “left-wing” extremists but failing to acknowledge the right-wing extremist violence that has proliferated in recent years. For example, the attack on our U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, that resulted in the deaths of five U.S. Capitol Police officers and lasting injuries for many more.

It is unfortunate that with this resolution, which should be focused on highlighting the important work law enforcement officers do every day, Republicans chose to use rhetoric to score political points with their base.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. D'ESPOSITO

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I have amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after the eighth clause of the preamble the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

Whereas calls to “defund”, “disband”, “dismantle”, or “abolish” the police should be condemned and rule of law should be strictly maintained;

Whereas local law enforcement officers take an oath to never betray the public trust;

Whereas in the course of investigations into officers who have allegedly exhibited misconduct, local law enforcement should have certain rights to ensure a fair administration of justice, including—

(1) a local law enforcement officer's inherent right to self-defense against physical threats;

(2) a local law enforcement officer's right to legal recourse if a civilian attempts to assault the local law enforcement officer;

(3) a local law enforcement officer's right to be protected from physical harassment targeting a local law enforcement officer;

(4) a local law enforcement officer's right to equipment necessary for personal protection;

(5) a local law enforcement officer's right to counsel or a representative present at any interview conducted as part of an investigation;

(6) a local law enforcement officer's right to be informed of the nature of the investigation before any interview commences, including the name of the complainant and sufficient information to reasonably apprise the officer of the allegations;

(7) during questioning in the course of an investigation a local law enforcement officer's right—

(A) to not be subjected to any offensive language;

(B) to not be threatened with departmental, civil, or criminal charges; and

(C) to not receive financial or promotional inducement;

(8) a local law enforcement officer's right to a hearing, with notification in advance of the date, access to transcripts, other relevant documents, and evidence;

(9) a local law enforcement officer's right to have the opportunity to respond to adverse accusations; and

(10) a local law enforcement officer's right to not be disciplined for exercising a Fifth Amendment right to remain silent unless granted immunity that such statements will not be used against the officer in any criminal proceeding;

Whereas in order to ensure these investigations are conducted in a manner that protects the public, respects the rights of local law enforcement personnel, and is conducive to good order and discipline;

Whereas States across the country are encouraged to adopt a "Bill of Rights" for local law enforcement personnel for protections related to investigation and prosecution arising from conduct during official performance of duties;

Whereas the local law enforcement community protects our streets, acknowledges the rights of all Americans, and keeps citizens safe from harm;

Whereas local law enforcement officers are recognized for their public service to all, knowing they face extremely dangerous situations while carrying out their duties;

Whereas a healthy and collaborative relationship between local law enforcement officers and the communities they serve is essential to creating mutually respectful dialogue;

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 398, the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment.

During police week, across this Nation, we have taken an opportunity to remember and to reflect upon men and women who have paid and made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting their community.

Throughout this week, I shared it with colleagues, not only colleagues from the House of Representatives, but colleagues from law enforcement agencies throughout this Nation. We shared

time at the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. One of the most striking parts of that beautiful memorial is an inscription under a lion that says: "It is not how these individuals died that made them heroes it is how they lived." This amendment recognizes the bravery and the courage of those men and women who are living in law enforcement.

As a retired NYPD detective, I understand the bravery and courage it takes to be a law enforcement officer. I have seen the dangers firsthand and know the struggles officers must overcome every day they suit up, put their bulletproof vest on, pin their shield to their chest, and head out to stand the line between good and evil.

It is critical for local law enforcement officers to have rights and protections as they work to keep our communities safe, such as the right to self-defense against physical threats, the right to be protected from physical harassment targeting law enforcement, the right to equipment necessary for personal protection and legal recourse if a civilian attempts to assault them.

My amendment works to ensure law enforcement officials have fair administration of justice during investigations and encourages States to adopt their own bill of rights to support the brave men and women of law enforcement.

As members of our law enforcement community put their lives on the line to protect our communities each and every day, I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to show them unwavering support and vote "yes" on my amendment.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I oppose the D'Esposito amendment as its central focus is advocacy for the law enforcement officers' bill of rights, a controversial measure pushed by police unions and adopted by many States in response to demands for greater accountability and transparency following many high-profile incidents of police abuse and misconduct. While seemingly benign, the impact of a bill of rights for law enforcement officers can be profound.

For decades, this type of legislation has been one of the greatest obstacles to police accountability, hindering investigations, and shielding misconduct from public scrutiny, a likely explanation for why less than half of all States have adopted one. In Maryland, the first State to adopt and the first State to repeal an officers' bill of rights, the statute was often cited as the reason for Baltimore's long history of police misconduct.

In many instances, the statutes offer protections and procedural privileges

to law enforcement officers facing accusations of wrongdoing or disciplinary action far beyond those afforded to other government employees or to the average civilian accused of criminal behavior.

For instance, some States provide officers involved in an incident a cooling-off period of 24 hours or so before they must cooperate with internal investigators. During this cooling-off period, an officer and his or her attorney may have access to evidence collected during the investigation before the officer is interviewed.

Through these statutes, officers are shielded from the very interview tactics that they use on civilians, such as lengthy interrogations or the use of aggressive or threatening questioning, or promises of rewards to induce cooperation, both of which this amendment suggests should be avoided to ensure the fair administration of justice when investigating officer misconduct and only officer misconduct.

These laws can allow officers accused of wrongdoing to remain on duty for prolonged periods of time while investigations are conducted, as well as limit the types of disciplinary actions that can be taken against officers accused of wrongdoing. They also often limit the authority of civilian review boards and make it difficult for the public to access information about officers' misconduct in disciplinary proceedings and, ultimately, for civilians to hold officers accountable for their actions.

These concerns have led to calls across the country to repeal or reform existing law enforcement officers' bills of rights to ensure more transparency, accountability, and fairness in the disciplinary process. When mayors and police chiefs have attempted to reform their troubled police departments, it has been their States' officers' bills of rights that have stood in the way.

While this amendment might be well intentioned, it encourages States to adopt a bill of rights for local law enforcement personnel without offering any guidance so that we might not further perpetuate the already problematic nature of these measures which I have just outlined.

Lastly, I note that just as the text of H. Con. Res. 40 celebrates local law enforcement while ignoring thousands of Federal, State, and Tribal law enforcement officers, so, too, does this amendment. It is for these reasons that I must oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. NADLER, the correct pronunciation of my last name is D'Esposito. Thank you.

The reason why this amendment is on the floor is because members of the party on the opposite side of the aisle have made it a popular decision to target law enforcement, to make their jobs more difficult, to legitimately take the handcuffs that are on their gun belt and use them on the cop so

they can't do their job. That is why this amendment is important.

It is important to honor law enforcement. It is important to recognize law enforcement. This is very simple. It is a bill of rights. It is giving them the ability to do the job that they took an oath to do. They rose their right hand, they swore on a Bible to protect, to serve, to go out each and every day and stand that line that I mentioned between good and evil.

The fact that any Member of this House of Representatives who claims to support law enforcement, who likes to put those tweets of thoughts and prayers, God forbid, when a member of law enforcement loses their life. Thoughts and prayers when an officer gets killed is not enough. What we need to do is supply them with a bill of rights. What we need to do is to implore States to do the same.

That is why I am asking all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing. Today is about supporting law enforcement.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, if I mispronounced Mr. D'ESPOSITO's name, I apologize. I thought I said it correctly.

Secondly, I outlined in my remarks the problems with existing State bills of rights for police officers. Some States have repealed them. They have gotten in the way of investigations. They have gotten in the way of investigations of police brutality and misconduct and generally have aggravated all the reasons, all the problems that I spoke about in my opposition to the main bill.

For that reason, I reiterate my opposition to this amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to vote against it.

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

□ 1015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution, on the preamble, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 156, not voting 10, as follows:

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Fry
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—268

Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jackson Lee
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Magaziner
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz

NAYS—156

Barragan
Beatty
Bera

Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pence
Perez
Petersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Santos
Scalise
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Swalwell
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Torres (CA)
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dine
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Burchett
Bush
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Crane
Crockett
Crow
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gaetz
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Good (VA)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stansbury
Stevens
Strickland
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Auchincloss
Bishop (NC)
DesJarlais
Garamendi

Green (TN)
Malliotakis
McHenry
Peltola

□ 1043

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. HOYER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. KAPTUR, WILD, HOULAHAN, TITUS, Messrs. ALLRED, HIGGINS of New York, and MOULTON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the concurrent resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 301, noes 119, answered “present” 3, not voting 11, as follows:

Beyer
Biggs
Blumenauer

As a Congressman committed to reducing gun violence, I applaud President Biden's successful efforts to make our country safer.