

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, academies, 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, academies, 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;

(3) the extent to which law enforcement officers use the resources or programs described in paragraph (2);

(4) the availability of, or need for, mental health screening within Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(5) additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in assessing, monitoring, and improving the mental health and wellness of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report required 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, academies, or other entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, 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.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7581.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be the lead sponsor of H.R. 7581, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, and I rise in support of it.

The bill would refine and expand the gathering and analysis of data about attacks on law enforcement officers across the country, our current-day scourge. Its sponsorship is bipartisan and bicameral. I am grateful for the leadership in the Senate of Senators GRASSLEY, TILLIS, and others, and the support of 25 bipartisan cosponsors in the House.

The justification, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. Just yesterday, the FBI forecast the release of its annual report on officers assaulted and feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2023, reporting that “from 2021 to 2023, more officers were feloniously killed (194) than in any other consecutive 3-year period in the past 20 years,” and 2024 is on track to be the worst year of any, other than 2021, because a repeat criminal who should have been in jail gunned down four heroes in Charlotte 2 weeks ago and injured five others. Criminals killed 10 cops nationwide in April alone. Until the full 2023 report is released, the latest data is that over 66,000 officers were assaulted in 2022.

This bill will deepen the available dataset in three ways: Reporting on the intentionality of targeting law enforcement officers because of their status as sworn officers; tracking aggression and trauma-inducing incidents that do not rise to crime; and cataloging the availability to officers of mental health resources to deal with the attacks they suffer.

One would expect unanimous support, and yet in the Judiciary Committee, Democrats amazingly sought to gut and replace the entire bill with the same old antipolice legislation to impair qualified immunity for police officers, create a national registry of police misconduct, and require implicit bias training, and so forth.

If reacting to unprecedented killings and assaults of cops by intimidating and undermining cops sounds backwards and astonishing to you, watch the vote on this bill.

□ 1515

The truth is that the strong impulse and desire among Democrats to demonize and delegitimize police remain powerful and just under the surface, even as many of them deny they ever uttered the words “defund” and “abolish” during the 2020 summer of love, which spawned mass riots and increased attacks and killings of not only police officers but also those most in need of their protection.

Especially here in Washington, D.C., the effects of this most irresponsible rhetoric in the history of American politics have been catastrophic.

Crime remains out of control, especially among juveniles, carjackings and assaults on Congressmen, a 20-year murder record.

Congress has disapproved with Joe Biden’s signature the D.C. Council’s radical rewrite of the District’s criminal law that eliminated mandatory minimums and cut maximum sentences for most crimes.

Two D.C. Council members face recall efforts by citizens beset by violent crime, and the Metropolitan Police Department has lost almost 600 of its 4,000-member force and almost every month loses more than it hires.

Yet, some Democrats will vote against this little bill to collect more information about attacks on officers.

It must be considered under a rule because it might not get the two-thirds majority required to pass on suspension as many such little bills do.

Here, to my right, are the searing consequences of this unforgivable political division—the human cost of the worst attack on law enforcement since 2026.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Officer Joshua Eyer, North Carolina Corrections Officers Sam Poloche and Alden Elliott, and Thomas Weeks, Jr., United States Deputy Marshal, all lost their lives on April 29.

I have been to their funerals. I have seen and heard from their families. May their names long endure in our memory.

One could list the other lives taken from us longer ago but just as strong in our memories: Jonathan Diller, NYPD officer shot and killed in March during a traffic stop, leaving behind a wife and a 1-year-old son; Philip Dale Nix, Greensboro police sergeant killed at a Sheetz gas station interdicting criminals who wanted to steal mass quantities of beer the night before New Year’s Eve; Ned Byrd, Wake County, North Carolina, sheriff’s deputy, ambushed and shot to death by illegals in 2022; Ryan Hendrix, Henderson County, North Carolina deputy, lost his life in a shoot-out with a hardened criminal wanted in multiple states; David Dorn, a 77-year-old retired police captain, fatally shot interrupting a burglary in St. Louis during the George Floyd riots in 2020; and far, far too many others to name in the time allowed. Is it time yet to come around?

The former New York City Police Commissioner, Bill Bratton, said about that place: Don’t hold your breath. The State and the city council have been captured by the progressive left, and it is unlikely that the voters are going to take them out of office anytime soon.

Let’s prove that the same cannot be said of Congress one way or the other. Support our men and women in blue—the American people certainly do, the overwhelming majority of them.

Let’s pass this little bill and develop the information necessary so that we can protect the officers who serve us, who risk their lives every day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the aisle just mischaracterized the Democratic amendment that was offered during committee, and I think if he went back and looked at the record, he would see that.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation purports to improve law enforcement officer safety and wellness. It seeks to do this by requiring the Attorney General and other Federal officials to issue reports about attacks on officers, aggression against officers, and officer mental health.

While this legislation may seem on the surface to be meaningful, let us be really clear: It is just more cheap talk from Republicans.

Absolutely nothing in this bill makes a single police officer safer or invests a single dollar in officer wellness.

While the collection of accurate data, including data on officer attacks and mental health is important, this bill is unlikely to provide any new or meaningful data.

By necessity, data about incidents of violence against law enforcement officers must already be initially collected and reported, if at all, by Tribal, State, and local authorities who are in the best position to know about these incidents, not the Attorney General.

The Federal Government collects this data through participation by

these authorities in voluntary data reporting programs like the National Incident-Based Reporting System and the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted data collection.

Nothing in this bill provides any resources for more agencies to participate in these data collection programs, nor does it mandate any kind of reporting.

Given that there is nothing in this bill to improve the underlying data that is available to the Attorney General and others, it is unlikely that the reporting required by the bill would be able to deliver any new insights that might actually improve officer safety.

Democrats sought to solve this basic problem of inadequate data collection through the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Under that bill, States would be required to report shootings, deaths, and other uses of force involving law enforcement officers, and States would receive grants to facilitate that reporting.

By both mandating and supporting data collection and reporting, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act would significantly improve the data available to the Congress, Federal agencies, and the public.

Critically, unlike this legislation, that bill would require reporting of uses of force both by and against law enforcement, enabling us to have a full understanding of the dangers faced by officers, as well as the injuries and deaths of civilians that are caused by police.

In focusing only on attacks against officers, this bill turns a blind eye to uses of force by law enforcement against civilians, whether it is justified or not.

The mental health reporting provisions of the bill are also unlikely to improve officer wellness because they fail to build on the work of past Congresses and the Biden administration.

In the 115th Congress, we passed the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act, a bipartisan bill signed into law by President Obama, which directed the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the DOJ's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to report on mental health practices and services that could be adopted by law enforcement and the programs already available to them.

It also expanded the availability of grant funds for law enforcement mental health and developed new educational resources.

Building on this work, President Biden issued a 2022 executive order on advancing effective, accountable policing and criminal justice practices to enhance public trust and public safety.

The executive order required the Attorney General to develop and publish a report on best practices to address law enforcement officer wellness and to make recommendations regarding the prevention of death by suicide of law enforcement officers.

The Attorney General has already complied with this executive order, so we already know much more about the mental health resources and the needs of law enforcement.

Rather than retread our steps, we should be moving forward to help our law enforcement officers implement this important work so that more officers can access the support that they need.

Last Congress, under Democratic control, the House passed numerous bipartisan bills that improved law enforcement officer safety and wellness like Protecting America's First Responders Act, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, the Confidentiality Opportunities for Peer Support, or COPS Counseling Act, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act.

At least seven bipartisan law enforcement bills, many led by Republicans, have been passed by the Democrat-led Senate.

These are bills that would help law enforcement and are priorities for the police groups, but, so far, House Republicans have only advanced one of them.

This legislation represents another wasted opportunity to work together on substantive proposals that will make our communities and the law enforcement officers that protect them safer.

I urge Members to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the comments to the gentlewoman from Washington developed, it became clear.

She said at first I mischaracterized what occurred in the Judiciary Committee, and then it became clear that I didn't mischaracterize anything.

What they offered to do was to, again, take this bill, which provides for additional data collection about attacks on law enforcement officers, to take the entire text of the bill and to gut it and replace it with, yes, indeed, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the name, and that is the bill that I described as having attempted to impair officer qualified immunity, to require training on implicit bias, and to establish a database to impugn officers nationwide.

That is the bill that was a very top priority of Democrats when they were in the majority. It passed on the floor under their majority rule, and it went on to the Senate where it didn't advance, for good reason, because the last thing America needs—again, as demonstrated by the events in Washington, D.C., the last thing America needs is police officers to be brushed back from their jobs and to be intimidated from doing the very tough work of criminal law enforcement by legislation that antagonizes, demeans, and delegitimizes them. That is the last thing they need.

Here we are. It is remarkable. Is this the only reporting bill that has ever come up that Democrats find objectionable because of their interest in good and efficient government?

Is it that they are concerned about the possibility that the bill might not have excellent impacts or be efficient or advance the game or break new ground? What is the harm, after all?

Here is what the harm is: Democrats cannot abide by even the simplest of legislation that recognizes the burdens that are borne every day by police officers across this country on our behalf; that they are being subjected to greater and greater incidents and risk of attacks on their persons and of their deaths in the line of duty by people who intend to do them harm, and that there may be gaps in terms of the resources that are available to them to deal with the difficulties they confront.

The response that you need to do the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in lieu of this reporting bill is absurd. It is gaslighting in the highest degree.

This little reporting bill, there is just nothing to it, and, yet, for some reason, it sticks in the craw of the minority just to say to police officers: We are going to extend further efforts, further minimal efforts to learn the information that we need to find out, to see just how big this problem is and whether you are being afforded the opportunity to deal with it in your personal lives as it wreaks havoc on you.

Joshua Eyer, Sam Poloché, Alden Elliott, Thomas Weeks, Jr.: One of the worst attacks on law enforcement ever.

Shouldn't we go and find out what we need to know for their benefit? Is that not an appropriate way, that little bill? Would that not be an appropriate way to honor their memory?

Is the concern with efficiency and breaking new ground so profound that you have to replace the bill to find out information about the assaults on them with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act that was rejected last Congress? It is simply astonishing, and Americans aren't going to tolerate it.

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

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will now control the time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me speak more directly to the circumstances in Washington, D.C., and what has transpired as a consequence of exactly the kind of policing bill represented by the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which the minority proposed in the Judiciary Committee to gut and replace this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, do you know why our Democratic colleagues oppose this report? Do you know why, Madam Speaker? They don't want clear, fresh, precise data provided to the American people on how many attacks uniformed law officers suffer every year.

They don't want America to know, Madam Speaker, because America

would be shocked. It is vastly under-reported by rank-and-file officers like me and my brothers and sisters from sea to shining sea, men who know what it is not just to wear a little pin like here and walk around D.C. with your head held high, but to wear a shield, to wear a badge, to earn that certification every year. We know what it is to be constantly under threat of attack and physical attack, but we carry on.

We rarely report what we don't absolutely have to because of the agenda-driven persecution that officers are currently facing. Where? In Republican-run cities with Republican district attorneys that actually prosecute criminals? No, Madam Speaker. In liberal cities.

Look at the maps. It is in cities run by Democratic policies and the agendas of the Democratic mayors and Democratic DAs. Those are the cities that are eaten alive by crime in America. This is why you cannot fill the ranks of law enforcement officers across the country.

When I was a cop, we had about 800,000 uniformed officers. We were on our way to a million. We are down to about 600,000 now. Your officers are leaving service not because of the threats that we have historically faced but because of the threats that we continue to face for physical danger on the streets and the very significant possibility, even probability in some municipalities, that the actions of that law enforcement officer are going to be treated more harshly than the criminal and violent attacks that the officer both faces and protects his community from.

To think that my colleagues across the aisle would oppose a bill that mandates the Department of Justice provide accurate data to the American people about how many violent attacks uniformed officers face across the country, my God, you can barely get your head wrapped around that.

Of course, this body that is supposed to represent we the people should endeavor to provide the American people with accurate, contemporary data regarding such things.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to support my colleague's bill, and I encourage Representatives on both sides of the aisle to join us in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think it bears repeating, in light of that extraordinary commentary, that right here in the District of Columbia, to the affliction of 700,000, roughly, local citizens and the 19 million who visit annually, exactly the kind of radical politicization that would say this reporting bill is beyond the pale and that you have to have the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. That is exactly what they did in D.C. That is exactly what they have

done to lead to citizen-led recall petitions on two D.C. councilmembers, what they have done to see carjackings explode in ways that no one ever thought possible, to have a 20-year record of homicides last year, and to have one D.C. councilmember still touting that he managed, because of the budget politics, to take millions and millions out of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department so that their force has declined from 4,000 by 600 or more and continues to decline 3 years into the phenomenon.

How far will ideology go to take us beyond common sense to a point we can't recover? Let's do a little reporting bill and find out the details. Let's get a rich dataset about this scourge that we see across the Nation precipitated and encouraged by those who still cannot bring themselves to say that law enforcement officers are a needed quantity, that the Nation must have them, that law and order must prevail in order for the country to succeed.

How could we have come to a point in the country where that cannot be conceded readily by everyone in the political spectrum? I do not know. I do not understand, but that is where we are.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this bill is more cheap talk from Republicans. Nothing in this bill makes a single officer safer or invests a single dollar in officer wellness.

This legislation falls far short of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which would invest in better data collection and reporting by requiring law enforcement agencies to report uses of force by or against law enforcement officers as a condition of the receipt of certain grants.

House Republicans are, again, refusing to work with police and the organizations that represent the police to pass meaningful legislation. This legislation is a missed opportunity. It calls for a report that duplicates existing reporting requirements.

It falls far short of meaningful progress in officer safety, and it represents an enormous step backward from the legislation offered by the Democratic majority in the 117th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation so that we can work together on bipartisan legislation that will really enhance the safety of our officers and our communities.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, cheap talk. That is what the gentleman from New York just said: cheap talk. Madam Speaker, there is nothing cheap about it. Behold the price.

That is why when this body, when this Republican House, undertook to

disapprove the D.C. crime bill that would have radically rewritten criminal law in the District of Columbia, this body disapproved it with the support of over 30 Democrats. That is why CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democratic majority in the Senate joined in disapproving that radical rewrite of the criminal law in the District of Columbia. That is why Joe Biden signed the law to disapprove the radical rewrite of the criminal law in D.C.

What is cheap talk is the concern that this would produce a duplicate report. That is the objection, that the report might be duplicative? Really?

I would take duplicative reports from here to kingdom come if there is the slightest chance that it will avoid this unspeakable price. Everybody in the Chamber should support the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam 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.

CONDEMNING THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS AND THE TREMENDOUS BURDENS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FACE AS A RESULT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1210) condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1210

Whereas the Biden administration brazenly eliminated effective and lawful Trump administration immigration enforcement policies, directly leading to the worst border crisis in the history of the Nation and affecting every State;

Whereas the Biden administration's failed border policies have resulted in an exponential rise in illegal alien encounters, totaling more than 9,300,000 in less than 4 years;