

them in our hearing and in our mark-up, yet they continue to seek to invalidate this rule and claim it will come as a surprise.

The fact is that those who profit from the sale of these braces have long known that they were circumventing the law. The ATF wrote to one brace manufacturer multiple times over the last 10 years. In 2018, 5 years ago, the ATF, under President Trump, told the brace manufacturer that it was engaging in false advertising by claiming devices were ATF approved, when in fact the ATF had not even evaluated those devices.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a July 18, 2018, letter from the ATF to SB Tactical, a brace manufacturer, stating that they must cease the false advertisement of products as ATF approved when they had not even been evaluated, much less approved by ATF.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO,
FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES,
Martinsburg, WV.

SB TACTICAL,
Saint Petersburg, FL.

DEAR SB TACTICAL: This letter is to inform SB Tactical that certain products currently marketed and sold by SB Tactical have not been evaluated nor approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), Firearms Technology Industry Services Branch (FTISB). It has come to the attention of FTISB that all of SB Tactical "braces" are being marketed as evaluated and approved by ATF as "pistol stabilizing braces," although, in most cases no evaluations or classification have ever occurred.

FTISB has found the following statement on the boxes of unevaluated SB Tactical models:

ATF Compliant—ATF has reviewed this product and determined that attaching a Pistol Stabilizing Brace to a firearm does not alter the classification of the firearm or subject the firearm to NFA control.

To date, FTISB has evaluated only two SB15 Tactical submissions: the SB15 brace and the MPX PSB brace. FTISB approved both of these models for use as "stabilizing braces," and classified them as not designed or intended to be used as shouldering devices. However, these classifications were based on the samples as submitted. Any change in the submitted design could change FTISB's classification.

Currently, SB Tactical markets more than 20 different designs of "pistol stabilizing braces." While some of these new models are similar to the original evaluated models, several are advertised as being based off shoulder stock designs. FTISB does not approve "stabilizing braces" which are similar or based off shoulder stock designs.

These are the submitted SB Tactical braces approved by ATF:

SB15 (Original submission)
MPX PSB

SB Tactical braces not submitted nor approved by ATF:

SBA3, SBPDW, SB-MINI, SBL, SBM4, SOB, SBX-K, SBV, SBM47, SOB47, SBT5, SBT5A,

SBT5KA, SBTEVO, SBT805, SBT, SBTI, VECTOR PSB, UZI PSB, TAC14-SBM4, 590-SBM4, TAC14-SBL, 590-SBL.

SB Tactical must cease false advertisement of products as ATF approved which have not been evaluated nor approved. If SB Tactical would like to get an official determination for these products, they may be submitted to FTISB for evaluation and classification.

In order for FTISB to evaluate these products and make an official determination, please submit the samples to: Chief, FTISB.

In order for FTISB to perform an evaluation, any submission must be on a complete firearm, with the "stabilizing brace" installed.

Please contact us if you have any additional questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL R. CURTIS,
Chief, Firearms Technology Industry
Services Branch.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the ATF, the agency specifically tasked with regulating dangerous weapons and keeping them out of the wrong hands, underwent a careful review process that began under the Trump administration.

The agency determined that gun owners were exploiting a loophole that allowed stabilizing braces to be used to assemble a short-barreled rifle without being subjected to the existing regulations for such highly dangerous weapons. The ATF then issued a rule, using the standard administrative process, to close this loophole and to protect our communities.

There should be nothing controversial about this rule, but Republicans want to overturn this sensible regulation and put more stabilizing braces on the streets and in the hands of more mass shooters.

I remind Members that mass shooters have already used stabilizing braces to kill 9 people outside a bar in Dayton in 2019; to kill 10 people, including a responding police officer, at a grocery store in Boulder in 2021; to kill 5 people in an LGBTQ nightclub in Colorado Springs last year; and just a few months ago to kill 6 people, including 3 children, at a school in Nashville.

Once again, Republicans are putting the interests of the gun industry over the safety of their communities.

I urge all Members to oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 44.

This resolution seeks to repeal reasonable restrictions on deadly weapons, at a time when gun violence is the leading cause of death for children and youth in the United States.

H.J. Res. 44 would nullify the Biden-Harris administration's stabilizing arm brace rule, which keeps dangerous firearms out of dangerous hands by requiring that guns equipped with stabilizing arm braces are subject to the same requirements as weapons with the same fire power. This rule makes it harder for individuals intending to inflict carnage and take lives to obtain these weapons, and it should remain in place in order to save more lives.

With this resolution, extreme Republicans continue their unpopular and unconscionable quest to oppose any and all restrictions on firearms, abolish the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), and prioritize the gun industry over the safety of

our communities and the law enforcement officers who serve them.

House Democrats are determined to defend the sensible and effective policies in place to protect Americans, and we will continue to work to pass additional safeguards to end America's gun violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 495, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1530

DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 26, 2023, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of May 26, 2023, at page H2645.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on overriding the veto.

H.J. Res. 42 is a profoundly undemocratic, paternalistic resolution. Congress, in which the nearly 700,000 District of Columbia residents have no voting representation, is attempting to nullify legislation passed by D.C.’s locally elected legislature.

While it is true that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it is false that Congress has a constitutional obligation to do so. It is a choice.

D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Democracy, according to the dictionary, is “a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections.”

D.C.’s lack of voting representation in Congress and Congress’ plenary authority over D.C. are the antithesis of democracy.

The legislative history and merits of D.C.’s Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, which is the subject of H.J. Res. 42, should be irrelevant, since there is never justification for Congress nullifying legislation enacted by D.C., but I would like to briefly discuss them.

D.C.’s Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 is consistent with House Democrats’ George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, President Biden’s executive order on policing and police accountability, and transparency legislation enacted by dozens of States, both red and blue, to improve public safety and public trust after the murder of George Floyd.

As President Biden said in his veto message, H.J. Res. 42, “would overturn commonsense police reforms.”

D.C.’s Comprehensive Justice and Reform Amendment Act of 2022 would, among other things, make it easier to fire officers for misconduct, prohibit the hiring of officers with prior misconduct, strengthen civilian oversight of police, and prohibit chokeholds.

Congress requires D.C.’s local legislature, the D.C. Council, to pass legislation twice, separated by at least 13 days.

The Council passed the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 by votes 11–0 and 13–0. While the legislation was enacted without the D.C.’s Mayor’s signature, the Mayor has urged Congress to oppose H.J. Res. 42.

The D.C. Council has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office.

Congress has 535 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote, they cannot vote them out of office.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or local D.C. matters, though they pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 19 States while being denied voting representation in Congress.

In closing, I would set the record straight on the legal effect of H.J. Res. 42. While Congress can legislate on any D.C. matter at any time, the process for a disapproval resolution is set forth in the D.C. Home Rule Act.

Under the Home Rule Act, a disapproval resolution only has legal effect if Congress passes it before the expiration of the review period for the legislation that is the subject of the disapproval resolution.

In the case of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, the review period expired before the Senate passed H.J. Res. 42. Therefore, H.J. Res. 42 would have no legal effect even if the veto were overridden.

Nevertheless, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on overriding the veto, and I say to every Member of Congress: Keep your hands off D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO).

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the Presidential veto of H.J. Res. 42, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council and approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022.

Democrat politicians in cities like New York and D.C. have continuously fed antipolice sentiment that endangers our officers and makes it harder for them to do their jobs.

Policies like those in D.C.’s deeply misguided police reform law only empower criminals at the expense of our men and women in blue. In fact, since these policies were enacted, more than 1,000 officers have left the D.C.’s police force.

Dedicated public servants are resigning in record numbers due to the current policing environment with very few willing to take their place. That means fewer officers to combat rising crime. This has become a public safety crisis.

I was proud to join with Congressman CLYDE to offer our joint resolution to disapprove the D.C. law, which went on

to gain a majority of support in both the House and Senate—bipartisan majorities in both the House and Senate.

Congress sent a clear message that enough is enough. We will not stand by while our law enforcement officers are vilified and handcuffed by pro-criminal/anti-cop legislation.

With this veto, President Biden showed his disregard not only for law enforcement but also for the American people whose duly elected Representatives voted to block this harmful D.C. legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the override to show our brave men and women in law enforcement that we have their backs and to reject the President’s attempt to undermine the will of Congress and the people we represent.

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

Mr. Speaker, I speak in opposition to this effort to overturn President Biden’s veto of H.J. Res. 42, legislation that was introduced by Georgia Representative CLYDE to strike down the people of Washington, D.C.’s local police reform law.

If it rings a bell, it is no wonder. The House and Senate have already voted on H.J. Res. 42. The overwhelming majority of Democrats voted to oppose it when Republicans brought it to the floor in April. When it reached President Biden’s desk in May, he vetoed Mr. CLYDE’s resolution, as he promised that he would.

Although the resolution narrowly passed the House and Senate, in neither Chamber did it assemble anywhere close to the two-thirds majority required in both Chambers in order to override a veto.

Mr. Speaker, today’s vote is an exercise in time-wasting and vainglorious futility. The Republican majority doesn’t have the votes to override the veto, and it doesn’t deserve to.

H.J. Res. 42 would nullify a law passed unanimously by the Council of the District of Columbia representing more than 700,000 residents to promote accountability for police officers who use excessive force or abuse their power, a goal that the vast majority of Americans share.

The D.C. law bans the use of chokeholds and other dangerous neck restraints and sets reasonable standards for the use of deadly force.

It requires public release of body-worn camera footage and creates a police officer misconduct database, but only for officers who have been either convicted of a crime or for whom allegations of abuse have been civilly or administratively sustained.

The law prohibits D.C. from hiring police officers who have engaged in prior criminal or official misconduct.

Most importantly, the new law empowers the chief of police to fire or discipline officers who break the law by removing police disciplinary matters from the collective bargaining table.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that this is the position that galvanized the opposition to D.C.'s law. This provision is why Republicans want the Congress of the United States to behave like a 535-Member nationally elected super-city council with the power to overturn the work of the 13-member Council of the District of Columbia elected locally by the actual residents of Washington, D.C.

So what is so important about this provision? Well, the local police union doesn't like it, and they have been the chief lobbyists against it. They sued when this reform legislation was first passed in D.C., asserting that the provision removing police discipline from the collective bargaining table violated the U.S. Constitution, but they lost their case in the U.S. District Court for D.C. and the U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C., and the Supreme Court failed to grant cert.

Now, in their haste to kick around the people of Washington and not to support D.C. police officers who, after all, came to our defense on January 6, many of whom were wounded by the insurrectionists and ended up with broken fingers and arms and legs, and so on, our GOP colleagues are suddenly embracing the extreme position on police disciplinary matters which has already been rejected by the courts in which jurisdictions across America are debating and doing away with.

Now, why is the ending of discipline of police officers a subject for collective bargaining such a big deal? Well, Washington itself is a good example.

The D.C. Metropolitan Police Department has been forced by labor arbitrators to rehire a significant number of officers who had been fired for engaging in serious criminal misconduct, including criminal assault, including sexual assault.

Every D.C. police chief for at least the last 25 years have expressed outrage about having to hire bad cops after they have been fired for engaging in serious misconduct. Forcing police chiefs to reinstate bad cops fired for breaking the law is bad for public safety, bad for community trust, and bad for morale among the vast majority of good police officers who are doing their jobs, like the ones who came to defend us on January 6, 2021, against the violent mob insurrection incited by the former President.

This should not be a partisan point. This is a matter for local decision-making in Washington, D.C., as it is in every other jurisdiction in the country.

Mr. Speaker, 700,000 tax-paying American citizens have decided through their locally elected representatives that the chief of police who is appointed by the Mayor should be able to discipline bad actors within the police department. Reversing the D.C. government on this local matter is outrageous interference by Congress to impose a bad public policy on the Capital City.

The D.C. police accountability law makes reasonable, commonsense re-

forms that will make the D.C. police more accountable to the community of people they serve, increase public trust, and strengthen public safety.

In fact, multiple provisions constituting the D.C. police reform law are mainstream reforms that enjoy strong public support and are congruent with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which passed the House in the 117th Congress, and with police accountability laws enacted by dozens of States and localities in recent years in the wake of notorious episodes of brutality, like the unconscionable murder of George Floyd.

For example, since May of 2020, at least 24 States have enacted legislation to limit the use of dangerous neck restraints against citizens; 39 States have passed reforms related to officer education and training.

□ 1545

Twenty-six States have enacted laws to improve data collection and increase transparency. At least seven States, including Arizona, Colorado, and Wisconsin, have passed legislation requiring the publication of police databases or use-of-force information. Twenty States since 2020 have enacted laws that address State-level use-of-force standards.

This is a matter for States and localities to decide themselves. Reversing D.C. on this local matter is an outrageous effort to impose bad public policy on the people of D.C.

Voting to override the veto of this GOP resolution is yet another attack on local decisionmaking, federalism, and the policies of meaningful oversight and accountability that the majority of Americans want. A vote to override the veto today is a vote against political democracy and local self-government in America. A "yes" vote today is a vote against common-sense oversight and accountability over policing in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for democracy, stand up for political self-determination, and vote "no" on this attempt to override the President's veto.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I continue to support this bipartisan resolution as a majority of my colleagues in the House did 2 months ago. Not much has changed since we last passed this resolution of disapproval.

Since Congress sent this resolution to President Biden, we have continued to see rampant crime in the District of Columbia. D.C. residents and visitors are still unsafe in their Capital City.

The Metropolitan Police Department continues to face retention and recruitment challenges.

Crime levels are still higher in 2023 compared to the same time in 2022. Total crime is up 27 percent. Violent

crime is up 16 percent. Homicide is up 19 percent. Motor vehicle theft is up a staggering 118 percent. This is unacceptable.

Most notably, as of June 7, D.C. hit a concerning marker. There have been 100 murders in D.C. this year. According to the D.C. Police Union, this is the earliest point in the calendar year that the city has reached this marker since 2003.

However, in the Committee on Oversight and Accountability's March 29 hearing, D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson claimed that there is no crime crisis in D.C.

In another Oversight and Accountability Committee hearing on May 16, U.S. Attorney Matthew Graves refused to take accountability for his office's failure to prosecute 67 percent of cases last year.

The D.C. Council and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia have failed the residents of D.C.

Congress has a duty to oversee the Nation's Capital and ensure its safety for all residents and visitors. It is time for this body to stand up to the criminals. I call on my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

The President's veto of H.J. Res. 42 serves no purpose other than to continue to allow crime to spread and hinder our local police from fulfilling their duties to protect the D.C. community and the Nation's Capital City.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to uphold what we and the Senate have done over the last 2 months by voting in favor of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will be postponed.

GAS STOVE PROTECTION AND FREEDOM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1615.

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