

be reelected due to the rejection of corrupt Judge Merchan's derangement.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who have successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

We do not need new border laws. We need to enforce existing border laws. Biden shamefully opens the borders for dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as warned by the FBI.

Christians appreciate the courage and the truth of Kansas City kicker Harrison Butker. Coach Lou Holtz is correct.

HONORING REVEREND WILLIAM LAWSON

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Reverend William "Bill" Lawson.

Reverend Lawson was a giant in Houston. He was a warrior against the evils of discrimination, of poverty, and of homelessness, lifting basic human dignity to its highest heights.

During the peak season of the civil rights era, he was a key leader in Houston where his best work was often behind the scenes.

A patriot for peace, Reverend Lawson organized quiet desegregation of Houston through secret meetings with the business community, a plan that kept away violence and bombings that were rampant across the South.

Reverend Lawson was always on the right side of good trouble. The positivity he brought to our community will be felt for years to come. Houston will miss Reverend Lawson and his quiet demeanor and his endearing smile.

I send my love and condolences to the entire Lawson family as we remember him and all that he accomplished. Well done, good and faithful servant.

THE GREAT STATE OF IOWA

(Mrs. HINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in Iowa, and I have always known that it was the place that I wanted to live and raise my family.

Recently, U.S. News and World Report caught up to what Iowans have known for a long time and officially ranked Iowa as one of the best States to live. They also ranked Iowa third for new opportunities. Under Governor Kim Reynolds, Iowa is flourishing.

While President Biden spent trillions of taxpayer dollars on woke priorities and created rampant inflation, Iowa cut taxes for families.

While President Biden opened our borders and allowed countless illegal

immigrants to invade, Iowa is working to deport illegal immigrants who endanger our communities.

Iowa is a model for the rest of the country. Our prosperity under Governor Reynolds is the perfect contrast to Joe Biden's national failures. Iowa is leading the way with commonsense conservatism, and our future is bright.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF GLENN HILLIARD

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate National Police Week, I take a moment to honor the memory of Wicomico County Deputy Sheriff Glenn Hilliard, a heroic Maryland Eastern Shore police officer who was killed in the line of duty while protecting his community from a violent criminal; unfortunately, an all too often occurrence in today's America.

In the evening hours of June 12, 2022, Officer Hilliard received a call that a fleeing fugitive was in the surrounding area.

While certainly potentially dangerous, this call wasn't much different from the hundreds of calls for help the Wicomico County police departments and police departments across the country receive daily as they confront crime to protect our communities.

Sadly, for Officer Hilliard, this call to duty would be his last. As he pursued the wanted criminal, the fugitive turned and fired, ultimately taking the life of Officer Hilliard.

As Officer Hilliard's family reminds us, he died doing what he loved and left behind a legacy of selflessly defending his community. In the end, it was not the way Officer Hilliard died but the way he lived.

As we honor National Police Week, let's take a moment to thank the many police officers who risk their lives so we can be safe.

May the memory of Officer Glenn Hilliard and all our fallen police officers never be forgotten.

PRATT'S COUNTRY STORE

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the good folks at Pratt's Country Store in Fountain City. They have been longtime friends of mine and my family.

Perry Pratt's grandfather and brother bought the acreage in the 1920s, and it has been family owned and family operated ever since, Mr. Speaker.

Pratt's sells fresh produce, dairy, baked goods, and fruits. My mama always loved to shop there. I always like to stop there, as well.

The whole family grew up working in and around the store, and you can tell.

They treat everyone like family when they walk in.

I also never have to worry about where the produce comes from, Mr. Speaker, because Pratt's is known for locally sourcing their food from east Tennessee farmers.

I always love walking into Pratt's because it just smells good. It smells like an old country store, it smells fresh, and it smells clean. They do things the old-fashioned way, and they make people feel like they are stepping back in time.

Ralph and Perry Pratt were recently honored as Fountain City's Men of the Year due to their amazing customer service.

Everyone that goes to Pratt's Country Store knows how delicious everything is, and they have some really great vegetables.

As good as their produce is, though, Mr. Speaker, they are best known for the family atmosphere. They are God-fearing people, and they have always been respected in our community. They have been here for three generations for a reason. I want them to know they are appreciated, and I hope they are around for several more generations.

□ 0915

RESOLUTION REGARDING VIOLENCE AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1213), a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1213

Whereas, beginning in 2020, and in conjunction with the "defund the police" movement, respect for the rule of law and law enforcement officials diminished;

Whereas this change in attitude has resulted in record death and injury to America's law enforcement officers at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level;

Whereas policies implemented at several State and local jurisdictions have increased the difficulty and added significant risks for law enforcement to do their jobs effectively and safely;

Whereas law enforcement is demanded to handle societal problems, including a nationwide mental health crisis, record-setting overdose poisonings due to fentanyl, and an increase in the homeless population;

Whereas the lack of accountability for violent criminals with decreased penalties and no-bail policies has opened the door for record criminal activity in cities across the country;

Whereas these policies have encouraged the public to aggressively and violently engage with law enforcement;

Whereas law enforcement officers answer every service call, regardless of community support or ridicule;

Whereas law enforcement officers answer every service call, regardless of the threat to their lives;

Whereas there are currently 23,785 names of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC;

Whereas the deadliest year on record for law enforcement was 2021, when 586 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas, in 2022, 224 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas, in 2023, 137 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas 378 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023, the highest year on record, of which 115 were violent ambush attacks;

Whereas the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund anticipates adding at least 151 names to the sacred walls in the spring of 2024, representing the current and historical deaths which, to date, have been approved as line-of-duty deaths;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer is 45 years old;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer has 15 years of service;

Whereas the average fallen law enforcement officer leaves behind 2 children; and

Whereas current data does not show how many law enforcement officers are assaulted, injured, or disabled in the line of duty each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns calls to defund the police, which has increased violence towards law enforcement officers;

(2) recognizes that law enforcement officers must have the equipment, training, and resources necessary to protect the health and safety of the public as well as their fellow law enforcement officers on the job;

(3) recognizes the need for better data collection on law enforcement officers who are assaulted, injured, or disabled in the line of duty;

(4) acknowledges its responsibility for exemplifying a respect for the rule of law and for the law enforcement officers who protect communities across the Nation;

(5) acknowledges the mental stress and strain law enforcement officers suffer not only due to the pressures and realities of the job, but also the negative environment in which they often must work;

(6) acknowledges the need to strengthen its relationship with law enforcement to ensure policy decisions are aligned with the realities law enforcement officers face daily; and

(7) expresses condolences and solemn appreciation to the loved ones of each law enforcement officer who has made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLINE. 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 the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to welcome so many fine men and women in blue here in our Nation's Capital for Police Week.

However, as always, I am concerned every day for the safety and well-being of these brave men and women in the communities across this great Nation where they live and work. Radical policies in States and cities across the country continue to promote a disastrous rise in crime and a dangerous environment for police officers.

Now more than ever, we must show our support for our law enforcement officers. As a former local prosecutor, I know just how important a robust police force is to keeping our community safe. For effective crime deterrence, you need prosecutors willing to pursue convictions and judges willing to sentence and incarcerate.

First and foremost, you need police willing to arrest and charge offenders for crimes committed. You need local and State governments willing to fund and support our police forces.

Let me be clear, this effort to defund the police has had a detrimental impact on efforts to combat crime but also on recruitment, retention, and morale among our law enforcement officers.

In Democrat-run cities across the country, areas where they defunded the police saw a spike in crime and continue to struggle today with keeping their cities safe. Despite Democrats' calls to defund the police and the emotional toll that that takes, we know that law enforcement officers answer every call for help regardless of who the person is or what they believe and regardless of the threat to their own lives. So many of those brave men and women who answer the call of duty put on the uniform and go to work in the morning but never return home in the evening.

Today, there are 23,785 names of law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty that are inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C. Words can never express our gratitude to each and every individual whose name is on that wall.

Unfortunately, we still see warning signs that the environment does not show any promise of becoming safer. According to the Fraternal Order of Police, 378 officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023, the highest number recorded since FOP began collecting the data.

So far in 2024, 136 officers have been shot. That must end. That is completely unacceptable.

We must take a stand against these attacks and honor our fallen law enforcement officers. This resolution does just that. This resolution con-

demns calls to defund the police. It also recognizes that law enforcement officers must have the training and resources necessary to protect the health and safety of the public as well as their fellow law enforcement officers on the job.

We must never forget those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. It is up to us in Congress to honor their memories and to stand up and protect those who do so much to protect us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on August 29, 2002, two deputy sheriffs in Prince George's County, Elizabeth Magruder and James Arnaud, were ambushed in the home of the shooter's family. They had been called to the house to execute a warrant, a health warrant, because the parents were concerned about the erratic behavior of their son.

Elizabeth Magruder was shot in the back of the head, and James Arnaud was shot and killed, as well. He left behind a wife, two children, and two grandchildren. She left behind a husband and a 3-year-old son.

I had just been elected State's attorney in Prince George's County, but I hadn't even been sworn in yet. One of my first duties was to attend the funerals for both of them. My first memorial service during Police Week was in their honor.

Therefore, I take this very seriously. The National Police Week commemoration, I think, is something that is very grave, and we should treat it with great respect.

Unfortunately, ambushes like the one Magruder and Arnaud faced that day haven't ended. We just saw recently the ambush in Charlotte. Four officers were killed, and eight were shot. We have had others like that all over the country.

My thought when we had Police Week approaching was that we would approach this in a bipartisan manner. I actually reached out and worked with Congressman HUNT from Texas, and we put together a bill that was aimed at expanding the number of police officers because we know that there are shortages across the country. We know that we need to increase the pipeline so that more officers will come and take on these dangerous tasks and stand in harm's way, or stand in the gap, as the pastor said this morning.

It was a bipartisan effort. It came out of the committee by voice vote. It was passed on the floor in a similar capacity. The Senate companion bill was passed, as well. We are looking forward to that becoming the law of the land in short order.

Unfortunately, much of the legislation that has come after that has been anything but bipartisan. The legislation we are speaking to today, I am afraid, falls into that category.

When I took a look at the resolution, H. Res. 1213, I had hoped to see praise go out to our officers across the country for the work that they do and for the officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. Indeed, there are paragraphs that speak to that. Unfortunately, there are passages that don't.

My colleague from Virginia and his comments a few moments ago made some of the same kinds of comments, with respect to, for example, the defund the police argument. My Republican colleagues have concluded that "defund the police," a phrase that was used several years ago, is somehow fueling the rise of crime and, in this particular instance, the death and attacks against police officers.

As I just went into a moment ago, Magruder and Arnaud were killed in 2002, over 20 years ago. We know we have been seeing deaths of officers in the line of duty for decades now. It is nothing new. To kind of casually blame it on a slogan that I am not aware of anybody in the body here today who espoused that—certainly, I didn't—to pretend that that is the reason these shootings or these killings are occurring, is, I think, unfortunate and an abuse of what this week is supposed to mean.

Now, in addition, I would say this: I just mentioned that I don't know that anybody supports the defund the police slogan from a few years ago, but we do have colleagues in the House right now, a House Republican, who has a bill, H.R. 374, to defund ATF, and we have House Republican colleagues who called for the defunding of the FBI.

The irony of that, as those of us who have worked in law enforcement know—I was a prosecutor for 12 years, 4 on the Federal level, 8 as the locally elected State's attorney—the local and Federal prosecutors work together all the time. It is critical. Sometimes they work together in task forces because they can bring the local, the State, and the Federal forces to bear and provide maximum support in protecting our communities.

Unfortunately, this piece of legislation and much of the legislation that has been discussed this week that has been offered by my Republican colleagues intentionally ignores Federal law enforcement. In fact, we had one that was marked up in my committee, the Judiciary Committee, where I offered an amendment to include Federal law enforcement. It was expressly rejected on a party-line vote by my Republican colleagues.

I have to say that the FBI, ATF, and Border Patrol put their lives on the line, too. We should respect them, as well. One of the reasons I can't support this legislation is that it really is disrespectful to those Federal officers.

The other is that, back to the defund police issue, there is a recognition in the legislation where it talks about the number of officers who died in the line of duty in 2021, 2022, and 2023. I can talk about the specific numbers in a mo-

ment when we move forward in the debate, but one provision actually notes that 378 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023. The one common thread between the vast majority of officers who have been killed in the line of duty, like Arnaud and Magruder, like the people who were ambushed in Charlotte, like most of the people with the names on the wall just a few blocks away from here, is they were shot.

Sadly, my Republican colleagues are unable, unwilling, un-something to take a step to address that gun violence. The resolution here speaks in terms of defunding the police as the cause of their deaths, but all of us know that the greatest threat that these officers face is not being stabbed to death. It is not being beaten to death with a slogan like defund the police. It is being shot to death.

Briefly, these are numbers from the cops working with the National Fraternal Order of Police. A total of 331 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty during calendar year 2022 in 267 separate shooting incidents, including 42 incidents where multiple officers were shot.

I appreciate the fact that we are going to offer resolutions to praise officers, but if we are really serious about protecting them, it is hard to ignore a data point like that. Yet, our officers have to go out there knowing that they face these threats all the time. Traffic stops are particularly dangerous, but sometimes, like for Arnaud and Magruder, officers can be ambushed in a home. Sometimes, like in Charlotte, they can be ambushed in the open air.

Taking that seriously, I think, is an important piece, yet the resolution doesn't even mention it.

I will say this, and then I will take a pause here for a moment, but there is legislation pending right now in the House of Representatives. I offered one, an assault weapons ban. I figured it might be a bridge too far for me to ask my Republican colleagues to cosponsor that, so I came up with a bill. It is called the Raise the Age Act, and it would elevate the age from 18 to 21 to purchase assault weapons.

I thought that would be a reasonable bill to offer because there was already a provision in the law for handguns. You had to be 21 to purchase a handgun. I believe that was put in place during the Reagan era.

For my bill, raising it to 21, since you have to be 21 to buy alcohol, I thought it might make sense to be 21 to buy an assault weapon, as well.

I think we have 171-plus cosponsors for that bill, but none of them are Republican, not one, even though Republicans had agreed to legislation similar to that in previous years.

□ 0930

I will speak to you in a moment about the resources issue, as well. In the 117th Congress, Democrats supported legislation to provide equip-

ment to police officers. We will get into the particular numbers of that in a moment, but none of that is moving forward here in the House now, and none of it is certainly moving forward in Police Week.

I want to point out one little factoid from the COPS document that I mentioned before. It is under the heading Bullet Resistant Vests:

At least 34 officers were protected from gunshots that struck a protective ballistic vest.

Yet, we are struggling to find a way to provide additional support and equipment for officers to help them stay safe on the street. That is what we ought to be doing during Police Week, and to the extent we are going to talk in terms of resolutions in support of officers, let's strip out the political nonsense. The defund the police stuff really has no place in helping to protect police officers and make them safe.

As I mentioned a moment ago, it is a slap in the face the way these legislative provisions have been proposed to always exclude Federal law enforcement. I know you guys have issues on the other side about some of them, but I think this isn't the time or the place to express it in that way. Federal law enforcement deserves the same kind of respect, the same kind of appreciation, the same kind of protection that local and State law enforcement officers do.

I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution. We have had other resolutions that have come through before, and we have urged them to oppose them, as well. I am going to urge my colleagues on the other side after this vote is over—and you are in the majority, so you can move this kind of stuff whether it really makes a difference or not. Hopefully, after we get past this moment, we can actually sit down and get back to the type of legislation that I worked on with Congressman HUNT that can really make a difference to help make police officers safer, to help get more police officers on the street, and to praise all of them for the great work that they do.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I agree with him that we should stand in support of all of our law enforcement officers at the local, State, and Federal level. In addition to the work that we have done together on bills affecting law enforcement in the Judiciary Committee, I am also honored to serve on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations where we deal specifically with support for Federal law enforcement, as well as programs for State and local law enforcement. I can commit to the gentleman that the appropriations process under Chairman COLE's leadership will be focusing on providing that support for law enforcement across the country

at all levels. I encourage him to keep a close watch on those bills as they move through, and hopefully we can get his support for those pieces of legislation that provide that funding.

We have the loss of officers in every community, and during National Police Week we pause to thank those brave men and women in blue, and in rural areas like mine wearing brown uniforms, as well as sheriff's deputies, and we remember those who were lost.

We have had loss in the Sixth Congressional District. In Bridgewater, recently we had officers who we lost, and it really does take a toll not just on the families of the victims but on the entire community.

We want to make sure that that number is reduced, eliminated, and we can do that not only through funding efforts to support our police but also through resolutions like this where we try and reverse the trend that we have seen across the country and in many Democrat-run cities, quite frankly, where the antagonistic attitude toward men and women in law enforcement has reached a fever pitch. We have to turn that around. We have to restore that respect for law enforcement in our communities, that confidence in law enforcement in our communities through efforts like this, but also through efforts on the ground.

Nothing can replace support for law enforcement among city councils, among elected officials at the local level, among teachers, among community members. That is what is going to be, ultimately, the driving force behind the reversal in this antipolice, defund-the-police-type attitude in our communities and the restoration of that respect and a reduction in crime that would follow. If you respect the police, hopefully it follows logically that you are not going to be someone who wants to cross the police by violating the laws.

We will continue to push legislation like this and legislation that we work on in a bipartisan manner. I am sorry the gentleman says he can't support this resolution, but I hope that we continue to work on these types of bills as we move forward.

As to the issue of gun violence, I would say that efforts to raise the age at which adults in this country can exercise their constitutional rights to defend their homes, defend their families, defend their communities are not the answer. We only need to look in the District of Columbia to see what has happened when the age at which juvenile crimes, the age for covering crimes and determining that they are juveniles, has been raised over the years and is now 25. If you are under 25 years old in the District of Columbia and you commit a crime, you can be considered a juvenile for purposes of sentencing and for purposes of punishment. That doesn't make sense.

We passed a bill this week that actually lowers that age from 24 down to 18 because, truly, if you commit a crime

and you are a juvenile—and I worked in juvenile courts, so I understand that there needs to be different approaches to punishing juveniles. They need a much more restorative process that brings them back to a point at which they will be law-abiding adults. Once they are adults, once they are 18, treating them as juveniles without any kind of punishment for the crimes that are committed really does nothing but encourage that type of illegal behavior once they reach adulthood.

We don't think that raising age and pretending someone who is an adult is not an adult and can't exercise all of the rights enshrined to them under the Constitution is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a great law enforcement officer.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated and angry but also deeply saddened. The law enforcement profession is an honorable one. To have so much compassion for others that you are willing to put your life on the line, it is, as we say, a call to service, and not many hear that call today.

If you had asked me a few years ago if my children should become law enforcement officers, I would have undoubtedly said yes. However, after these last few years of observing the treatment of our law enforcement officers, I would have to think twice about my answer.

Since 2020, I have watched the law enforcement profession become a punching bag, scapegoated by rabid media pundits more interested in clickbait than the facts, villainized by Hollywood, and disparaged by city councils, Members of this Congress, both men and women, and even our President.

Yet, all these people expect law enforcement to respond to their calls for service. They expect them to take the verbal assault and show up with a smile on their face ready to serve.

The wonderful thing about my brothers and sisters in uniform is that despite this treatment and abuse, they will show up. They will answer every call. They will sacrifice their safety for others. They will help protect their community no matter how much ridicule or resentment they face.

I am here to say the things that they can't. I am here to protect my brothers and sisters in the blue and brown because others won't.

Enough is enough.

Law enforcement officers deserve our respect, our admiration, and our support. To provide anything else is unacceptable.

The resolution before us acknowledges the change in attitude toward law enforcement over the last few years and the subsequent violence directed toward them. It acknowledges that they respond to calls for service no matter who is on the other line.

It acknowledges that the job has only become more dangerous and more men-

tally and physically exhausting, yet they still show up for work, not knowing if they have kissed their families good-bye for the last time.

Importantly, this resolution also acknowledges that we in this Chamber set the standard. We are the ones who must demonstrate a respect for the rule of law and a respect for our law enforcement officers if we are to expect the public to do the same. We must do so in our actions, in our conversations, and even the policies we consider.

Bills that never become law can have the most staggering ripple effect. They can persuade local municipalities to implement soft-on-crime policies and strip law enforcement of resources. They can encourage the public to cheat, steal, and disrespect fellow community members. They can cause good, noble people to change their minds about entering the profession that I love so much, which is law enforcement.

Actions have consequences, and our communities are suffering as a result.

Let's take this moment to learn, to change for the better. We can rise to the moment, stand with our law enforcement officers, reestablish law and order, and bring safety back to our communities.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to respond to my good friend and colleague who is managing the time on the other side of the aisle. He talked about his support for law enforcement and what he did.

I want to read something to you: "It is not enough to hold the officers involved accountable. In the past year, police killings have reached a record high. Rogue, militant policing continues to run rampant across our country, threatening public safety and the lives of millions of Americans.

"Our antiquated criminal justice system has long allowed law enforcement to utilize excessive force and prejudicial policing practices while avoiding accountability. We need extensive reform now with de-escalation training, selective bias training, and better policing. I am urging my colleagues in Congress to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

"Additionally, we must invest in our communities through unarmed first responder agencies, mental health and crisis support treatment options, diversion programs, community intervention groups, and re-entry programs. We can and must do better to avoid tragedies and improve public safety. I will never stop working to support and enact changes that will make our country safer for all Americans."

The first part, this whole quote that I read was from my colleague who is managing the time on the other side of the aisle. That is horrendous because the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act takes away qualified immunity. If you take away qualified immunity

from the American law enforcement officer, it will devastate our communities. It will devastate recruitment, retention, and morale.

□ 0945

You have to be kidding me.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we are dealing with.

I became a law enforcement officer in late 1994 when Ron Ryan and Tim Jones from the St. Paul Police Department were ambushed and killed. I was a young officer. I didn't even have my funeral uniform yet, but I went to those funerals wondering what profession I was getting in, even taking a second thought whether I should stay in the profession. I was 1 week on the job.

In Cottage Grove, Minnesota, I was working the night shift. My partner and I that night, Tom Uland, stopped at a gas station to have a cup of coffee on the midnight shift. We talked about our families. We split up. He went one way, and I went the other. Within 3 minutes he is screaming for help. He needed help on a traffic stop. I couldn't get there fast enough. When my squad car got on that scene, the whole engine was shaking. I couldn't get to him fast enough.

He was being attacked by the driver and a dog, and the female passenger was crying. We found out when Officer Uland went to make that traffic stop the driver said to the female passenger: I am going to kill him.

When Officer Uland went up to the window, the suspect was digging into his armrest trying to get a handgun, and the female passenger was trying to move it away from him to save the officer's life. I got there during the struggle. Five minutes before that, he and I were having a cup of coffee and talking about our families and our futures. That is how quickly it can change.

The cavalier attitude of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is unconscionable. Where were they during the summer of love, 2020, when officers were getting ambushed? Where were they, Mr. Speaker?

On December 15, 1995, at 10:32 p.m., at the intersection of Sixth Avenue East and Fourth Street, Duluth, Minnesota, a career criminal tried to shoot me in the head and kill me, and I survived by the grace of God. He was a career criminal who should have been put away years ago.

Don't tell me we don't have issues.

We have issues with prosecution, too. The Federal prosecutor in Minneapolis would not charge him with felon in possession of a handgun. We couldn't figure out why. An off-duty police officer was shot in the head by a career criminal who should never have had the gun, and he wouldn't prosecute.

It was about 8 years later when the drug task force supervisor woke me up in the middle of the night and called me.

He said: Pete, we got him. He is going to prison for a long time. We have got

the stolen guns on him. He is not getting away with this one.

It took him years after to put this guy away.

Then on London Road in Duluth, Minnesota, suspects tried to kidnap some folks. I get the call with my supervisor. I don't get to choose what call I go on. I don't get to say: I don't want to go on this gun call. I don't want to go on that.

I get the call, and I go, and every single police officer in this Nation does the same thing.

It is a kidnapping, suspect with a gun. I go, I clear the room, Mr. Speaker, and the suspect comes flying in the room, points a handgun right at me, and pulls the trigger. By the grace of God, it didn't go off.

Do you know why I knew it didn't go off?

It happened so fast; I saw it in his eyes. I was in a street fight for my life; and, yes, I needed some help after that call. That is why I am adamant that the professionals who serve our communities get the mental health they need, and they need it now sometimes.

To listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pretend they support law enforcement, they have never worn the boots, or many of them have never worn the boots. They have never answered a call: Two shot, officer needs help. Most of them have never had a suspect with a rifle in his hand ready to kill you.

I have to make a decision, Mr. Speaker. If that rifle comes up, then I have to save my life. I have to do that. I don't want to, but his actions are causing me to save my own life and the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, the honorable men and women in law enforcement in America deserve better treatment. This week we celebrated Law Enforcement Week, Police Week. We saw the men and women in uniform, the proud men and women in uniform, come to our Nation's Capitol and be proud of their profession.

This week, Law Enforcement Week, should be 52 weeks a year. Every week we should support law enforcement and protect law enforcement. I am sick and tired of seeing this happen to law enforcement men and women, Mr. Speaker, throughout this Nation. There are Members in this body who stand at a microphone and vilify law enforcement. They will go to their funerals though. They will go to their funerals.

When it comes to supporting the legislation that I have here, a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement, my colleague says that it is partisan.

You have to be kidding me.

This is a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers, and my good friend calls it partisan.

Yes, defund the police was real. We are seeing the effects of it today. The recruitment and retention morale are at the lowest ever. There are shortages, Mr. Speaker, in police departments across this Nation, including my hometown.

Do they want to sit up here during National Police Week and pretend?

No. We are not going to have it. You are either going to support law enforcement or you don't.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

Most departments today wear body cameras or have squad car cameras, in-squad cameras. In this Nation, cooler heads must prevail on the support for law enforcement. We have to understand what they go through. We must push: comply now, challenge later. Comply now, challenge later.

Mr. Speaker, in 23 years of law enforcement, when I placed somebody under arrest: Please put your hands behind your back. You are under arrest. Palms out. Don't resist. Do you understand?

I placed my handcuffs on them, gapped them, and double-locked them, escorted them to the right rear seat of my squad car. When they obeyed my lawful order, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get hurt, the suspects didn't get hurt, and the public didn't get hurt.

When a law enforcement gives you a lawful order, obey her. Obey a lawful order. When a law enforcement officer says: Put your hands on the steering wheel, then put your hands on the steering wheel.

When a law enforcement officer says: Sit on the sidewalk for safety purposes, then sit on the sidewalk.

When a law enforcement officer says: You are under arrest for domestic assault, obey a lawful order, Mr. Speaker.

As a society, where do we want to be? Judge, juror, and executioner on the streets of the United States of America?

It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we have to change, and it is up to leadership in our Nation's Capital and elected leaders at all levels in every State.

To the men and women who wear the uniform in this great Nation: I will tell you it is a noble, honorable profession. No matter what you hear from some folks that you are not wanted, it is unwarranted, it is not a good career, I will tell you: I spent 23 years as a police officer in the city of Duluth, Minnesota. I helped build a community policing program. I love the profession, and I enjoyed the profession.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the darkest hours of someone's life we deal with, and we deal with it with compassion and professionalism. It is not easy, but we need the good men and women.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to hold people who perform violent acts against innocent citizens accountable. We need prosecutors to hold them accountable when they perform a violent crime.

In closing, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we in this country had better reshape our thinking and our focus toward safety of all of us, and we do that by supporting the men and women in uniform. We do that by electing leaders at all levels of government who support law enforcement.

We in law enforcement want to be held accountable, but let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. Right now we have a rogue attorney general in Hennepin County, Minnesota, who is bringing murder charges against Minnesota Trooper Ryan Londregan for what he did to save his partner's life, and the use of force expert opined to that, that Trooper Londregan used lawful force to save his partner's life. He is now being charged in Hennepin County by an anti-law enforcement attorney general.

In fact, she can't even find an attorney in her own department, Mr. Speaker, to prosecute the case. She is spending over \$1 million of taxpayer money, Mr. Speaker, to come to this town and find a prosecutor. It is unbelievable.

The people of Minnesota and Hennepin County should understand what is happening to that good man, that good trooper and his family. I will stand up to the good men in law enforcement no matter what I have to do, no matter what I have to do.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this: If we don't have a change of attitude toward law enforcement, then this country is going to be in trouble.

Before I close, I want to ask—this is an ask to the American people, to every American: The next time you see a law enforcement officer, I want you to look her in her eye and tell her: Thank you for your service. We appreciate you.

She will take that response and carry it with her the rest of the day, the rest of her shift, and forever.

We need to show appreciation.

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I have got to say that I am deeply shocked and offended by the statements that were just made, especially regarding me, but the larger context, too.

The gentleman from Minnesota read a quote that he attributed to me, and it is a statement I made, but it was about the killing of Tyre Nichols.

Tyre Nichols was the gentleman in Tennessee who was beaten to death over a period of 10 to 15 minutes by I believe it was six police officers. In fact, I remember watching the video, and there were multiple videos because they had different angles. One of the officers who had been beating him got tired and stepped away so he could catch his breath and then came back to continue beating him.

I had never seen anything like it. I was shocked.

□ 1000

I had cases when I was the State's attorney where police officers used excessive force, and I prosecuted those cases. In some cases, we convicted those individuals.

I guess my colleague from Minnesota thought that the beating death of Mr. Nichols was good policing, but keep something in mind. The chief of the police of that department fired those officers because he recognized that that

had crossed the line that good police officers recognize and follow every day, under every circumstance, and in every situation.

I thought that is what we were going to honor this Police Week. To sort of hold up the Tyre Nichols scenario as an example of what police officers are supposed to be doing during Police Week is insane. I can't believe it, but that is what the gentleman did.

Let me say this. It is important for us to make sure that we walk and chew gum at the same time. We want to honor good policing, for sure, because every community needs it. We need police officers who go out and respond to calls for robberies, shootings, or whatever. We need detectives who respond in homicide and rape prosecutions and investigations at the local, State, and Federal levels. We definitely need it, but even they have recognized over time that the bad apples, and the ones in Tyre Nichols' case were clearly not just bad apples but about as bad as you can get, have to be separated out because it is important for the police to police themselves. I know it is hard, but we have to make sure that they do it.

The gentleman mentioned body cameras a moment ago. Guess why we have body cameras. That was one of the innovations that was made to address excessive force. Guess what. One of the things that has led to is better policing.

When I first ran for State's attorney in Prince George's County, one of the issues I ran on was videotaping interrogations, and I wrote an op-ed. It was titled "Safeguards for the Innocent." I was joined by the former head of the homicide unit here in Washington, D.C. We wrote it together.

The reason we wrote it was because we knew that if these investigations were videotaped, it would address the flurry of false confessions that had been made in Prince George's County. We knew they were false because they were proven to be innocent by DNA evidence. We knew they were false confessions, so we made this change to try to address that.

Guess what happened. Initially, the police officers opposed it, but the good detectives realized quickly that the videotapes showed the great work that they were doing and that they were going about it the right way. The juries appreciated that, too, because then we could just bring it in, set up the video, play the tape, and the jurors could see for themselves and make their decision. That is good policing.

I think it is important for us to make sure that we hold police officers, just like we do prosecutors or any other law enforcement profession, to a basic level of following the law even as they try to protect us from misconduct.

I guess this is kind of par for the course now for my Republican colleagues. On the January 6 piece, for example, we have colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are calling the

perpetrators of January 6, the rioters of January 6, hostages and patriots. The majority is calling the people who participated in it patriots, the ones who had been prosecuted, convicted, and jailed. Even though I think over 900 of them pled guilty, others were convicted after jury trials.

They have had their day in court. They have had their due process. They were rightly convicted and held accountable. They have been sentenced to jail, but we still have my colleagues on the other side of the aisle calling them patriots and hostages, even though five officers died as a result of January 6 and many others were injured, too.

Mr. Speaker, this is Police Week, and I am hoping that we can get back to trying to do things in a bipartisan way here, but based on what I heard from my colleague from Minnesota, that is not likely to happen.

It is important to make sure that we do this: We have to make sure that we recognize the challenges we face in law enforcement. I support law enforcement, as I mentioned earlier. We have legislation to try to increase the number of police officers who are going to be out there on the street because we need more police officers on the street. The George Floyd Act, which was referenced, I think, a minute ago, is aimed at making sure that, in addition to having more on the street, they do the job in the right way.

When I first got elected, we didn't have iPhones very often. We would prosecute these cases and present the evidence to the jury in excessive force cases, and many times, the jury would reject it.

One of the transformations that happened with the iPhone, though, was that people, standing there on the street while excessive force was taking place, videotaped it, and then they were able to bring that to the police. Additionally, cases that probably wouldn't have been charged previously were not only charged but led to convictions.

The George Floyd scenario, the person who that legislation is named after, is a paradigm example. Derek Chauvin was there with his knee on George Floyd's neck for 9½ minutes. The police report that Derek Chauvin and his other colleagues on the street filled out made no mention of all of that, but the videos made it clear that Derek Chauvin had basically just strangled him to death with his knee. He was held accountable, and the other officers around him, who basically did nothing while it was happening, were held accountable, too.

Maybe my colleague from Minnesota had that in mind when he made some of the statements he just said a few minutes ago. I sure hope not because officers who do that belong in jail. They shouldn't have a badge, a gun, and a license to kill. That has to be given to the people we can trust to enforce the law in the right way.

For the vast majority of police officers, that is how they do it, and that is why we appreciate and respect them. When they cross the line, I hope we don't have people like the gentleman from Minnesota act like that is okay because it is not. We have to hold them accountable.

A minute ago, I mentioned serious legislation. It is a little surprising to me that we are having such a debate like this over legislation that is just a resolution basically. It speaks only of defund the police and the like.

The Democrats in the last Congress, for example, passed meaningful reforms to support police even though, in many instances, they were opposed by Republicans. Last Police Week, we passed H.R. 6943, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, which extended death benefits to law enforcement officers with PTSD. It happened over the objection of 17 Republicans, including 4 on the Judiciary Committee.

Last Police Week, H.R. 2992, the Traumatic Brain Injury and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Law Enforcement Training Act, passed, as well. Twenty-one Republicans objected to that also.

We keep passing legislation, or we did when the Democrats were in control, to actually provide additional resources and benefits to police officers who get injured in the line of duty. I think that is important for us to continue to do, but our colleagues aren't doing it.

Republicans are bringing this political legislation, and it got really political a minute ago when the gentleman from Minnesota was up there, frankly, kind of ranting about things he attributed to me, which I think was wrong and incorrect, but, more importantly, things the gentleman keeps trying to attribute to Democrats and the change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, here are a couple of other quick points about some of the things my colleague said, like the decline in police officers. I have to be clear. One of the things we have in the bill I cosponsored with Mr. HUNT was a report that is going to study this because I think it is going to help address a lot of the misinformation that is coming out on the other side about why we are having some shortages.

They are saying it is based on the defund the police slogan, but the roots of these shortages started many years ago. In some instances, in some jurisdictions, we just have a cycle of people who are coming up for their retirements at their 20-year and 30-year marks. In any event, let's try to make sure we get the evidence and the data so we can correct those challenges.

It is not just fixing a slogan on the street. It is a dangerous job. It doesn't pay as much as it should. Many of the officers or potential officers find that they can have jobs that pay as much but don't have to work as hard. For example, in a Homeland Security Committee hearing, I remember the Border

Patrol agents testifying that they are having trouble retaining officers at the border, not because of a defund the police slogan but because they can leave the job and make more money doing other things and stay in the same community, and it is less taxing than being an officer.

If we are honest about it, we can come up with better solutions to try to retain them, like maybe paying them more money, but if we keep spreading rhetoric about this is defund the police, we won't fix the problem and get more officers.

If money is the issue, and of course it is a factor, then just standing here and haranguing about defunding the police doesn't fix it. We have to find ways to raise the salaries and help attract and retain more of them to go out on the street.

I am going to stop with this, for the moment. I first went into law enforcement in 1990 as a prosecutor, and I took it seriously then.

The gentleman on the other side is accusing Democrats of not being serious about police. We have former police officers here on this side of the aisle who are Democrats, and I know them across the country. Not only that but every time I have run for office, I have been endorsed by the FOP in my jurisdiction. It is a little unfortunate to sort of use those sorts of attacks to justify the resolution that is proposed here.

Let's get serious. Let's get back to doing things that actually will address the problems and retain more police officers, recruit more police officers, and address the concerns that we have with respect to keeping safe on the street.

Yes, gun violence is a big factor in the dangers that they face on the streets. I think it is kind of hard to be serious about protecting them if we are not even going to discuss that.

My colleague from Virginia mentioned that he thinks we want to make sure that they are 21 because if you wait until they are 21, it undermines their Second Amendment rights. I appreciate that, but I don't agree with that take.

Let me say this: Ghost guns, I haven't come across anybody who thinks those make sense. They are intentionally designed to avoid prosecution. They don't have any numbers on them in order to avoid being tracked in the event of use for a criminal enterprise. The use of ghost guns in crimes on the street is exploding.

We need to get our Republican colleagues to help us support legislation like that. We are having trouble finding it, but today would be the day.

By the way, talking about killings on the street, it is handguns primarily, as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, that are leading to officers' deaths on the streets. If we are really serious about protecting police officers, can't we do something to try to address that? Can't we do something to try to limit the number of guns on the street?

Also, I know that the argument is going to be Democrats are soft on crime and all of that, but remember, a lot of the people who commit these crimes don't have prior offenses. The guy who killed the two deputies in my jurisdiction, Arnaud and Magruder, didn't have any prior record. He had mental health issues.

We can't just assume that all of these issues revolve around people who have long criminal records because they don't, and many times police officers are killed on the street by people with no prior records.

Let's try to address all of these issues in a serious way, in a bipartisan way, because that is the way to actually help keep our police officers safe on the street.

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

□ 1015

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress questions the difficulty, danger, or stress associated with serving in law enforcement. We are grateful for each and every Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement officer, agent, or employee working daily, putting their lives on the line to keep us safe in every corner and territory of this Nation.

This week we should come together to honor their dedication to their jobs and communities, lift up the names of those officers and agents who gave their lives in service, and wrap our arms around their loved ones left behind.

Sadly, Republicans have chosen partisanship over bipartisanship at this time. I, therefore, must oppose H. Res. 1213, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, we should all come together. We should all be standing united on this floor in support of law enforcement today. Unfortunately, it is the other side that is going to object to this legislation in support of police. To the defund the police movement, this rhetoric has come from Members in this Chamber on the other side and, yes, that has been followed up by action in cities across the country.

We just had a field hearing in Philadelphia where they defunded the police. They took money away from police departments in Philadelphia.

The gentleman may call the testimony of our colleague from Minnesota, former law enforcement, ranting, but, instead, I believe it was a passionate defense of each and every law enforcement officer in this country. We must stand and back the blue.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1213, A resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers.

Let me be clear: I am supporting this resolution because our law enforcement officers deserve better training and equipment, better data about the injuries they incur in the line of duty, and better resources to support their mental health and community engagement. Peace officers who serve their communities faithfully deserve our respect, and I resoundingly condemn the increase in violence against law enforcement officers. However, this resolution also inserts unnecessarily divisive language into what should be a unifying message of support. The claim that an increase in violence against law enforcement officers is tied to calls to defund the police is unsupported and irresponsible. Congress should never use our first responders to force a partisan, politically charged message. This is especially true during Police Week, when we reflect on those who have died in the line of duty, and honor those who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe.

The work law enforcement does is felt every day, and they deserve real, tangible support. Genuine support for our law enforcement officers requires Congress to address the myriad challenges they face. For example, we must work to stem the proliferation of ghost guns and assault weapons that make it especially dangerous and difficult for law enforcement to do their job. Congress must also ensure law enforcement is equipped to respond to the many calls they receive. I strongly support federal COPS grants to local law enforcement agencies, which have provided more than \$16 million to Minnesota law enforcement agencies since 2016, putting more than 100 additional officers in our communities. Just as strongly, I oppose the Republican Majority's budget proposals to cut this essential funding. Additionally, support for mental health professionals to accompany officers in certain situations is needed. Being a law enforcement officer already entails so much. They should not be expected to fill dozens of specialized roles in addition to their primary responsibilities.

During my service in Congress, I have been committed to ensuring that our law enforcement officers have the resources and support they need to do their jobs. In my role on the Appropriations Committee, I have secured more than \$8 million in Community Project Funding to directly support Fourth District law enforcement agencies and programs. I will continue to work to support Minnesota's first responders and invest in community safety.

I thank our law enforcement community for the sacrifices they make every day to keep us safe.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 337, nays 61, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—337

Adams	Espallat	Letlow
Aderholt	Estes	Levin
Agullar	Ezell	Lieu
Alford	Fallon	Lofgren
Allen	Feenstra	Loudermilk
Allred	Finstad	Lucas
Amo	Fischbach	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fitzgerald	Luna
Armstrong	Fitzpatrick	Luttrell
Arrington	Fleischmann	Lynch
Auchincloss	Fletcher	Mace
Babin	Flood	Malliotakis
Bacon	Fox	Maloy
Baird	Frankel, Lois	Mann
Balderson	Franklin, Scott	Manning
Banks	Fry	Massie
Barr	Fulcher	Mast
Bean (FL)	Gaetz	Matsui
Beatty	Gallego	McBath
Bentz	Garbarino	McCaul
Bergman	Garcia, Mike	McClintock
Beyer	Golden (ME)	McCollum
Bice	Gonzales, Tony	McCormick
Biggs	Gonzalez,	Meeks
Bilirakis	Vicente	Menendez
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Meng
Blunt Rochester	Gooden (TX)	Meuser
Boebert	Gosar	Miller (IL)
Bost	Gottheimer	Miller (OH)
Boyle (PA)	Graves (LA)	Miller (WV)
Brecheen	Graves (MO)	Mills
Brown	Green (TN)	Molinaro
Brownley	Griffith	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Grothman	Moore (AL)
Budzinski	Guest	Moore (UT)
Burchett	Guthrie	Moran
Burgess	Hageman	Morrell
Burlison	Harder (CA)	Moskowitz
Calvert	Harris	Moulton
Cammack	Harshbarger	Mrvan
Caraveo	Hayes	Mullin
Carbajal	Hern	Murphy
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Neguse
Carl	Hill	Nehls
Carter (GA)	Himes	Newhouse
Carter (LA)	Hinson	Nickel
Carter (TX)	Horsford	Norman
Cartwright	Houchin	Nunn (IA)
Case	Houlahan	Obenolte
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Ogles
Chavez-DeRemer	Hoyle (OR)	Owens
Cherfilus-	Hudson	Pallone
McCormick	Huizenga	Palmer
Chu	Hunt	Panetta
Ciscomani	Issa	Pappas
Cline	Jackson (NC)	Pascrell
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Pelosi
Cohen	Jacobs	Peltola
Cole	James	Pence
Collins	Jeffries	Perez
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Perry
Connolly	Johnson (SD)	Peters
Correa	Jordan	Pettersen
Costa	Joyce (OH)	Pfluger
Courtney	Joyce (PA)	Phillips
Craig	Keating	Posey
Crane	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Raskin
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler
Crow	Kennedy	Rodgers (WA)
Cuellar	Khanna	Rogers (AL)
Curtis	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (KY)
D'Esposito	Kildee	Rose
Davids (KS)	Kiley	Rosendale
Davidson	Kilmer	Ross
Davis (NC)	Kim (CA)	Rouzer
De La Cruz	Krishnamoorthi	Roy
Dean (PA)	LaLota	Ruiz
DeLauro	LaMalfa	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lamborn	Rutherford
Deluzio	Landsman	Ryan
DeSaulnier	Langworthy	Salazar
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Salinas
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
Donalds	Latta	Scalise
Duarte	LaTurner	Schiff
Duncan	Lawler	Schneider
Dunn (FL)	Lee (FL)	Scholten
Edwards	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Ellzey	Leger Fernandez	Schweikert
Emmer	Lesko	Scott, Austin
Escobar		Self

Sessions
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland

Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Van Orden

Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—61

Balint	Garcia (TX)	Omar
Barragan	Garcia, Robert	Pingree
Blumenauer	Goldman (NY)	Pocan
Bonamici	Gomez	Porter
Bowman	Green, Al (TX)	Pressley
Bush	Huffman	Ramirez
Cárdenas	Ivey	Sarbanes
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Scanlon
Casar	Jayapal	Schakowsky
Casten	Johnson (GA)	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Kamlager-Dove	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Stansbury
Crockett	Lee (PA)	Takano
DeGette	McClellan	Tlaib
Doggett	McGarvey	Underwood
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Foster	Moore (WI)	Waters
Foushee	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Frost	Napolitano	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Neal	
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—32

Bera	Gimenez	McClain
Bishop (GA)	Granger	McHenry
Buchanan	Greene (GA)	Mfume
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	Miller-Meeks
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Mooney
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Norcross
Clyburn	Kim (NJ)	Sewell
Davis (IL)	Kuster	Trone
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Wexton
Evans	LaHood	Wilson (FL)
Ferguson	Magaziner	

□ 1049

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. ESCOBAR, BROWNLEY, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, AMO, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. PANETTA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for today's vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218, H. Res. 1213.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I had to miss votes today to travel back to Illinois. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218.

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I missed one vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 218.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2024, TO TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024

MR. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to