

We abandoned Afghanistan to the Taliban.

We slow-walked weapons to Ukraine, giving them just enough to bleed out but not to win.

President Biden's decision to withhold weapons, approved by myself, the chairman, and the ranking member, and appropriated by Congress, defied congressional intent and is tantamount to an arms embargo.

Mr. Speaker, red lines are meant for our enemies. Red lines are not meant for our allies and our friends, but that is precisely what this administration is doing to Israel.

What a terrible message to send to our allies. Even more dangerous is the message that we are sending to our adversaries.

This week marked the 76th anniversary of Israel's independence. Think about that and the timing of this. To mark this occasion, the State Department released a statement saying: "The United States was the first country to recognize Israeli statehood when Israel declared independence in 1948. Our history of shared democratic values, trade, deep cultural ties, and commitment to regional security has provided the basis for our countries' strong partnership and friendship."

A strong partnership and commitment to regional security means standing with our allies, not withholding vital weapons during an unprecedented war and not withholding vital weapons after Iran, for God's sake, for the first time in the history of the State of Israel, fired endless rockets from Iran directly into Israel.

We all want peace and stability in the region, but that cannot happen as long as Hamas remains in power.

Israel remains under attack, and as their closest ally and partner, we must give them the tools they need to finish the job. The time is now. We cannot wait any longer. It has been delayed enough.

Only until that final military objective is completed can we begin the other phase of this that Mr. MEEKS and I have been looking forward to, and that is working with the Saudis and Israelis on a security agreement, along with the other Arab nations, to finally just maybe bring peace and prosperity to a part of the world that has been at war for so many years, for way too long.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and to stand with Israel in its darkest hour. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8369, the Israel Security Assistance Support Act.

It is deeply disappointing to see the Republican majority continue to play politics with America's national security. For over a year, Republicans refused to work in good faith with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to fund the federal government, including the Department of Defense, and support our Ukrainian allies in their fight against Putin's illegal invasion of their nation. Now, Republicans are using as-

sistance to Israel to attack President Biden, and place unprecedented restrictions on the administration's ability to implement American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I believe the Hamas terrorist attacks of October 7, 2023, were a barbaric and heinous act that cannot ever be excused. I condemned the attacks when they took place, and I continue to condemn them. I also believe that Israel has the right to self-defense, and I have always supported defensive security assistance to Israel, like Iron Dome.

But as a democracy, Israel, just like the United States, has a certain responsibility to its people and to the world to ensure the protection of civilian lives by defending itself in a proportionate manner. As a Member of Congress, I have been consistent in this belief my entire career, and I hold Israel to the same standard that I hold the United States to when we use military force. When I have felt that American administrations have failed to live up to this standard, I have said so publicly. That includes former President Trump's decision to use excessive force in Syria which resulted in the unnecessary deaths of civilians in American airstrikes. Unfortunately, the last seven months have shown that Prime Minister Netanyahu's government has pursued a grossly disproportionate use of force in Gaza as a response to the Hamas terrorist attacks.

The United Nations now believes that the death toll in Gaza has reached over 35,000 people, many of them women and children. The Israeli government has deliberately used large ordinance to destroy critical infrastructure in Gaza like hospitals and schools. Humanitarian assistance has been repeatedly stalled, and Northern Gaza faces catastrophic levels of malnutrition. Now it appears that Prime Minister Netanyahu intends to launch a broad military offensive into the city of Rafah, where over a million Palestinian civilians are sheltering. The results would be catastrophic.

The level of death and destruction that Prime Minister Netanyahu has inflicted on Gaza is shocking, has made Israel less safe, and must end immediately. That is why I have called for a regional ceasefire since October of last year. I commend President Biden and his national security team for working with partners in the region to try to secure a ceasefire. I also support President Biden's recent decision to pause shipments of certain types of offensive weaponry to Israel as a way of preventing further catastrophic loss of life in Gaza, particularly in Rafah. And let's be clear, the President's actions to withhold some security assistance are entirely consistent with U.S. law. They are also consistent with the actions of previous Republican administrations, including those led by Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Both these Republican administrations withheld and conditioned certain military assistance to Israel to affect a change in Israeli policy when it was misaligned with the foreign policy goals of the United States. This history speaks to why the legislation before us today is so dangerous.

H.R. 8369 would eliminate all control and oversight that the administration has over the flow of taxpayer funded weapons, including highly destructive offensive weapons like 2,000- and 500-pound dumb bombs, to Israel. This legislation would force the delivery of these types of weapons to Israel within 15 days of being signed into law, and it would in-

extricably tie the administration, and America's foreign policy itself, to the way Prime Minister Netanyahu chooses to prosecute Israel's military campaign in Gaza. If Republicans had their way and this bill were to be enacted, the Government of Israel would set America's foreign policy instead of our own President and his administration. The precedent this would create is dangerous. The only Nation that should decide where and how the American taxpayer's dollars are utilized is the United States of America. Full stop.

As if H.R. 8369 were not bad enough, the legislation contains provisions that would withhold funding for portions of the budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the National Security Council until all assistance to Israel had been delivered. As the Ranking Member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I find the threat to withhold funding for national security agencies charged with defending our Nation to be an appalling and shocking abdication of the Republican majority's responsibilities to govern our Nation in a safe and responsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8369 is one of the worst pieces of legislation produced by the 118th Congress, and that is saying something. America's foreign policy decisions are ours to make, led by the administration in office at the time. Forcing taxpayer dollars to be sent to any other nation, while prohibiting the ability of the Executive Branch to provide suitable oversight and ensure that those funds are not being used in contravention of U.S. law, will make America less secure and have tremendous negative consequences.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no.

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

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

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Meeks of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8369 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MEEKS. 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 are postponed.

□ 1330

LEOSA REFORM ACT

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I

call up the bill (H.R. 354) to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by 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. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-34 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 354

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “LEOSA Reform Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. CONFIRMING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY ACT AND THE GUN-FREE SCHOOL ZONES ACT OF 1990.

Section 922(q)(2)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of clause (vi);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (vii) and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(viii) by an individual authorized by section 926B or 926C to carry a concealed firearm.”.

SEC. 3. MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY ACT.

(a) Each of sections 926B(a) and 926C(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or any other provision of Federal law, or any regulation prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior pertaining to a unit of the National Park System” after “thereof”.

(b) Each of sections 926B(b) and 926C(b) of such title are amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, except to the extent that the laws apply on property used by a common or contract carrier to transport people or property by land, rail, or water or on property open to the public (whether or not a fee is charged to enter the property)” before the semicolon; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, except to the extent that the laws apply on property used by a common or contract carrier to transport people or property by land, rail, or water or on property open to the public (whether or not a fee is charged to enter the property)” before the period.

(c) Each of sections 926B(e)(2) and 926C(e)(1)(B) of such title is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(d) Section 926C(c)(4) of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(4) has met the standards for qualification in firearms training during the most recent period of 12 months (or, at the option of the State in which the individual resides, a greater number of months, not exceeding 36 months), and for purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘standards for qualification in firearms training’ means—

“(A) the standards for active duty law enforcement officers as established by the former agency of the individual;

“(B) the standards for active duty law enforcement officers as established by the State in which the individual resides;

“(C) the standards for active duty law enforcement officers employed by any law enforcement agency in the State in which the individual resides; or

“(D) any standard for active duty law enforcement officers for firearms qualification con-

ducted by any certified firearms instructor within the State in which the individual resides;”.

(e) Section 926C(d) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “not less recently than one year before the date the individual is carrying the concealed firearm, been tested or otherwise found by the agency to meet the active duty standards for qualification in firearms training as established by the agency to carry” and inserting “met the standards for qualification in firearms training required by subsection (c)(4) for”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) a certification issued by the former agency of the individual, the State in which the individual resides, any law enforcement agency within the State in which the individual resides, or any certified firearms instructor within the State in which the individual resides that indicates that the individual has met the standards for qualification in firearms training required by subsection (c)(4).”.

SEC. 4. PERMITTING QUALIFIED CURRENT AND RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TO CARRY FIREARMS IN CERTAIN FEDERAL FACILITIES.

Section 930 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the possession of a firearm or ammunition in a Facility Security Level I or II civilian public access facility by a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B(c)) or a qualified retired law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926C(c)).”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘Facility Security Level’ means a security risk assessment level assigned to a Federal facility by the security agency of the facility in accordance with the biannually issued Interagency Security Committee Standard.

“(5) The term ‘civilian public access facility’ means a facility open to the general public.”.

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

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 354.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 354, the Law Enforcement Safety, or LEOSA, Reform Act allows qualified active and retired law enforcement officers to carry a concealed firearm in national parks, school zones, public transportation, and some Federal facilities that are open to the public.

LEOSA was initially signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2004 to exempt certain active and retired law enforcement officers from local and State prohibitions on the carrying of concealed firearms. In order to qualify under LEOSA, active law enforcement officers must meet several important requirements. For example, they must be authorized to carry a firearm by their agency.

They cannot be subject to disciplinary actions by the agency that can result in the loss of their police power.

They must meet certain firearm qualification standards. They cannot be under the influence of alcohol or other intoxicating substances. They must not be prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

Retired law enforcement officers must also meet several requirements in order to qualify under LEOSA. For example, they must have separated from service in good standing and served as a law enforcement officer for an aggregate of 10 years or more. They also are required to meet certain firearm training standards and must not be prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

The LEOSA Reform Act will allow these officers to carry a concealed firearm in the same manner many citizens carry a firearm in their State.

For example, the LEOSA Reform Act will allow law enforcement officers qualified under LEOSA to carry concealed firearms in national parks, Federal facilities that are open to the public, on public transportation, in school zones, and in other areas.

The bill also reduces the frequency that qualified retired law enforcement officers are required to obtain certain qualification standards.

Many States allow State-licensed, concealed carry permit holders to carry concealed firearms in gun-free school zones and on public transportation in the State in which they are licensed. This bill affords certain law enforcement officers the same privilege.

The legislation improves public safety. Our officers face greater dangers, and current restrictions hinder their ability to carry firearms.

At a time when violent crimes continue to plague our Nation, we must support our active and retired law enforcement officers and ensure that they are able to protect themselves and others, no matter where they are in the United States.

This legislation is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Major County Sheriffs of America, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and many others.

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

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

Before I speak on the LEOSA Reform Act, let me express my deep disappointment in the behavior of the Judiciary Committee majority.

The Judiciary Committee is now considering a resolution to hold in contempt the Attorney General of the United States for refusing to submit certain audio recordings to the committee.

I think it is a deeply wrong request. I have expressed my opinion in committee. I am not going to go through it again here.

The point is, we have a series of Judiciary Committee bills now, and the Judiciary Committee is meeting on that resolution now. Members of the Judiciary Committee who may want to speak on this series of bills we are going to be considering now cannot because they are trapped in the Judiciary Committee considering the contempt resolution. I cannot vote against the contempt resolution because I am stuck here.

It is normally the practice that when you have committee business on the floor, you suspend the committee meeting so that people can do their work.

I very much protest that the committee is still meeting while we have committee bills on the floor so that I must choose between dealing with these bills or voting on the contempt citation, and other members of the committee cannot be here to debate these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the LEOSA Reform Act. This bill threatens the safety of all Americans by advancing the Republican agenda of more guns for more people in more public places.

In 2004, Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act, or LEOSA, which forced States to allow off-duty and retired law enforcement officers to carry concealed weapons even when doing so conflicted with that State's concealed carry laws.

It garnered bipartisan opposition, including from the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee at the time, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, because it supplanted the judgment of the States about the appropriate use of firearms.

It was also opposed by organizations such as the International Chiefs of Police, which was concerned that it could endanger law enforcement by causing confusion among local police who might not be able to distinguish between a criminal and the retired officer using a firearm.

Other organizations opposed it because it could put police agencies at risk for liability for an officer who misuses a weapon in another State and because the requirements for retired officers were insufficient.

Despite these objections, LEOSA became law, but importantly, it included exceptions for places like government buildings, gun-free school zones, and private property where States have a special interest in retaining control of their gun safety laws.

These exceptions have been in place for 20 years and have served as important protections, but this legislation tosses those exceptions out the window.

It forces States to allow off-duty and retired officers to carry firearms on playgrounds, in government buildings, and on buses, trains, subways, and boats.

It undermines State laws limiting magazine capacity. It reduces the rights of private property owners who may not want concealed weapons on their property or in their businesses.

It relaxes training standards so that some people will be able to carry a concealed firearm, even though it has been 3 years since their last firearms training certification.

In addition, this legislation unravels Federal laws that have kept firearms out of Federal facilities. It does this for Federal facilities that are "open to the public" that are classified as "Facility Security Level I or II," definitions that will create significant confusion for those trying to abide by it and for those tasked with enforcing it.

For example, if a Federal facility is only partially open to the public or only open to the public during certain hours, does it fall within the bill's definition? We don't know.

What about a facility that is open to the public so long as they are not carrying firearms? The bill does not say.

As the bill itself states, the Facility Security Level is determined on a facility-by-facility basis and may not be publicly posted, so it is virtually impossible to know what Federal facilities are included in this definition.

We looked for a listing of Federal facilities that are classified at these security levels, and we could not find one.

Members may even have offices in Federal facilities that will suddenly be forced to allow concealed firearms in their doors as a result of this legislation.

Not only would this bill inject confusion into Federal law, but it also intrudes on private property rights and undermines States' careful determinations on how best to protect their citizens from gun violence.

I urge members to join me in opposing this misguided legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I actually listed four organizations. There are 21 law enforcement agencies and organizations around the country that support this legislation.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a friend of mine and one of the best shots I know.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act. This LEOSA Reform Act will expand the ability of qualified officers, whether active, retired, or no longer in law enforcement, to carry concealed

firearms in any State or territory, regardless of State or local laws.

If we trust our law enforcement officers to carry guns while they are wearing a badge, why wouldn't we trust them to carry one on State and Federal property in their retirement?

There is no one better trained and equipped to safely use and carry these firearms. In fact, we encourage our officers at the State and local level to carry their firearms when they are off duty because they are never off duty.

□ 1345

They are always required to respond if an incident occurs in their presence. Officers carry off-duty anyway, but what this does is expand that protective force multiplier concept to the entire country. I don't see what is wrong with that. In fact, I think it makes good sense that we would want good men and women who are qualified to carry firearms to protect those who do not.

This bill also gives retired officers more flexibility in the timing of their firearms recertification, reducing unnecessary burdens while ensuring that they are still properly trained in firearm proficiency. They must remain proficient.

Officers would be able to carry a concealed firearm if they qualify yearly, or whatever their State may require, up to a 3-year limit.

The LEOSA Reform Act also extends concealed carry rights into, as you heard earlier, certain Federal facilities, such as post offices and Social Security Administration offices, whether or not they are there in an official capacity.

I am not sure how that would create a lot of confusion. We carry firearms into all sorts of facilities now. This simply makes it open to these Federal facilities.

This legislation very importantly will also exempt LEOSA-certified officers from State magazine capacity limits, which is very important. This will simplify concealed carry for officers as they travel across cities and States, ensuring that, in various locations, their local laws don't interfere with the operational readiness of these officers.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, as a former sheriff, I have seen how law-abiding citizens have used legally owned and carried firearms to protect their lives, their family's lives, and the lives of others who they don't even know in many situations in my own hometown of Jacksonville. These officers have dedicated their lives to protecting the public. We must leverage every bit of their training and skills to keep our communities safe even when they are out of uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill to keep our police officers ready to protect our communities wherever they may find themselves. This will be a tremendous force multiplier for all of our

State and local law enforcement agencies.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation intrudes on the States' ability to make their own judgments about public safety, concealed firearms, and the regulation of their own law enforcement and would make us all less safe.

We hear from the other side of the aisle all the time about States' rights. Then, we get legislation like this that overrules the States and says we know best about issues of public safety.

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle very often told us that we didn't need firearms to protect ourselves, that they would send the police, and then last year and the year before, they were calling to defund the police. The very constituents that they said, don't worry, you can call the police, they want to defund.

Now, they want to disarm retired law enforcement officers, who could be Johnny-on-the-spot, in many cases, to save civilian lives.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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. MOORE of Alabama. 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.

POLICE OUR BORDER ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 8146.

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

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. 8146.

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

□ 1353

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. 8146) to require a report by the Attorney General on the impact the border crisis is having on law enforcement at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level, with Mr. RUTHERFORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chair, on Inauguration Day of 2021, our borders were secure. The Trump remain in Mexico policy had cut phony asylum claims to a trickle. The border wall was nearing completion. The court-ordered deportations were being enforced. By the end of that day, President Biden had reversed those policies, and thus began the greatest illegal mass migration in history.

Since that day, he has allowed 6.9 million illegal migrants to enter our country and demand free food, free clothing, free legal assistance, free education, free shelter, free lodging, free phones, and free cash. Except, of course, it is not the least bit free. It all comes out of the earnings of American families and out of the services that we set aside for Americans in need.

Unlike legal immigrants who obey our laws and do everything our country asks of them, the first act of these 6.9 million aliens who have illegally entered our country is to commit a Federal crime. I have watched them personally taunt our Border Patrol at the border as they do so.

Woke cities and States have passed sanctuary laws that forbid our law enforcement officials to turn over illegal aliens who have committed other crimes to ICE for deportation as the law requires. This administration has made these policies national by refusing to enforce over a million court-ordered deportations.

It shouldn't surprise us that many who are willing to violate our immigration laws are also willing to violate the rest of our laws, as well. The number of terrorist suspects that the Border Patrol has encountered has ballooned exponentially, and law enforcement officials are warning that

among the 1.9 million got-aways—mostly single, military-aged men—is likely a dangerous fifth column, which could soon launch devastating attacks within our borders.

Fentanyl brought in through the open border is killing hundreds of Americans every day. The Democrats' sanctuary policies hamstringing attempts to deport criminal illegal aliens. Worst of all, the admission of untold thousands of the most vicious gang members on the planet is now producing a terrible butcher's bill of murders and assaults on Americans.

When the Federation for American Immigration Reform looked at the requests by States to be reimbursed for the cost of incarcerating aliens, they found that immigrants are 231 percent more likely jailed for crimes in California, 440 percent more likely in New Jersey, and 60 percent more likely in Texas, just to name a few.

Immigrants are 231 percent more likely to be jailed in California, according to their own SCAAP numbers. You won't find that anywhere else because it is illegal in California to otherwise report the immigration status of criminals and criminal suspects. By their criteria, not a single crime is committed by illegals in California, yet their jails are overflowing with them.

As of last December, there were at least 617,000 aliens on Immigration and Customs Enforcement's non-detained docket who have criminal convictions or pending criminal charges. Yet, these dangerous offenders are out on American streets, free to re-offend.

This past year, Mr. Biden removed 60 percent fewer criminal illegal aliens than Trump did in 2019 despite an exponential increase of illegal aliens entering our country, and we are seeing the results every day in murders and assaults on America's streets and in empty chairs at Americans' family dinner tables.

Earlier this year, New York City Police Commissioner Edward Caban declared that "a wave of migrant crime has washed over our city." He should know because, earlier this year, a group of illegal aliens brutally assaulted two NYPD officers. New York Mayor Eric Adams described the assault as "an attack on the foundation of our symbol of safety." He then called on the city council to consider if there should be more collaboration with Federal immigration officials. I suppose it is better late than never.

The bill before us today, H.R. 8146, the Police Our Border Act, requires the Attorney General to submit a report to Congress on the impact of the Biden border policies on law enforcement officers. This report would document officer safety concerns that are linked to increased cross-border movement, such as fentanyl exposure and assaults on law enforcement officers. The report would also examine the overall burden of this unfolding tragedy on law enforcement capabilities and officer morale.