

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—213

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

NOES—204

Adams	Casten	Dean (PA)
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Amo	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Ansari	Cherfilus-	DelBene
Auchincloss	McCormick	Deluzio
Balint	Chu	DeSaulnier
Barragan	Cisneros	Dexter
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bell	Clarke (NY)	Elfreth
Bera	Cleaver	Escobar
Beyer	Clyburn	Espallat
Bishop	Cohen	Evans (PA)
Bonamici	Conaway	Fields
Boyle (PA)	Connolly	Figures
Brown	Costa	Fletcher
Brownley	Courtney	Foster
Budzinski	Craig	Foushee
Bynum	Crockett	Frankel, Lois
Carbajal	Crow	Friedman
Carson	Cuellar	Frost
Carter (LA)	Davids (KS)	Garcia (CA)
Casar	Davis (IL)	Garcia (IL)
Case	Davis (NC)	Garcia (TX)

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

NOT VOTING—16

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1404

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call No. 20 and NAY on Roll Call No. 21.

LAKEN RILEY ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 53, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 53, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 5

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”;

(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, shoplifting, or assault of a law enforcement officer offense, or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person.”;

(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’, ‘shoplifting’, ‘assault of a law enforcement officer’, and ‘serious bodily injury’ have the meanings given such terms in the jurisdiction in which 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 paragraph (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”;

(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 such term 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 the 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from 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 S. 5.

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, S. 5 bears the name of Laken Riley, murdered by one of the 8 million illegal aliens that Joe Biden and his Democratic supporters deliberately allowed into our country over these last 4 years.

In Laken's case, the murderer was paroled into this country through a shocking abuse of that power. He was repeatedly arrested for theft and other crimes in sanctuary jurisdictions and each time released back onto our streets. Just months before he murdered Laken, he was arrested for theft, but ICE couldn't take him into custody because of the Biden-Harris administration's policies that shielded such monsters from arrest and deportation.

This measure, first introduced by Representative MIKE COLLINS, would require ICE detention for illegal aliens who are charged with, arrested for, or convicted of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense.

The Democrats have argued that the mere accusation of committing a crime should not be grounds for detention and that shoplifting is no big deal. They ignore the fact that every illegal alien is currently required to be detained by current law throughout the pendency of their asylum claims.

The Democrats have thumbed their noses at this law for the past 4 years. Their excuse is that they were prioritizing detaining more dangerous offenders. This bill does exactly that, yet they still oppose it.

□ 1415

During his first term, President Trump proved that the President, on his own authority, can secure our borders. President Biden proved that a President who is determined to make a

mockery of our immigration laws can willfully open our borders to the most violent criminals, terrorists, gangs, and cartels on this planet and then use the Democrats' sanctuary laws to protect them.

This national nightmare ended at noon on Monday, but what of future Presidents? This bill ensures that what happened to Laken Riley cannot happen again should another Joe Biden disgrace the Presidency.

Our Senate colleagues have added to the Laken Riley Act parts of Sarah's Law, introduced by Representative RANDY FEENSTRA and Senator JONI ERNST, to mandate detention for illegal aliens who commit any offense that involves death or serious bodily injury.

Sarah's Law was named after Sarah Root. On January 31, 2016, as Sarah drove home after celebrating her college graduation, an illegal alien, who was street racing while drunk, slammed into her SUV, snapping Sarah's spine and fracturing her skull. Sarah died 4 days later, on February 4.

Within hours of her death, a judge set the illegal's bond at \$50,000 because no detainer was filed despite a desperate request by local police to do so.

The administration defended this dereliction of duty because the illegal alien had not been convicted of a criminal charge and, therefore, was not an “enforcement priority.”

S. 5 closes this loophole by requiring detention for illegal aliens, like Sarah Root's killer, who are arrested for, charged with, admitted to, or convicted of any crime that resulted in someone's death or serious bodily injury.

In addition, this bill includes elements of Representative JEFF VAN DREW's Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act, which passed the House last year and applies the same mandate for those who assault law enforcement officials.

This bill would also allow States to bring a civil action against derelict Federal officers who refuse to enforce immigration law. This was first introduced by Representatives DAN BISHOP and CHIP ROY in the SUE for Immigration Enforcement Act. That bill also passed the House twice as part of the Laken Riley Act. That bill was also killed by Senate Democrats last year.

Whether it is sober reflection or perhaps the sobering results of the November election, a handful of Democrats in both the House and the Senate have now come over to support this law. We welcome them. We wish them well in convincing the majority of their party that they need to change course, if not for the good of our country, then at least for the good of themselves. We will take their support any way we can get it.

I have every confidence that President Trump will end this scourge upon our Nation during the next 4 years. This law, and the others that will follow it, will ensure that no future President will be able to unleash upon our country what Joe Biden and his Democratic supporters did.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 5.

We have all these fine speeches and all these fancy parties with billionaires and Congressmen in tuxedos; all these executive orders for Big Oil and tech brologarchs; all these complete and unconditional pardons for Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, and violent extremists who chanted “Hang Mike Pence” and smashed, swarmed, and wounded our police officers in this building with steel poles, baseball bats, American flags, Confederate battle flags, and bear mace—all this sound and fury on day one and week one, but nothing to bring down grocery prices; nothing to bring down the cost of rent, as they promised; nothing to improve our healthcare system or build on our success in the last Congress in reducing prescription drug prices; nothing to get health insurance coverage for millions of people who don’t have it; nothing to bring down the cost of housing or build new housing; nothing to combat the nightmare of climate change, other than the full-scale retreat of withdrawing from the Paris climate accord; nothing to address the real problems faced by the American people.

Today, they want to change the subject from the indelible and shocking public safety disaster of the President releasing hundreds of convicted felons, specifically violent, cop-beating felons caught on tape in the act, whom he had incited on January 6, 2021, back into the population with no plan for protecting the American people or the public safety.

What do they want to talk about today in their wisdom? Public safety and immigration. Great. Let’s do it.

This bill does nothing to address the major problems we face in the immigration system or to secure the American border, nor does it do anything to address the major problems we face in public safety, such as the central and overriding problem of out-of-control gun violence, which takes tens of thousands of American citizens’ lives every year and is the leading cause of death among American citizen children up to the age of 18.

Mr. Speaker, it may surprise a lot of Americans, but we actually know how to solve these problems, how to make substantial progress on both immigration and public safety. The roadblock is that the majority completely lacks the political will to do it.

Why? Well, the Republicans are divided between two extreme positions: the big business tech oligarchs who bankroll their party and who love cheap foreign labor under the current regime, and the inflamed, nativist, MAGA element who want to shut down all immigration, including legal immigration, and believe in rightwing conspiracy theories like the racist great replacement theory.

Congress could pass bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform this week. Senate Republicans and Democrats reached a powerful and painstaking compromise with President Biden last year to fortify our border with more border agents and more enforcement, more detection technology, more asylum judges, and more funding, but President Trump told House Republicans to tank this popular bipartisan agreement, to sink it.

He didn’t want a bipartisan border solution to improve things in the real world. He wanted a permanent border crisis to run against on TV.

Not doing anything means that Trump doesn’t offend his big business supporters who want cheap foreign labor under the current regime, but it allows him to pander indefinitely to his MAGA base with nativist rhetoric and tiny, little messaging bills that move a few words around but don’t fundamentally change anything.

We should add to the tough border measures already negotiated last Congress a meaningful pathway to citizenship proposed for Dreamers, TPS holders, and other law-abiding, productive immigrants.

If we move from demagoguery to deliberation, we can flesh this out, and we can make immigration work for America, a nation built on immigrants.

We have huge job shortages in agriculture, manufacturing, retail, seafood, nursing, hospitals, and many other areas. We should not be plunging America into chaos to deport millions of people when we already need millions of new people to work here.

If the GOP plan of deporting 12 million people were really to happen, it would plunge us into another Trump economic crisis like the last one under COVID-19 but maybe even cause a depression this time.

The vast majority of Americans know what common sense dictates. We must make it a lot harder for people to get into our country illegally, but we must make it a lot easier for people to get into our country lawfully.

Today, only 2 percent of people seeking admission lawfully are admitted, and Donald Trump, in his first administration, crippled legal immigration into the country. He banned many legal immigrants unable to prove that they have high incomes. He banned immigrants from 13 specific countries. He banned most visa applicants and most skilled temporary workers, deeming them an economic threat. We must reform our system consistent with our values as a nation.

Similarly, when it comes to public safety, we could arrive at a common-sense, bipartisan agenda right now to make our communities a lot safer if we were serious about it.

Let’s take the central problem of gun violence, for example, which now takes more than 48,000 American lives a year and is the leading cause of death for children and young people in America up to the age of 18.

Gun violence costs us, costs America, an astonishing \$557 billion a year, Mr. Speaker, more than half a trillion dollars a year because of gun violence.

Mass shootings with an AR-15 or other assault weapons have become a terrifying feature of gun violence in America, although they account for just over 1 percent of the tens of thousands of lives we lose generally to gun violence, with old-fashioned handgun homicides, suicides, and accidents continuing to cause the vast majority of deaths.

Here are some policies that the vast majority of Americans support that we could pass this week if they would allow us to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Congress could close the loopholes in the Brady legislation, like the internet loophole and the private gun show loophole. We could pass universal violent criminal background checks on all gun purchases, something supported by upward of 90 percent of the American people, vast majorities of people of both political parties, independents, conservatives, liberals, gun owners, and non-gun owners. Almost everybody supports it.

We could pass a military-style assault weapons ban, which more than 60 percent of Americans support. We could crack down on the proliferating danger of ghost guns. We could expand red flag laws nationwide.

Alas, our colleagues refuse to do any of it because their well-advertised compassion for the American victims of violent crimes committed by undocumented aliens, which they base their entire argument on and which we all share, apparently does not extend to the far larger class of American victims of violent gun crimes committed by other American citizens, even though we have not just 48,000 Americans killed every year but 115,000 American citizens wounded and maimed trying to survive this gun violence debacle handed to us by the NRA and their followers in Congress.

They argue that the Second Amendment prevents all these commonsense gun safety measures, even though the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld them, including an assault weapon ban, criminal background checks on gun buyers, and so on.

When a white supremacist gunman bearing an AR-15 assassinates dozens of American citizen schoolchildren in Connecticut or Florida, dozens of citizen and noncitizen Walmart shoppers in El Paso, Texas, supermarket shoppers in Buffalo, worshippers at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina, or worshippers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, our colleagues extend only thoughts and prayers. They say nothing can be done. Alas, there is just evil in the world, and the Second Amendment keeps them from acting. We just have to accept this as the inescapable human price and sacrifice paid for the Second Amendment, even though that is not what the Supreme Court says.

At least today shows they think something can be done to stop violent crime in America. Will they take their newfound sense of moral outrage and compassion and apply it not just in one case but to the tens of thousands of victims of gun violence in America? America is waiting for an answer.

What is the majority proposing today? S. 5 is a bill to subject to mandatory detention not just undocumented people who have been convicted of theft, shoplifting, and other criminal offenses, which has been the law supported unanimously by both parties since 1996, but people who have been simply charged with such offenses or arrested for such offenses, even if the charges are dropped or even if they are never filed in the first place.

It is an odd way to fix the border because it has nothing to do with the border, and it is an extremely attenuated and constitutionally dubious way to protect public safety.

The vast majority of serious crimes committed in America are committed by American citizens, not aliens, and the vast majority of aliens don't commit crimes at all.

□ 1430

However, this bill doesn't even focus on the culpable class of undocumented immigrants who commit crimes. That the law already does. It focuses on those who are arrested even if they are never charged or those who are charged with crimes even if they are never convicted or even if their charges are dropped.

A young person in DACA who is with a group of friends when one of them is arrested for shoplifting and then all the kids get charged will be subject to mandatory detention and deportation even if the child was not shoplifting and the charges are dropped.

The bill is likely to pass, no doubt, because of the profound sympathy we all share for the parents and family of Laken Riley who have suffered an unthinkable, totally shocking, and profoundly unnecessary trauma. This should not be a partisan issue, and it should not be demagogued for partisan purposes.

Nevertheless, when we get serious about comprehensive threats to public safety in our immigration system, we will have to address the mass crises staring us in the face, like the gun violence epidemic, which takes the lives of tens of thousands of American citizens every year at the hands overwhelmingly of U.S. citizen gunmen.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the so-called bipartisan legislation that the gentleman refers to would have made it impossible for President Trump to have taken the actions he has just taken to secure our border until illegal immigration exceeded 4,000 entries a day. That is why it collapsed in the Senate and it was ultimately disavowed by its own author.

The gentleman is correct to lament the terrible violence in our Nation, especially in our dangerous Democratic cities. So here is a modest proposal: Take the criminals off the streets, like Laken Riley's killer, which is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YAKYM).

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Laken Riley Act.

The Biden-Harris administration was marked by failure and corruption, but the failure that sits head and shoulders above all others was their open-border policy. Almost immediately after President Biden was sworn in, America was overrun by a massive, unprecedented surge in illegal immigrants.

The chart next to me shows just how dramatically President Biden failed compared to his predecessors, over double the southern border crossings of any President since 2001. This border chaos was ignored for all 4 years of the Biden-Harris administration. It was downplayed as seasonal or written off as mere ebbs and flows.

Mr. Speaker, find me somewhere on this chart where the surge was only seasonal. Show me where it ebbed or flowed.

Illegal immigrants continued streaming across President Biden's open border in droves because they knew they would face no consequences from an administration that was more focused on inventing new rhetorical flourishes to paper over this very real crisis. They were more content to wish it away rather than actually do something about it.

President Biden's failure at the border had impacts across America. Every town was a border town. Once sleepy places were suddenly forced to contend with sex trafficking, drug trafficking, child labor, infectious diseases, petty theft, and, yes, even rape and murder.

Cartels got rich, and small towns in my district were left scrambling for money and resources. This chaos was a choice made every single day of Joe Biden's Presidency.

No more, Mr. Speaker. Monday marked a new era. President Trump has already taken more decisive action in 48 hours than President Biden took in 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, let's send this bill to President Trump's desk. I urge my colleagues to vote for sanity and common sense. I urge them to vote "yes."

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 5. I rise in opposition to S. 5 because the bill is redundant. In fact, the provisions in this bill to penalize those who have committed violent crimes are already included in the penal code. So this legislation is redundant.

What it does do, in fact, is it would force ICE to treat minor offenses as

violent ones. That includes, of course, a child caught stealing a candy bar from Walmart, someone who jumps the turnstile in a New York City subway or takes a box of cornflakes because they otherwise have no way to make ends meet.

It also sends a chilling effect out there amongst law-abiding families and workers who are too frightened to show up to their shifts at farms, hospitals, businesses, and schools across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is redundant, and, frankly, the Laken Riley family should not be subject to the political theater that is about to happen here today.

In fact, we should be looking at this issue to fix the problems of both the border, but also to regularize Dreamers, farmworkers, and keep families whole. At the end of the day, Dreamers are productive. They contribute to our society. Farmers need their workers, and we need their workers. Families need to stay together because families that are divided are weak families, and that makes a weak nation.

So this is a redundant bill.

While they are targeting the immigrant communities for stealing a candy bar, the folks from January 6, get this, Mr. Speaker, were released. Felons were released and sent out to our communities.

Today, I think of Officer Daniel Hodge whose gas mask was ripped off his face as he was punched in the face and was stuck in between two doors. America saw the film. America saw the video of him crying for help.

Today, we will continue to fight for sanity and against any political theater that happens here on our floor.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), who is the author of Sarah's Law that is incorporated into this bill.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Laken Riley Act which includes my bill, Sarah's Law, as an amendment.

In the early morning hours of January 31, 2016, Michelle and Scott Root received the call that every parent never wants to hear: their daughter, Sarah, had been killed in a car accident. What is worse is that Sarah was murdered by an illegal immigrant who was driving while drunk three times over the legal limit.

However, instead of answering for his crimes, the illegal immigrant posted bail, was released from jail, and fled our country never to be seen again.

This egregious loophole in Federal law must be closed so that victims like Sarah Root can receive justice and so that criminals can do the hard time they deserve.

That is why I, alongside Senator JONI ERNST, introduced Sarah's Law to ensure that any illegal immigrant who injures or kills an American citizen is swiftly detained and punished to the fullest extent of the law. As a father of

four, I can't fathom the pain the Root family feels to this day. It is truly heartbreaking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to deliver justice for Sarah and her family. I look forward to President Trump signing this bill into law so that illegal immigrants who break our laws are held accountable for their crimes. This must be done.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill for many reasons, but I really want to get to the heart of the problem for me. On day one, President Trump started his project to deport thousands of our neighbors, even legal immigrants, asylum seekers, and people who were born here in the United States. The Laken Riley Act is another piece of that tragic project.

Laken Riley's death is a tragedy. She should be alive today, and I am glad that that killer is facing accountability, as should anyone who harms an innocent person.

However, we have to be really clear about the bill in front of us. This bill does not make our communities safer. It gives this extreme President the authority to do something that actually most Americans don't agree with. Changing our laws so that any immigrant is detained if they are accused, not convicted, of a crime undermines due process.

This bill requires the government to detain people who pose no risk to our communities. It is a shameful bill that will result in the violent detention of innocent people and children.

Many are going to regret enabling Trump's brutal agenda, and the question is when.

When abusive boyfriends trap women in violent relationships by threatening to falsely accuse them of a crime, will you think back to this day?

When ICE raids kids' classrooms or goes into the Sunday school service to lock up some classmates, will you feel shame then?

When there are no more resources because we have been prioritizing looking at promising young DACA students and rounding them up for no reason, will you regret voting for this bill then?

Our country has failed to ensure that every American has the resources they need to live a good life. It is because of the greedy and richest 1 percent of corporations and spineless politicians that you don't have healthcare, that you need multiple jobs, that your check isn't big enough for those bills, and that you can't afford to rent or to buy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FROST. It is not the fault of our fellow Americans who might be undocumented. The solution here is not

violence. On its face, this is an evil bill meant to empower a violent man who is not interested in solving the problems of working people but interested in power. It seems that any bill that gives him power he and his party will ruthlessly pursue, but not I.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman that current law already requires every illegal immigrant to be detained. That law is simply not being enforced. This bill says that if that illegal alien who is supposed to be in custody anyway is arrested for other crimes, then they really have to be taken off the streets.

If this bill had been law, then Laken Riley would be alive today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, these are not prepared notes, but I wanted to address a few of the things that the ranking member, Congressman RASKIN, mentioned. It seems to me that from what I hear on the other side is everything but really dealing with and focusing on what this bill says and what it does.

I want to talk about inflation which, by the way, was created on that other side, food prices and energy and utilities, all of it. I want to talk about all that.

I want to talk about gun violence. I am willing to debate gun violence for hours and discuss the issue, but definitely even on that issue, we don't want to speak about the liberal policies that exist in so many urban areas where we let out violent criminals over and over and over again and change very often felonies to misdemeanors.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to know about gun violence, that is what gun violence does. That is what gun violence is created by, so much that is happening there. Their answer would be to put more gun laws in place that inflict more regulation upon honest, good gun owners who don't ever do anything to anybody. It would be to impinge on Second Amendment rights. Nevertheless, I don't want to talk about that.

I want to talk about this act because I know we are on the right side of this. Laken Riley was killed while going for a jog. That is the issue. An innocent woman who never did anything harmful to anybody in her life, who wanted to be a nurse, who wanted to help other people, and who couldn't even get the last damn telephone call from her mother, was murdered.

Then I hear from the ranking member: Well, the vast majority of illegals don't commit crimes.

My God, I hope not, because we have got close to 10 million of them, as best as we can tell. There are hundreds who

are on the terror watch list and thousands who have committed crimes. That is where the problems really do exist, and that is unacceptable.

The previous administration has recklessly abused the mass parole policies. It has flooded our Nation with illegal immigrants. It never should have happened, and it impinges and hurts the security of the American people. I am here to represent, and we are here to represent the American people.

□ 1445

Across the country, we heard about the woman that was set on fire in New York City. What was the first thing that the city of New York did with its liberal policies? They refused to honor ICE's detainer request for the man responsible for setting another human being on fire.

Our immigration laws have to be upheld. Failure to do so is why Laken Riley is not alive today. It is why Washington State Trooper Christopher Gadd's family will never see him. His children and his wife will never know him anymore. He is gone.

It is why, when Laken Riley struggled for almost a half hour, when she was beaten, when she was disfigured, when her head and skull was crushed, that we can't bring her back. We can't bring her life back.

I don't want to hear about all this other political stuff. I don't think the American people do. They want an answer.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the Senate adopted the amendment that we wanted, which was to put into the bill the legislation that we had to detain and deport illegal aliens who assault cops. They have broken the law once, and now we are saying: My God, if you do it again, no, you are going to be detained, and you are going to be deported. A lot of Democrats are going to vote for it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to know, with eyes wide open, what is inside this bill. We stand here just 2 days after President Trump gave unconditional pardons to violent criminals who attacked our Nation's Capitol on January 6, and these are the people who want us to believe that they are trying to keep criminals off the streets, when they are opening the floodgates.

I want the American people to know what is in this bill because, in the guise and in the wake of tragedy, we are seeing a fundamental erosion of our civil rights in this bill. If a person is so much as accused of a crime or if someone wants to point a finger and accuse

someone of shoplifting, they will be rounded up and put into a private detention camp and sent out for deportation without a day in court, without a moment to assert their rights, and without a moment to assert the privilege of innocence until proven guilty.

Without being found guilty of a crime, they will be rounded up. What is inside this bill is a fundamental suspension of a core American value, and that is why I rise to oppose it.

If you are a Dreamer, all someone has to do is point a finger, and you will be rounded up. We have seen moments like these happen before in the USA PATRIOT Act, in the wake of the travesty of 9/11, a fundamental suspension of America's civil liberties, that is what we are seeing here today.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may wonder why so many of our friends across the aisle, who care so deeply about the rule of law, happen to be so desperate to pass this bill after they are unleashing people who attacked police officers here in this Capitol and who are now free to roam our streets, who are publicly saying now that they want to get a gun. Suddenly, these folks care about public safety? I don't think so.

Look no further than the \$83 billion price tag of this bill. They know that it can't be paid for. They know that the capacity is not there.

Do you know what will be there? Private prison companies are going to get flooded with money, who give this money, no doubt. I want folks at home to look at which Members of Congress are invested in private prison companies, who receive this kind of money, and look at the votes on this bill.

It is atrocious that people are lining their pockets with private prison profits in the name of a horrific tragedy on the victim of a crime. It is shameful. It is absolutely shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with this: In a few months, there are Members of Congress who voted for this bill who are going to pretend that they didn't know about all the bad things that are going to happen because of it.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, when a private prison camp opens in your town and they say they didn't know this was going to happen, know that they did and that they voted for it.

When a Dreamer has disappeared from your classroom and when the President of the United States destroys what is left of the Constitution as he has announced in his attack on birthright citizenship, they will all say: We didn't know this was coming.

I want the American people to know that they did. This vote represents it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope we do open as many prisons as possible to round up as many illegal aliens who have invaded our country and those who are breaking our laws; killing our citizens, women and children; and causing complete havoc across our great land.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Laken Riley Act. I support the Laken Riley Act because Laken Riley should be alive today, and she would be alive today if it hadn't been for the Democrats and the Biden administration who ripped our border open and allowed this illegal alien monster to come into our country.

Then, in the State of New York, when this monster was arrested for committing crimes, the Democrat-led State of New York let him go. That is how he came down to Georgia and murdered our Laken Riley.

This is a bill that cannot get passed soon enough, and I am so thankful that the American people overwhelmingly voted for Donald Trump so that we can sign this bill into law. It can't happen fast enough. Thank God.

Listening to my colleagues, the Democrats on the other side of the aisle, complain and whine and defend illegal aliens who break the law the minute they cross our border is pathetic. The American people are so sick and tired of it. They cannot believe what our country has gone through. It is enough. It is absolutely enough.

Democrats will go on and on to defend anyone who is not American because of their America-last policies. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about tax dollars used. Our tax dollars should be used for defending Americans.

Members want to talk about spending a lot of money? Spending a lot of money should happen for American causes, American purposes, and Americans' security.

Laken Riley is a young woman who should be living her American Dream, and she had the right to do it. People who come across our border illegally are not Americans, and they do not have rights here.

That is exactly why, anytime they break a law and anytime they cross into our country, they should be rounded up and shipped out as fast as possible. If we need to build more prisons, then we will do it because the American people will support it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to keep myself composed when I hear people speak their hypocrisies that actually generate profits for them when they talk the way they do and then also use the word "God" somehow in their speech.

Let me say this: We cannot realize justice by engaging in grave injustice. We cannot achieve safety by putting millions in harm's way. We cannot

honor our ideals that we talk so much about in this place by undermining civil rights.

Preemptively jailing people is not accountability. It is inhumanity. Mandatory, indefinite detention based not on charges or convictions, but on accusations, that is the tool of dictators, not democracies.

Let me be clear that Laken Riley's death is a tragedy, and we have work to do to protect women and make our communities safer. We should be bringing bills like Break the Cycle of Violence Act to the floor. We could perhaps have a discharge petition and do it right now.

Let's remember that undocumented immigrants didn't make college unaffordable. They didn't destroy our environment. They didn't deny insurance claims. They didn't raise our rents.

Scapegoating immigrants just deflects the accountability from the corporations and from the billionaires and bosses profiting from everyday American hardships. That is what this is all about. It is about ending due process so that they can profit.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER).

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 5, the Laken Riley Act.

First, I point out that my Democratic colleagues are all exercised about the pardons of Donald Trump of January 6 protesters, but they said not a word when President Biden commuted the sentences of 37 cold-blooded murderers on death row in our Federal prisons.

This bill is the Senate amended version of Representative COLLINS' bill that passed this Chamber earlier this month. It is named after Laken Riley, the 22-year-old Georgia nursing student who was brutally murdered by a criminal illegal alien, another casualty of the Biden-Harris, Democratic, open-border policies.

This bill adds burglary, theft, and larceny to a list of crimes for which it would be mandatory that illegal alien criminals be deported. The Senate also added to this act a very important provision that adds assault of a law enforcement officer or causing bodily injury to another person.

The Laken Riley Act, when signed by President Trump, will begin the long and hard work of protecting Americans from the more than 10 million illegal aliens who were enabled by Biden's open-border policies.

On January 7, I was very encouraged to see 48 of our Democratic colleagues in this Chamber vote for the common-sense protections that Americans support in the Laken Riley Act. Yesterday, 12 Senate Democrats joined all the Republicans in supporting this commonsense measure.

Mr. Speaker, deporting criminal illegal aliens should not be a partisan bill.

I hope our Democratic colleagues will side with us on this issue to protect Americans and put Americans first.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is so shameful that the first bill of the new Congress will put a target on the backs of millions of our neighbors. These are neighbors who worked so hard and who build up our communities. It is also going to increase militarization of our neighborhoods.

As someone who grew up in southwest Detroit, where you will find 20 different ethnicities, people from all over the world, who came together, you should see how beautifully diverse it is. They built up communities and neighborhoods. They are an integral part of our neighborhoods.

One of the things that I have been seeing over and over again on social media already, Mr. Speaker, is literally militarization of Border Patrol, officials everywhere, just people scared and petrified because that is what is exactly happening because this promotes racial profiling.

The bill blatantly violates due process. These have literally been allegations and charges, not actual convictions. You all act like if somebody is undocumented they can't be deported. They can. As a former immigration attorney, I know that for a fact.

You are making this up so you can literally allow people to be profiled and discriminated against.

Blame them for the cost of eggs? Is that what we are doing here? We are blaming them because you guys can't put corporate greed to the side? That is a disease, and that is killing our economy. People can't afford housing. You think it is because of our immigrant neighbors?

No. If you truly care about fixing our immigration system, you would go fix it so that U.S. citizens married to undocumented spouses can actually adjust their status when we have mixed statuses because we have ignored and vilified immigrants for 30 years.

Enough is enough.

It will separate families. It would lead again to continued discrimination. It is shameful that my colleagues are giving in to racist fear-mongering at the first opportunity to pass legislation, to scapegoat our immigrant neighbors and fuel hate in our communities.

I know what is going to happen. It won't just be undocumented. It will be people like my mother who will get stopped and profiled. Does she have to carry her U.S. passport around? Are we asking people now to have documentation? That is what you want to turn our neighborhoods into, is militarization?

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. I just ask all of you to truly understand what this will do to our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to please vote "no" on this divisive bill. It is so important to understand what you are going to turn our communities and our neighborhoods into. We can't allow that to continue to happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS). He is the author of the Laken Riley Act in the House, representing her hometown and her grieving family.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a minute to talk a little bit about the journey of this bill. When this tragedy happened and we took a look at what possibly could be done to make sure that this doesn't happen again, I talked with the family and asked them if we could put Laken Riley's name on it.

□ 1500

Their response was: Congressman, if there is anything that Congress can do to make sure that this doesn't happen to another family, then please put her name on it and get this thing passed.

Mr. Speaker, and that we did. Thirty-seven Democrats with all Republicans in the House passed that bill in the 118th Congress. We sent it over to the Senate and where so many of the other good bills went, it fell into the black hole of the Senate never to be seen again.

I had another discussion with the family later and told them where the bill was sitting and what was going on. I told them that I can never let it go. I just couldn't let this go because Laken fought with every ounce in her body to stay alive that day. I vowed I would fight with every ounce I had to make sure that we protected families across this country, and that we did.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the family for allowing us to do that. I also thank my colleagues for sticking in here and voting with us, not just the Republicans but the Democrats, people on the other side of the aisle and not just in the House, it went through the Senate. We had Senate Democrats that went with this bill, as well.

This is a good bill. It is a common-sense, law enforcement bill. It simply states that for minor-level crime local law enforcement can contact ICE to get these people detained, processed, and deported. These people, these criminals that come across and inflict violence on American families, they just get more and more emboldened.

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 Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS. They commit larger and more heinous crimes, and that is

exactly what happened here in the Laken Riley murder.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to get this passed today. Let's get this done. I will leave you with one other thought, too. I have always heard a saying that there is nothing with any meaningful legislation that happens up here in this town until the American people demand it, and by God, they are demanding this get passed and we get these criminals out of our country.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good colleague from California for leading this charge and being that strong voice.

Mr. Speaker, we seem to have a common California problem on a lot of issues. I will remind people that California is a sanctuary State and some of the first sanctuary cities emanated from California leading to this problem.

Governor Gavin Newsom and the rest of the State is actually defying Federal law on enforcing borders and turning over criminal illegal aliens when they capture them and detain them. Lives are being lost because of that.

Let me go back in time a little bit so they are not forgotten.

Jamie Shaw, II, a 17-year-old high school student and a promising athlete was shot and killed in March 2008 near his home in Los Angeles. His assailant, an undocumented immigrant or illegal alien, whatever you want to call it, was a member of the 18th Street Gang and had been released from jail just a day before this shooting.

Later, he was finally convicted in 2012 and sentenced to death, then commuted by Gavin Newsom.

Shaw's death led to increasing scrutiny of these policies and hopefully results here today.

Let me remind you of Kate Steinle. That one gripped the Nation as well. She was killed on a pier in San Francisco when an illegal immigrant, who shouldn't have been there, got a hold of a gun and discharged it and shot poor Kate Steinle. This man was acquitted of murder and manslaughter and only put away on a felon in possession of a firearm. This became a focal point in discussions of sanctuary cities, as well.

We have an opportunity here to not have this happen again and again. We know well, unfortunately, the story of Laken Riley because that is fresher in our minds. We can't go back and forget about people like Jamie Shaw, whose father I met who was grieving at the time and is still grieving now; Kate Steinle, and so many other names that we are not naming here yet today. We need to do better.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that Representative COLLINS has left. I was just presented with a tweet that he sent out about the New Jersey-born Episcopalian Bishop Mariann Budde, who performed a service as part of the inaugural ceremonies. Apparently, he was not pleased with what she had to say, and he wrote, "The person giving this sermon should be added to the deportation list."

I would have asked him whether he was serious about that. Of course, the Episcopalian Bishop is a U.S. citizen, but, of course, that is very much in the spirit of the times. It reminds me of the period of the Alien and Sedition Acts in 1798 when there was an effort to use the Alien and Sedition Acts, which have been invoked recently by the new President, in order to persecute the political opponents of the administration as well as to chase down and kick out of the country all of the dangerous French immigrants who were spreading revolutionary propaganda in the country. A friend of Jefferson's wrote to him, John Taylor, to say how exhausted he was by all of the political fighting and the demonizing of immigrants and the attempt to shut the borders down and to attack political opponents as enemies of the State, and so on.

Jefferson wrote in this beautiful letter back—you should check it out online, if you can. It is a letter to John Taylor. In it he counseled patience.

He said:

A little patience, and the reign of witches shall pass over, their spells dissolve and the people, recovering their true sight, recover the true principles of their government.

In the meantime, we are suffering all of the horrors and indignities of the hysteria. If the game runs against us at home sometimes, as inevitably it will, then we must have patience because this is a game where principles are at stake.

Our colleagues have spoken up for nothing other than due process. The idea that the bipartisan compromise that has been cemented and lost since 1996 should stand, saying that we want the immediate detention and deportation of undocumented people who actually commit crimes. In an effort to drive a wedge in this body, they now say they want to move from people who have been convicted of crimes, which obviously accords completely with common sense, to people who have just been accused or charged with crimes, even if the charges are dropped even for offenses as small as shoplifting.

In any event, we don't claim somehow that one side or the other is morally righteous and the other is morally wrong. We are trying to have a public policy debate. In the role of public emotion in public policy debates, Mr. Speaker, is an interesting thing. Some people think it is enough to show up and say, there has been a terrible event. There has been a sickening murder or rape, therefore, you must pass

our bill without even reading the bill, without even looking to see what is in the bill. Does it make sense as a matter of public policy?

If that were the standard they actually believed in, they would be voting for all of the gun safety legislation they have been rejecting, because every time there is a massacre, whether it is in Connecticut or Florida or Texas or Illinois or any of our communities, we come in and we say, we want what the American people want in public opinion polls: a universal, violent criminal background check. We want a ban on military-style assault weapons.

There is no reason 18 year olds should be bearing AR-15s and showing up in classrooms and churches and synagogues with weapons of mass destruction. If it were enough just to appeal to emotion, they would be voting with us, but, no, they say that conflicts with their public policy understanding.

Well, at the very least you would think they would have the burden of telling us what they do support, but we never hear anything. You don't hear a peep out of them about gun violence because the second amendment, as they misinterpret it, is sacrosanct as well as their NRA support and contributions. That is what they bow down to is the National Rifle Association when it comes to this policy debate because they won't advance anything that conflicts with the NRA, even if the Supreme Court says it is perfectly fine.

We had a ban on assault weapons for a decade. It was perfectly constitutional. We have the Brady act. We have a violent criminal background check, but even though expanding it to make it universal would save hundreds or thousands of American citizen lives every year, they won't touch it.

Don't invoke emotion selectively and say everybody has got to go along with what you are saying without even analyzing the policy implications and the constitutional implications if you are not willing to put anything on the table to reduce the sickening death toll for gun violence in America. There is nothing in the world that approaches what we have got here. It is 25 times higher than the EU countries, dozens of times higher than Japan, Canada, U.K., you name it. Yet, they pretend as if there is no problem and they seize on an opportunistic bill like this to try to drive a wedge within our Congress and within our people.

I hope they do better when we get to the second week of this new administration than freeing violent criminal felons who stormed this Capitol and attacked our police officers than bringing forward a bill like this to try to cover up for their complicity with that sickening violence against our constitutional order.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

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

First, in response to my friend, I would say after the last 4 years in which the Democrats brought the full force of the government to intimidate social platforms, to shut down dissenting opinions, and stifle public debate, I would be a little more careful about invoking the Alien and Sedition Acts.

The gentleman offers us gun control as an antidote; we offer criminal control. Get the criminals off the streets, which is exactly what this bill does. I am sure that he must be very upset that Mr. Biden pardoned his son for gun crimes.

Mr. Speaker, to my Democratic colleagues who have joined Republicans to pass this bill into law, I thank them for standing up to the woke left of their party. That is a hard thing to do, especially when it exposes them to their insults and epithets and threats of political retribution. To the others, I ask how many more laws with names attached to them do we need to pass before you take this crisis seriously.

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

The fine point of the matter comes down to this: If this bill had been law, Jocelyn Nungaray, Sarah Root, Rachel Moran, Laken Riley, and many, many more such victims would be alive today because their killers would have been taken into custody. Under President Trump, they never would have been allowed into our country in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 53, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be 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. 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