

signals a dangerous leniency to those who have plotted against our country.

Despite the administration's claims, releasing these individuals only increases the likelihood that they will return to their extremist roots and try to maybe pull off another 9/11 along with the cells that are already in this country. We have already seen a recycling through of some who were released during the Obama era.

This prioritizes political agendas, especially at the very end of this term, over the security of the American people and those who have fought so hard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1115

THANKING MICHIGAN'S 12TH DISTRICT

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I thank the incredible families of Michigan's 12th Congressional District for sending me back to Congress. I am truly honored to be able to be your voice in the people's House.

As one of the only Members of the United States Congress who created neighborhood service centers, we have already returned over \$6.2 million directly back into the pockets of many of my neighbors, invested \$52 million in our communities, and assisted more than 10,000 of our families who needed help.

As we begin the 119th Congress, I am determined more than ever to continue to fight for clean air, clean water, ending utility shutoffs, holding corporate polluters accountable, lowering the cost of living for working families, protecting Social Security and Medicare, and growing the Congressional Mamas Caucus, as well as, of course, ensuring equality and justice for all.

To my residents, I thank them for believing in me. I will always have their backs, and I will never sell out.

CONGRATULATING GALVESTON REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Galveston Regional Chamber of Commerce on an incredible milestone—180 years of outstanding service to our community.

Since its founding in 1845, the Galveston Regional Chamber of Commerce has been an absolute cornerstone of economic development, business growth, education, and enhancing the quality of life in the Galveston area.

The chamber proudly represents over 750 members across diverse sectors, in-

cluding small businesses, education, research, healthcare, government, non-profit organizations, and religious groups—truly embodying the spirit of collaboration and progress.

As the oldest chamber of commerce in Texas, we are blessed to have this remarkable institution in our community and in my district. It is under the outstanding leadership of President Gina Spagnola and her exceptional team, and the chamber continues to make an enduring impact on Galveston and beyond with her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Gina Spagnola and the Galveston Regional Chamber of Commerce on 180 years of absolute excellence.

REMEMBERING DR. BOB NICHOLS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to grieve the loss of Dr. Bob Nichols, who passed away on December 20.

Dr. Nichols was a renowned professor at Young Harris College with an impressive 35-year teaching career at the school. He taught math and coached tennis at the Westminster Schools in Atlanta, Gainesville State College, and Young Harris College.

Dr. Nichols was an All-American tennis player during his time at Georgia Tech and earned a spot in the Georgia Tech Sports Hall of Fame.

Dr. Nichols impacted thousands of students during his 42-year teaching career. In September 2011, Young Harris College named their campus tennis complex in honor of Dr. Nichols.

Additionally, Dr. Nichols designed a strong advising program and was the chair of the mathematics and science division at Young Harris College.

The college's board of trustees awarded him professor emeritus status in 2010 for his decades of dedicated service, and he received several other remarkable awards.

Dr. Nichols will always be remembered as an outstanding coach, an outstanding mentor, and a friend to all.

LAKEN RILEY ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 5, I call up the bill (H.R. 29) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RULLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 29

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 “Laken Riley Act”.

SEC. 2. DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO COMMIT THEFT.

Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or”;
(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “, or”; and
(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E)(i) is inadmissible under paragraph

(6)(A), (6)(C), or (7) of section 212(a), and

“(ii) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E), the terms ‘burglary’, ‘theft’, ‘larceny’, and ‘shoplifting’ have the meaning given such terms in the jurisdiction where the acts occurred.

“(3) DETAINER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue a detainer for an alien described in paragraph (1)(E) and, if the alien is not otherwise detained by Federal, State, or local officials, shall effectively and expeditiously take custody of the alien.”.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.

(a) INSPECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION.—Section 235(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention and removal requirements under paragraphs (1) or (2) that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this paragraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this paragraph, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.”.

(b) APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF ALIENS.—Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “or release”; and

(B) by striking “grant, revocation, or denial” and insert “revocation or denial”; and
(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging an action or decision by the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security under this section to release any alien or grant bond or parole to any alien that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on

the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subsection to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subsection, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.”.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the requirement to discontinue granting visas to citizens, subjects, nationals, and residents as described in subsection (d) that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of State on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subsection to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subsection, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.”.

(d) CERTAIN CLASSES OF ALIENS.—Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the limitation under subparagraph (A) that parole solely be granted on a case-by-case basis and solely for urgent humanitarian reasons or a significant public benefit, that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subparagraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subparagraph, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.”.

(e) DETENTION.—Section 241(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “During the removal period,” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—During the removal period,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention requirement under subparagraph (A) that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subparagraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subparagraph, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.”.

(f) LIMIT ON INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Section 242(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(f)) is amended by adding at the end following:

“(3) CERTAIN ACTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an action brought pursuant to section 235(b)(3), subsections (e) or (f) of section 236, or section 241(a)(2)(B).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 29.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the brutal murder of Laken Riley was foreordained the day Joe Biden took office and reversed the successful Trump policies that had finally secured our borders.

Since that day just 4 years ago, more than 7.8 million illegal aliens have been deliberately allowed into our country—a population the size of the State of Washington, our 13th largest State.

Very little is done to vet these millions of illegal migrants. We don't know how many terrorists and violent criminals are among them, and worse, the Democrats don't seem to care.

We know that the number of terrorists we are apprehending has skyrocketed and that violent international crime cartels and violent foreign gangs are now operating freely in our communities, often protected from deportation and detention by the Democrats' sanctuary laws.

One of these criminals has now been convicted of the brutal murder of Laken Riley. How many such monsters have the Democrats deliberately allowed into our country we do not know, but we are slowly, painfully, and tragically finding out victim by victim.

In this case, the murderer was paroled into this country through a shocking abuse of this power by the Biden administration. He was repeatedly arrested for theft and other crimes in sanctuary jurisdictions and each time released back onto our streets.

Just months before Laken Riley's murder, this murderer was arrested for theft, but he was released. ICE did not take him into custody because of a Biden administration policy that shields many criminal aliens from arrest and deportation.

Sadly, this is exactly what those who voted for Joe Biden in 2020 voted for because this is exactly what the Democrats promised to do.

Fortunately, those who voted for Donald Trump in 2024 voted to stop this tragic travesty of our immigration laws because that is what he has promised to do and will begin doing over the Democrats' objections beginning at noon on January 20.

During his first term, President Trump proved that the President on his own authority can secure our borders. President Biden proved that a President determined to undermine and make a mockery of our immigration laws can willfully open those borders to the most violent criminals, terrorists, gangs, and cartels on this planet and use the Democrats' sanctuary laws to protect them.

This national nightmare will end at noon on Inauguration Day, but what of future Presidents?

The Laken Riley Act would require ICE detention for illegal aliens who are charged with, arrested for, or convicted of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense.

H.R. 29 further requires the Department of Homeland Security to issue a detainer for those illegal aliens and take custody of them effectively and expeditiously. It would also allow States to bring a civil action against derelict Federal officials who refuse to enforce these laws.

Joe Biden and Alejandro Mayorkas, I am looking at you.

This bill passed the Republican House in March of last year, but Senate Democrats stopped it cold. I said at the time that, today, the name on the bill is Laken Riley. Tomorrow, it will be another victim of these policies, another son, daughter, or loved one.

It won't stop until this administration is stopped, and that can only be done by the American people. Thank God, the American people have done exactly that. They have given this Congress and this President the tools and mandate to secure our borders and remove every person who has broken into our country by violating our laws.

Without this law, a future Democratic President could once again release dangerous illegal aliens back onto our streets to prey on our people and destroy innocent lives like Laken Riley's. This bill would stop them.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration brought us back from a devastating pandemic and the Trump economic crisis by investing in American workers, American manufacturing, and American infrastructure. Our policies for the working-class majority instead of the tiny rapacious billionaire class pulled our economy back from the brink.

Today, our Nation's economic strength is “the envy of the world,” as The Economist magazine put it, with

an unemployment rate of 4.2 percent, wages rising across America, and the gross domestic product growing at a robust 3.1 percent.

Moreover, the murder rate is way down in America. Unlawful immigration at the southern border is now below where it was when Donald Trump left office 4 years ago. The roaring stock market, which is what Trump and his billionaire entourage care about, just completed its strongest 2 years in a quarter century.

Now, it is time to make sure all Americans enjoy the benefits of this astonishing economic growth. We should be coming together today to increase the minimum wage, to lift children out of poverty, and to strengthen unions, Social Security, Medicare, and the middle class. Donald Trump is instead assembling a billionaire Cabinet from the top 0.0003 percent of the wealthiest Americans, drawing the top tier of his new administration from poolside cocktail hour at Mar-a-Lago and setting up the broligarchs and the plutocrats to plunder an even larger share of government contracts and public resources.

Trump campaigned on the seductive promise of bringing down the high post-COVID-19 prices for rent, groceries, consumer goods, and healthcare, but now he is preparing to give power over the economy to his team of globe-trotting, dictator-dealing CEOs and billionaires, the very people responsible for exploiting the pandemic to increase prices in the first place.

I doubt the billionaire oligarchs have any interest in bringing down the cost of living for the working middle class in America, but if they do, Democrats stand ready to work with them. After all, we are the ones who dramatically lowered prescription drug prices in Medicare, capping out-of-pocket monthly expenses at \$35 a month. I had constituents who were paying \$500 a month for insulin as diabetics before that, and it is capped now at \$35 a month. We capped annual total out-of-pocket expenditures for prescription drugs at \$2,000 a year.

It was the MAGA Republicans deep in the pocket of Big Pharma who categorically and vehemently opposed us every step of the way on lowering prescription drug prices in Medicare.

If our colleagues now have good policy proposals for continuing to lower prices as we have done, which is what they campaigned on, by all means, bring the proposals forward. Let's see them.

Democrats have repeatedly crossed the aisle to hammer out bipartisan compromise. Last year, President Biden and Senate Democrats worked with the ultraconservative Republican Senator JAMES LANKFORD to arrive at a tough bipartisan border security deal, but President Trump aggressively tanked the deal, openly expressing his preference for rallying against a border crisis rather than actually developing a border solution.

Now, today, the Republicans are on the floor but not with their long-awaited, entirely missing policy solutions to the problems of inflation or immigration. Instead, their bill today is an empty and opportunistic measure. It is not, like the compromise they tanked in the last Congress, a bill for greater border security or better technology in the ports of entry, expanding legal pathways to immigration and citizenship for millions of people, or addressing huge immigrant visa backlogs. No, this bill would upend 28 years of mandatory immigration detention policy by requiring that any undocumented immigrant arrested for theft, larceny, or shoplifting be detained even if they are never convicted or even charged with a crime.

This is a radical departure from current law, which since 1996 has generally required mandatory detention only for persons who are criminally convicted or who admit to having committed certain serious crimes—that is, when criminal guilt is certain and established beyond a reasonable doubt.

□ 1130

Under this bill, a person who has lived in the United States for decades, say for most of her life, paid taxes, and bought a home, but who is mistakenly arrested for shoplifting would not be free to resume her life. Rather, she would be detained and deported even if the charges are dropped and even if the police admit that the arrest was mistaken.

Consider a young Dreamer or TPS recipient who is with a group of friends after school and someone in the group shoplifts, stealing a candy bar. To scare the whole group straight, everyone is arrested, whether they were involved in the shoplifting or not. However, nobody is charged, and the charges are dropped. For most of the kids, it is a humiliating afternoon and a valuable life lesson, but for one of them, a young person who has been in America lawfully for years with his or her family, the consequences would be devastating under this legislation—mandatory detention and deportation from the country just for having been arrested, even if never charged.

It seems to me passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that our friends are taking this position when they do not even believe that the criminal justice system can be trusted when a jury unanimously convicts someone who has had the best legal representation money can buy in the State of New York on 34 different felony criminal counts after an extended criminal trial with all due process protections, including cross-examination and the right to counsel being afforded.

If the criminal justice process cannot be trusted to identify a truly guilty person even when that person has been arrested, charged, indicted, prosecuted, represented at every stage, given an opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses, and to testify personally, and

then is unanimously convicted by a jury of his peers beyond a reasonable doubt, how can the criminal justice process be trusted to identify a truly guilty person just with an arrest and no indictment, no prosecution, no cross-examination, no neutral adjudication by an impartial judge, no fact-finding, and no criminal conviction by a 12-person jury beyond a reasonable doubt?

Mandatory detention has always been reserved for people who are convicted of crimes and actually commit crimes. Expanding the detention requirement to include every person who has merely been accused of or arrested for, even if not charged for shoplifting, for example, collapses the distinction between actual conviction on serious events versus simply being charged with or arrested for something very minor even if the charges don't even lead anywhere.

Congress has never even appropriated sufficient resources to detain all non-citizens who do fall under the currently serious mandatory detention categories. Even President Trump, during his first term, never tried to detain all migrants theoretically subject to mandatory detention. Therefore, this extremely elastic new provision adds nothing to the equation other than more empty rhetoric and greater bureaucratic bloat.

The bill also seeks to give State governments authority and control over the Federal immigration system by trespassing on the Article II executive power in a way that eight out of nine Justices on the Supreme Court completely repudiated 2 years ago as a blatant violation of the separation of powers.

The bill seeks to give State attorneys general precisely what the Supreme Court has denied: constitutional standing to sue the Federal Government in court for perceived violations of sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act so States can block Federal immigration policies, capsizing the Supremacy Clause and expanding judicial power to encroach upon executive discretion under Article II.

In June of 2023, the Supreme Court in the United States v. Texas emphatically rejected the alleged standing of States to sue the Federal Government to alter the government's immigration arrest policies. This bill attempts a legislative bypass of this constitutional decision in U.S. v. Texas written by Justice Kavanaugh and joined by eight of nine Justices on the Court.

In rejecting the States' standing argument, the Court observed, among other things, that lawsuits alleging insufficient arrests or prosecution run against the executive branch's exclusive Article II authority to enforce immigration law, which includes the discretion to determine enforcement priorities in the face of a chronic lack of resources and shifting public safety, public welfare, and foreign policy needs and priorities.

If this bill were to become law, both provisions would have the perverse effect of undermining the Federal Government's efforts to prioritize the detention and the deportation of the truly most dangerous convicted felons. With the vastly expanded new statutory scope and new authority for States to get legal standing on steroids, the government can be sued by a State for not detaining everyone charged with or not even arrested for the pettiest of crimes like shoplifting.

This bill tries to give States standing to sue for harms as small as \$100, dramatically shifting power from the executive branch to the courts and the Federal Government to the States, both in ways considered completely dubious by the Supreme Court.

Like many of the immigration-related bills the GOP is now advancing, this one seems to follow a simple strategy: Pick a crime, paste into it a template immigration law covering convicted criminals, and then require detention or deportation of certain persons merely accused of committing the crime or arrested for committing the crime. No due process is required at all. This allows us to get up and demonize immigrants without doing anything to fix the immigration system and to act tough without actually making America safer or solving any of the problems within the immigration laws.

We should be working together on comprehensive, meaningful reform. My colleague from California invites us to believe that the only crimes committed by undocumented aliens are those who entered during the Biden administration. Well, in fact, if you look at it, hundreds of thousands, 500,000 crossed the U.S.-Mexico border in the first Trump administration, and over 1.1 million people who crossed during the first 4 years of his administration were eventually released from custody.

One of the people released from custody, an undocumented alien, is charged with murdering 19-year-old Adam Luker from Alabama. Why don't we have a bill named after Adam Luker? Is it because of the inconvenient fact that the undocumented alien who killed him came in under Donald Trump? I would hate to think so. However, we can find lots of cases like that.

That is not what we should be doing here in Congress. We should be seriously confronting the problems in a serious way together rather than just trying to make partisan hay out of other people's tragedies in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not move the ball forward on any of the problems facing America, and they are being moved under closed rules without a hearing, without any legislative scrutiny. This means that no Member—not only just Democrats, but Republicans, too, no Member—can offer any amendments to repair the gaping flaws and gaps in these slapdash political bills.

I would urge our colleagues to take a much more serious approach here. The murder of Laken Riley was an un-

speakable and appalling crime, a heinous act, and no parent, no family should ever have to bear such a calamity. We must take clear steps to make sure that people who commit crimes like this are punished to the full extent of the law. I trust that my friends agree that those who commit horrific, violent crimes like these must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

This bill fails to take any meaningful action to improve our broken immigration system and to prevent crimes like this from occurring again, whether the undocumented aliens entered under a Democratic administration, as they have, or a Republican administration, as they have. We are asked to vote on a bill that fails to address any of the real issues at stake, and we are foreclosed from offering any amendments to improve this sloppy and political product.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

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

I want you to listen to what my friend just said, that we shouldn't be placing illegals in detention simply for being charged with a crime; and, besides, shoplifting is no big deal anyway.

Listen to what he is actually suggesting. Current law requires the detention of every illegal alien who crosses our border. Every one.

The Democrats have studiously ignored this law, and now they are saying ignore this law even if the illegal has now been charged with committing other crimes as well. Let them back onto the streets, as they did with Laken Riley's murderer. If a few innocent teens happen to get raped and murdered along the way, well, too bad.

The Democrats have told us for 4 years that their refusal to enforce our immigration laws is because they are prioritizing more dangerous offenders. That is precisely what this bill does. It prioritizes dangerous offenders, and yet the Democrats are still opposing it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the author of this measure. Mr. COLLINS represents Laken Riley's hometown and her grieving family in this House.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support the Laken Riley Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we record into history exactly what happened to this young lady.

This young lady didn't have a care in the world. She was just out for a jog, enjoying the day, when an illegal criminal took her life away. He didn't even have any remorse. He never hesitated.

This legislation could have prevented her death. Her murderer was in our

country illegally and was a known criminal. He had abused a child in New York City and was flown to Athens, Georgia, a sanctuary city, all of this on the taxpayers' dime, where he was once again cited for shoplifting. Every part of our system failed Laken that day, and there is nothing we can do to bring her back.

I will tell you what, we can make sure this never happens again. Right now, ICE is unable to detain and deport illegal criminals who commit these minor-level crimes, but the Laken Riley Act will fix this and give ICE and our local law enforcement the tools to get these criminals out of our country and make our communities safer.

We need to get these people off the street. These criminals are getting bolder and bolder while our communities become more and more unsafe. Our lax policies gave her murderer the courage to kill Laken Riley. We have got to make sure that this doesn't ever happen again.

Mr. Speaker, he bashed her head in with a rock. This is one of the most heinous crimes imaginable. People need to know what this animal did to her. I am going to tell you what, they also need to know how she fought back. Laken fought back with every ounce in her body. When I spoke to the family about this bill last year, I told them I would never let it go. I will fight with every ounce that I have to make sure that no family has to suffer a loss like they have to these illegal criminals.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in America, it is a sad day when we allow these thug criminals to invade our homes, our country, and impose their violence and their will on the American people. We have the opportunity today, we have the opportunity to fix this, and I encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting "yes."

I will leave you with an excerpt from a statement made by Laken Riley's family:

The Laken Riley Act has our full support because it would help save innocent lives and prevent more families from going through the kind of heartbreak we have experienced. Laken would have been 23 on January 10. There is no greater gift that could be given to her or our country than to continue her legacy by saving lives through this bill. Every single Member of Congress should be able to get behind this purely commonsense bill that will make our country and communities safer.

Mr. Speaker, God help us. God help us.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 29.

I start by expressing my deepest condolences to Laken Riley's family. Her death was a tragedy, and we all mourn her loss. May her memory be a blessing.

□ 1145

I wish that we were considering legislation that was worthy of her name. Instead, the Republican majority is beginning this new Congress right where

they left off in the last one, with legislation that targets and scapegoats immigrants, but does nothing to address the real problems in our broken immigration system, all while ignoring basic due process and constitutional principles.

Among other things, this legislation would subject to mandatory detention any undocumented immigrants who are merely charged with committing an act of theft or shoplifting, even if they are innocent.

This means if someone is merely accused of shoplifting, someone who might be innocent, who might be the victim of mistaken identity, and who has not had the opportunity to clear his name, would be subject to mandatory detention.

This bill is so broad that it would lead to the detention of people who have committed no crime and have no intention of harming anyone. That flies in the face of all notions of basic due process and reason. It is both pernicious and absurd.

Where will the Federal Government get the resources to detain all these people? Congress has never appropriated, and no administration has ever requested, sufficient resources to detain all noncitizens who fall under the mandatory detention categories. Even President Trump, during his first term, never tried to detain all migrants subject to mandatory detention. It was far too costly, even for him.

Since this bill is so sweeping, even Dreamers and people living here on temporary protected status, people who may have lived in this country for decades and shortly after their birth, could be subject to the bill's harsh provisions.

If that weren't bad enough, the bill also declares that States have standing to sue over certain immigration provisions so long as the State or its residents suffer even the most trivial financial harm. This appears to be a ham-handed attempt to circumvent recent Supreme Court rulings limiting States' standing to sue the Federal Government over immigration enforcement matters.

Merely declaring that the States have standing to sue does not make it so. This provision is almost certainly unconstitutional. Unfortunately, the lack of attention that Republicans pay to such matters perfectly sums up their entire approach to immigration.

Instead of working toward serious solutions to serious problems, they are content to simply play politics and consider it a job well done. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who has done work on our subcommittee on this issue.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, again, our hearts go out to the Laken Riley family. We think about them. This bill is named for Laken Riley, but it has an impact far greater.

Once again, we must acknowledge that we can no longer take the famed empty words of sympathy from those across the aisle in the Biden-Harris administration because they refuse to do anything meaningful to stop the carnage or even slow down the border surge that has been going on.

Illegal aliens who commit crimes must not be released into our communities. Our colleagues cannot even use the term of art that is in the statute: "illegal alien." They cannot even use that. They conflate legal immigration with those who enter our country illegally. They call them undocumented immigrants. That is what they do.

They don't ever stand up for the American people. Instead of taking the mandate of an overwhelming popular vote victory and electoral college victory by this incoming President Donald Trump on the issue of border security, they let it go. They ignore it.

In fact, places like San Diego—you know what San Diego just did? They declared themselves a super sanctuary city. Nobody is going to be held for ICE.

You get to explain to the victim of Nicholas Jose Francisco, a 25-year-old illegal alien from Guatemala, charged with molesting and raping a 5-year-old little girl. In New York City, there is more than 58,000 illegal aliens with a criminal record who have been charged with a crime on their streets.

You get to explain and apologize to the victim of the 31-year-old illegal alien from Mexico who was recently arrested for breaking into a woman's home and raping her. This goes on and on because my colleagues don't want to hold these people in detention.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, you get to explain to the victim of the 28-year-old illegal alien who tortured and burglarized a Dallas woman just a month or two ago.

You can stand up and say we are not bringing meaningful legislation. You can stand up and say that you feel real bad for Laken Riley and her family. How about all the other victims of illegal aliens who have committed crimes? You know the first thing they did that was illegal? They entered our country. Democrats want to protect them. Republicans want the law enforced.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, in fact, the Democrats got behind a bipartisan border security bill, which beefed up law enforcement at the border, which beefed up judges at the border, and that was tanked by Donald Trump and by Republicans in the House.

They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who refuse to engage in meaningful legislative work to get the job done here. Democrats won't be lectured by our colleague that we don't stand up for the American people.

The author of this legislation actually yesterday sent out a tweet, a so-

cial media statement, characterizing the January 6 violent assault on this Chamber where 140 officers were wounded, injured, and hospitalized by a rampaging mob this way: "On this day in history, 2021," said the gentleman, "thousands of peaceful grandmothers gathered in Washington, D.C., to take a self-guided, albeit unauthorized, tour of the U.S. Capitol Building." I like that touch, "albeit unauthorized."

Earlier that day, President Trump held a rally, where supporters walked to the Capitol to peacefully protest the certification of the 2020 election. During this time, some individuals entered the Capitol, took photos, and explored the building before leaving."

Well, isn't that sweet. We see exactly how much faith and confidence they really have in the American criminal justice system and how much they really stand on the side of law enforcement. Yeah, it was a just a leisurely stroll by a bunch of peaceful grandmothers on January 6.

These are the people that now are inviting us to dramatically change the immigration laws without even a hearing as to what it is going to mean in any particular case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, Laken Riley was, by all accounts, a remarkable young woman, whose life was tragically cut short by a horrific act that should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. My heart goes out to her family and loved ones who grieve her death.

I understand, as a mother myself, fully why in the face of such senseless violence, especially against someone so young, there is an urge to do something, anything, to feel like you are actually helping to fix the problem.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing to fix the immigration system or to prevent future tragedies like this. It is simply an attempt to score cheap political points off of a tragic death, and in the process, it unfairly sweeps up many more innocent lives with no due process.

Let us be clear: This is the Republican playbook over and over again. Scare people about immigrants, never propose anything that actually solves an outdated and arcane immigration system that desperately needs Congress to allocate resources and update legal pathways to make the immigration system work for everyone.

My Republican colleagues simply want to preserve a broken immigration system as a campaign issue so that they can scapegoat and demonize immigrants all to distract the American people from their real goals of making working people pay for another Republican tax scam that benefits billionaires and the wealthiest.

Just look at the rules package that they just passed. Out of the 12 bills included in that, not a single one does anything to secure the border, to fix

the broken immigration system, to lower costs for working people, to address the housing crisis, tackle the extraordinary levels of income inequality in this country, or tamp down on inflation.

Those were the promises of the Trump campaign, but not a single one of those things is actually included in the first bills that they are bringing to the floor without hearings.

Let's talk about what this bill actually does. This bill goes far beyond subjecting those who are convicted to or admit to committing a theft offense to mandatory detention. What this bill actually does is subject any undocumented immigrant to mandatory detention for merely being arrested or charged with committing an act of theft, larceny, or shoplifting, along with those who are convicted or who admit to committing such acts.

Under this bill, a DACA or TPS recipient could be subjected to mandatory detention for crimes that are extremely low-level or for something that is not even a crime without even having had a fair day in court, without a conviction.

Let's be clear, we are talking about people who have been in this country for decades. Many of us in Congress are parents. Imagine your child is with a group of kids grabbing an after-school snack at a 7-Eleven and one of them chooses to just snatch a little candy bar off the shelf.

The shop owner calls the police, and all the kids are arrested for shoplifting. If your child is a DACA recipient, someone who has lived here nearly their entire life, they are now subject to mandatory detention under this bill.

Unfortunately, there are countless real-life examples of people getting wrongfully arrested for crimes that they didn't commit. In 2019, a man in New Jersey was arrested for shoplifting and trying to hit a police officer with a car because facial recognition software falsely identified him as the perpetrator.

He spent 10 days in jail, even though he was actually 30 miles away from where the crime was committed. If he had been a DACA or a TPS recipient, and this bill had been enacted, he would be subject to mandatory immigration detention even though he was innocent of the crime of which he was accused.

People deserve to have their day in court and are innocent until proven guilty. That seems to be something that the majority has forgotten or doesn't seem to care about unless the alleged criminal is the President-elect.

The upcoming administration is poised to bring back their no-priority immigration enforcement priority guidelines in which a convicted murderer would be the same priority for deportation as an undocumented mom who has been living in this country for 20 years.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, imagine how much money a sweeping mandatory detention proposal like this will cost the Federal Government at a time when Republicans are talking a big game about cutting budgets, but not this one. Why? Because this is a great boon to those for-profit detention companies who make enormous profits for mandatory detention when there are far more effective and cheaper ways to address the issue.

Who pays for all this? The taxpayers. Even in a Republican trifecta, ICE has limited resources to detain and remove folks. However, in this bill, like President Trump's enforcement priorities, we seek to use those resources on people who committed low-level crimes or even no crime at all. That makes no one safer and costs a lot of money.

Finally, this bill also bizarrely attempts to give State attorneys general the authority to try and stop the administrations from carrying out important policy priorities by giving them standing to sue in Federal court under various sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That entire section of the bill, likely unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this overly broad, deeply flawed legislation.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to go a long way to reverse the lawlessness of the Biden-Harris administration. I will tell you a story for a moment.

A criminal illegal alien entered the country with known gang tattoos and was allowed through Biden's porous border. He made his way to the State of Wisconsin where he had warrants issued in Dane County for strangulation, suffocation, false imprisonment, battery, and disorderly conduct. He was not detained and deported, as he should have been, because Dane County is a sanctuary county.

□ 1200

He then made his way to Minneapolis, Minnesota, where he was arrested for simple property crimes. He was not detained and deported, as he should have been as a criminal illegal alien, because Minneapolis is a sanctuary city.

He then made his way to a small town of 5,600 people, Prairie du Chien, my hometown, where he brutally raped a mother and savagely beat her daughter over a period of days and was finally arrested for domestic battery, strangulation, suffocation, physical abuse to a child, disorderly conduct, and two counts of second-degree sexual assault.

None of this needed to happen if the law was adhered to. None of this would have taken place if this person was detained and deported for a simple property crime. Enough.

It is the Federal Government's primary responsibility to protect its citizens. My Democratic colleagues are refusing to do this, and it is shameful. It is time to protect our American citizens against criminal illegal aliens, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support this bill.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 29, the Laken Riley Act.

For the past 4 years, the American people have suffered under the Biden administration's disastrous open-border policies that have allowed millions of illegal aliens to flood our communities.

One of those illegal aliens was Jose Ibarra. In 2023, he was caught shoplifting. Despite multiple arrests on his record in addition to his illegal status, he was released under the Biden administration. Months later, as we all know, he murdered 22-year-old nursing student Laken Riley.

There is no other way to put it. Her death is a direct result of President Biden's deliberate refusal to enforce our laws. It is the Federal Government's job to defend our borders and protect our citizens, and our government has failed us.

Fortunately, a new leader is taking office soon. This past November, Americans demonstrated that they are fed up with the left's refusal to secure our border. I am proud to be part of a Republican majority that will work with the new administration to strengthen our laws to ensure the safety of every American.

While I am confident that the Trump administration will secure our border and, yes, empower ICE to do its job, we must not allow our security to depend on whether or not a Republican occupies the White House. We in this Congress must ensure there are no future Laken Rileys.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 29, the Laken Riley Act.

This bill is in remembrance of Laken Riley, the 22-year-old nursing student who was tragically murdered last year in my home community of Athens, Georgia, by an illegal alien from Venezuela who should have never even been in our country.

After illegally crossing the southern border in 2022, Laken's murderer was released through the Biden administration's weaponization of the parole program. The following year, he was arrested by the NYPD for acting in a manner to injure a minor and for committing a motor vehicle license violation.

According to an Athens-Clarke County Police Department report, this illegal alien went on to shoplift in Georgia just weeks after his encounter with law enforcement in New York.

Clearly, this illegal alien had a pattern of criminal history, one that started when he accepted Joe Biden's invitation to illegally enter our country. He should never have been allowed to reside in the United States illegally, and ICE should have immediately issued a detainer after he committed these crimes. Ultimately, if ICE had been aware and then issued a detainer, this criminal illegal alien would not have even been in the United States to commit the horrific murder of Laken Riley.

We must enact changes now to protect our communities across the country from facing additional avoidable tragedies.

Thankfully, H.R. 29 provides a commonsense solution to do just that. This legislation requires ICE to issue detainers and take custody of illegal aliens who commit crimes like theft, burglary, and larceny.

The local jurisdiction, the Athens-Clarke County Unified Government, was a sanctuary city, and that is another problem. That is a big problem. The sanctuary policy hampered the Athens-Clarke County Department of Police Services and the Clarke County Sheriff's Office from recognizing and acting upon an ICE detainer, which could have prevented Laken's murder.

Time and time again, communities and families throughout our Nation have been devastated by heinous crimes committed by illegal aliens. In fact, this past October, the Peach State faced another unspeakable tragedy. In Habersham County, in my home district, Ms. Mimi Rodriguez-Ramirez was brutally murdered by an illegal alien from Mexico. She was just 25 years old and left behind a young daughter and a loving family.

The citizens of Clarke County and Habersham County are hundreds of miles from any border but are still being brutally victimized by illegal aliens. Enough is enough. These preventable tragedies must come to an end.

As a cosponsor of this critical legislation, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Laken Riley Act. After all, one of the most formidable ways that Congress can deliver justice for Laken Riley, Mimi Rodriguez-Ramirez, and their families is by passing this legislation to prevent additional avoidable tragedies from victimizing the law-abiding citizens of our Nation.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I want to address one thing before we start. It was again mentioned about the bipartisan bill. The bipartisan bill was a bad bill. It didn't stop catch and release. It didn't expedite immediately to the country of origin. It didn't rebuild the wall. It didn't have a stay in Mexico policy. It was words. It wasn't actions. It wasn't good. That is why people didn't vote for it. That is why it wasn't successful.

Speaking about words, though, when I came here today, I thought about a lot of words. I hear a lot of words, a lot of debate, a lot of discussion. To the family of Laken Riley and to so many others across the United States of America, words don't matter. Condolences don't count. Speeches don't do it. Words will never replace her life.

In life, we have all gone through tragedies sometimes, so we often say: My God, why did this happen? Why did this car accident happen? Why did this person get cancer? Whatever it is.

This is different. We know why it happened. It happened because of the administration allowing illegals, some of whom—not all of whom but some of whom—were criminals into our country, feeding them, clothing them, transporting them, housing them, paying for them. Men and women are breaking their backs in this country to make a living, but we are paying for it.

We know how it happened. We know how it happened to the New York City woman who was set on fire. We know how it happened to State Trooper Christopher Gadd in Washington State when he died because of an illegal alien. We know how it happened to Lizbeth Medina from the great State of Texas. She was 16 years old, and her life was snuffed out. That is never okay.

Laken Riley fought for her life. You hear about her last 20 minutes on this Earth. She fought, and she fought with everything she had. She didn't want to be raped. She didn't want to be brutalized.

I don't want to curse here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, this individual then took a rock and bashed her head in until she was unrecognizable.

Do you know what? Condolences aren't going to do it. I say it to my friend on the other side of the aisle, the ranking member. Feeling bad, feeling sorry, is not going to do it. It doesn't make the difference.

All of us here, most of us have been mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, daughters, or sons. You can't imagine

how her family feels. People say, "I know how you feel." No, I don't know. I don't know. You don't know.

There is something we can do. All this bill does is detain people who have done something wrong, who have broken the law already, and who have the potential to do even worse. All of these cases that I mentioned and many more would not have occurred if we had this law in place.

Don't give condolences. Vote for the bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I am moved by the words of the gentleman from New Jersey who said: Don't give us words. Words don't matter. Speeches don't cut it. Speeches don't do it.

It sounds like an absolute echo of what you hear from our colleagues whenever there is an explosion of gun violence in any of our communities. We hear thoughts and prayers, lots of words, but no action.

The fact that there is sympathy or condolences, I agree with the gentleman, is not enough. We need real public policy changes that will be effective and that will be constitutional.

That is what the discussion is about today. Will these policy changes, in fact, be effective? Will they be constitutional or not?

I agree that we should move from the situation of identifying and empathizing with people who have suffered terrible family tragedies and private tragedies to effective public policy. That is our job as legislators.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, perhaps we should take all the criminals off the streets, starting with those who shouldn't have been in our country in the first place, which is what this bill does.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I support this important legislation that would take concrete policy steps toward addressing the problem of open borders created by this administration.

We listened to the gentlewoman from Washington on the other side talk about the cost of implementing the legislation. That requires a certain amount of hubris to claim to be worried about the cost of implementing a piece of legislation when the cost of the open borders that have been created by this administration and embraced by the other side are clearly evident.

I have been to the border. We have seen the impact that open borders have had on the educational systems, the transportation systems, the housing systems, and the agriculture systems. All across this country, our Nation is a nation of border communities now because we are all being impacted by these open borders.

Back in 2022, Laken Riley's horrific murder shocked the Nation. Also

shocking was the fact that her murder was preventable. It was preventable by enforcing the laws of this country. After his arrest for crossing the border illegally in 2022, he was paroled into the United States. Months before murdering Laken Riley, he was arrested for theft. Local authorities in Georgia released him, and ICE didn't lodge a detainer for the alien. Unfortunately, these two actions directly contributed to the murder of Laken Riley.

This legislation that bears her name would require ICE to arrest illegal aliens who commit theft offenses and, importantly, would mandate that these aliens are detained until they are removed from the country. It further requires that the Department of Homeland Security issues a detainer for these illegal aliens and take custody of them effectively and expeditiously.

While we anxiously await President Trump's inauguration and know that his administration will follow and enforce immigration law and take steps to advance the enforcement of our borders, the Laken Riley Act ensures that all administrations are held accountable, including the previous one, and that our immigration laws are followed.

Madam Speaker, I support this important legislation, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the bill.

□ 1215

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support and full support of H.R. 29, the Laken Riley Act. It is long overdue that we actually take law and order seriously, that we enforce the laws that are on the books.

Laken Riley is not an isolated incident, unfortunately. Jocelyn Nungaray from Texas, mother Rachel Morin, and many others, were innocent women who were horrifically killed by illegal aliens, and their families are going to be mourning their loss of life for the rest of their lives.

Violent criminals like the ones who committed this heinous act and others continue to pour over our border daily, which is why we desperately need to pass this act today.

This legislation will protect American communities by requiring Immigration and Customs Enforcement to issue detainers, mandatory detention for those who are here illegally who also commit theft. It is pretty simple. There should be nothing controversial about this.

In fact, I am interested to see how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who vote against this go back to their districts, Madam Speaker, and say: I don't stand for law and order because I don't want illegal aliens who are here committing theft, rape, murder, or any other offense, to be detained. How can you go back to a district and say that?

In Texas, by the way, good news. With the Laken Riley Act, you now have standing to sue the Federal Government when they don't do this, when they don't enforce the laws on the books. You have standing to sue the Federal Government for failing to uphold the laws that are on our books.

My heart goes out to Laken Riley's family. My heart goes out to other people who have had to watch as this administration has stood by and done nothing to protect our country, our communities, and the sanctity of the safety that we as Americans should always have. Let's go home and let's be proud, in a bipartisan way, that we are willing to uphold the law.

I stand in full support of the Laken Riley Act.

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

In answer to the distinguished gentleman, he stated precisely what the law is now. He said: How can we go back to our districts and not defend the immediate deporting of people who have committed theft? That is what the law is. They want to change the law to go from someone who has actually committed theft, or been convicted of theft, to people who have been charged with it, even if the charges have been dropped, or arrested for it, even if charges were never brought in the first place.

I think that the misstatement of the meaning of this legislation speaks very deeply to what an opportunistic exercise this really is.

What the gentleman was asking for is the law today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I remind my friend that the law also requires every illegal alien to be detained until their case is adjudicated, which is what the Democrats have ignored these last 4 years.

This bill simply says if on top of that the illegal is charged with a crime, they need to be detained and taken off the streets.

The murderer of Laken Riley was charged but not convicted. Had he been treated as the detainer law requires, he would have been deported and Laken Riley would be alive today.

I am prepared to close when the gentleman is ready. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for this debate.

I must say that the legislation before us and the approach that it embodies reflect a profound disrespect for our criminal justice system and for our constitutional values.

To begin with, they want to change the mandatory detention provisions

which we have had since 1996 on a bipartisan basis for the last 28 years. We have operated on the basis of criminal conviction, which is obviously congruent with the constitutional demands and values that we have in our country.

Now, without having a legislative hearing, they want to radically revise the statutes to say that it is sufficient for somebody to have been charged with or arrested for an offense like shoplifting or theft, even if the charges are dropped and even if charges are never brought after an arrest is made. It seems to me that they are backtracking from purported fidelity to our constitutional values.

Similarly, they want to essentially overthrow Justice Kavanaugh's 8-1 decision in the United States v. Texas from just a couple of years ago where the Supreme Court determined that States do not have standing to go to court to say that they don't like the way that a particular administration is allocating its resources and implementing a public policy.

Now, if they want to argue that there is a law that is unconstitutional, they can argue that, but they can't go to court and simply say that the executive branch is implementing the law in a way that a particular State doesn't like. Yet, they want to occasion that massive shift of power, as Justice Kavanaugh characterized it, so that the States would essentially be able to control Federal immigration policy.

I am still reeling from reading the author of this legislation's statements yesterday, which I think also speak to a fundamental disrespect for the rule of law, which says: Since January 6, hundreds of peaceful protesters have been hunted down, arrested, held in solitary confinement, and treated unjustly. Countless hours and taxpayer dollars have been spent pursuing innocent grandmothers and raiding President Trump's home while terrorists and millions of illegal immigrants continue to cross our Nation's borders.

That is the fundamentally demagogic and lawless approach to this whole debate that they have taken. Our body was invaded by a mob of insurrectionists who injured 140 officers, wounding them and hospitalizing them, and they cannot even acknowledge that as a fact but instead change the subject to millions of people crossing the border illegally, which over the decades has undoubtedly happened under both Democrats and Republicans. That is what we should be working on today.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague that the riot at the Capitol 4 years ago was an abomination. I have said so repeatedly whenever the subject arises. There is no excuse for it.

I would also remind the gentleman what Justice Kavanaugh said in the United States v. Texas. That is where the Supreme Court ruled the States

currently don't have standing to sue to enforce these laws. What he actually says was, the ruling was, it would require a change in law: elevating de facto injuries to the status of legally cognizable injuries redressable by a Federal court. That is what Justice Kavanaugh said we needed to do. That is exactly what this bill does, by the book, and yet the Democrats still oppose it.

To my Democratic colleagues, I ask them: How many more laws with names attached to them do we need to pass before they take this crisis seriously?

How many American citizens must die at the hands of illegal aliens before we all agree that these tragedies are all preventable, lest the name of my child or your child be the one attached to an H.R. number before the Democrats can vote "yes" on these commonsense bills?

How much more blood must be shed before we can all join in calling for an absolute end to the Democrats' reckless open borders and sanctuary city policies that have threatened our safety, devastated our families, and are in the process of destroying our country? The American people have now spoken clearly on this issue. Enough is enough.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the bill. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam 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 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 1 p.m.

LAKEN RILEY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of

the bill (H.R. 29) 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 bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 159, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—264

Aderholt	Garbarino	Mannion
Alford	Gill (TX)	Massie
Allen	Gillen	Mast
Amodei (NV)	Gimenez	McBath
Arrington	Golden (ME)	McCaul
Babin	Goldman (TX)	McClain
Bacon	Gonzales, Tony	McClain Delaney
Baird	Gonzalez, V.	McClintock
Balderson	Gooden	McCormick
Barr	Goodlander	McDonald Rivet
Barrett	Gosar	McDowell
Baumgartner	Graves	McGuire
Bean (FL)	Gray	Messmer
Begich	Green (TN)	Meuser
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Miller (IL)
Bergman	Griffith	Miller (OH)
Bice	Grothman	Miller (WV)
Biggs (AZ)	Guest	Miller-Meeks
Biggs (SC)	Guthrie	Mills
Bilirakis	Hageman	Min
Boebert	Hamadeh (AZ)	Moolenaar
Bost	Harder (CA)	Moore (AL)
Boyle (PA)	Haridopolos	Moore (NC)
Bresnahan	Harrigan	Moore (UT)
Buchanan	Harris (MD)	Moore (WV)
Budzinski	Harris (NC)	Moran
Burchett	Harshbarger	Morelle
Burlison	Hayes	Moskowitz
Bynum	Hern (OK)	Mrvan
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Murphy
Cammack	Hill (AR)	Nehls
Carey	Hinson	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Horsford	Norman
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Nunn (IA)
Ciscomani	Hoyle (OR)	Obernolte
Cline	Hudson	Ogles
Cloud	Huizenga	Onder
Clyde	Hunt	Owens
Cole	Hurd (CO)	Palmer
Collins	Issa	Pappas
Comer	Jack	Perez
Costa	Jackson (TX)	Perry
Courtney	James	Pfluger
Craig	Johnson (LA)	Reschenthaler
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Riley (NY)
Crank	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Rose
Cuellar	Kaptur	Rouzer
Davids (KS)	Kean	Roy
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Rulli
Davis (NC)	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
De La Cruz	Kennedy (UT)	Salazar
Deluzio	Kiggans (VA)	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Kiley (CA)	Schmidt
Donalds	Kim	Scholten
Downing	Knott	Schrier
Dunn (FL)	Kustoff	Schweikert
Edwards	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Elizy	LaLota	Self
Emmer	LaMalfa	Sessions
Estes	Landsman	Sewell
Evans (CO)	Langworthy	Shreve
Ezell	Latta	Simpson
Fallon	Lawler	Smith (MO)
Fedorchak	Lee (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Feenstra	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Figures	Letlow	Smucker
Finstad	Levin	Sorensen
Fischbach	Loudermilk	Spartz
Fitzgerald	Lucas	Stanton
Fitzpatrick	Luna	Staubert
Fleischmann	Luttrell	Stefanik
Flood	Lynch	Steil
Fong	Mace	Steube
Fox	Mackenzie	Strong
Fox	Malliotakis	Stutzman
Franklin, Scott	Maloy	Subramanyam
Fry	Mann	Suozzi
Fulcher		

Sykes
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Torres (NY)
Tran

Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—159

Adams	Frost	Omar
Aguilar	Garamendi	Pallone
Amo	Garcia (CA)	Panetta
Ansari	Garcia (IL)	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)	Peters
Balint	Gomez	Pettersen
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pingree
Beatty	Himes	Pocan
Bell	Houlihan	Pou
Bera	Hoyer	Pressley
Beyer	Huffman	Quigley
Bishop	Ivey	Ramirez
Bonamici	Jackson (IL)	Randall
Brown	Jacobs	Raskin
Brownley	Jayapal	Rivas
Carbajal	Jeffries	Ross
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Johnson (TX)	Salinas
Caspar	Kamlager-Dove	Sánchez
Case	Keating	Scanlon
Casten	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Kennedy (NY)	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
McCormick	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Chu	Larson (CT)	Simon
Cisneros	Latimer	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Lee (PA)	Soto
Clarke (NY)	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Cleaver	Liccardo	Stevens
Clyburn	Lieu	Strickland
Cohen	Lofgren	Swalwell
Conaway	Magaziner	Takano
Connolly	Matsui	Thanedar
Correa	McBride	Thompson (CA)
Crockett	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
Crow	McCollum	Tlaib
Davis (IL)	McGarvey	Tokuda
Dean (PA)	McGovern	Tonko
DeGette	McLever	Torres (CA)
DeLauro	Meeks	Trahan
DelBene	Menendez	Turner (TX)
DeSaulnier	Meng	Underwood
Dexter	Mfume	Vargas
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Vasquez
Doggett	Morrison	Veasey
Elfreth	Moulton	Velázquez
Escobar	Mullin	Vindman
Espallat	Nadler	Wasserman
Fletcher	Neal	Schultz
Foster	Neguse	Waters
Foushee	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Frankel, Lois	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Friedman	Olshewski	

NOT VOTING—11

Brecheen	Garcia (TX)	Sherrill
DesJarlais	Gottheimer	Waltz
Evans (PA)	Grijalva	Wilson (FL)
Fields	Ruiz	

□ 1327

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 6.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2025, TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 2025

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. Thursday, January 9, 2025.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oklahoma?