

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 471, FIX OUR FORESTS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 5, LAKEN RILEY ACT

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 53 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 53

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 471) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 5) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate

only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 53, providing for consideration of two measures, the first of which is H.R. 471, the Fix Our Forests Act, to be considered under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their respective designees, provides for one motion to recommit, and makes two amendments in order.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of S. 5, the Laken Riley Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate a rule on two timely pieces of legislation, beginning with H.R. 471, the bipartisan Fix Our Forests Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the U.S. Forest Service, more than 1 billion acres of forest land are at risk of wildfire. Further, nearly one-fifth of all land overseen by the Federal Government is at high or very high risk of wildfire.

This didn't happen overnight. It is the result of the buildup of bureaucratic red tape, burdensome regulations, and frivolous legislation that have prevented forest management activities like thinning, prescribed burning, and mechanical treatment.

What we are left with are dangerous wildfires occurring at record levels and intensities. It doesn't have to be this way, though, Mr. Speaker.

The Fix Our Forests Act takes the proper steps toward restoring forest health, increasing resiliency to catastrophic wildfires, and protecting communities. It does so by reforming NEPA to expedite environmental reviews, reducing frivolous lawsuits, and increasing the pace and scale of forest restoration projects.

Additionally, H.R. 471 promotes Federal, State, Tribal, and local collaboration through the creation of a new fire-shed center. It will provide agencies

with new technologies and other critical tools which allow a quicker response to wildfires and the ability to implement the most vital forest management projects immediately.

As we are unfortunately seeing more frequently, active forest management techniques and a focus on forest health are needed now more than ever. This bipartisan product is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for the consideration of S. 5, the Laken Riley Act, another bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Laken Riley was murdered in my home State of Georgia in February of 2024 by a Venezuelan man who was illegally present in the United States. He previously crossed our southern border in September of 2022, where he was paroled and released for further processing.

Between arriving here and committing his heinous act, the individual was arrested in New York and then again in Georgia for stealing from a Walmart. At the time of Laken Riley's murder, there was a bench warrant out for his arrest for failing to show up in court.

Mr. Speaker, S. 5, the Laken Riley Act, as amended, requires the Department of Homeland Security to issue a detainer for any individual inadmissible to the United States who is charged with, is arrested for, convicted of, admits to having committed, or admits to committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, shoplifting, assault of a law enforcement officer, or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person.

Additionally, the bill grants the attorney general of a State the power to hold future administrations accountable by providing standing to bring civil action against Federal officials for the failure to enforce immigration statutes, including mandatory detention, individual parole authority, and visa sanctions.

I commend my colleague from Georgia, MIKE COLLINS, for his work on this legislation. I send my condolences to Laken Riley's family.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to passing this rule. I look forward to passing this bill in the House for the third time and sending it to President Trump's desk.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are bringing up a rule for two bills that will be debated on the floor this week. I look forward to that debate.

I feel compelled to focus on this majority's screwed-up priorities which now include handing a get-out-of-free card to KKK members, Proud Boys, and other criminals who violently beat cops within an inch of their lives on January 6, 2021.

I thought this election was about lowering costs. What the hell happened? I thought it was about securing the border. I thought it was about making sure that our communities are safe, not whatever the hell these pardons are. These pardons are sick. They are offensive. They are un-American.

I don't ever want to hear about law and order from the Republican side again, Mr. Speaker, when Republicans are letting criminals back on the streets, criminals who beat cops and tried to overthrow our government.

There were 1,500 criminals, including over 600, who were charged with violently assaulting police officers. I am here to talk about that on the floor because I think it is disgusting. I think it is a disgrace.

The people Trump let out broke through windows, beat up cops, and desecrated this beautiful symbol of our country, a building, by the way, that terrorists tried to destroy on September 11, 2001. They couldn't get here because they were stopped by the courageous people onboard flight 93.

The crowd that Donald Trump sent here breached the building, and they attacked it in a way that had never been done. It was a horrible, awful thing that happened that day.

I was in this Chamber. I was in this room. I was in your chair, Mr. Speaker. I took over for Speaker PELOSI when she was evacuated. I was one of the last people off the floor. I exited through those doors.

I saw the faces of the rioters smashing windows to try to get at us. They wanted to kill people, kill police, kill us. I saw the walls they covered with feces. I saw them use flagpoles to beat police officers.

I saw the fear in the eyes of my Republican colleagues as they cowered that day. I saw the bravery of law enforcement that protected us.

Mr. Speaker, how the hell do the Republicans walk into this place every day? How does the majority look the police officers in the eye? How does the other side do it, knowing the people who tried to kill them will walk free, thanks to Donald Trump?

These were brave officers who tried to hold the line against a violent mob. They were outnumbered, and they were overwhelmed because Donald Trump refused to lift a finger to help. The people he sent were not peaceful protestors. They were criminals, violent, angry, vicious people. They beat cops into the ground, leaving them bruised and battered.

Donald Trump let them out of jail, and now he calls them heroes. He wants to invite them to the White House. We even had colleagues who went to a D.C. jail to celebrate their release and complained they weren't being let out fast enough.

This is unbelievable. This is an insult to every police officer in this country. It is an insult to the families of the people who died because of what happened and an insult to the millions of

Americans who believe in law and order, democracy, and decency.

□ 1230

Trump is abandoning the blue. He could have chosen to let out only the nonviolent offenders, but he let out people who beat the cops. That tells you all that you need to know.

I think my Republican colleagues owe it to us during this debate, the first time we are debating on the floor since the pardons, to come down and explain themselves. They owe America an explanation because the people I am talking to think those pardons are shameful, disgusting, and wrong. Mr. Speaker, I will wait for an answer, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we are here to discuss H.R. 471 and S. 5.

I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule. The rule that we have adopted will take up important legislation ensuring our forests are no longer such that they are going to catch fire, as we are seeing happen in California, and, importantly, to deal with the Laken Riley Act.

This is the bill we passed off the House floor last year. It was rejected by the Democrat-led Senate. They refused to move it. We moved it last week here on the House floor and sent it over to this Senate, now a Republican Senate, after the voters spoke. The Senate amended it, made it, I believe, better, and sent it to the House, and now that amended bill is on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Let's remember what we are talking about. This bill is named after Laken Riley. My friend from Georgia just discussed the facts involving the unfortunate death of Laken Riley at the hands of someone here illegally, someone here who had committed crimes.

I had as my guest this weekend at the inauguration a woman named Alex is Nungaray, a wonderful woman from Houston, Texas, whose 13-year-old little girl was murdered by people released into our country last year by the Biden administration.

Fortunately, those policies are ending under President Trump, but here is the truth: Never again should any American, any Texan, any Georgian, have to deal with what was thrust upon them by the Biden administration in terms of the damage, despair, death, destruction, murders, and rapes that were perpetrated against the people we represent.

This legislation would take a giant step forward to ensure that we can stop any future administration that is not just refusing to enforce Federal law but is actually abusing Federal law to endanger our people, our citizens who we represent.

This legislation would simply say that we must detain some of the worst people who are here illegally and en-

sure that they are not released. We are talking about serious bodily injury. We are talking about things that result in death, assaulting police officers. That is all in this legislation.

In addition, in this legislation is an important provision that I was proud to introduce with my friend DAN BISHOP from North Carolina in the SUE Act to ensure that attorneys general can sue the Federal Government when the Federal Government is failing to do its job.

Imagine the ability of Texas, North Carolina, or Georgia, for my colleagues to be able to say: Do you know what? Enough.

The Federal Government does not get to ignore its fundamental duty under the Constitution to defend its citizens, and the attorneys general of States ought to be able to stop the Federal Government when it is endangering our people. This law would do that.

This law would honor the memory of Laken Riley. It would honor the memory of Jocelyn Nungaray. It would honor the memory of the countless Americans who have lost their loved ones and have been dealing with the scourge of illegal immigration, which is endangering our people. I proudly support it, and I proudly support this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it takes a lot of nerve to come down here and talk to us about law and order when the gentleman who just spoke was at the D.C. jail celebrating the release of people who attacked and beat cops here in this Capitol, who almost killed them. Some died as a result of their injuries.

I know my Republican friends don't want to defend these pardons because what the President did was indefensible. He couldn't release these people who attacked our police officers quick enough. He couldn't release them quick enough.

The Speaker of this House was asked about January 6, about January 6 defendants like Daniel Rodriguez, who pled guilty to viciously injuring a police officer with a weapon. The Speaker said: "It is not my place. It is the President's sole decision, and he made a decision, so I stand with him on it."

It is not your place? It is not your place? Mr. Speaker, it literally is your place. It is your place.

Mr. Speaker, you preside over this House. You hire the Sergeant at Arms. You oversee the captain of the Capitol Police force. If it isn't your place, then who the hell's place is it?

I have a radical idea. How about you stand with the officers who were beaten and bloodied protecting you rather than stand with a reality TV wannabe dictator?

If your response to the question about the pardons of people who attacked and injured the officers that you oversee and are responsible for is "it is not my place," my question to you is this: Who do you work for? Do

you think you work for President Trump?

I would suggest you do some soul searching, and while you are at it, maybe reread the United States Constitution because you don't work for Donald Trump. You are the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and it damn sure is your place to have an opinion on the people who beat the officers who protect you and this institution having no consequences for beating men and women who protect this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for his commonsense piece of legislation that we are discussing this afternoon.

This is a new day in America. The days of forestry mismanagement are coming to an end. For far too long, our national forests and the communities that surround them have been at the mercy of unelected Federal bureaucrats who have become beholden to misguided environmental policies.

My district in Colorado is home to 6 of the State's 11 national forests. We have witnessed the destructive force of poor forestry management firsthand. The Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 mandates that national forests be managed for multiple use. This includes outdoor recreation and timber management.

Washington, D.C., has turned our national forests into national parks by bringing timber management to a standstill and setting the stage for the terrible disasters like those we have seen in California. We can no longer afford to ignore the safety and well-being of our communities.

The Fix Our Forests Act lets the Forest Service do its job to restore forest health, increase wildfire resiliency, and protect communities like those in Colorado's Third District.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and on final passage.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will anybody on that side come down and defend these pardons, which are indefensible?

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order amendment No. 1 to provide a permanent pay fix for Federal wildland firefighters. We tried to get this made in order in the Rules Committee, but the Republicans said no to better benefits and a pay raise for the people who are fighting these fires.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amend-

ment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) to discuss this proposal.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with Mr. MCGOVERN's remarks condemning the unconscionable silence we hear across the aisle in the wake of these pardons of violent criminals, seditionist thugs who should never be pardoned or celebrated. Yet, that is exactly what is happening even here in the building that they desecrated.

Turning to the bill at hand, one thing I hope we can agree on, which is clearly missing from this bill, is a permanent pay raise for Federal wildland firefighters. These brave men and women put everything on the line. They deserve to be paid fair wages for the long hours, dedication, and sacrifice they are putting out.

The good news is that under that Democratic leadership, Congress approved a pay raise in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The bad news is the authority to continue paying Federal wildland firefighters the wages they deserve is about to run out because of partisan politics.

Thanks to Republicans, the entire Federal Government is operating under a continuing resolution, a short-term patch that will expire March 23.

Good luck hiring a Federal firefighter right now, being underpaid to start with and having a looming pay cut because of partisan politics just weeks away.

Fixing this should be an unequivocal bipartisan priority, and we have an opportunity to do it right now. That is why two of my Democratic colleagues filed amendments to address these issues. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee is refusing to allow a vote on the amendments from Representative NEGUSE and Representative LEE. That is a shame.

A permanent pay raise is not merely a matter of fairness. It is a recognition of the invaluable service these front-line heroes provide. It is an investment in their future, ensuring they can provide for their families and have peace of mind knowing their sacrifices are valued.

Instead of rushing this so-called Fix Our Forests Act to the floor to exploit a disaster in Los Angeles, we should be working together to address a real problem and doing right by our wildland firefighters.

In a few moments, Republicans will be moving the previous question to end debate on the rule. I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question because doing so, voting no, will allow Mr. NEGUSE's Tim's Act to

be brought forward instead of the Fix Our Forests Act, ensuring that Federal wildland firefighters are getting the pay and benefits they deserve.

That is the bill we should be considering instead of a bill that rolls back our environmental laws and does nothing to help Los Angeles.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am concerned about some of the pardons that were issued. I can't fathom what was going through President Biden's mind when he pardoned his family members and any of his political allies this past week. It is something that I think does merit much more discussion on how someone just gives family members and political allies a blanket pardon when they had not yet been charged for the crimes they had committed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill, the Fix Our Forests Act.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I express my sincere condolences to the families who have lost loved ones, homes, and history in the tragic fires in southern California. Our hearts break for them, and our prayers continue to be with them.

Today, we have an opportunity to help mitigate future forest fires and protect not only homes and communities but critical wildlife habitat.

Proper forest management can, in fact, help prevent forest fires. If we follow the science, as this legislation does, we can identify the top areas of concern and take action to address those fire sheds.

This bipartisan legislation will empower States and local, Tribal, and private partners to do critical wildfire prevention activities necessary to prevent the tragic fires we have just seen recently and in recent years. I also note that the legislation does not waive a single environmental law.

Mr. Speaker, I am a conservationist. Coming from the Great Lakes, the State of Michigan, I know the importance of clean air and clean water. What this bill does is streamline fragmented Federal programs and makes the existing tools more flexible and efficient.

By passing this legislation, we can help protect millions of acres from the threat of wildfires, save lives and livelihoods and history, and protect wildlife habitat for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for his leadership on this critical legislation, and I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

The gentleman from Georgia just changed topics so quickly back to Biden that I have whiplash. I think I need a neck brace to be able to follow his logic here.

Spare me your comparisons of Biden pardoning his family and Trump pardoning violent criminals who attacked police officers on January 6.

Do you know what? You can be against both of those actions, but they are not the same and shouldn't even be mentioned in the same conversation.

□ 1245

Let me tell you about the people whom you continue to want to defend and who have been pardoned.

Here are some of the convicted felons that Trump set free on Monday:

Steve Cappuccio, convicted of six felonies, including assaulting a police officer. He ripped off Metro Police Officer Daniel Hodges' gas mask. At one point during the assault he said: How do you like me now, mother f'er?

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

David Dempsey, sentenced to 20 years. He stomped on police officers' heads, struck an officer in the head with a metal crutch, and attacked police with pepper spray and broken pieces of furniture. He also attacked a fellow rioter who was trying to disarm him, and he has a demonstrated history of political violence.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Enrique Tarrío, sentenced to 22 years. He is a former national leader of the Proud Boys, a domestic terrorist far-right militia. He was found guilty of seditious conspiracy. He helped plan the January 6 attack and made sure it was violent.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Guy Reffitt, sentenced to 7 years and 3 months. He brought a gun, zip ties, body armor, and a helmet to the Capitol, presumably to try to take hostages in an attempt to keep Trump in office after he lost.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Daniel Joseph "DJ" Rodriguez, sentenced to over 12 years. He repeatedly tased Officer Mike Fanone, shocking him in the neck multiple times and causing him to lose consciousness and have a heart attack.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Patrick McCaughy III, sentenced to 90 months. He assaulted police, beat their faces and bodies with riot shields and batons that he stole from them.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Peter Francis Stager, sentenced to 4 years and 4 months. He pled guilty to assaulting an officer with a deadly weapon. He is on video declaring: "Every single one of those Capitol law enforcement officers, death is the remedy." Those were his words: That is the only remedy they get.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Julian Khater, sentenced to 6 years, attacked Officer Brian Sicknick with pepper spray. Officer Sicknick died the next day after suffering two strokes.

Edward "Jake" Lang was on trial for 11 charges, including swinging a baseball bat at officers. In addition to his January 6 charges, he began organizing a nationwide network of armed militias in all 50 States.

He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, the criminals pardoned were not tourists. They were not peaceful. They were violent criminals.

Here is just one example: Daniel Ball's case was dismissed today, and he was released from jail.

Why was he in jail?

He was being held in pretrial detention because of what a judge described as "some of the most violent and serious offenses of any of the charges being brought against participants in the January 6 events." That includes hurling an explosive device into the lower west terrace tunnel of the Capitol, the scene of some of the most egregious violence against police that day.

Some officers suffered from hearing loss for months.

Get this, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ball has already been arrested again on Federal gun charges, and he was already a two-time convicted felon for domestic violence battery by strangulation and resisting law enforcement with violence.

Yes, he was already arrested again. This is whom the President pardoned. This is why my Republican friends are silent. It is because this is indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a Politico article titled: "Trump freed a January 6 defendant charged with assaulting police. DOJ had him arrested again on a gun charge."

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

There was no objection.

[From the POLITICO, Jan. 22, 2025]

TRUMP FREED A JAN. 6 DEFENDANT CHARGED WITH ASSAULTING POLICE. DOJ HAD HIM ARRESTED AGAIN ON A GUN CHARGE

(By KYLE CHENEY)

A Jan. 6 defendant whose felony assault charges were dismissed a day earlier was arrested Wednesday on federal gun charges that have been pending for nearly two years in Florida.

Daniel Ball, one of the hundreds charged with violence on Jan. 6, 2021, aimed at police, was among the members of the mob whose charges were dismissed at the behest of President Donald Trump. Trump on Monday pardoned more than 1,000 people who stormed the Capitol that day and ordered the Justice Department to drop hundreds of pending cases.

Ball was being held in pretrial detention in Washington, D.C., because of what a magistrate judge described as "some of the most violent and serious offenses of any of the charges being brought against participants in the January 6 events."

Among them, Ball is charged with hurling an "explosive device" into the packed Lower West Terrace tunnel of the Capitol, the scene of some of the most egregious violence against police that day.

"The explosion allegedly disoriented officers and caused hearing loss—which for some of the officers lasted months," Magistrate Judge Robin Meriweather noted. "Defendant also allegedly threw a large piece of wood into the line of officers protecting the Capitol."

Ball's charges were dismissed by U.S. District Judge Rudolph Contreras on Tuesday after Trump's directive.

But Ball's charges for being a felon in possession of a firearm remained pending and unconnected to his Jan. 6 case. According to that indictment, Ball has previously been convicted of domestic violence battery by strangulation in June 2017, resisting law en-

forcement with violence and battery of a law enforcement officer in October 2021.

It's unclear if U.S. marshals executed the arrest warrant on Ball prior to his release on the Jan. 6 charges. However, it's the first docketed federal criminal case in Washington since Trump's inauguration.

Mr. MCGOVERN. All these people were pardoned, and not a word from the other side.

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have a whole number, the total number, but how many murderers had their sentences commuted by then-President Joe Biden?

Do you know? How many was it?

Let's see, Biden commuted the sentences for 2,500 drug offenders and clemency for 37 of the 40 people on death row, 1 of whom shot two FBI agents, if I am not mistaken.

So you are pretty quick to point the finger at the gentleman who was the 45th and now the 47th President of the United States. I would suggest to you that Donald Trump is the President of the United States today and sitting in the White House today because your policies are so bad because you put illegal immigrants and their rights above the rights of American citizens.

So, again, Biden commuted a lot of sentences for a lot of drug offenders and a lot of people who committed murder. So I don't think you should be pointing the finger at what the 47th President of the United States did when the 46th President of the United States is the one who let people who shot FBI agents out.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, the best we get from the gentleman is whataboutism. He can criticize President Biden, but he can't bring himself to criticize President Trump. He is afraid, and that is the problem.

All my Republican friends are in fear that if they question anything that this guy does that somehow they themselves will be punished.

However, he didn't even get his facts right on the Peltier issue. The former U.S. Attorney who prosecuted Mr. Peltier wrote in a letter to President Biden: "The prosecution and continued incarceration of Mr. Peltier was and is unjust."

He also said: "I believe that a grant of executive clemency would serve the best interest of justice and the best interest of our country."

Again, this is coming from the man who prosecuted him.

He also said that we were not able to prove that Mr. Peltier personally committed any of the offenses that happened on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

Contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with the Nation's seeing the criminals that Trump pardoned assault cops on live TV.

Please, I ask my friends across the aisle: Find me one prosecutor of one of the cop beaters whom Trump pardoned who regret their conviction.

Which one of Trump's pardoned criminals have already served nearly 50 years in prison?

By the way, Peltier is 80 years old, and he is dying. He was not pardoned, by the way. The gentleman is wrong on that. His sentence was commuted so he could die at home with an ankle bracelet on. This was done only after faith and human rights leaders like the Dalai Lama, Nelson Mandela, and Pope Francis begged for release for years.

So to say that this is remotely the same is a joke.

Why can't my Republican friends just say that what Trump did by pardoning vicious, violent criminals was wrong?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we should absolutely hold immigrants accountable when they commit a crime, especially when it is against a law enforcement officer. However, there are already existing laws for the detention and deportation of immigrants who commit violent crimes.

What we are talking about today is that we must hold convicted felons accountable for attacking our very own Capitol Police. In this very building, January 6 insurrectionists brutally attacked our Capitol Police and other law enforcement officers. More than 140 cops suffered injuries and went to the hospital. Five police officers died. President Trump just pardoned the violent thugs who were convicted of those attacks. It is "shameless," "sin verguenza," as we say in Spanish. If Republicans were truly concerned about attacks on law enforcement, they would denounce those pardons.

We just heard about the violence that was inflicted and about the violent offenders who committed them. I am asking my Republican colleagues to also keep in mind the faces and the names of those who were brutally attacked.

When the majority walked into this building and they walked past those Capitol Police who are protecting them today, do they tell them: Good morning?

They should also tell them: I am sorry. I am sorry that my President pardoned the people who beat you. I am sorry, and I denounce those attacks because I honor you.

However, they do not seem to have the courage to say I am sorry to those police officers.

It is hypocrisy to say that they care about law enforcement if they don't denounce those pardons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Those violent criminals whom Trump described as peaceful and loving are being released into our communities. We have seen the videos of the attacks, the shouts, and the pounding of Officer Fanone, and so many others, and their cries for help. It was on video. Americans remember it.

I ask my colleagues to remember it and to see those videos. The convicted attackers were not peaceful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to denounce the pardons and to vote against this rule.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this rule is about the Laken Riley Act and the Fix Our Forests Act. I hope people vote for it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, not a word about what happened in this place on January 6. They just can't bring themselves to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question, and that is: Why won't you install the plaque honoring the brave members of law enforcement who protected us on January 6?

A lot of my colleagues don't know this, but Congress actually passed a law, Public Law 117-103, on requiring the plaque to be installed on the west front of the Capitol before March 15, 2023.

So for 21 months now, almost 2 years, this Speaker has refused to honor the Capitol Police and other law enforcement by installing the plaque that we all voted for.

I know it exists, Mr. Speaker. I have actually seen photos of it, so I know it exists. I have seen photos.

Why the delay?

Why won't you put it up, Mr. Speaker?

I think I know why. It is because Republicans don't want to honor the police who were hurt and who died after that attack.

Maybe the gentleman from Georgia can explain why the plaque is yet to be installed. I won't hold my breath, but instead let me read the plaque, Mr. Speaker, so Speaker JOHNSON and others know what it says.

It says: "On behalf of a grateful Congress, this plaque honors the extraordinary individuals who bravely protected and defended this symbol of democracy on January 6, 2021. Their heroism will never be forgotten."

Because Republicans will not, I want to take a moment to thank all the agencies that are listed on this plaque who are being disrespected by this leadership by refusing to honor them.

I want to say thank you to: the United States Capitol Police. I also want to thank the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia; Arlington County Police Department in Virginia; Fairfax County Po-

lice Department in Virginia; Maryland Department of State Police; Metro Transit Police Department; Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, Montgomery County Department of Police in Maryland; New Jersey State Police; Prince George's County Police Department in Maryland; Prince William County Police Department in Virginia; Virginia State Police; Bureau of Alcohol, Firearms, and Explosives; Department of Health and Human Services; Department of Homeland Security; Federal Bureau of Investigation; National Guard Bureau; Pentagon Force Protection Agency; United States Marshals Service; United States Park Police; and United States Secret Service.

I say thank you to all of the officers from all of those agencies who were here that day to protect our country and to protect all of us. I appreciate you, and you should know that a lot of Americans have your back, even if this President and the Republicans do not.

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank all of the law enforcement and first responders who protect this country on a daily basis, and, Mr. Speaker, we know the polls show that a majority of them voted for Donald Trump.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that to say what he just said but not reference what happened that day and not acknowledge the pain that has caused so many families and so many people whom we work with every day to protect us, I have to say that is a little bit much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), who is a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1300

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing but unsurprising that House Republicans have made it their top priority in their new Congress to pass a bill, H.R. 28, designed to generate headlines rather than solve actual problems.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the serious flaws in this bill several times, including last night in the Rules Committee, but it is worth noting that since the House last considered this bill, it has been altered with an increasingly ironic amendment.

The amendment added mandatory imprisonment for people accused of assaulting a law enforcement officer. I say this amendment is ironic because yesterday, just hours after taking the oath of office, President Trump granted mass pardons for over 1,200 January 6 MAGA rioters who had been convicted. President Trump also ordered the dismissal of cases of hundreds more, including hundreds who assaulted police officers with bats, poles,

bear spray, explosives, and other weapons.

Over 140 officers were hurt that day, with injuries including crushed spinal disks, traumatic brain injuries, heart attacks, and strokes, while they bravely defended the Capitol and those who work here. Some lost their lives or became permanently disabled after sustaining injuries and horrific trauma at the hands of fellow citizens during the MAGA attack on January 6, 2021.

In issuing those pardons, President Trump put the Presidential seal of approval on political violence, so long as it supports him, and even if it is directed against law enforcement.

Just to be clear, there was no case-by-case review of these convictions. This is a blanket pardon. We are already seeing the fruits of that incredibly dangerous act of pardoning the people who attacked the Constitution, this Capitol, and the police officers and people within it.

Among those attackers are dangerous felons who are not chastened or remorseful or reformed. They feel emboldened. One of them, Daniel Charles Ball, has just been rearrested, one day after his January 6 case was dismissed, on new weapons charges.

Another, the infamous MAGA supporter known as the QAnon Shaman, tweeted Monday: I got a pardon baby. Thank you, President Trump. Now I am going to buy some motha f'ing guns.

These pardons show an utter disrespect for law enforcement, our criminal justice system, and the rule of law. They have been rightly condemned by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police, among other police organizations, but virtually every House Republican has turned their backs on our police and cowered in silence rather than denounce the shameful decision to put those criminals back on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to oppose this rule and this bill.

I seek unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the Joint International Association of Chiefs of Police and The Fraternal Order of Police Statement on the Recent Presidential Pardons dated January 21, 2025.

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

There was no objection.

JOINT IACP-FOP STATEMENT ON THE RECENT PRESIDENTIAL PARDONS

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) have had long standing and positive relationships with both President Trump and President Biden and have greatly appreciated their support of the policing profession. However, the IACP and FOP are deeply discouraged by the recent pardons and commutations granted by both the Biden and Trump Administrations to individuals convicted of killing or assaulting law enforcement officers. The IACP and FOP firmly believe that those convicted of such crimes should serve their full sentences.

Crimes against law enforcement are not just attacks on individuals or public safety—

they are attacks on society and undermine the rule of law. Allowing those convicted of these crimes to be released early diminishes accountability and devalues the sacrifices made by courageous law enforcement officers and their families.

When perpetrators of crimes, especially serious crimes, are not held fully accountable, it sends a dangerous message that the consequences for attacking law enforcement are not severe, potentially emboldening others to commit similar acts of violence.

The IACP and FOP call on policymakers, judicial authorities, and community leaders to ensure that justice is upheld by enforcing full sentences, especially in cases involving violence against law enforcement. This approach reaffirms our commitment to the rule of law, public safety, and the protection of those who risk their lives for our communities.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Wall Street Journal today entitled: "Trump Pardons the Jan. 6 Cop Beaters."

The editorial reads: "Law and order? Back the blue? What happened to that GOP?"

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

There was no objection.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 21, 2025]

TRUMP PARDONS THE JAN. 6 COP BEATERS—
LAW AND ORDER? BACK THE BLUE? WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT GOP?

(By The Editorial Board)

Republicans are busy denouncing President Biden's pre-emptive pardons for his family and political allies, and deservedly so. But then it's a shame you don't hear many, if any, ruing President Trump's proclamation to pardon unconditionally nearly all of the people who rioted at the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021. This includes those convicted of bludgeoning, chemical spraying, and electroshocking police to try to keep Mr. Trump in power. Now he's springing them from prison.

This is a rotten message from a President about political violence done on his behalf, and it's a bait and switch. Asked about Jan. 6 pardons in late November, Mr. Trump projected caution. "I'm going to do case-by-case, and if they were nonviolent, I think they've been greatly punished," he said. "We're going to look at each individual case."

Taking cues from the boss, last week Vice President JD Vance drew a clear line: "If you committed violence on that day, obviously you shouldn't be pardoned."

So much for that. The President's clemency proclamation commutes prison sentences to time served for 14 named people, including prominent leaders of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers, who were organized and ready for violence. Then Mr. Trump tries to wipe Jan. 6 clean, with "a full, complete and unconditional pardon to all other individuals." The conceit is that there are hundreds of polite Trump supporters who ended up in the wrong place that day and have since rotted in jail.

Out of roughly 1,600 cases filed by the feds, more than a third included accusations of "assaulting, resisting, or impeding law enforcement." The U.S. Attorney's office said it declined "hundreds" of prosecutions against people whose only offense was entering restricted grounds near the Capitol. Of the 1,100 sentences handed down by this year, more than a third didn't involve prison time. The rioters who did get jail often were charged with brutal violence, including:

Daniel Joseph "DJ" Rodriguez, sentenced to 151 months, who can be seen on video, federal prosecutors said, deploying an "electroshock weapon" against a policeman who was dragged out of the defensive line, by "plunging it into the officer's neck." The night before, he promised in a MAGA chat group: "There will be blood."

William Lewis, given 37 months, "sprayed streams of Wasp and Hornet Killer spray at multiple police officers on four distinct occasions," forcing several to flee the line and "seek treatment for their eyes."

Isreal James Easterday, 30 months, blasted a cop "in the face with pepper spray at point-blank range," after which the officer "collapsed and temporarily lost consciousness, which enabled another rioter to steal his baton."

Thomas Andrew Casselman, 40 months, hit multiple officers "near their faces" with pepper spray. His later internet searches included, "The statute of limitations for assault on a police officer."

Curtis Davis, 24 months, punched two police officers in the head. That night he filmed a video of his fist, in which he bragged: "Them knuckles right there, from one of those m—faces at the Capitol."

Ronald Colton McAbee, 70 months, hit a cop while wearing "reinforced brass knuckle gloves," and he held one down on the ground as "other rioters assailed the officer for over 20 seconds," causing a concussion.

Michael Joseph Foy, 40 months, brought a hockey stick with a TRUMP 2020 flag attached, which he swung "over his head and downward at police officers as if he were chopping wood."

There are more like this, which everyone understood on Jan. 6 and shortly afterward. "There is nothing patriotic about what is occurring on Capitol Hill," one GOP official tweeted. "This is 3rd world style anti-American anarchy." That was Marco Rubio, now Mr. Trump's Secretary of State. He was right. What happened that day is a stain on Mr. Trump's legacy. By setting free the cop beaters, the President adds another.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman thanking, in general, our law enforcement officials, but it is troubling that he can't bring himself to address what happened that day. My Republican friends are afraid to debate and to discuss what happened on that day. It is so disappointing in so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, January 6 was not a tourist day. It was a horrific attack on the police who protect our country. I saw with my own eyes the officers with blood on their faces, battered and bruised from fighting off a violent mob. So many of them had to go to the hospital to get stitches and to get medical care. They were severely wounded.

I will never forget the smell of tear gas or the horror on people's faces as we were rushed out of this Chamber. I watched from the Speaker's chair as

Republicans cowered and hid for their lives that day, letting the Capitol Police run to the front lines to protect them.

On Monday, Republicans let out the violent political extremists who did all of this. Republicans let them back out onto the streets.

Trump called them patriots. He called them hostages. There is nothing patriotic about beating police officers with flagpoles, Mr. Speaker.

The patriots were the law enforcement officers who protected this institution. There is nothing patriotic about the KKK, the Oath Keepers, or the Proud Boys. Trump pardoned them.

There is nothing patriotic about viciously assaulting police officers. There is nothing patriotic about bashing heads and breaking into the Capitol Building because of a deranged fantasy about overthrowing the government. There is nothing patriotic about any of that, but Donald Trump doesn't care. He pardoned them because he only cares about himself.

Mr. Speaker, where is your outrage over any of this? Where is your spine? To be silent after these pardons is terrible, and it speaks for itself.

As for me, I stand with the police officers who were here that day. I stand with the officers who were trying to maintain law and order. I stand with the people who are disgusted that Donald Trump is opening the doors and letting out the criminals who attacked them.

I don't hear a single Republican brave enough to come to this floor and condemn these pardons. I don't hear a single one. It is cowardice. It is hypocrisy. They are rewarding political violence and setting the stage for much, much worse things to come.

My colleagues heard Representative SCANLON. Some of them are bragging about how they are going out to buy more guns. What is that about? Violent, dangerous people who beat cops, who tried to kill Members of this body, and who tried to kill our staff were let back out onto the streets by Donald Trump.

It is a disgrace. The Speaker should be ashamed. The Speaker owns this now. The Speaker knows that, and the law enforcement officers of this country know it, too. They are watching, and they will remember.

There is a great conservative, Edmund Burke, who once said that all that it takes for evil to triumph is for good men and women to do nothing, to be silent.

Well, I, for one, am not going to be silent. We are going to continue to talk about this until we get it right in this country and this Chamber.

I can't speak for my friends on the other side of the aisle, but if today is any indication, Republicans are just hoping and praying that it goes away and that everybody forgets. We will never forget what happened here on January 6. The American people won't ever forget.

The American people did not vote for this. They did not vote to let these violent criminals back onto the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is on the rule to advance H.R. 471, the Fix Our Forests Act; and S. 5, the Laken Riley Act, regardless of what you have listened to if you have been watching this over the last hour.

This week, the House has the ability to advance significant legislation in the House of Representatives. That is our job.

The Fix Our Forests Act can mark a return to active forest management and return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and I would be willing to bet that that piece of legislation probably passes in a bipartisan manner.

The Laken Riley Act will ensure that criminals who illegally cross our borders and endanger our communities are detained and deported while also giving States the ability to bring civil action against any Federal official in the future should they refuse to enforce our country's immigration laws and put American citizens at risk by refusing to do so.

Again, I thank the law enforcement officers, the Capitol Police specifically, and all those who take care of us on a daily basis.

I send my condolences to Laken Riley's family.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to voting "yes" on this bill and sending it to President Trump's desk for his signature. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the rule, and then I hope Members will vote "yes" on the legislation. The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 53 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lee of Nevada or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE V—RATES OF PAY FOR WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS

SEC. 501. SPECIAL BASE RATES OF PAY FOR WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5332 the following:

"§5332a. Special base rates of pay for wildland firefighters

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'firefighter' means an employee who—

"(A) is a firefighter within the meaning of section 8331 (21) or section 8401(14);

"(B) in the case of an employee who holds a supervisory or administrative position and is subject to subchapter III of chapter 83, but who does not qualify to be considered a firefighter within the meaning of section 8331 (21), would otherwise qualify if the employee had transferred directly to that position after serving as a firefighter within the meaning of that section;

"(C) in the case of an employee who holds a supervisory or administrative position and is subject to chapter 84, but who does not qualify to be considered a firefighter within the meaning of section 8401(14), would otherwise qualify if the employee had transferred directly to that position after performing duties described in section 8401(14)(A) for at least 3 years; or

"(D) in the case of an employee who is not subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84, holds a position that the Office of Personnel Management determines would satisfy subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) if the employee were subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84;

"(2) the term 'General Schedule base rate' means an annual rate of basic pay established under section 5332 before any additions, such as a locality-based comparability payment under section 5304 or 5304a or a special rate supplement under section 5305;

"(3) the term 'special base rate' means an annual rate of basic pay payable to a wildland firefighter, before any additions or reductions, that replaces the General Schedule base rate otherwise applicable to the wildland firefighter and that is administered in the same manner as a General Schedule base rate; and

"(4) the term 'wildland firefighter' means a firefighter—

"(A) who is employed by the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior; and

"(B) the duties of the position of whom primarily relate to fires occurring in forests, range lands, or other wildlands, as opposed to structural fires.

"(b) SPECIAL BASE RATES OF PAY.—

"(1) ENTITLEMENT TO SPECIAL RATE.—Notwithstanding section 5332, a wildland firefighter is entitled to a special base rate at grades 1 through 15, which shall—

"(A) replace the otherwise applicable General Schedule base rate for the wildland firefighter;

"(B) be basic pay for all purposes, including the purpose of computing a locality-based comparability payment under section 5304 or 5304a; and

"(C) be computed as described in paragraph (2) and adjusted at the time of adjustments in the General Schedule.

"(2) COMPUTATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The special base rate for a wildland firefighter shall be derived by increasing the otherwise applicable General Schedule base rate for the wildland firefighter by the following applicable percentage for the grade of the wildland firefighter and rounding the result to the nearest whole dollar:

"(i) For GS-1, 42 percent.

"(ii) For GS-2, 39 percent.

"(iii) For GS-3, 36 percent.

"(iv) For GS-4, 33 percent.

"(v) For GS-5, 30 percent.

"(vi) For GS-6, 27 percent.

"(vii) For GS-7, 24 percent.

"(viii) For GS-8, 21 percent.

"(ix) For GS-9, 18 percent.

"(x) For GS-10, 15 percent.

"(xi) For GS-11, 12 percent.

"(xii) For GS-12, 9 percent.

"(xiii) For GS-13, 6 percent.

"(xiv) For GS-14, 3 percent.

"(xv) For GS-15, 1.5 percent.

“(B) HOURLY, DAILY, WEEKLY, OR BIWEEKLY RATES.—When the special base rate with respect to a wildland firefighter is expressed as an hourly, daily, weekly, or biweekly rate, the special base rate shall be computed from the appropriate annual rate of basic pay derived under subparagraph (A) in accordance with the rules under section 5504(b).”.

“(b) AMENDMENT TO PREVAILING RATE DETERMINATIONS.—Section 5343 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) (1) For a prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) who is a wildland firefighter, as defined in section 5332a(a), the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior (as applicable) shall increase the wage rates of that employee by an amount (determined at the sole and exclusive discretion of the applicable Secretary after consultation with the other Secretary) that is generally consistent with the percentage increases given to wildland firefighters in the General Schedule under section 5332a.

“(2) An increased wage rate under paragraph (1) shall be basic pay for the same purposes as the wage rate otherwise established under this section.

“(3) An increase under this subsection may not cause the wage rate of an employee to increase to a rate that would produce an annualized rate in excess of the annual rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule.”.

“(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5332 the following:

“5332a. Special base rates of pay for wildland firefighters.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after October 1, 2025, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT AND JOBS ACT.—Notwithstanding section 40803(d)(4)(B) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (16 U.S.C. 6592(d)(4)(B)) and authority provided under the headings “WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT—FOREST SERVICE” and “WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR” in fiscal years 2024 and 2025, the salary increase in such section and under such headings shall not apply to the positions described in such section 40803(d)(4)(B) for service performed on or after the effective date described in subsection (d) of this section.

SEC. 502. WILDLAND FIRE INCIDENT RESPONSE PREMIUM PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5545b the following:

“§5545c. Incident response premium pay for employees engaged in wildland firefighting

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
“(1) the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

“(B) the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives;

“(C) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

“(D) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

“(E) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(F) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(G) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

“(H) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

“(2) the term ‘covered employee’ means an employee of the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior who is—

“(A) a wildland firefighter, as defined in section 5332a(a); or

“(B) certified by the applicable agency to perform wildland fire incident-related duties during the period that employee is deployed to respond to a qualifying incident;

“(3) the term ‘incident response premium pay’ means pay to which a covered employee is entitled under subsection (c);

“(4) the term ‘prescribed fire incident’ means a wildland fire originating from a planned ignition in accordance with applicable laws, policies, and regulations to meet specific objectives;

“(5) the term ‘qualifying incident’—

“(A) means—

“(i) a wildfire incident, a prescribed fire incident, or a severity incident; or

“(ii) an incident that the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior determines is similar in nature to an incident described in clause (i); and

“(B) does not include an initial response incident that is contained within 36 hours; and

“(6) the term ‘severity incident’ means an incident in which a covered employee is prepositioned in an area in which conditions indicate there is a high risk of wildfires.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A covered employee is eligible for incident response premium pay under this section if—

“(1) the covered employee is deployed to respond to a qualifying incident; and

“(2) the deployment described in paragraph (1) is—

“(A) outside of the official duty station of the covered employee; or

“(B) within the official duty station of the covered employee and the covered employee is assigned to an incident-adjacent fire camp or other designated field location.

“(c) ENTITLEMENT TO INCIDENT RESPONSE PREMIUM PAY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered employee who satisfies the conditions under subsection (b) is entitled to premium pay for the period in which the covered employee is deployed to respond to the applicable qualifying incident.

“(2) COMPUTATION.—

“(A) FORMULA.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), premium pay under paragraph (1) shall be paid to a covered employee at a daily rate of 450 percent of the hourly rate of basic pay of the covered employee for each day that the covered employee satisfies the requirements under subsection (b), rounded to the nearest whole cent

“(B) LIMITATION.—Premium pay under this subsection may not be paid.

“(i) with respect to a covered employee for whom the annual rate of basic pay is greater than that for step 10 of GS-10, at a daily rate that exceeds the daily rate established under subparagraph (A) for step 10 of GS-10; or

“(ii) to a covered employee in a total amount that exceeds \$9,000 in any calendar year.

“(C) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(i) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall assess the difference between the average total amount of compensation that was paid to covered employees, by grade, in fiscal years 2023 and 2024.

“(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date that is 1 year after the effective date of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly publish a report on the results of the assessment conducted under clause (i).

“(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—After publishing the report required under clause (ii),

the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, may, in the sole and exclusive discretion of the Secretaries acting jointly, administratively adjust the amount of premium pay paid under this subsection (or take other administrative action) to ensure that the average annual amount of total compensation paid to covered employees, by grade, is more consistent with such amount that was paid to those employees in fiscal year 2023.

“(iv) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 3 days after an adjustment made, or other administrative action taken, under clause (iii) becomes final, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification regarding that adjustment or other administrative action, as applicable.

“(d) TREATMENT OF INCIDENT RESPONSE PREMIUM PAY.—Incident response premium pay under this section—

“(1) is not considered part of the basic pay of a covered employee for any purpose;

“(2) may not be considered in determining a covered employee’s lump-sum payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave under section 5551 or section 5552;

“(3) may not be used in determining pay under section 8114 (relating to compensation for work injuries);

“(4) may not be considered in determining pay for hours of paid leave or other paid time off during which the premium pay is not payable; and

“(5) shall be disregarded in determining the minimum wage and overtime pay to which a covered employee is entitled under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).”.

“(b) AMENDMENTS TO PREMIUM PAY PROVISIONS.—Subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5544—

“(A) by amending the section heading to read as follows: “Wage-board overtime, Sunday rates, and other premium pay”; and

“(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) A prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) shall receive incident response premium pay under the same terms and conditions that apply to a covered employee under section 5545c if that employee—

“(1) is employed by the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior; and

“(2) (A) is a wildland firefighter, as defined in section 5332a(a); or

“(B) is certified by the applicable agency to perform wildland fire incident-related duties during the period the employee is deployed to respond to a qualifying incident (as defined in section 5545c(a)).”; and

“(2) in section 5547(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “5545c,” after “5545a.”.

“(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

“(1) by amending the item relating to section 5544 to read as follows:

“5544. Wage-board overtime, Sunday rates, and other premium pay.”;

“and (2) by inserting after the item relating to section 5545b the following:

“5545c. Incident response premium pay for employees engaged in wildland firefighting.”.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after October 1, 2025, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT from Georgia.
Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance

of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 53; and

Adoption of H. Res. 53, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 471, FIX OUR FORESTS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 5, LAKEN RILEY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 53) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 471) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resiliency to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (S. 5) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 204, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]
YEAS—214

Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Alford	Gooden	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gosar	Mills
Amodei (NV)	Graves	Moolenaar
Arrington	Green (TN)	Moore (AL)
Babin	Greene (GA)	Moore (NC)
Baird	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Grothman	Moore (WV)
Barr	Guest	Moran
Barrett	Guthrie	Murphy
Baumgartner	Hageman	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Begich	Haridopolos	Norman
Bentz	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Obernolte
Bice	Harris (NC)	Ogles
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Onder
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Owens
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Perry
Bost	Hinson	Pfleger
Brecheen	Houchin	Reschenthaler
Bresnahan	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hunt	Rose
Burlison	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Roy
Cammack	Jack	Rulli
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	James	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Schmidt
Cline	Jordan	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cole	Kean	Sessions
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Crane	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (MO)
Crank	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kim	Smucker
Davidson	Knott	Spartz
De La Cruz	Kustoff	Staubert
DesJarlais	LaHood	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	LaLota	Steil
Donalds	LaMalfa	Steube
Downing	Langworthy	Strong
Dunn (FL)	Latta	Stutzman
Edwards	Lee (FL)	Taylor
Ellzey	Letlow	Tenney
Emmer	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Lucas	Tiffany
Evans (CO)	Luna	Timmons
Ezell	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Fallon	Mace	Valadao
Fedorchak	Mackenzie	Van Drew
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Finstad	Maloy	Van Orden
Fischbach	Mann	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Massie	Walberg
Fleischmann	Mast	Weber (TX)
Flood	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fong	McClain	Westerman
Fox	McClintock	Wied
Franklin, Scott	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Fry	McDowell	Wittman
Fulcher	McGuire	Womack
Garbarino	Messmer	Yakym
Gill (TX)	Meuser	Zinke
Gimenez	Miller (IL)	
Goldman (TX)	Miller (OH)	

NAYS—204

Adams	Bonamici	Castor (FL)
Aguilar	Boyle (PA)	Castro (TX)
Amo	Brown	Cherfilus-
Ansari	Brownley	McCormick
Auchincloss	Budzinski	Chu
Balint	Bynum	Cisneros
Barragán	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Beatty	Carson	Clarke (NY)
Bell	Carter (LA)	Cleaver
Bera	Casas	Clyburn
Beyer	Case	Cohen
Bishop	Casten	Conaway

Connolly	Keating	Ramirez
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Randall
Courtney	Kennedy (NY)	Raskin
Craig	Khanna	Rivas
Crockett	Krishnamoorthi	Ross
Crow	Landman	Ruiz
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Salinas
Davis (IL)	Latimer	Sánchez
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Scholten
DeLauro	Levin	Schrier
DelBene	Liccardo	Scott (VA)
Deluzio	Lieu	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sewell
Dexter	Lynch	Sherman
Doggett	Magaziner	Sherrill
Elfreth	Mannion	Simon
Escobar	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Espallat	McBath	Sorensen
Evans (PA)	McBride	Soto
Fields	McClain Delaney	Stansbury
Figures	McClellan	Stanton
Fletcher	McCollum	Stevens
Foster	McDonald Rivet	Strickland
Foushee	McGarvey	Subramanyam
Frankel, Lois	McGovern	Suozi
Friedman	McIver	Swalwell
Frost	Meeks	Sykes
Garcia (CA)	Menendez	Takano
Garcia (IL)	Meng	Thanedar
Garcia (TX)	Mfume	Thompson (CA)
Gillen	Min	Thompson (MS)
Golden (ME)	Moore (WI)	Titus
Goldman (NY)	Morelle	Tlaib
Gomez	Morrison	Tokuda
Gonzalez, V.	Moskowitz	Tonko
Goodlander	Moulton	Torres (CA)
Gray	Mullin	Torres (NY)
Green, Al (TX)	Nadler	Trahan
Harder (CA)	Neal	Tran
Hayes	Neguse	Turner (TX)
Himes	Norcross	Underwood
Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Houlahan	Olshewski	Vasquez
Hoyer	Omar	Veasey
Hoyle (OR)	Pallone	Velázquez
Huffman	Panetta	Vindman
Ivey	Pappas	Wasserman
Jackson (IL)	Perez	Schultz
Jacobs	Peters	Waters
Jeffries	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Pocan	Whitesides
Johnson (TX)	Pou	Williams (GA)
Kamlager-Dove	Pressley	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Quigley	

NOT VOTING—15

Bacon	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Correa	Grijalva	Pettersen
Dingell	Jayapal	Riley (NY)
Fitzpatrick	Lawler	Schneider
Garamendi	Mrvan	Williams (TX)

□ 1356

Ms. ROSS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Messrs. RASKIN, and KRISHNAMOORTHY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PALMER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 204, not voting 16, as follows: