

Lofgren	Pascrell	Stansbury
Loudermilk	Pelosi	Stanton
Lucas	Peltola	Staubert
Luetkemeyer	Pence	Steel
Luttrell	Perez	Stefanik
Lynch	Peters	Steil
Mace	Pettersen	Stevens
Malliotakis	Pfluger	Strickland
Maloy	Phillips	Strong
Mann	Pingree	Suozzi
Manning	Pocan	Swalwell
Mast	Porter	Sykes
Matsui	Posey	Takano
McBath	Pressley	Tenney
McCauley	Quigley	Thanedar
McCollum	Ramirez	Thompson (CA)
McCormick	Raskin	Thompson (MS)
McGarvey	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
McGovern	Rodgers (WA)	Tiffany
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Meng	Rose	Tlaib
Meuser	Ross	Tokuda
Mfume	Rouzer	Tonko
Miller (IL)	Roy	Torres (CA)
Miller (OH)	Ruiz	Torres (NY)
Miller (WV)	Ruppersberger	Trahan
Miller-Meeks	Rutherford	Turner
Mills	Ryan	Underwood
Molinaro	Salazar	Valadao
Moolenaar	Salinas	Van Drew
Moore (AL)	Sánchez	Van Dуйne
Moore (UT)	Sarbanes	Van Orden
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Vargas
Moran	Scanlon	Vasquez
Morelle	Schakowsky	Veasey
Moskowitz	Schiff	Velázquez
Moulton	Schneider	Wagner
Mrvan	Scholten	Walberg
Mullin	Schrier	Waltz
Murphy	Schweikert	Wasserman
Nadler	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Napolitano	Scott, David	Waters
Neal	Self	Watson Coleman
Neguse	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Nehls	Sewell	Webster (FL)
Newhouse	Sherman	Wenstrup
Nickel	Sherrill	Westerman
Norcross	Simpson	Wild
Nunn (IA)	Slotkin	Williams (GA)
Obernoite	Smith (MO)	Williams (NY)
Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (NE)	Williams (TX)
Omar	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Owens	Smith (WA)	Wittman
Pallone	Smucker	Womack
Palmer	Sorensen	Yakym
Pappas	Soto	Zinke

## NAYS—26

Beyer	Greene (GA)	Ogles
Biggs	Grothman	Panetta
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Burchett	Jackson (IL)	Rosendale
Connolly	Luna	Scott (VA)
Crane	Massie	Spanberger
Davidson	McClellan	Spartz
Gaetz	McClintock	Steube
Good (VA)	Norman	

## NOT VOTING—17

Barr	Grijalva	Meeks
Boyle (PA)	Jackson Lee	Mooney
Cleaver	Johnson (SD)	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton
Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)
Granger	McClain	

## □ 1416

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 200.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be present to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 198, NO on Roll Call No. 199, and NO on Roll Call No. 200.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

DETAIN AND DEPORT ILLEGAL  
ALIENS WHO ASSAULT COPS ACT

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7343.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227 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. 7343.

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

## □ 1421

## 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. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, with Mr. FULCHER 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 New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

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

Mr. Chair, my bill, the Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act, sends a simple but clear message: If an illegal alien assaults our law enforcement officers, they will be detained and they will be deported. This is because these actions must have consequences.

Now, that seems like a pretty commonsense life lesson that most of us have learned at a very early age, but it is a lesson, unfortunately, that President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas never have learned.

In less than 3½ years, President Biden has released nearly 4.9 million il-

legal aliens into the United States. That doesn't include the got-aways. That doesn't include a whole lot, and in most cases, we don't even know who these people are. We don't even know where they are going. We don't even know their intentions once they are here, Mr. Chair.

The Biden administration's policies are reckless, and these policies are dangerous. These policies have very real-life consequences, particularly for American law enforcement.

Here are just a couple of examples: In March 2023, an illegal alien violently assaulted a U.S. Border Patrol agent as the agent attempted to take the alien into custody, injuring the agent's face and his arms.

In November 2022, the FBI arrested two illegal aliens for pushing, dragging, and punching a U.S. Border Patrol agent.

Now, the chaos at the southwest border is spreading into communities, towns, and cities throughout the United States of America, and there is no end in sight.

Take this example just from this past January. It is just one example. According to the New York Post: As many as 14 migrants were believed to have been involved in a brutal beatdown of two NYPD officers in Times Square.

To make matters worse, because of New York's far-left, extreme soft-on-crime policies, many of the attackers were freed without bail. Everybody heard me right: Freed without bail. Moreover, they were given reduced sentences through very weak plea deals.

Some of the alleged attackers received a taxpayer-funded bus ride straight to California. Some of the attackers were arrested again while out on bail. The border crisis meets a sanctuary city and a sanctuary State. What a bad combination.

Are we surprised by the results of this completely broken system, Mr. Chair?

I don't think so. These are actions without consequences. This is Joe Biden's America. The longer Joe Biden and his administration go without taking action and holding these bad actors accountable, the longer our American citizens will suffer.

That is why I introduced this bill. That is why it is so important that we pass laws that rein in lawlessness in this country.

Actions must have consequences. This bill takes an important step in ensuring that we have zero tolerance for those in our country who break our laws and assault those who are sworn to protect and to serve our American communities.

This bill requires the DHS Secretary to issue a detainer for illegal aliens who are charged with, arrested for, convicted of, or have admitted to assaulting a law enforcement officer. It also requires DHS to quickly take custody of the alien if the alien isn't already detained.

By requiring mandatory detention for illegal aliens who assault cops, the bill not only prevents these dangerous criminals from being loose on American streets, but it also speeds up the process to remove them from the United States of America entirely.

The time for standing by and doing nothing must end.

We cannot stand by as the fabric of our American society devolves into violence and lawlessness. Americans are tired of it.

The bill isn't just a commonsense solution to removing illegal aliens from our streets and out of the country, it is a call for action and a demand for accountability to those who would break our laws, and it is a reminder that those who do will face real consequences.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this overly broad and unnecessary legislation. Supposedly, this bill would subject any undocumented immigrant to mandatory immigration detention if they commit an assault on a law enforcement officer.

To be clear, that is already current law.

However, this bill goes far beyond that. It would subject even those individuals with lawful status, like DACA and temporary protected status, to mandatory detention if they are merely arrested or charged with assault on a law enforcement officer.

There are no provisions to protect those who are mistakenly arrested and are released without charges. In addition, the definition of "assault" varies widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Nevertheless, this bill adopts the definition of "assault" used in the local jurisdiction to subject somebody to mandatory detention.

That means that conduct that people would not normally think of as an assault, like literally touching an officer, could result in an arrest and mandatory detention. Furthermore, people are mistakenly arrested for assault on a police officer far more often than we would like to admit.

When this bill was introduced, it was clearly in response to an incident earlier this year in which some recently arrived migrants allegedly assaulted a group of law enforcement officers in Times Square.

□ 1430

That incident sparked outrage across the country, but our Republican colleagues directed much of their ire at one particular individual who flipped off TV cameras as he left his arraignment. The image was plastered all over FOX News and was promoted by former President Trump as a symbol of everything that is wrong with the Biden administration's approach to immigration.

There was only one problem, Mr. Chairman. As it turned out, that specific individual, who everyone was so quick to demonize and attack, had the charges dropped against him. Despite being arrested and initially charged, he was not even present when this crime occurred.

We also see this in protests, where one person gets unruly and the police arrest everyone in the crowd.

Let's be clear: Violence is never the answer and should never be used in a political protest. It was wrong for people to assault the police right here in the United States Capitol on January 6, just as it is wrong for people to assault the police or anyone else during any protest, regardless of their politics.

That is why U.S. law already makes assault a crime. Admitting to or being convicted of a serious assault on a law enforcement officer already results in immigration consequences under current law, including mandatory detention and deportation.

This bill doesn't change that, doesn't make anybody safer, and doesn't fix any problems in the immigration system. Instead, this legislation deems everyone guilty until proven innocent.

It serves only to further the Republican agenda to fearmonger about immigrants and keep immigration in the news during an election year while, at the same time, bankrolling the private, for-profit prison companies.

This bill is going nowhere fast, just like the very similar bill that House Republicans passed last Police Week.

The American people aren't stupid. They see what House Republicans are doing. They want meaningful reforms to the system, and they know that bills like this would do absolutely nothing toward that end.

House Republicans refuse to negotiate on immigration, and the majority fails to do anything that would actually solve some of these problems we face, only to turn around and complain when those problems get worse.

This is political theater at its worst, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me to oppose this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle on one thing: The American people are not stupid.

The American people know, see, hear, and feel what is going on around them. The American people know that their streets aren't as safe. The American people who live in certain cities know that their kids are being moved out of their schools so that we can house illegals. The American people know that they are paying lots of taxes, and they are paying taxes in so many ways—to pay for transportation, to pay for housing, to pay for legal care, to pay for bank cards, to pay for all kinds of services to illegals, including, in

some cases, education subsidies. The American people are not stupid, and they are tired of it.

Additionally, they are really tired of individuals who come from other countries illegally. Let me be clear because I never want this to be morphed into anything else. We love legal immigration in America. Some of our best citizens are legal immigrants. It is illegal immigration that creates this problem.

What we know is that there are illegals who break the law once when they come over. Then, they break the law again by committing an illegal act by assaulting someone—in some cases, a police officer.

We had cases here just recently. This was published on May 14: "Migrants charged in attack on NYPD cops in Times Square offered plea deals." They were offered a plea deal, but they can still stay in the country. They broke the law when they came here. Then, they came here and broke a law again by assaulting someone. Then, they were let out again, and they broke the law again.

This isn't for an election. This is to try to save our country and the American people. They are tired of it, and law enforcement is tired of it.

We ask law enforcement, these men and women, to protect this Nation, to protect our people, and then we don't back them up. It is wrong. It is un-American.

I want to address something else because we are the United States of America. On top of it all, this is probably the only country in the world where you can come here illegally because we have open borders. Other countries don't allow this. No country can prevail with it.

Currently, we allow it, unfortunately. They come here. We allow them here. They break the law here, and we still give them due process.

Yes, they should be detained. I will tell you something else. Do you know why they need to be detained? They need to be detained. I hope everybody sits down with the inspector general for Homeland Security, like I did, for 1½ hours. He would tell you they check the names, addresses, and locations where you are supposed to find those illegals when they are allowed in the country. They are vacant lots. They are vacant storefronts. They are nonexistent addresses. Once they are in, we can't find them anymore, and that is the truth. Additionally, they are breaking the law sometimes, and that is the truth.

When they are here and break the law, they have to be detained so we know where they are. Then, they will go through due process and will come before a judge. If a mistake has been made and something is wrong, it will be dealt with the way that it is dealt with always in the United States of America.

If they have broken the law once, twice, three times, four times, they should be detained, and then they

should be deported. They don't belong in the United States of America.

That is not what immigration is about. Immigration is about coming here, loving this country, pledging to the flag, loving America.

If you asked in my world what it would be, if you break the law and come here illegally, you should be detained and sent back, period. You don't even have to assault anybody.

At a very minimum, for God's sake, let's get this done. Enough is enough.

The American people are smart, and the American people are tired. They are tired of it. They are tired of being unsafe and tired of it costing them so much money in tax dollars. They are tired of not being able to take care of their kids, not being able to pay their grocery bills, and worrying about their Social Security and Medicare because we are spending money on all of this other stuff. It is enough. They have had it. I have had it. I believe the majority of this Congress has had it.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, assaulting a law enforcement officer is a serious offense that deserves both criminal and immigration consequences. That is why serious assaults on law enforcement officers are already immigration violations that require detention and deportation.

The bill before us today would do absolutely nothing to change that. This legislation instead would dramatically expand the type of conduct that would subject somebody to mandatory detention, to include people who may not have even committed a crime at all.

That is not a good use of our limited law enforcement resources. Instead of wasting our time on these bills that do nothing to fix our immigration system and stand no chance of becoming law, we should be talking about how to create a workable immigration system that allows Americans to reunite with their families and allows American businesses and universities to attract the best and the brightest, essentially creating a workable process so that people wouldn't be forced to go to the border as the only way to come to the United States.

We should be talking about the fact that immigrants are good for the country and good for our economy. One in four American doctors were born abroad, and roughly 45 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or the children of immigrants. Seventy percent of agricultural workers are immigrants.

Immigrants feed us, heal us, and help ensure that this country remains an economic powerhouse. We could be embracing the positive impacts of immigrants rather than demonizing them.

The Congressional Budget Office recently announced that new immigrants will add \$1 trillion in previously unexpected revenue to our country's GDP

between 2023 and 2024. Similarly, the Department of Health and Human Services found that, over a 15-year period, asylees and refugees contributed nearly \$124 billion more in revenue than they received in services from the government. Documented and undocumented immigrants paid tens of billions of dollars in taxes each year.

The majority insists on scapegoating and fearmongering immigrants. It is true that the immigration system has deep problems, but they cannot be solved through an enforcement-only approach. We have been trying that approach for 30 years, and it has failed.

The truth is that the immigration system is all connected. People are coming to the border because the legal immigration system has not been updated in over 30 years, and they cannot find any other pathway to come in.

The majority often talks about legal immigrants. Let me say that the wait time for some permanent residents to bring their families into this country is over a century-long—a century for legal permanent residents to bring their family members into the country.

Employers are begging us to modernize the employment-based immigration system because the limits on high-tech visas were set when floppy disks were the height of technology. These companies cannot hire the people who they need.

Additionally, the small number of immigration judges that we have are absolutely crushed under a massive backlog of asylum cases so extensive that it is now taking people over 8 years to even get a hearing.

Why doesn't the majority just help us put more money into immigration judges so we can resolve that backlog? Why not open legal pathways for people who are trying to come here legally?

I know this, Mr. Chairman, because I came here, and it took me 17 years to navigate the immigration system and become a U.S. citizen, but that was several decades ago. Now, you can't even get through the process.

I hope that one day we can get back to actually governing, to passing real bills that can make a difference in the lives of the American people. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that today is not that day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I said I agreed with the gentlewoman on one issue. I am going to agree with her on a second one, that immigration is a good thing, but let's not morph this. Let's be really clear. Legal immigration is good. Illegal immigration is not.

Let's talk about legal immigration for a minute. I always like to tell this story because it is a real story. It is a true story. I have a whole bunch of them.

I have, in my district, many legal immigrants who came here, who work hard, who are taking care of their families, who love the United States of America so much.

I had this friend of mine who bought a small store and gas station. He lived above it, did it beautifully, reconstructed the whole thing. His kids did well in school. His wife worked hard along his side, and we talked about the issues of the day. I would always stop by there. That is a true story.

One day, I went by, and he was there. By the way, he was somebody who believes in American values, and I guess that is the point I am going to make. I go by, and I am talking to him. He starts to tear up, for real. He is a big guy. He is a tough guy. He has gone through a lot in his life. I asked what was wrong.

He said: This was a big day for me yesterday.

I asked what happened. I thought maybe he lost a family member. I didn't know what happened to him.

He said: I became a United States citizen, an American citizen. I am so proud.

This is real.

He said: I am proud to defend this country. I would fight for this country. I love this country. I will stand up against any foe of this country. This is the greatest country ever on the face of the Earth.

That is a good thing.

Illegal aliens who come here and flip off the cameras when they are walking out of court because they have been released, illegal aliens who commit crime after crime and keep getting released because of prosecutors that are ultraleft, illegal aliens who get all kinds of benefits but don't want to work hard in America—and that is not all of them, but there are some—illegal aliens who don't even love the United States of America but come here because they want to reap financial benefits, that is not a good thing.

Don't let anyone ever say that because you oppose illegal aliens, you oppose immigration. That is not true.

□ 1445

It is a sad state of affairs that we are in that this bill is even needed, but given the abandoned southwest border and the violence of the Biden border crisis that it has unleashed on our communities and every community in this great country, the Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act is another necessary piece of legislation.

It is important. It means something. Actions do have consequences. Mr. Chair, what you do has consequences, what I do has consequences. The actions that these individuals, these criminals take have consequences.

If you assault a law enforcement officer and you are in this country illegally, you will be detained. If it is true, you should be deported. Period. No questions asked.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is common sense. It is the right thing to do. It is the American thing to do.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7343

*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 "Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act".*

**SEC. 2. DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO COMMIT ASSAULT AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**

*Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1)—*

*(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "Attorney General" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security";*

*(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking " , or" and inserting a comma;*

*(C) in subparagraph (D), by adding "or" at the end; and*

*(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:*

*"(E)(i) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(A) or (C) or under section 212(a)(7); and*

*"(ii) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any offense involving assault of a law enforcement officer,";*

*(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and*

*(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:*

*"(2) CIRCUMSTANCES.—*

*"(A) IN GENERAL.—The circumstances referred to in paragraph (1)(E) 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.*

*"(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E)—*

*"(i) the term 'assault' has the meaning given that term in the jurisdiction where the acts occurred; and*

*"(ii) the term 'law enforcement officer' is a person authorized by law—*

*"(I) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, investigation, or prosecution, or the incarceration of any person for any criminal violation of law;*

*"(II) to apprehend, arrest, or prosecute an individual for any criminal violation of law; or*

*"(III) to be a firefighter or other first responder.*

*"(3) DETAINER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue a detainer for an alien described in paragraph (1)(E) and, if the alien is not otherwise detained by Federal, State, or local officials, shall effectively and expeditiously take custody of the alien."*

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in

order except those printed in Part A of House Report 118-511. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-511.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The 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. GAO STUDY.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit a report to Congress on the number of aliens present in the United States who are inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(A) or (C) or under section 212(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act who were detained, during the 5 year period preceding the date of the report, for committing an assault against a law enforcement officer.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, as we pause this week to recognize the men and women in law enforcement who sacrifice and serve our communities across America, it is important that we take additional steps to provide for their safety, for the protection of their colleagues, and to enhance public safety in communities across our country.

I listened intently to the debate that ensued regarding the base bill. I, for one, am interested in governing. Governing is terrifically important. I might remind my colleagues across the aisle that the Congress legislates. We adopt laws that then the executive, as part of governing, must actually enforce. What we have seen systemically over the last 4 years is this administration and this President have surrendered the southern border to drug cartels.

This administration and this President have made it easier for individuals, nearly 12 million after 4 years, to enter into our country unchecked, unvetted, and, in many cases, allowed to avoid the law.

Now, add to that, if we are to govern in this country, we not only need the President, but we need States like New York and Governors like Kathy Hochul to actually enforce the law, and yet this administration and the administration in New York are making it consistently harder for law enforcement to do their job.

New York State alone is now seeing over 200,000 undocumented individuals,

and that is in New York City alone. Why? Because New York State and New York City declared themselves sanctuary cities.

If we are to govern in this country and actually enforce the law, you would need States like New York and cities like New York to actually enforce the law, but in New York, they don't allow for the deportation of undocumented individuals even after they assault police officers. We saw this in New York City only weeks ago. Why? Because it is illegal in New York for law enforcement to interact with Federal law enforcement, ICE.

Consistently, the State of New York has been allowed to make it easier and easier for individuals not only to enter into our country illegally, but to commit crimes. New York has cashless bail.

This is a consistent effort to put people back on the streets without any intervention, without any enforcement of law, and because of it, we consistently see an increase in assaults against law enforcement and American citizens.

Eighty percent of those who are transported from the border to other cities and States across the country aren't being transported by other States, they are being transported by the President and the Federal Government.

Again, if we are to govern, the President needs to follow the law. My amendment requires a report to Congress to speak on the number of migrants who were detained for assaulting a police officer over the past 5 years. We can't actually enforce the rules if we don't have the data.

This amendment wouldn't be necessary at all if the Biden administration took actions to secure the border and States like New York didn't flaunt the law and create their own to avoid the law and make communities like mine less safe.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study and report to Congress on the number of undocumented immigrants detained for committing an assault against a law enforcement officer over the past 5 years.

It is important for us to take a step back and remind ourselves what the underlying legislation is about. This bill would subject even those individuals with a lawful status like DACA or temporary protected status to mandatory detention if they are merely arrested or charged with an assault on a law enforcement officer. There are no

provisions to protect those who are mistakenly arrested and are released without charges. This is an unnecessary expansion of the law, which already subjects people to mandatory detention and deportation if they admit to or are convicted of such assault.

In fact, I imagine that this report would demonstrate that the underlying legislation is wholly unnecessary because it would show that under current law people who commit assaults on law enforcement are already subject to detention. Therefore, I see no reason to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the support from my colleague across the aisle. I might remind her some moments ago she encouraged that we ought to be governing.

The problem is that Congress has adopted legislation that should be enforced at the border. Congress has established rules, as have States, to ensure that law enforcement is protected, yet States are permitted to avoid that law. Presidents like this one are permitted, apparently, to simply ignore the law.

The base legislation is necessary because we continue to see an escalation in violence against law enforcement officials, while at the same time, there is an abandonment of security at our border and the allowance of States like New York to simply avoid any responsibility for bringing criminals to justice.

The base bill is necessary. The amendment is necessary. I appreciate the support for the amendment.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this legislation has absolutely nothing to do with the border. It doesn't do anything to secure our border. It doesn't do anything to fix the broken immigration system. I don't oppose this amendment because I actually think it is going to make my point at the end of the day with the report. I don't oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 118-511.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 8, strike "or" at the end.

Page 5, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert "; or".

Page 5, insert after line 10 the following:

"(IV) to be a campus police officer or a school resource officer."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I applaud Congressman VAN DREW and his leadership on this issue and am proud to support his legislation to detain illegal immigrants who assault law enforcement.

My amendment is really straightforward and I believe in line with the goals of the underlying bill.

My amendment simply ensures that campus police officers and school resource officers are considered law enforcement officers for the purpose of the bill's provisions.

In light of the increase in violent protests on college campuses, it is especially important that we show these brave campus police officers that we have their back.

Under President Biden's watch, nearly 4.7 million illegals have been released, and more than 1.8 million known illegal alien got-aways have escaped into the United States.

In South Carolina alone, we have over 175,000 illegal aliens in my home State. These include dangerous individuals who violate our laws and then assault the law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

It is imperative that we fight back against the Biden administration's radical open-borders policy by mandating immigration detention for illegal aliens who assault law enforcement officers.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to explicitly ensure that our hardworking campus police officers and resource officers are afforded the same protections as other law enforcement officers under this legislation.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment would expand the scope of this already bad bill to include campus police and school resource officers under the term "law enforcement officers."

Unfortunately, this amendment makes a bad bill even worse while highlighting one of the many flaws in the bill.

First, the fact that Mr. NORMAN felt the need to file this amendment to begin with just highlights the lack of clarity around this bill. As we have discussed, this bill will subject any inadmissible immigrant to mandatory immigration detention for merely being arrested or charged with assault on a law enforcement officer or first responder, but the bill lacks any definition for what is considered a first responder. Mr. NORMAN was clearly concerned with this as well and felt the need to make sure that campus police

and school resource officers were included.

Unfortunately, Mr. NORMAN's amendment does not bring any additional clarity to the definition of first responder, and it even adds another undefined term, "school resource officer."

Now, Mr. NORMAN could easily have remedied this by choosing the definition that exists in title 34 of the U.S. Code, but for some reason he did not. States all over the country use different definitions for school resource officers. They have different duties and functions depending on the State, so this amendment raises far more questions than it begins to answer.

On top of the poor drafting, this amendment expands an already bad bill and makes the bill worse. As I discussed during general debate, it is quite common during protests for law enforcement to arrest an entire group of people after one person in the crowd gets unruly.

After the largely peaceful protests that we have seen on college campuses over the last month, protests made up largely of young people and teenagers, it would be a mistake to extend this definition to include campus police.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I think we have all seen the college campuses. The protests that you are talking about, many include breaking windows, knocking down doors. That is not protest. That is destruction of property. This has no place on the college campuses. To have the presidents and the tenured professors be quiet on this and to have students scared to go to class and to cancel exams, that is not what they paid money for. That is not what the taxpayers deserve.

This is very simple. If you are a resource officer, your job is to protect the students and the facilities. If you are in law enforcement on the campuses hired by the individual school, you are there to protect the campus and protect the students.

I am sick and tired of these liberals who keep saying peaceful protest. It is like the 50 cities that were burned a couple of years ago. That was not a peaceful protest. That is destruction of property and that has consequences.

All we are saying is: Give these officers the protection that law enforcement has. It shouldn't even have to be said for me to have to bring this amendment. It is a shame that we have reached this point in this country that we are having to define what a resource officer is.

□ 1500

I would ask all those who may be questioning this, you go out and volunteer to be a resource officer or sign up to be a resource officer. You go out and sign up to protect the campus, and let's see how the tables will turn.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, none of us are condoning violence on campuses. All I said is that the vast majority of protesters on campuses have been peaceful. What happens when one person does something and the entire group is arrested is relevant for this amendment. I don't think anybody believes that that should be the case.

I am not really sure why the gentleman felt the need to clarify exactly what the definition was in this underlying legislation except that it wasn't clear, which is the point that I have been making all along. The problem is that the amendment actually makes other terms unclear, as well.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY Mr. LALOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 118–511.

Mr. LALOTA. 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:

Page 5, line 15, insert after “alien.” the following:

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall on an annual basis report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives the number of aliens described in paragraph (1)(E) who were detained in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security in the preceding year pursuant to such section.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chairman, President Biden's open border policies, notably the mass parole of unvetted migrants, have essentially turned every State into a border State and have made every community less safe.

In good faith, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my good friend, has proposed an effective bill that mandates the swift identification, detention, and deportation of illegal immigrants who commit violent acts against law enforcement. This legislation serves as a necessary corrective to the current administration's perilously lax border security.

Mr. Chairman, I am proposing an amendment to Congressman VAN DREW's bill that would further strengthen our national security framework. This amendment will compel the Secretary of Homeland Security

to systematically collect and report to Congress data on illegal migrants detained for charges or convictions of assaulting law enforcement officers.

This measure will prevent the avoidance of accountability by ensuring that Secretary Mayorkas and other officials can no longer disregard this critical data. Furthermore, it eliminates the need to depend solely on media reports to understand the full scope of violent crime linked to current border policies.

Consider, Mr. Chairman, a recent incident in Times Square, widely seen on social media, where illegal migrants violently attacked NYPD officers. Despite their arrest, these individuals were quickly released, and one was soon re-arrested for another crime. Yet, they were not deported. Instead, they received plea deals from Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg.

This pattern, where the safety of our law enforcement officers is sidelined, is becoming distressingly common. In this fiscal year alone, Mr. Chairman, Customs and Border Protection apprehended over 18,000 illegal migrants with criminal backgrounds, including 248 known gang members, 35 of whom were affiliated with MS-13.

Mr. Chair, supporting this amendment is the least we can do to bolster the safety of those who risk their lives for us every day. It is about ensuring that our approach to public safety is proactive and grounded in reality, not just wishful thinking.

As we mark National Police Week, I call on my colleagues to stand with our law enforcement officers by backing this amendment and the crucial bill introduced by Mr. VAN DREW. Let us commit to a policy that upholds the rule of law and ensures the safety of every American community. We should not put our heads in the sand and think that “see no evil, hear no evil” is an effective policy to keep our heroes safe.

During National Police Week especially, I urge all of my colleagues to support law enforcement by supporting my amendment to Congressman VAN DREW's vital underlying bill.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that the Department of Homeland Security provide an annual report to the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Senate containing the number of immigrants the Department detained as a result of this bill in that year.

Under this bill, that report would include people being detained even if a person is merely arrested and never charged or after the charges against them were dropped. It is important to remember that this bill does not in-

clude any waivers or provisions to exempt people who were mistakenly arrested or found not guilty.

I really hope that this report, if requested, will contain a breakdown of the number of people detained by category so that we could see how many innocent people were subject to mandatory detention under this bill. Right now, the amendment doesn't get into that level of detail, but I hope my colleagues across the aisle will work with me to make sure that we get all of the data that is provided, including that breakdown.

Nevertheless, while this amendment does nothing to improve the underlying legislation, it doesn't do anything to make it worse, and so I therefore see no reason to oppose it.

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

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chairman, I would welcome another amendment that would be more specific to Congress' endeavor to ensure that we have the clarity of the size and scope of this issue. My amendment is something along that path, and if the gentleman wants more, the gentleman understands that she can submit her own amendment on that issue.

Nevertheless, on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LALOTA) 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. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill 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 bill.



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

Mr. VAN DREW. 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.

## IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT OF 2024

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7581

*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 “Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act of 2024”.

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There has been a rise in anti-police rhetoric and a corresponding rise in violence against law enforcement officers.

(2) In 2022, a total of 60 police officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty.

(3) Nearly 30 percent of police officer killings in 2022 were caused by unprovoked attacks or ambushes on officers.

(4) Law enforcement officers bravely put themselves at risk for the betterment of society.

(5) A data collection that represents the full circumstances surrounding violent attacks and ambush attacks on law enforcement officers is vital for the provision of needed Federal resources to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(6) Police suffer assaults and other offenses that do not rise to the level of Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted or National Incident-Based Reporting System reporting due to the frequency of such incidents, lower risk to officers, and minimal administrative resources to report such frequent events.

(7) The mental health of law enforcement officers has suffered due to overwork, recruitment issues, and the general stress of their work.

(8) The people of the United States will always remember the victims of these hateful attacks against law enforcement officers and stand in solidarity with individuals affected by these senseless tragedies and incidents of hate that have affected law enforcement communities and their families.

(9) The United States must demonstrate to its brave law enforcement officers that they are important, valued, and respected.

(10) Congress has made a commitment to helping communities protect the lives of their police officers, as evidenced by the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-155; 130 Stat. 389) and other laws.

(11) Subsection (c) of the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988 (34 U.S.C. 41303(c))

requires the Attorney General to “acquire, collect, classify, and preserve national data on Federal criminal offenses as part of the Uniform Crime Reports” and requires all Federal departments and agencies that investigate criminal activity to “report details about crime within their respective jurisdiction to the Attorney General in a uniform matter and on a form prescribed by the Attorney General”.

### SEC. 3. ATTACKS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) the number of offenders that intentionally target law enforcement officers because of their status as law enforcement officers;

(2) the number of incidents reported to the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection that occur through the coordinated actions of 2 or more parties;

(3) a description of the Federal response to ambushes and violent attacks on Federal law enforcement officers;

(4) a detailed survey of what State and local responses are to ambushes and violent attacks on State and local law enforcement officers;

(5) recommendations for improving State, local, and Federal responses to ambushes and violent attacks on law enforcement officers;

(6) a detailed survey of Federal and State-based training programs that law enforcement officers receive in preparation for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(7) an analysis of the effectiveness of the programs described in paragraph (6) in preparing law enforcement officers for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(8) recommendations on how to improve State, local, and Federal training programs for law enforcement officers relating to ambush attacks;

(9) an analysis of, with respect to the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership under part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10530 et seq.)—

(A) the efficacy of the Partnership in distributing protective gear to law enforcement officers across the United States, including any location-specific limitations to the distribution under such Partnership; and

(B) the general limitations of the Partnership, including any location-specific limitations to the distributions under the Partnership, considering the fact that law enforcement officers are suffering from ambush attacks;

(10) an analysis of the ability of the Department of Justice to combine the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection and a 09C Justifiable Homicide report for officer-involved shooting reports and any roadblocks to producing a clear report with such information;

(11) an analysis of the ability of the Criminal Justice Information Services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to expand data collection to include a suspect offender's level of injury at the time of a reported Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection incident;

(12) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to ambush attacks against law enforcement officers; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(13) an analysis of any additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in deterring ambush attacks against law enforcement officers.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report required under subsection (a), the Attorney

General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

### SEC. 4. AGGRESSION AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) an analysis of the ability to implement a new category in the Uniform Crime Reporting System and the National Incident-Based Reporting System on aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are not reported in such systems;

(2) the level of detail the category described in paragraph (1) would include and the standard of evidence that would be used for any reported incidents;

(3) an analysis of how to engage State and local law enforcement agencies in reporting the data described in paragraph (1), despite the fact that such data is beyond the standard crime-based reporting to the systems described in paragraph (1);

(4) an analysis of potential uses by the Department of Justice and any component agencies of the Department of Justice of the data described in paragraph (1);

(5) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that do not rise to the level of crimes; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(6) an analysis of additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in deterring aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

### SEC. 5. MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the types, frequency, and severity of mental health and stress-related responses of law enforcement officers to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers;

(2) mental health and stress-related resources or programs that are available to law enforcement officers at the Federal, State, and local levels, especially peer-to-peer programs;