

The amendment would sanction an additional 170 or so alternate members of the CCP Central Committee. It is the policy equivalent of taking out a chain saw when the job requires a scalpel. Chaotically applying sweeping sanctions is not thoughtful. It is not smart.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, nothing? It gives the President of the United States, whether Republican or Democrat, the ability to defend our country, to create accountability when a bad actor engages in undermining our national interests.

My colleagues say we need better communication, and when we were communicating to them that Americans were dying because of precursor chemicals, they did nothing. When we communicated that we needed them to stop because our kids were dying, they did nothing. This idea of communicating and appeasement did not work, and hundreds of thousands of Americans paid the price.

I will not sit idly by and allow China to bully our country. Now, if others want to do that, then that is up to them, but this bill is permissive. It gives the President of the United States another tool, another opportunity to hold China accountable.

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

Mr. AMO. Mr. Chair, once again, this shortsighted amendment makes a bad idea even worse.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I think it is shortsighted to allow Americans to die on our streets because the Chinese Communist Party is flooding our country with fentanyl.

I think it is shortsighted that we allow the Chinese Communist Party to influence our foreign policy.

I think it is shortsighted that we don't stand up for Taiwan and let them take full control over their own destiny.

It is time that America stands up for its allies: Israel, Taiwan, and all of those beacons of democracy around the world.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-705.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, after line 13, insert the following:

(B) ceased all forms of oppression of the Tibetan people, including those significant human rights abuses detailed in the Tibet section of the Department of State's 2023 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices;

Page 13, line 14, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 13, line 23, strike "(C)" and insert "(D)".

Page 14, line 4, strike "(D)" and insert "(E)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1486, 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, the underlying bill rightfully includes a robust set of preconditions prior to lifting any sanctions on members of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

However, when it comes to those who have been sanctioned for their role in the political oppression of minority groups in the PRC, the bar of accountability ought to be set even higher. The ones suffering in Communist China aren't just the people of East Turkestan.

Over the years, the United States has demonstrated its solidarity with the people of Tibet and with the plight of the Tibetan people. Seven decades after the CCP began its illegal occupation of the country of Tibet, the Chinese Communist Party continues its policy of wholesale persecution of the Tibetan people.

This amendment simply states that the sanctioned members of the PRC's Central Committee must also cease any and all oppression of the Tibetan people. The amendment references the State Department's 2023 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, a report which details the numerous different ways the PRC authorities are oppressing the Tibetan people.

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

□ 1315

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, just to be clear, the persecution is rather stark: enforced disappearance, torture or cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment or punishment; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions; arbitrary arrests or detentions; serious problem with the independence of the judiciary, particularly regarding political prisoners; transnational repression against individuals located in other countries; arbitrary or unlawful interference with privacy; punishment of family members for alleged offenses by a relative; serious restrictions on freedom of expression and media freedom, including censorship; serious restrictions on internet freedom; and substantial interference with the freedom of peaceful assembly.

This is the Chinese Government. This is whom some on the other side of the aisle seek to appease. It is important that we leverage every tool to stand

firm as the dominant superpower in the world and that we continue to be the light of freedom and hope for our tired world.

It is time we take a stand. It is time that we say no to China. It is time that we pass my amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OGLES) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATURNER, 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. 3334) to provide for the imposition of sanctions on members of the National Communist Party Congress of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS ACT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1486, I call up the bill (H.R. 8205) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that Byrne grant funds may be used for public safety report systems, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATURNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1486, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-51 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8205

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 "Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act".

SEC. 2. FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH POSTING BAIL.

Section 1033(f)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the comma the following: "(including the posting of monetary bail, criminal bail bonds, and Federal immigration bail bonds)".

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and the gentleman from

New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 8205.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today in support of my bill, H.R. 8205, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act.

This bill defines the posting of cash bail by a corporate, nonprofit, or for-profit entity as engaged in the business of insurance, subjecting them to Federal insurance laws and our criminal fraud statutes.

My district, unfortunately, knows the painful consequences of some of the leftwing bail policies after a repeat offender drove his car through the Waukesha Christmas parade nearly 3 years ago. The Waukesha community continues to heal from this violence that was unleashed that day, but our community is resilient.

While we must take time to remember those whom we lost, we should also turn an eye toward preventing a similar attack from ever happening again. That starts through regulating the use of charitable bail funds, which have been abused time and again to release violent criminals back onto our streets with no consequences.

Charitable bail funds generally flew under the radar until 2020 when the George Floyd riots caused revenues to balloon in many of these funds. The solicitations were done, for the most part, from celebrities and politicians.

What used to be small, community-based organizations that helped post bail for nonviolent misdemeanors has now grown into a multimillion-dollar industry.

For example, the Minnesota Freedom Fund saw revenues increase by 18,000 percent between 2019 and 2020, no doubt benefiting from then-Senator Kamala Harris' tweet encouraging her supporters to help fundraise for the group. A snap of that is just to my right.

Perhaps most alarming, what was intended to help bail out low-level, non-violent protesters has instead been used to release violent felony offenders back into the streets with little to no oversight.

In 2021, for example, the Minnesota Freedom Fund released a domestic abuser back onto the street. Two weeks later, that man, George Howard, was charged with second-degree murder for a road rage incident.

Michael DeWitt of Louisville, Kentucky, was bailed out by The Bail

Project in February 2021 after being arrested on multiple charges. Two months later, he was arrested again for murder.

Shawn Michael Tillman, 3 weeks after having his bail paid by the Minnesota Freedom Fund, murdered a man at a light rail station in St. Paul and is now serving a life sentence for that crime.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on.

According to an investigation conducted in Hennepin County, Minnesota, the Minnesota Freedom Fund has bailed out at least 65 defendants who were awaiting trial on felony charges involving violence, physical threats, or sex crimes.

Moreover, because these funds are often anonymous, or at least unrelated to the defendant, there is no incentive to show up for their court dates. It makes no sense. Many of them don't.

According to CNN, which took a look at this issue, nearly 42 percent of the roughly 500 defendants bailed out by the Minnesota Freedom Fund later failed to appear at one or more court hearings between 2021 and 2022.

Commercial bail companies, by comparison, had a failure to appear rate of only 22 percent during that same period of time. This is why many States have begun regulating the use of charitable bail funds. Unfortunately, a State-by-State patchwork has now developed, and it will not solve this problem.

That is why we introduced the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act. The bill makes a small but important change to our criminal code to define bail bonds as an insurance product—it doesn't seem that significant; it is very simple—thereby subjecting them to the same Federal background check and regulatory requirements as those for for-profit bail agencies under the Federal Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1994.

This change would also bring charitable bail funds under State insurance regulation, giving States the ability to better scrutinize the use of the funds. There is no mandate on any of the State insurance regulations.

Let me be clear: This bill does not outlaw the use of charitable bail funds, nor does it regulate the posting of cash bail by family and friends of the accused. This bill merely says that if you are operating a not-for-profit with the purpose of posting cash bail, then you should be subjected to the same regulation and oversight requirements as those operating as for-profit entities.

This will bring needed oversight to organizations that for years have gone unregulated—\$42 million in the Minnesota Freedom Fund—while ensuring accountability of these funds by subjecting them to Federal insurance fraud statutes if they misappropriate funds or misrepresent the use of these funds in any financial reports. We now will have some oversight.

It is a critical step toward reversing steps by the Democrats, like Vice

President HARRIS, to remove bail safeguards and let violent criminals back into our communities to cause further damage.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio, Chairman JORDAN, for his leadership on this important issue, as well as Congressman TROY NEHLS, Congressman BRYAN STEIL, Congressman TOM TIFFANY, Congressman CLAY HIGGINS, and Congressman KEN CALVERT from California for their support of H.R. 8205.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "yes" vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8205 is yet another vehicle for Republican campaign messaging that does nothing to help the American people. It is simply another attempt by Republicans to baselessly claim that Democrats are soft on crime and to distract the American people from the indisputable fact that crime rates continue to drop across this country, as they have for each of the last several years.

This legislation, which would amend the Federal insurance fraud statute to define "the business of insurance" to include the posting of any kind of monetary bail, would do nothing to actually keep violent offenders off our streets.

Instead, it targets nonprofit bail funds that try to address the clear inequities that result when people without financial means are held pending trial simply because they can't afford to pay the bail amounts set by the courts.

Defendants who can afford to pay the bail amount set by the court are set free. In New York, we have such a person, a well-known person who was accused of many felonies was set free on bail pending trial, was convicted of 34 felonies, and is now free on bail pending sentencing. I refer, of course, to Donald Trump.

Nonprofit bail funds, the Minnesota Freedom Fund in particular, have become a favorite target of Republicans recently as they desperately try to prop up their failing Presidential candidate by attacking Vice President HARRIS and Governor Walz. Former President Trump has repeatedly and falsely claimed that Vice President HARRIS donated to the Minnesota Freedom Fund and that her donation secured the release of a man who went on to commit murder.

This is nothing more than another made-up story the Republican ticket has created, and it is just as false as the former President's claim that immigrants are eating the dogs and cats in Springfield, Ohio.

Minnesota Freedom Fund has confirmed that Vice President HARRIS has never donated to them and that her only relationship to the fund was a 2020 tweet encouraging people to chip in if they were able.

□ 1330

The fund, 2 years later, bailed out an offender who went on to commit murder. The majority's attempt to link this incident to Vice President HARRIS demonstrates that Republicans are willing to politicize even the most heinous crimes to serve their desperate needs.

We know from experience and from actual data that, when the political rhetoric is put aside, Democratic policies work to reduce crime. Homicides are down across the country. Violent crimes are down. Property crimes are down. We learned just last week that even drug overdoses are substantially down this year.

While my Republican colleagues love to criticize policies aimed at eliminating or reducing our justice system's reliance on cash bail, study after study, including a recent comprehensive study of 33 jurisdictions, shows that bail reform has not led to an increase in crime.

The majority's only answer to this mountain of evidence about the crime rate is to claim that the FBI's crime data is fraudulent or that it does not include critical jurisdictions, but the FBI's data covers jurisdictions encompassing more than 312 million Americans. It includes every jurisdiction in this Nation with more than 1 million people.

Moreover, data from other agencies and organizations show the same decrease in crime rates that are shown by the FBI's data.

Despite the bill's title, it has nothing to do with violent crime or offenders. It applies to entities that post any type of monetary bond, including non-criminal immigration bonds and bonds for nonviolent criminal offenses, which make up the vast majority of criminal bonds.

In fact, the provision of this bill that actually attempted to address violent crime was stripped from the bill in the Judiciary Committee. All that remains in the bill is the provision relating to insurance fraud, despite the title.

I expect that, during today's debate, Republicans will cite individual examples of people who committed violent offenses after being bailed out by non-profit bail funds. Each is tragic, and our hearts go out to the victims and their families.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle won't mention is the thousands more who received help from these funds, finished their cases, and moved on with their lives without incident. The majority won't mention the people who commit crimes after being released with the help of commercial bail agents. Republicans will not mention that it is a judge, not a bail fund, who decides whether to set cash bail in a given case and, if so, in what amount.

Bail funds simply allow indigent defendants to obtain a release that a court has already deemed to be appropriate.

We must remember that we cannot ask for or expect perfection from our

bail system. What we can do is to make sure that the solutions we propose for violent crimes are actually targeted to address the problem rather than to provide sound bites for social media.

There is no question that we must address the root causes of violent crime, invest in proven solutions, such as community violence intervention and drug treatment. We must also support law enforcement with funding and other resources rather than attacking the FBI, the ATF, and our other Federal partners relentlessly.

If and when the majority decides to get serious about combating violence in America, I will gladly join them in exploring serious solutions, but this legislation is no solution at all.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on H.R. 8205, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward nominees for the Office of the President.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8205, the so-called Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act.

While I have many concerns with this bill, my primary concern is that it was designed to target nonprofit bail funds, which help defendants who cannot afford bail themselves to obtain pretrial release, release that a court already determined to be appropriate.

Research has found that socioeconomic inequity often makes it harder for people of color to afford bail and that they are more likely to receive higher bail amounts than their White counterparts. I will clarify that the color orange has never been considered a person of color.

As a result, we find people of color in pretrial detention at disproportionately high rates, not out of being guilty, but, rather, due to poverty.

Nonprofit bail funds work to address these disparities and increase fairness in our criminal justice system.

Unfortunately, today's bill turns a blind eye to this and, instead, perpetrates the myth that bail reform has increased violent crime, which data consistently disproves. Understanding that, it should come as no surprise that the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act does nothing to address violent crime.

Rather, the bill applies criminal penalties for misconduct that is already covered by Federal wire fraud and money laundering statutes, applies to any entity that posts bond, including noncriminal immigration bonds, and affirms a bail system that we know deepens inequity and cycles poverty.

This bill is a distraction from the fact that, thanks largely to Demo-

cratic policies, violent crimes and homicides are down across our country. It is also a distraction from real bipartisan work that we could be doing to bring communities relief and perpetrators of violent crimes to justice.

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 direct the Department of Justice to provide funding to State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to hire, train, and retain detectives, investigators, and victim services personnel to investigate unsolved violent crimes.

In recent years, the percentage of violent crime and homicide cases solved by law enforcement agencies has declined significantly across the country. To give a clearer picture of what that means, today, nearly half of murders in the United States go unsolved, depriving victims of healing and grieving families of justice.

If Republicans truly want to address violent crime, this amendment would offer a solution by improving clearance rates for violent crimes, bringing perpetrators to justice, radically improving community safety, and enhancing supportive services for victims.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, Republicans have brought us to the brink of a government shutdown, threatening to cut off essential services for millions of Americans.

Instead of addressing the real needs of the American people, Republicans are poised to advance legislation that does little more than advance false Trump campaign rhetoric.

Although the majority claims that the bill is necessary to provide oversight of bail funds, the bill provides no oversight. It simply applies criminal penalties of up to 10 years, or 15 years in some cases, for misconduct that is already covered by Federal wire fraud and money laundering statutes.

The majority does not even attempt to explain how this bill will live up to its title of "Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets," as the bill has nothing to do with addressing violent crimes.

Like the majority's failed hearings in blue cities across the country, this bill

is another baseless attempt by Republicans to engage in fear-mongering and to label Democrats as soft on crime while ignoring their own documented red State murder problem, the mountain of data showing that crime has been steadily declining throughout the U.S. under the Biden-Harris administration, and that bail reform policies have not contributed to increases in crime that occurred during the pandemic.

In bringing up this legislation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to distract the American people from the fact that their own actions have repeatedly made every American, from Presidential candidates to school children, more at risk at every turn by failing to support law enforcement funding and commonsense gun safety measures.

I urge Members to oppose this flawed legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle mentioned that many of these bail funds operate locally and, therefore, do not affect interstate commerce. I think it is important to describe the current landscape of the charitable bail funds, and we are not trying to eliminate them.

According to the National Bail Fund Network, there are over 90 charitable bail funds operating across the country. Perhaps the largest fund by revenue, The Bail Project, operates in at least 19 States. That is according to a 2023 annual report.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, The Bail Project saw revenues triple after the George Floyd riots to a whopping \$42 million in 2020. That is \$42 million. There is zero oversight.

Thanks to solicitations from Vice President HARRIS and thanks to those generous donations, The Bail Project ended calendar year 2023 with an astonishing \$71 million. I think an important part that has flown under the radar is that these donations are also tax deductible.

That is right. A lot of Americans are surprised by that. The bail for a violent felony offender could be paid and written off on a tax return, the same as if it were a donation to any charitable cause.

That is an incredibly important point in the context of regulating the payment of cash bail. The donors to these funds have no skin in the game, which makes it incredibly difficult to secure a defendant's appearance in court. They likely care more about their tax deduction than about who actually receives the bail money.

In other words, there is no disincentive to commit a new crime and have a bond forfeited because the source of funds are not tied to the defendant.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8205, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act.

H.R. 8205 is a poorly written Republican messaging bill that seeks to undermine and discredit our Nation's nonprofit support systems. It would do nothing to "keep violent offenders off our streets." Any misconduct by nonprofit bail funds is already a crime under federal wire fraud and money laundering statutes, and both statutes convey harsher penalties than insurance fraud. These nonprofits support low-income people who are in pre-trial detention to be able to post bail. In America, you are innocent until proven guilty. Defendants for non-violent crimes do not deserve to lose their jobs or be forced into poverty simply because they cannot afford to post bail.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to stand ready to work toward real, impactful solutions to address violent crime. Instead debating this bill, Congress should be investing in community violence intervention, fully funding our Federal law enforcement, preventing the flow of weapons of war into our communities, and supporting our local law enforcement agencies.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1486, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CÁRDENAS. 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. Cárdenas of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8205 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. CÁRDENAS is as follows:

Mr. Cárdenas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8205 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all that follows after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2024" or "VICTIM Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Research indicates that law enforcement agencies can increase clearance rates by improving—

- (A) investigative processes;
- (B) detective capacities; and
- (C) organizational oversight and supervision of investigations.

(2) When a law enforcement agency expends additional investigative effort, the law enforcement agency improves its success in gaining cooperation of key witnesses and increases the amount of forensic evidence collected.

(3) Effective investigation of shootings can prevent subsequent related violence by—

- (A) deterring retaliation; and
- (B) providing interventions to individuals who may continue to commit crimes or become victims of retaliatory violence.

(4) Law enforcement agencies that demonstrate higher rates of clearance for violent crimes committed against a person—

(A) have more structured oversight and formal interactions between investigative units and agency leadership;

(B) are more likely to have investigative units that have collaborative relationships and robust information sharing with other units of the law enforcement agency;

(C) have investigative units that have specific goals and performance metrics for both the unit and for investigators within the unit;

(D) have investigators who more frequently respond to the initial crime scene shortly after crimes have been reported to collect evidence and interview witnesses;

(E) have investigators who either have specialized experience before joining investigative units or are trained in investigations once they join those units;

(F) often have standard operating procedures for investigations that establish policies and evidence-based best practices for conducting and completing homicide investigations; and

(G) have better relationships with the communities they serve, even if no specific community-oriented campaign or initiative exists between investigative units and community groups.

(5) Criminal justice agencies should collaborate with each other and share best practices for solving violent crimes committed against a person.

(6) A comprehensive community engagement strategy concerning gun violence is essential to improving clearance rates for violent crimes committed against a person.

SEC. 3. GRANT PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLEARANCE BY ARREST.—The term "clearance by arrest", with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

(A) has—

(i) arrested not less than 1 person for the offense;

(ii) charged the person described in subparagraph (A) with the commission of the offense; and

(iii) referred the person described in subparagraph (A) for prosecution for the offense; or

(B) has cited an individual under the age of 18 to appear in juvenile court or before another juvenile authority with respect to the offense, regardless of whether a physical arrest occurred.

(2) CLEARANCE BY EXCEPTION.—The term "clearance by exception", with respect to an offense reported to a law enforcement agency, means the law enforcement agency—

(A) has identified not less than 1 person suspected of the offense; and

(B) with respect to the suspect described in subparagraph (A), has—

(i) gathered enough evidence to—

(I) support an arrest of the suspect;

(II) make a charge against the suspect; and

(III) refer the suspect for prosecution;

(ii) identified the exact location of the suspect so that the suspect could be taken into custody immediately; and

(iii) encountered a circumstance outside the control of the law enforcement agency that prohibits the agency from arresting the suspect, charging the suspect, or referring the suspect for prosecution, including—

(I) the death of the suspect;

(II) the refusal of the victim to cooperate with the prosecution after the suspect has been identified; or

(III) the denial of extradition because the suspect committed an offense in another jurisdiction and is being prosecuted for that offense.

(3) **CLEARANCE RATE.**—The term “clearance rate”, with respect to a law enforcement agency, means—

(A) the number of offenses cleared by the law enforcement agency, including through clearance by arrest and clearance by exception, divided by

(B) the total number of offenses reported to the law enforcement agency.

(4) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency or prosecuting office, or a group of Tribal law enforcement agencies or Tribal prosecuting offices.

(5) **GRANT RECIPIENT.**—The term “grant recipient” means a recipient of a grant under the Program.

(6) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “law enforcement agency” means a public agency charged with policing functions, including any component bureau of the agency (such as a governmental victim services program or village public safety officer program), including an agency composed of officers or persons referred to in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 2(10) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C. 2801(10)).

(7) **PROGRAM.**—The term “Program” means the grant program established under subsection (b)(1).

(b) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a grant program within the Office of Justice Programs under which the Attorney General awards grants to eligible entities to establish, implement, and administer violent incident clearance and technological investigative methods.

(2) **APPLICATIONS.**—An eligible entity seeking a grant under the Program shall submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by—

(A) such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require; and

(B) a description of each eligible project under paragraph (4) that the grant will fund.

(3) **SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.**—The Attorney General, in selecting a recipient of a grant under the Program, shall consider the specific plan and activities proposed by the applicant to improve clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings.

(4) **ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.**—A grant recipient shall use the grant for activities with the specific objective of improving clearance rates for homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including—

(A) ensuring the retention of detectives who are assigned to investigate homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings as of the date of receipt of the grant;

(B) hiring and training additional detectives who will be dedicated to investigating homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings;

(C) developing policies, procedures, and training to improve the ability of detectives to effectively investigate and solve homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and non-fatal shootings, including implementing best practices relating to—

(i) improving internal agency cooperation, organizational oversight and accountability, and supervision of investigations;

(ii) developing specific goals and performance metrics for both investigators and investigative units;

(iii) establishing or improving relationships with the communities the agency serves; and

(iv) collaboration with and among other law enforcement agencies and criminal justice organizations;

(D) training personnel to address the needs of victims and family members of victims of homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, or non-fatal shootings or collaborating with trained victim advocates and specialists to better meet victims’ needs;

(E) acquiring, upgrading, or replacing investigative, evidence processing, or forensic testing technology or equipment;

(F) development and implementation of policies that safeguard civil rights and civil liberties during the collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(G) hiring or training personnel for collection, processing, and forensic testing of evidence;

(H) hiring and training of personnel to analyze violent crime and the temporal and geographic trends among homicides, rapes, sexual assaults, kidnappings, and nonfatal shootings;

(I) retaining experts to conduct a detailed analysis of homicides and shootings using Gun Violence Problem Analysis (commonly known as “GVPA”) or a similar research methodology;

(J) ensuring victims have appropriate access to emergency food, housing, clothing, travel, and transportation;

(K) developing competitive and evidence-based programs to improve homicide and non-fatal shooting clearance rates;

(L) developing best practices for improving access to and acceptance of victim services, including victim services that promote medical and psychological wellness, ongoing counseling, legal advice, and financial compensation;

(M) training investigators and detectives in trauma-informed interview techniques;

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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

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.

STUCK ON HOLD ACT

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6656) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Commissioner of Social Security to implement automated systems with callback functionality for each customer service

telephone line of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration, respectively, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6656

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 “Stuck On Hold Act”.

SEC. 2. IMPROVEMENTS REGARDING WAIT TIMES FOR CALLERS TO CERTAIN SERVICE TELEPHONE LINES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **AUTOMATED SYSTEM.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall implement, for each covered line, an automated system that—

(1) informs a caller to a covered line about the anticipated wait time, if any; and

(2) automatically offers a callback to any such caller with an anticipated wait time of more than 10 minutes.

(b) **GUIDANCE REGARDING CALLER WAIT TIMES.**—The Secretary shall issue such guidance the Secretary determines necessary to reduce the average wait time of a caller to a covered line to not more than 10 minutes.

(c) **COVERED LINE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered line” means a customer service telephone line of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such term does not include—

(1) the toll-free hotline for veterans provided by the Secretary under section 1720F(h) of title 38, United States Code; or

(2) a phone line for the emergency department of a health care facility of the Department.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 6656, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6656, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend and colleague.

The Stuck on Hold Act would require the VA to implement an automated callback system. This bill would inform veterans of the expected wait time for their call to be answered. This change would make life easier for veterans while ensuring the VA responds to them in a timely manner.

During my time in Congress, I have long heard horror stories from veterans about waiting on hold for over an hour to talk to someone at the VA. That is unacceptable in today’s digital age, and the VA needs to do better.

Representative CALVERT’s bill is in lockstep with the House Republicans’