

death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 432, YEA on Roll Call No. 433, NAY on Roll Call No. 434, and YEA on Roll Call No. 435.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes today due to circumstances beyond my control. The roll call votes I missed included the MTR on H.R. 3724, passage of H.R. 3724, the MTR on H.R. 4790, and passage of H.R. 4790. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 432, "nay" on Roll Call No. 433, "yea" on Roll Call No. 434, and "nay" on Roll Call No. 435.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 19, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 19, 2024, at 3:20 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 1871.

That the Senate passed S. 3187.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 9468.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,  
Acting Clerk.

NO BAILOUT FOR SANCTUARY  
CITIES 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. 5717.

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 1455 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. 5717.

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

□ 1635

## 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. 5717) to provide that sanctuary jurisdictions that provide benefits to aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status under the immigration laws are ineligible for Federal funds intended to benefit such aliens, with Mr. CLOUD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from 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. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in just 3½ years, President Biden and his border czar, KAMALA HARRIS, have allowed more than 7.6 million unvetted, illegal aliens into the United States. That is the equivalent of adding an entirely new State almost the size of Arizona, our 14th largest State, with nine congressional districts. Those not engaged in criminal activities are almost entirely destitute and are overwhelming public schools, hospitals, food banks, public housing, and social services.

This began the very first day of this administration, when Biden and HARRIS rescinded the remain in Mexico policy, ordered construction on the border wall halted, and literally instructed ICE to stop enforcing court-ordered deportations.

Today, ICE remains hog-tied in discharging its duty to remove even criminal illegal aliens from our midst. Before they can do so, they are now required to first develop a full profile of the criminal and to identify mitigating circumstances, such as if the criminal has high blood pressure or is a caregiver.

A former top ICE official told the Judiciary Committee that the Biden-Harris policies have made immigration enforcement more dangerous, more difficult to carry out, and less efficient overall. The flood of illegal mass migration at our southern border has thinned the ranks of ICE officers available to enforce laws within the interior because so many have been siphoned off to process illegals being allowed into our country.

When constituents ask me how this could be happening to their communities, I have to remind them that if they voted for Biden and HARRIS, this is exactly what they voted for, and if that surprises them, they weren't paying attention.

In 2019, KAMALA HARRIS told the ACLU she would slash funding for immigration detention and close private immigration detention centers. As ABC News has been forced to confess, HARRIS did, in fact, endorse taxpayer funding to provide transgender surgeries for illegal aliens detained in the United States.

Americans are beginning to realize the severe danger to public safety

posed by cities and States that refuse to notify ICE so that dangerous criminals can be turned over to them for deportation once they have served out their sentences, as the law requires. Instead, the woke left releases these criminals back onto our streets and into our communities to prey on new victims.

Instead of ICE being able to take these criminals into custody while they are disarmed and in custody, ICE agents, instead, must track them down and confront them when they are armed and at large. This is the very essence of the sanctuary policies that so many Democrats, including Biden and HARRIS, have supported and facilitated.

Although current law already prohibits jurisdictions from refusing to cooperate with Federal immigration officials, jurisdictions controlled by leftist officials continue to do so. This bill changes that.

The growing list of Americans victimized by criminal aliens released back onto our streets, in defiance of Federal law, is truly appalling.

According to ICE, Cook County, Illinois, saw law enforcement release 1,070 criminal aliens and immigration violators in fiscal year 2019 despite requests by ICE to notify the agency before they are released from local custody. One of those criminals was a Mexican national who had been arrested for theft. After his release from custody, that illegal alien lured a 3-year-old girl into a McDonald's bathroom and sexually assaulted her. Had Chicago authorities cooperated with Federal officials, that man, a convicted aggravated felon who previously had been deported, could have been in ICE custody and instead removed to Mexico.

In January 2023, a 27-year-old illegal alien from Mexico was allowed to remain in the United States through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program despite his arrest for domestic violence in New Jersey. Local law enforcement ignored an ICE detainer and released him, where he went on to murder his girlfriend and a married couple.

Without this legislation, we should brace ourselves for what is to come. In 2019, KAMALA HARRIS committed to ending ICE detainers. H.R. 5717 would prevent any jurisdiction from ever doing so again.

Specifically, this bill renders sanctuary jurisdictions ineligible to receive certain taxpayer dollars that would bankroll illegal immigration in American communities. By denying certain Federal funding to jurisdictions that prohibit or restrict their cooperation with Federal immigration officials, the bill encourages sanctuary jurisdictions to end their anti-enforcement policies in favor of working with the Department of Homeland Security.

Today, Democrats will present far-fetched hypotheticals about how Republicans want to strip funding from program after program. On the contrary—to continue to receive these

funds, the jurisdiction would simply need to follow existing law. Isn't that what a nation of laws is all about?

It is absurd that a bill like this is even necessary. As we have seen time and time again, far-left jurisdictions would prefer to release dangerous criminal aliens back onto American streets than to deport them once they have served their sentence, as Federal law requires. This bill helps end this dangerous and tragic absurdity.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, rather than bring up an immigration bill that attempts to secure our border or address the broken immigration system, the Republican majority has brought us a bill that would simply bankrupt States and localities that have chosen a different path on immigration than the Republican agenda.

I am not surprised that this bill offers no solutions, though. Republicans have made it very clear that they are more interested in trying to scapegoat immigrants and score cheap political points, especially in these weeks leading up to the election, than in working to solve problems.

This legislation would prevent so-called sanctuary jurisdictions—in some cases entire States, like New York, California, and North Dakota—from receiving any Federal funds that might “benefit” undocumented immigrants, resulting in drastic cuts to education, transportation, law enforcement, and healthcare. This bill is being rushed to the floor without following regular order. Given how poorly written this bill is, it is clear why its supporters might have wanted to shield it from greater scrutiny.

The title of the bill implies that it is narrowly crafted and targeted at Federal funds for undocumented immigrants in sanctuary jurisdictions. In reality, however, its impact would be much, much wider. It would target not only States led by Democrats like New York, California, and Illinois, but Republican strongholds like Utah and North Dakota, and its impact would be felt across the country.

Let's think about how this bill would affect our communities. For example, local police protect the public. They do not check a person's immigration status when responding to a call for help or answering a 911 call. As a result, under this bill, State and local police forces will lose millions of dollars in Byrne JAG grants from the Department of Justice, one of the main ways that the Federal Government supports police equipment purchases, training, and officer salaries.

Likewise, States are required by law to provide students with a K–12 public education regardless of immigration status. As such, States receive billions of dollars from the Department of Education to fund K–12 education. Under this bill, any so-called sanctuary juris-

diction would lose this funding for all its students, regardless of their immigration status.

One more example that highlights how truly absurd this bill is: Last year, the Federal Government provided the States of California and New York, both of which are considered sanctuary jurisdictions under this bill, with \$5 billion and \$2.3 billion respectively to build and maintain highways, bridges, and pedestrian infrastructure. This funding benefits all of the States' residents, including undocumented immigrants, which puts the funding at risk under this bill.

□ 1645

My Republican colleagues will argue that we are reading the bill too broadly, but we know this is exactly what Republicans want to do.

The Trump administration has previously tried to condition Department of Justice funding on States changing their sanctuary city policies. Further, this concept is straight out of Project 2025, which specifically calls on a potential future Trump administration to try to coerce States and localities into adopting anti-immigrant policies by withholding Federal funds.

Republicans used the term “sanctuary city” the same way that Donald Trump tells stories about immigrants eating cats and dogs. They want their constituents to be afraid of immigrants and to imply that some cities harbor criminals and refuse to comply with Federal law. The truth is, in some cities, gaining the trust of immigrant communities is a key component of good policing.

The Major Cities Chiefs Association argues that when local police are viewed as colluding with immigration authorities, they may spur “increased crime against immigrants in the broader community, create a class of silent victims, and eliminate the potential for assistance from immigrants in solving crimes or preventing future terroristic acts.” Following this guidance, many cities across the country have adopted policies that limit contact between local police and Federal immigration agencies.

However, regardless of how someone may feel about sanctuary jurisdictions and community trust policies, the answer is not a blunt instrument that claws billions of dollars away from these States and localities. Our constituents send us here to fight for their interests, not to take away funds they depend on.

This is a dangerous and overly broad bill.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA), the author of this bill.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, you break it, you bought it. That is not a Republican saying. That is not a Democrat

saying. That is just a widely accepted premise in our culture: You break it, you bought it.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chair, nobody broke the border like President Biden and Vice President and border czar KAMALA HARRIS, along with the mayors and Governors of sanctuary cities and States.

President Biden broke the border when he repealed 64 very effective Trump-era policies. Biden repealed remain in Mexico. Biden applied lower asylum standards. Biden stopped border wall construction. Biden even repositioned border agents away from the border to be in migrant processing centers behind desks just to process more and more migrants into the country.

By reversing Trump's very effective policies, President Biden and border czar and Vice President KAMALA HARRIS have created a wide-open border for illegal immigration and asylum abuse.

The immediate consequence of these actions was a surge in illegal border crossings, reaching levels we have never seen before. Now, every State, including New York, nearly 2,000 miles away from the southwest border, has become a border State.

While the Biden-Harris administration has done its damage, sanctuary city jurisdictions are only exacerbating this crisis even further. When cities like New York adopt sanctuary policies and forbid local law enforcement from coordinating with Federal officials on enforcing immigration law, they send a huge signal to those who are in our country illegally or those who would break our asylum laws.

The message is: Come to New York. Come because we will not enforce Federal immigration law here.

The migrants sure got the message. Mr. Chair, 100,000 migrants have passed through New York City since the spring of 2022. At the height of the crisis, there were over 64,000 migrants in the city's care, all at the taxpayers' expense.

New York's Governor recently proposed \$5 billion more to address New York's migrant crisis at the same time she proposed cutting from our kids' public schools. Yet, New York State officials did absolutely nothing to change New York City's and New York State's sanctuary policies. Despite the uncontrolled crisis across the five boroughs, New York City has refused to change its sanctuary policies, the very policies incentivizing illegal immigration.

Those illegally crossing the border or who feign asylum to be paroled into the interior of our country know that if they make it to New York, they will be given taxpayer-funded food, shelter, healthcare, transportation, and social services. Hardworking American taxpayers will be the ones footing the bill, Mr. Chair.

If we do not put an end to these sanctuary city policies, that number will continue to balloon, costing families even more, all during a time of significant financial hardship and record inflation. New Yorkers, and indeed all

taxpayers, should not have to bear this burden.

Schools are at capacity. Our cities are overrun. Our law enforcement is stretched to the limit. Our social services are being overwhelmed. Our hospitals are overburdened. Local budgets are strained to the breaking point. Homeless Americans are having trouble accessing shelter services. Migrant children, many unaccompanied, are being exploited by smugglers, traffickers, and violent gangs, and they are being put to work illegally or, worse, abused and trafficked.

Instead of changing course, cities like New York have the audacity to turn around and demand more money from taxpayers from nonsanctuary jurisdictions to fund their failed sanctuary policies.

Today, Mr. Chair, enough is enough. My No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act is about accountability. It is about ensuring that cities and States that refuse to enforce Federal laws are not rewarded with Federal dollars related to their defiance.

Let the policymakers from sanctuary jurisdictions hear us loud and clear: If you incentivize illegal immigration in your city, knowing full well the migrants will come, don't come to the Federal Government for a bailout.

Let me make something also abundantly clear: This legislation will prohibit Federal funding from going toward fueling the root causes of the migrant crisis. In no way, Mr. Chair, can this legislation be construed to harm school systems, law enforcement, and other benefits for American citizens. Those entities will remain eligible for Federal funding under this legislation.

Mr. Chair, America is like a ship taking on water. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle, their solution is to merely build a bigger boat. My solution, Mr. Chair, is to plug the hole causing the crisis in the first place by cutting off Federal funds that would only exacerbate the crisis.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his support of my legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act.

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

Let's be real. The reason these migrants are in New York is because they were bused there involuntarily by Governor Abbott of Texas.

Mr. LALOTA's bill would remove from New York all Federal funding for schools, all funding for transportation, because it says that in a sanctuary State or city, anything that may benefit migrants will not be paid. As I said in my opening remarks, roads benefit migrants like anybody else, so no funding for roads, bridges, and highways. Schools benefit migrants like anybody else, so no funding for the schools.

This bill would essentially take all Federal funding away from New York State. Why Mr. LALOTA would introduce a bill to take basically all Federal funding away from our joint State of

New York is a question his constituents are going to have to address in 2 months.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, here we are, wasting time again on the floor on a bill that has no chance of becoming law, when, meanwhile, Republicans have failed to pass a continuing resolution that would keep our government funded. Some in your party are even calling for a government shutdown, which would have detrimental effects on Americans across the country.

Are we dealing with that issue? No. Republicans couldn't pass their own bill, a partisan bill, to continue to fund the government, and we are not trying to do anything on that. Instead, we are here talking not about a bill that actually works for real solutions for our outdated immigration system, but we are once again talking about a bill that demonizes immigrants.

This is something that Republicans have refused to put forward, real solutions to our broken immigration system, because, in their own words, they want to keep immigration broken so that they can continue to demonize immigrants and continue to try to make this an election issue.

Here we are today, once again, debating a bill inspired by Trump's Project 2025 that would strip billions of dollars in vital Federal funds from States and localities across the country, including in my home State of Washington.

Under this bill, jurisdictions that want to keep the proper division between Federal enforcement and local law enforcement are penalized for doing just that, taking away any Federal funds that might "benefit" undocumented immigrants. That makes absolutely no sense on multiple levels.

First of all, community trust policies in these jurisdictions foster cooperation and trust between immigrant communities and local authorities. That is crucial for effective policing and public safety.

When immigrants feel safe reporting crimes and working with law enforcement, it actually strengthens public safety for everyone. That is why members of the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, which is made up of law enforcement officials from across the country, have expressed concern with this bill, stating that when local police are viewed as colluding with immigration authorities, "undocumented residents may fear that they, or people they know or depend upon, risk deportation by working with law enforcement," and that "this fear undermines trust between law enforcement and the communities we serve," which actually can facilitate an increase in violent crime.

That is law enforcement talking about what this bill would actually do. It would hurt our ability to protect public safety.

On top of that, local jurisdictions have neither the money, the training, nor the time to enforce Federal immigration laws, particularly when it undermines their own ability to build community trust and do their necessary work.

H.R. 5717 is just bad policy. It implements Trump's extreme Project 2025 agenda by stripping localities and States across the country of billions of dollars in Federal funding for education, transportation, infrastructure, law enforcement, and healthcare just because those funds might benefit undocumented immigrants, forgetting that they actually benefit everybody in the community.

Let's remember that undocumented immigrants are interwoven into our communities. Approximately 1.1 million U.S. citizens are married to undocumented immigrants, and over 600,000 U.S. citizen children live in mixed-status households where at least one person is undocumented, not to mention the DACA recipients who work in public schools, hospitals, and small businesses.

Attempts to punish cities and States for using funding in a way that benefits undocumented people take away the very necessary funding that communities across the country have been asking for, and it will inevitably also harm U.S. citizens and American communities in those same localities.

Welcome to Donald Trump and Stephen Miller's America, where the Federal Government tries to coerce State and local governments to adopt the most anti-immigrant policies. If they refuse to do so, well, then that entire community is going to be stripped of Federal funding for the most essential services.

We have recently seen how dangerous this rhetoric and this policy can be. For the past few weeks, Republicans have relentlessly pushed debunked myths about how Haitian immigrants have supposedly invaded Springfield, Ohio, and are eating people's pets.

Sadly, that led to the city having to evacuate city hall and lock down multiple hospitals due to bomb threats. Parents are afraid to send their kids to school as Springfield elementary schools were evacuated 2 days in a row because of the bomb threats.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

□ 1700

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, my Republican colleagues love to talk about so-called immigrant crime and chaos at the border, but the reality is that their callous disregard for the truth, for conspiracy theories and lies and demonization of immigrants, has brought crime and chaos to the residents of Springfield, Ohio, putting their well-being and security at risk.

Mr. Chairman, we are better than this. America is better than this. We

can fix the immigration system without ripping communities apart and stripping away billions of dollars in vital Federal funding. We can solve the problems at the border without fear-mongering and scapegoating immigrants who are helping to build our communities across the country.

Unfortunately, that would require bipartisanship, compromise, and a commitment to actually solving the problem, all of which my Republican colleagues have made clear they have zero interest in doing.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, every grant the Federal Government makes to States and localities comes with conditions that they must fulfill in order to receive those funds. This measure simply says to get Federal funds, you must obey Federal law.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I rise today not only to support this legislation, but let's also clarify for a moment: My colleague across the aisle suggested that it is time to get real. Law enforcement has been trusted in our communities to do their jobs and provide for public safety without Federal or State interference for years. Sanctuary city policies are actually handcuffing local law enforcement and precluding them from intervening in protecting American citizens. Sanctuary city policies keep local law enforcement from even being able to interact with Federal law enforcement, therefore making it impossible for them to do their jobs.

My colleague across the aisle said it is time to get real. The overwhelming number of illegal immigrants being transported to cities and States like New York is not at the hands of Governors of States, but of the Federal Government. I know this because, as a county executive, I saw it firsthand. In fact, it was imposed on my community and my law enforcement.

Since President Biden took office, over 11 million individuals have entered our country illegally. In the State of New York, because of sanctuary city policies, Governor Hochul and Mayor Adams have allowed for the transport of migrants—apparently, that is okay if Democratic mayors do it—to cities, communities, motels, and hotels throughout upstate New York.

One of my colleagues referred to the so-called crime committed by illegal immigrants. We are not suggesting that everyone who comes to this country commits a crime, but we are suggesting that when we interface with an illegal immigrant who does, in fact, break the law, law enforcement should be able to do its job and interact with Federal officials and, ultimately, arrest and deport individuals who break the law.

We know that this has occurred in our State. Just 1 month ago, a Peru-

vian serial killer wanted for 23 murders was arrested at the southern border, released based on the current administration's policy, and then transported to New York.

I don't think Governor Abbott drove him there. Instead, it is likely the Federal Government and our tax dollars brought him to New York, where he was arrested, living in Endicott, New York.

In another instance, an illegal immigrant raped and strangled a woman in Delaware County, New York. This individual committed a heinous act while out on bail for raping another woman, thanks to New York City's sanctuary city policy and cashless bail. This crime could have been prevented but was not.

At what point does the State of New York recognize that this is a crisis of their own making? No one will lose a dollar if States like New York and cities like New York would abandon sanctuary city policies and allow local law enforcement to do their jobs.

At times, I come here and it feels as if we are in some sort of version of the Wizard of Oz. Pay no attention to the crisis of our making. Look, over there—Project 2025. Pay no attention to the crimes being committed. Look, over there—an offensive tweet.

To my colleagues, it is very simple: Law enforcement can do its job well, and we ought to demand accountability from States that preclude them from protecting American citizens.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, once again, I point out that what everyone thinks of the Biden administration's immigration policies, the only effect of this bill would be to take all Federal funds away from States like New York, California, North Dakota, Utah.

Again, for Mr. MOLINARO, who represents New York, he will have to explain to his constituents why he thinks all Federal funds should be taken away from New York.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA), a new member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chair, today, I rise to express my profound concerns about the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act and its potential ramifications for cities like Chicago, which I proudly represent.

As the Nation's first sanctuary city, Chicago is a shining example of what it means to be a melting pot of cultures, backgrounds, and experiences. We are committed to the principles of inclusion, safety, and justice for all its residents, regardless of immigration status.

As a welcoming city and State, our policies are designed to build trust between our immigrant communities and local law enforcement, ensuring that everyone feels safe to report crimes and seek assistance without fear of deportation.

The No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act threatens to undermine these ef-

forts by withholding essential Federal funds from cities that uphold such priorities. The bill proposes to penalize cities like Chicago, counties like Cook County, and States like Illinois by cutting off essential resources that support public safety, community service, education, and transportation.

Let me be clear: This legislation not only affects the bureaucratic operations of our city and State government, it would also deeply impact the daily lives of our own families and neighbors.

Federal grants play a vital role in equipping emergency response services and our law enforcement with the resources that they need to keep our communities safe. This bill would cut these funds, compromising our ability to effectively protect our communities and maintain our public safety.

Similarly, many of our community programs, which provide critical support to our most vulnerable populations, are also funded by Federal grants. Losing this funding will mean significantly reduced support for after-school programs, fewer resources for schools and healthcare services, and less assistance for families facing economic hardship. It would decimate the Federal dollars used to maintain and improve our city's transportation infrastructure, from roads to public transportation to clean water access.

The Federal dollars threatened by this bill are essential for our economic growth and for the quality of life of all residents.

The message of this bill is clear: If a city chooses to embrace the immigrant communities and prioritize their safety and well-being, it will be punished. This is not only unjust but counterproductive.

Our Nation's strength lies in its diversity, and our cities' efforts to protect and support all residents should be applauded, not penalized.

Let us reaffirm our commitment to values that unite us rather than divide us. Let us support policies that uplift all of our communities and ensure they have the resources they need to thrive.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chair, if those cities want the hard-earned tax dollars of our citizens, they need to respect our laws, our sovereignty, and the safety of the American people.

Mr. Chair, there are fewer things more despairing than having to pass laws to enforce laws because our chief law enforcement officer and Commander in Chief has fallen down on the job. If President Biden and Vice President HARRIS don't respect the laws of our land, I don't suspect other people will either.

I rise in support of H.R. 5717, the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act.

Sanctuary cities are magnets. They are part of the perverse incentives that are drawing illegal immigrants into

this country. In fact, their mere existence is illegal under U.S. law. Title 8, Section 1324 of the United States Code prohibits the harboring of illegal aliens, making such acts a felony punishable by imprisonment up to 5 years. Other sections in title 8 prohibit local jurisdictions from withholding the immigration status of an individual from Federal authorities.

These rogue local officials who promote these policies and flout the rule of law are themselves acting as criminals, and they are a disgrace to our great country. They should be impeached or prosecuted.

These jurisdictions are sanctuaries for lawlessness, crime, and chaos that is a cancer pervading our country.

Sanctuary cities are a scourge to our country's law and order, to a civil society whose sacred duty is to provide for a common defense, promote domestic tranquility, and enforce the laws of the land.

As John Adams once said, this is "a government of laws, not of men," and when we depart from that central tenet of this Republic, we are diminished as a people and weaker as a nation.

Mr. Chair, you get what you tolerate, and we have tolerated this recklessness for way too long. Sanctuary cities must be stopped. This legislation would prohibit Federal dollars from funding public services for illegal aliens in sanctuary cities.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to do the right thing, uphold the rule of law, and protect the American people. I urge them to vote for H.R. 5717.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5717. This bill is a deeply absurd and completely transparent attempt to fearmonger and continue stoking hatred of immigrants in our communities.

Let me be loud and clear: Immigrants make our communities stronger and more vibrant every single day, and Americans can see through these tactics.

Instead of recognizing the beauty of our diverse communities and working to serve them, Republicans are putting forth a bill that would actually strip billions in Federal funding from their own communities and even from entire States, including my home State of New York.

This bill is so broadly written that it could endanger Federal funding for school lunches, public schools, hospitals, public transportation, roads and bridges, police equipment, emergency response, and much more.

These are the institutions that keep us safe, healthy, and able to thrive, but Republicans are throwing it all away for what? For hate, for fear-mongering, and for their own power. Our job in Congress is to serve our communities, not destroy them just to score cheap political points that are completely unfounded in reality.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would restore desperately needed title I funding for our public schools. I am a lifelong educator. I was a teacher, counselor, and middle school principal before coming to Congress.

I have watched as Republicans have tried to come for public schools. In the FY25 budget, they proposed to cut title I funding by 25 percent. In fact, Project 2025 wants to cut title I funding for schools completely. Think about what that would mean for our kids. That means 180,000 teachers gone.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1715

Mr. BOWMAN. Funding that improves academic achievement, provides high-quality learning opportunities, enables extracurricular activities and co-curricular activities and supplemental services are all decimated.

Schools are the backbone of our communities and the lifeblood of our democracy.

Increasing title I means more quality educators, more school-based programs to nurture students, smaller class sizes, and better student outcomes.

So my amendment would do just that. That is because it is far past time that we prioritize our kids, and our communities deserve a bill that actually meet their needs, not one that completely abandons them.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

I include in the RECORD the text of this amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5717 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

#### SEC. 4. APPROPRIATION.

In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Secretary of Education for fiscal year 2025, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$4,716,578,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, for carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as "ESEA"): *Provided*, That \$2,358,289,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA: *Provided further*, That \$2,358,289,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, as we get closer to the end of our fiscal year with no resolution in sight, we are wasting our time with these absurd bills.

I know that Members of this Chamber have very mixed feelings about appropriations bills and the earmarks that go along with them, but only in this backwards Congress would Members think that stripping their constituents of Federal funding is good policy.

This legislation, which offers no solutions and would serve only to punish our communities, is opposed by law enforcement, organized labor, and civil and immigrant rights organizations.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Last week, the House Judiciary Committee received chilling testimony from Sheriff Mike Boudreaux of the rural Central Valley county of Tulare, California. What he told us should be an earsplitting alarm for every town and every city in America.

In the sanctuary State of California, the criminal cartels have sunk deep roots throughout the State. In his county alone, a single assassin for the Sinaloa cartel admitted to over 25 murders. The sheriff said:

That he was responsible for a certain area of California and there were many other assassins assigned by cartels in California, throughout California, that were responsible for those areas.

Then he spoke to California's sanctuary State law. He told of a reign of terror committed by an illegal migrant over a 24-hour period in his county: a murder in Visalia, attempted murders an Exeter and Tulare, as well as shootings in Pixley, Sultana, and Visalia and an armed robbery in Exeter.

Here is the fine point of the matter: 2 days before this nightmare unfolded, this monster had been arrested, and ICE had requested a detainer so that they could deport him.

As Sheriff Boudreaux testified again:

Due to California's sanctuary State law, the Sheriff's Office was legally prohibited from recognizing or honoring the detainer of this would-be murderer and we were further prohibited from notifying ICE of his release from jail.

This is the dystopian world the Democrats have created in California with their sanctuary law which was supported at the time by then-State Attorney General KAMALA HARRIS.

As Sheriff Boudreaux told us:

Much of what I speak of in regard to California and the violence, as well as the human trafficking, it is mirrored in other States all throughout the United States. The cartel wants to control these migrant towns and truly lead the same way that they are in other countries, specifically in Mexico.

He estimated that well over 50 percent of the crimes that he is dealing with in his county are now being committed by illegal immigrants, but since he can't report or confirm these numbers, the official number is zero.

I might add that the NYPD estimates that 75 percent of the crimes that they are now dealing with in Manhattan are committed by illegal migrants.

If it has not come to your neighborhood yet, Mr. Chairman, it soon will if we continue down the path that we are on.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have precious little time to awaken and stop this insanity before it engulfs their towns, neighborhoods, and communities if it hasn't already. In the meantime, measures like this will assure that policies like this never again are allowed to threaten our families.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5717

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act".

#### SEC. 2. SANCTUARY JURISDICTION DEFINED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), for purposes of this Act, the term "sanctuary jurisdiction" means any State or political subdivision of a State that has in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from—

(1) sending, receiving, maintaining, or exchanging with any Federal, State, or local government entity information regarding the citizenship or immigration status (lawful or unlawful) of any individual; or

(2) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A State or political subdivision of a State shall not be deemed a sanctuary jurisdiction based solely on its having a policy whereby its officials will not share information regarding, or comply with a request made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer regarding, an individual who comes forward as a victim or a witness to a criminal offense.

#### SEC. 3. SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS INELIGIBLE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL FUNDS.

Beginning in the fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, a sanctuary jurisdiction is ineligible to receive any Federal funds that the sanctuary jurisdiction intends to use for the benefit (including the provision of food, shelter, healthcare services, legal services, and transportation) of aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status under the immigration laws (as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 118-685.

Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by

the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 118-685.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, beginning on line 3, strike "Beginning" and all that follows through "Act" on line 4, and insert the following: "Beginning on the earlier of the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act or the first day of the fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, there are nearly 300 sanctuary jurisdictions in the United States. That is 300 places in our Nation that refuse to cooperate with Federal law enforcement to detain and remove illegal aliens. That is why this underlying bill is so important.

There is not a single so-called sanctuary jurisdiction locality that intentionally refuses to uphold the law who should be receiving Federal funds. Every city, county, or State that has laws, regulations, resolutions, or policies protecting illegal alien criminals from ICE should not receive a penny of Federal funding for the benefits of those illegal aliens.

Unfortunately, these jurisdictions received over \$300 million from the Department of Justice in 2021 alone.

My concern with this legislation, and it is a fairly minor one, is the timeline. Right now, the bill says that there will be a complete funding prohibition on food, shelter, healthcare, and other services for illegal aliens in sanctuary jurisdictions, but the funding ineligibility kicks in at the beginning of the fiscal year after the date of an enactment.

Practically, that could raise a circumstance in which the funding prohibition described in this bill wouldn't kick in until nearly a year after this bill becomes law.

In my view, that is too long. It is too long of a timeframe for these sanctuary cities, these jurisdictions, to get away with violating our laws and taking tax dollars from hardworking Americans.

This amendment amends section 3 of the text to ensure that the funding ineligibility for these jurisdictions become effective no later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act and potentially even sooner.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes a bad bill even worse. The underlying legislation is already dangerous and overly broad. It would prevent so-called sanctuary jurisdictions, in some cases entire States, from receiving any Federal funds that might benefit undocumented immigrants, resulting in drastic cuts to education, transportation, law enforcement, and healthcare.

To make matters worse, this amendment would force this bill into effect within 60 days of passage. So even if States and localities wanted to change their policies to comply with this bill, they likely would not be able to do so in time.

Many State legislatures are only in session for parts of the year. The legislature for my State of New York, for example, is only in session 6 months out of the year and does not convene again until January 2025.

There has been no consultation with the relevant agencies to determine if this short timeline is feasible, not only to determine every sanctuary jurisdiction, but also what funds and programs are impacted.

This amendment makes this dangerous bill even more absurd.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, these jurisdictions are aiding and abetting criminals. They are ignoring and violating Federal law. They created this problem, so if they have to call a special session to fix the problem they created, that is on them. It shouldn't be the taxpayers of Tennessee who have to fund it.

I have got veterans in my community that aren't getting services because of illegal immigrants. There are only so many dollars to go around. Tennessee spends roughly \$850 million a year annually for illegal immigrants. That is textbooks, that is computers for our kids, that is psychological evaluations and treatment for our veterans. If I have to choose between a citizen and an illegal who is violating our laws, I choose an American every single time.

Mr. Chairman, if Soros-funded sanctuary jurisdictions want to violate the law and turn their backs on America, on our citizens, and on law enforcement personnel, they should not be financially rewarded for doing so. There is no good argument my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can make that involves asking my constituents, hardworking Americans in middle Tennessee, to subsidize the lives of lawbreakers as well as the decisions of sanctuary jurisdictions who want to protect those lawbreakers.

It is time to defund and to deport. This is our country. We get to decide who comes in, and we get to decide who has to leave.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, again, this bill would take funds away not from illegal immigrants only; it would take funds away from everybody in many States and many cities. It would take virtually all funds for police; virtually all funds for highways, bridges, and roads; and virtually all funds for health and hospitals.

Most of the people who would suffer under this bill are American citizens.

The Republicans say: So what? They have made the choice to be a sanctuary space.

American citizens have this choice. They have the right to make decisions. That is what self-government is all about, and this bill comes along and says, let's take away the right of all of the people of New York, of California, of Utah, of North Dakota, and of Illinois to make decisions about their government. They are not really Americans. Let's take those rights away.

It is pernicious, and this amendment would say: Don't even give them the time to do it, and don't even give the Federal agencies the time to adjust their policies to do it.

This makes no sense.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the crazy conjecture of the consequences is clearly confounding.

Let's be honest. We are talking about the food, the shelter, and the healthcare that is going directly to illegal immigrants, nothing to American citizens. Keep in mind, it is the jurisdictions who created this problem. It is the jurisdictions that are violating our laws and making a mockery of our system and turning their backs on law enforcement.

Mr. Chair, you have girls and women all across the country who have been sexually assaulted by illegals. These are crimes that would never have happened if they were back in their home country if they had never been allowed in this country, if they had not been given sanctuary, had they not been released.

So when the gentleman talks about consequences, why doesn't he ask those women and those children?

Why doesn't the gentleman ask those families?

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into a debate over the Biden administration's immigration policy. That is a separate debate that is happening.

The fact of the matter is that this bill would take virtually all Federal funds away from many States and many cities in this country.

A sanctuary jurisdiction is ineligible to receive any Federal funds that the sanctuary jurisdiction intends to use for the benefit, including the provision of food, shelter, healthcare services, legal services, and transportation of aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status.

Aliens present in the United States without lawful status use our roads and highways, so no road and highway money for all the people who are born who are here. Aliens who are here go to schools, so no funding for education. Aliens who are here go to hospitals when they are sick, so no funding for healthcare.

This makes no sense. This bill would take large amounts of money and virtually all Federal funds in fact away from many States in the Union.

Mr. OGLES says it would leave more money for Tennessee. I don't know whether that is true or not, but it would take virtually all Federal funds away from most States, and frankly as a Representative from New York which would lose all Federal funds, I wouldn't vote for a nickel for Tennessee in that case. That is because all Americans, whether in Tennessee or New York or Pennsylvania or Illinois, should be treated equally and not sacrificed on the altar of someone's opinion of immigration policy.

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

□ 1730

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 118-685.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

**SEC. 4. REPORT ON NONCOMPLIANCE.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that includes a list of States, and political subdivisions of States, that have failed to comply with requests described in section 2(a)(2).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, what this does is asks Homeland Security to produce a report. So-called sanctuary jurisdictions choose to undermine Federal law enforcement when it attempts to enforce our immigration laws. I am grateful we are considering the underlying bill to hold them accountable. I thank the chairman.

One policy that would make a city a sanctuary city is a prohibition or a restriction on government entities or officials from complying with lawful requests from the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

My modest amendment just asks that DHS provide an annual report to Congress detailing which jurisdictions have failed to honor such lawful requests. I believe having that information and having the report is important. Without it, it could be difficult to know which jurisdictions are complying with the law.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to provide an annual report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees listing all the jurisdictions that failed to comply with a detainer request or inform the Department about the release of an individual. It is important for us to take a step back and remember what this bill is about. This bill is intending to strip Federal funding from jurisdictions that have "sanctuary" policies.

I think a report like this would be quite illuminating for Members across the aisle because it would show Republicans just how many of their own constituents are being harmed with their own legislation.

Communities in Wisconsin, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia, North Carolina, just to name a few, would lose out on funding for central services, like public schools, infrastructure, and policing.

Yes, I think this report would help show exactly how damaging this legislation is, and, therefore, I do not oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for supporting my amendment.

As we look at the jurisdictions across the country that may be ignoring current Federal law, whether by ordinance, whether by order of the mayor, by statute, or just an unwritten rule, this report would illuminate and bring to light those jurisdictions that, quite frankly, are putting America at risk.

A border crisis is a disaster for the country. It has turned every State into a border State. It spurred drug trafficking, human trafficking, and other crime. There was just a bodega that was shut down that was trafficking illegals today.

It has caused resource crises for cities and towns across the country who have found that they don't have the resources to deal with the influx, the mass influx, of people the Biden-Harris administration has released upon them.

Again, this information is critical as we move forward, as we look for solutions and put an end to this crisis that is plaguing our country.

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

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing, again, it is a simple report. It is valuable information. It is time that all cities, all communities enforce the Federal law. It is time to deport the illegals who are draining our system, taking money away from American citizens.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MORAN). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLOUD) having assumed the chair, Mr. MORAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5717) to provide that sanctuary jurisdictions that provide benefits to aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status under the immigration laws are ineligible for Federal funds intended to benefit such aliens, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1455, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOWMAN. 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. BOWMAN of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5717 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOWMAN. 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.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### ENHANCED PRESIDENTIAL SECURITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9106) to direct the Director of the United States Secret Service to apply the same standards for determining the number of agents required to protect Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

#### H.R. 9106

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Enhanced Presidential Security Act of 2024".

#### SEC. 2. UNIFORM STANDARDS FOR SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION OF PRESIDENTS, VICE PRESIDENTS, AND MAJOR PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.

The Director of the United States Secret Service shall apply the same standards for determining the number of agents required to protect Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates.

#### SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Secret Service shall conduct a comprehensive review of the provision of protection by the Secret Service for Presidents, Vice Presidents, former Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that includes the findings from such review, along with any recommendations for improving the provision of protection.

#### SEC. 4. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term "major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates" has the meaning given such term in section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, and includes any other Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate for whom the President has otherwise authorized the Secret Service to protect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the

gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JORDAN. 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. 9106.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), my friend, who is the sponsor of this critical legislation.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

In America, elections are determined at the ballot box, not by an assassin's bullet.

In recent months, we have seen two such attempts on the life of former President Donald Trump: first in Pennsylvania, and most recently in Florida.

That these incidents were allowed to occur is a stain on our country. We have endured through assassinations of political leaders, including Presidents. It is destructive to our country. It is destructive to our democracy, our constitutional Republic, and it undermines the confidence that Americans have in their government and in the electoral process.

But for a millimeter's difference, Donald Trump would be dead. But for a millimeter's difference, an assassin would have upended our election. Regardless of how every American feels, regardless of how every American intends to vote, it is the right of the American people to determine the outcome of this election.

The idea that our election could be decided by an assassin's bullet should shake the conscience of our Nation, and it requires swift action by the Federal Government. It requires Congress to ensure that the Secret Service provides the same level of protection as it does to the President of the United States to the leading candidates for President. In this case, they are former President Trump and Vice President HARRIS.

Either one of them is going to be President come January 20, 2025, and the American people should get to make that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) for assisting in immediately moving to introduce this legislation in the aftermath of the first assassination attempt on Donald Trump.

It is shocking that it took a second assassination attempt for Donald Trump to get the same level of protective detail from the Secret Service as the President of the United States. It shouldn't have come to that, which is all the more reason why this bill is necessary. It will ensure that this never happens again and that the Secret Service conduct an immediate review to determine what resources are