

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 884, PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2056, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2096, PROTECTING OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EMERGENCY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 331, HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 489) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 884) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2056) to require the District of Columbia to comply with federal immigration laws; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2096) to restore the right to negotiate matters pertaining to the discipline of law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia through collective bargaining, to restore the statute of limitations for bringing disciplinary cases against members or civilian employees of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (S. 331) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 206, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—211

Aderholt	Bost	Davidson
Alford	Brecheen	De La Cruz
Allen	Bresnahan	DesJarlais
Amodeli (NV)	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Burlison	Donalds
Babin	Calvert	Downing
Bacon	Cammack	Dunn (FL)
Baird	Carey	Edwards
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Ellzey
Barr	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Barrett	Ciscomani	Estes
Baumgartner	Cline	Evans (CO)
Bean (FL)	Cloud	Fallon
Begich	Clyde	Fedorchak
Bentz	Cole	Feenstra
Bergman	Collins	Fine
Bice	Comer	Finstad
Biggs (AZ)	Crane	Fischbach
Biggs (SC)	Crank	Fitzgerald
Bilirakis	Crawford	Fitzpatrick
Boebert	Crenshaw	Fleischmann

Flood	Kustoff	Pfluger
Fong	LaHood	Reschenthaler
Fox	LaLota	Rogers (AL)
Franklin, Scott	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Fry	Langworthy	Rose
Fulcher	Latta	Rouzer
Garbarino	Lawler	Roy
Gill (TX)	Letlow	Rutherford
Gimenez	Loudermilk	Scalise
Goldman (TX)	Lucas	Schmidt
Gonzales, Tony	Luna	Schweikert
Gooden	Luttrell	Scott, Austin
Gosar	Mace	Sessions
Graves	Mackenzie	Shreve
Greene (GA)	Malliotakis	Simpson
Griffith	Maloy	Smith (MO)
Grothman	Mann	Smith (NE)
Guest	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	Mast	Smucker
Hageman	McCaul	Spartz
Hamadeh (AZ)	McClain	Staubert
Haridopolos	McClintock	Stefanik
Harris (MD)	McCormick	Stell
Harris (NC)	McDowell	Steube
Harshbarger	McGuire	Strong
Hern (OK)	Messmer	Stutzman
Higgins (LA)	Meuser	Taylor
Hill (AR)	Miller (IL)	Tenney
Hinson	Miller (OH)	Thompson (PA)
Houchin	Miller (WV)	Tiffany
Huizenga	Miller-Meeks	Timmons
Hunt	Mills	Turner (OH)
Hurd (CO)	Moolenaar	Valadao
Issa	Moore (AL)	Van Drew
Jack	Moore (NC)	Van Dwyne
Jackson (TX)	Moore (UT)	Van Orden
James	Moore (WV)	Wagner
Johnson (LA)	Moran	Walberg
Johnson (SD)	Murphy	Weber (TX)
Jordan	Nehls	Webster (FL)
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Westerman
Joyce (PA)	Norman	Wied
Kean	Nunn (IA)	Williams (TX)
Kelly (MS)	Oberholte	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (PA)	Ogles	Wittman
Kennedy (UT)	Onder	Womack
Kiggans (VA)	Owens	Yakym
Kiley (CA)	Palmer	Zinke
Kim	Patronis	
Knott	Perry	

NOES—206

Adams	DelBene	Keating
Aguilar	Deluzio	Kelly (IL)
Amo	DeSaulnier	Kennedy (NY)
Ansari	Dexter	Khanna
Auchincloss	Dingell	Krishnamoorthi
Balint	Doggett	Landsman
Barragan	Elfreth	Larsen (WA)
Bell	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Bera	Espallat	Latimer
Beyer	Evans (PA)	Lee (NV)
Bishop	Fields	Lee (PA)
Bonamici	Figures	Leger Fernandez
Boyle (PA)	Fletcher	Levin
Brown	Foster	Liccardo
Brownley	Foushee	Lieu
Budzinski	Frankel, Lois	Lofgren
Bynum	Friedman	Lynch
Carbajal	Frost	Magaziner
Carson	Garamendi	Mannion
Carter (LA)	Garcia (CA)	Matsui
Casar	Garcia (IL)	McBath
Case	Garcia (TX)	McBride
Casten	Gillen	McClain Delaney
Castor (FL)	Golden (ME)	McClellan
Castro (TX)	Goldman (NY)	McCollum
Cherfilus-	Gomez	McDonald Rivet
McCormick	Gonzalez, V.	McGarvey
Chu	Goodlander	McGovern
Cisneros	Gray	McIver
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	Menendez
Cleaver	Hayes	Meng
Clyburn	Himes	Mfume
Cohen	Horsford	Min
Conaway	Houlahan	Moore (WI)
Costa	Hoyer	Morelle
Courtney	Hoyle (OR)	Morrison
Craig	Huffman	Moskowitz
Crockett	Ivey	Moulton
Crow	Jackson (IL)	Mrvan
Cuellar	Jacobs	Mullin
Davids (KS)	Jayapal	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Jeffries	Neal
Davis (NC)	Johnson (GA)	Neguse
Dean (PA)	Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
DeGette	Kamlager-Dove	Olsewski
DeLauro	Kaptur	Omar

Pallone	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Panetta	Schneider	Titus
Pappas	Scholten	Tlaib
Pelosi	Schrier	Tokuda
Perez	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Peters	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Pettersen	Sewell	Torres (NY)
Pingree	Sherman	Tran
Pocan	Simon	Underwood
Pou	Smith (WA)	Vargas
Pressley	Sorensen	Vasquez
Quigley	Soto	Veasey
Ramirez	Stansbury	Velázquez
Randall	Stanton	Vindman
Raskin	Stevens	Wasserman
Riley (NY)	Strickland	Schultz
Rivas	Subramanyam	Waters
Ross	Suozzi	Watson Coleman
Ruiz	Swalwell	Whitesides
Ryan	Sykes	Williams (GA)
Salinas	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Sánchez	Thandad	
Scanlon	Thompson (CA)	

NOT VOTING—15

Beatty	Green (TN)	Rulli
Buchanan	Harrigan	Salazar
Correa	Hudson	Self
Ezell	Lee (FL)	Sherill
Gottheimer	Norcross	Trahan

□ 1414

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.

Stated for:

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 161.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 160 and NAY on Roll Call No. 161.

PROTECTING OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EMERGENCY ACT

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 489, I call up the bill (H.R. 2096) to restore the right to negotiate matters pertaining to the discipline of law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia through collective bargaining, to restore the statute of limitations for bringing disciplinary cases against members or civilian employees of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2096

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 "Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act".

SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF EQUITABLE AND FAIR TREATMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) *RESTORATION OF RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO DISCIPLINE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS THROUGH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.*—Section 1708 of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (sec. 1-617.08, D.C. Official Code), as amended by section 116(b) of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-345), is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) *RESTORATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR CLAIMS AGAINST MEMBERS OR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.*—Subtitle M of title I of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-345) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such subtitle is restored or revived as if such subtitle had not been enacted into law.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2096, sponsored by Mr. GARBARINO, the Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act.

The men and women of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department serve the community every day to keep this District safe and secure.

On January 4, 2023, the D.C. Council passed the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. The act stripped D.C. police officers of certain employee protections, making the job more difficult despite rising crime in the District.

When the D.C. Council passed this law, Congress acted swiftly in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to overturn it. The House and Senate passed H.J. Res. 42, which would have overturned the entire D.C. law, with 14 House Democrats and 6 Senate Democrats joining Republicans in support of the resolution.

However, then-President Biden vetoed the bipartisan resolution of disapproval, allowing the harmful policies of the D.C. Council to remain in effect today.

In another attempt to protect the D.C. police, Representative GARBARINO

introduced this bill to repeal certain provisions of D.C.'s Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act. That bill passed through the Oversight Committee last Congress in 2024 and was reintroduced this Congress, again, favorably reporting out of the Oversight Committee, but now with the full support of the White House.

H.R. 2096 restores D.C. police officers' right to collectively bargain over disciplinary matters and reinstates clear timelines for disciplinary investigations.

H.R. 2096 also repeals the D.C. Council's requirement that the time and place of some adverse action hearings be posted to a public website.

This public posting requirement enables antipolice activists to harass officers attempting to pursue their due process in the workplace.

In summary, this legislation is necessary to support the recruitment and retention of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Washington, D.C., cannot afford to continue to lose police officers during the ongoing crime crisis in the Nation's Capital city.

My colleagues recognize the importance of supporting the law enforcement officers who risk their lives to protect our communities.

By restoring employee protections, this legislation gives the Metropolitan Police Department officers the due process they need to confidently do their job.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am strongly opposed to H.R. 2096, which would repeal provisions of a law enacted by the District of Columbia. Madam Speaker, D.C. deserves the right to govern itself. The Supreme Court has held that Congress can delegate full legislative authority to the District of Columbia for local matters. However, Republicans choose not to do so.

Police officers are entrusted with extraordinary authority to protect public safety. The vast majority of officers exercise it honorably and bravely. However, there must be accountability and transparency for instances in which officers violate their oath of office.

H.R. 2096 would repeal provisions of a 2023 D.C. law that made it easier for the police department to discipline officers for crimes and serious misconduct. Before that law, the department had been forced to rehire a significant number of officers it had fired for crimes and official misconduct.

Let me provide examples of the types of officers the department had to rehire: officers convicted or arrested for child abuse, sexual assault, indecent exposure, drunk driving causing injuries, domestic violence, and assaults while off-duty. D.C. also had to provide millions of dollars in backpay to those officers it was forced to rehire. D.C. also had to pay millions of dollars to

resolve police officer misconduct lawsuits.

Before the 2023 D.C. law, every single D.C. police chief, for at least the prior 25 years, has requested more authority to discipline officers. H.R. 2096 would inexplicably revoke this authority. By bringing H.R. 2096 to the floor, Republicans are declaring they know better than the D.C. police chiefs how to run the department.

Let's hear what some of these D.C. police chiefs have had to say about this authority. Let's start with former Chief Peter Newsham. He said that he had to allow "very bad police officers back into our department."

Former Chief Charles Ramsey said: "It is demoralizing to the rank and file who really do not want to have those kinds of people in their ranks. It causes a tremendous amount of anxiety in the public. Our credibility is shot whenever these things happen."

Former Chief Robert Contee said that this authority would "help reduce the risk of returning poor performers to the force. . . ."

Following the devastating murder of George Floyd, D.C. enacted the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, which, in pertinent part, made it easier for the police department to discipline officers. H.R. 2096 would repeal that discipline provision in that law.

H.R. 2096, as introduced, includes a purpose section. The purpose is "to combat the rise in violent crime in our Nation's Capital by eliminating policies which place law enforcement personnel of the District of Columbia at risk and discourage them from serving, ensuring that such personnel will be treated equitably and fairly and the recruitment and retention of such personnel shall be increased." We are not surprised that the version of H.R. 2096 on the floor today does not include that purpose section since it is inaccurate.

Violent crime is not rising here in D.C. In 2025, violent crime in D.C. is down 22 percent compared to the same period in 2024. In 2024, violent crime in D.C. was the lowest in over 30 years. Let me repeat. Violent crime is falling in D.C. and is at a 30-year low in the District of Columbia.

The D.C. Police Department is not alone in having difficulty in recruiting and retaining police officers. Police departments of all sizes across the country have had this difficulty for many years. A survey conducted in 2019, before jurisdictions across the country enacted police accountability and transparency legislation after the murder of George Floyd, found "that the difficulty in recruiting law enforcement officers and employees is not due to one particular cause. Rather, multiple social, political, and economic forces are all simultaneously at play. . . ."

H.R. 2096 would repeal four discipline provisions.

MAY 21, 2025.

First, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that removed police officer discipline for collective bargaining. Several States, including States represented by Republicans, prohibit collective bargaining by police officers. The 2023 D.C. law maintained the right of police officers to collectively bargain, except over discipline, and maintained the civil service protections and due process rights of officers.

Collective bargaining by police officers has been widely criticized for protecting police officers from discipline. A Republican staff report for the Joint Economic Committee said: "Collective bargaining plays a significant role in shielding police officers from the consequences of their misconduct. . . ."

Second, H.R. 2096 would reinstitute a 90-day statute of limitations on the police department to commence discipline. The 2023 D.C. law repealed that provision because 90 days was not enough time, in some cases, to commence discipline. Adjudicators had overturned discipline because the department had exceeded the 90-day statute of limitations. There is no statute of limitations for most D.C. employees. The home State of the sponsor of H.R. 2096 has an 18-month statute of limitations to commence discipline against police officers.

□ 1430

Third, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that gave the police chief the authority to increase the discipline proposed by a police trial board, which consists of police officers. Before the 2023 D.C. law, the police chief could only impose or reduce the proposed discipline or order a new trial. The D.C. law increased the discipline power of the chief and reduced the discipline power of the trial board, which may be more inclined to protect their fellow officers from discipline.

Fourth, H.R. 2096 would repeal a provision that required the police department to publish on a public website a schedule of officer discipline hearings which are open to the public. The House of Representatives itself publishes on a public website a schedule of its committee hearings.

I close with a question and a plea. If Republicans support police officers, why hasn't Speaker JOHNSON installed the plaque honoring the brave police officers, including D.C. officers, who defended this Capitol on January 6? Federal law requires its installation by March 15, 2023, more than 2 years ago.

That plaque in honor of officers who were killed defending the Members of this Congress, defending this institution, is apparently sitting in a closet. The families of those officers who were killed and beaten that day are waiting for the due respect that is owed to their husbands, sons, and fathers.

The more than 700,000 D.C. residents who have all the obligations of citizenship, including paying Federal taxes and serving in our Nation's wars, deserve voting representation in Congress

and full home rule. I call on the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 2096, the Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act.

Washington, D.C., is facing a public safety crisis. Last month alone, 20 people were shot and killed in the District of Columbia. In recent years, D.C. was rated the fifth deadliest city in America.

At the core of the problem is a dangerously understaffed police force brought about by reckless policies. Law enforcement in D.C. has been left without basic bargaining rights or procedural protections, something my colleagues on the other side usually support, but for some reason here they are against it.

This guts MPD's ability to recruit, retain, and respond. The result is consistently high crime rates and a staffing shortfall of about 800 officers that puts both police and residents at risk. I mean, I don't know if people forget, just under 2 years ago, one of our own colleagues was mugged at gunpoint several blocks from the Capitol. That might not have happened if we weren't understaffed by about 800 officers in Washington, D.C.

When we undermine law enforcement, we embolden the criminals. Congress has a constitutional duty to ensure the MPD can effectively combat crime and keep Washingtonians safe. This legislation restores fairness and support for the men and women who risk their lives to keep our capital secure. If Washington, D.C., won't fix this problem, it is our job to.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and send a clear message: We stand with law enforcement and will not allow D.C. to spiral further into lawlessness.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this antidemocratic bill, which would repeal provisions of a law enacted by the locally elected District of Columbia Government. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of local self-government.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters, including a letter from D.C.'s locally elected Chief Executive, Mayor Muriel Bowser, opposing this bill; a letter from every Member of D.C.'s locally elected legislature, the Council, opposing this bill; and a letter from D.C.'s locally elected attorney general, Brian Schwab, opposing this bill.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Oversight Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Ranking Member, House Oversight Committee,
Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER CONNOLLY: As Mayor of Washington, DC, I write to express my Administration's opposition to H.R. 2096, the "Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act of 2025". This legislation purports to protect hardworking police officers from unnecessary, protracted disciplinary procedures. However, it would reverse common-sense disciplinary reforms adopted by the District to the sole benefit of those few Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) officers who engage in egregious, sometimes criminal misconduct and seek to evade accountability.

A 2022 report by the District of Columbia Auditor documented the shortcomings of the prior disciplinary process. It chronicled the cumbersome, union-negotiated process that on average took eight years to resolve a termination case. Over the 18-month period considered in the audit, 36 terminated police officers were reinstated within five and a half years of their terminations, at a cost of over \$14 million in backpay to DC taxpayers. This process was neither efficient for the officers nor responsible to the residents of the District.

The conduct for those terminated officers included criminal acts such as sexual assault, sexual abuse, indecent exposure, solicitation of prostitution, domestic violence, receiving stolen property, fraud, and false statements. For many of those cases, the misconduct was not in dispute; and in nearly 40 percent of the reinstatements, labor arbitrators applied their own, often conflicting, interpretations of procedural requirements and ordered reinstatement without even considering the merits of the cases.

The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 removed serious police discipline from collective bargaining and introduced additional transparency and accountability measures to address these systemic problems. This new process has been in place for more than two years and has been a success. Members are still entitled to union representation throughout the process and MPD policy still requires disciplinary cases to commence timely within 90 days, although those deadlines are tolled during criminal investigations.

Under the new system, members have a right to be heard, in person, before any discipline is imposed, and the vast majority of disciplinary cases are resolved by agreement. While labor arbitrators have been removed from the process, members still have the right to appeal their discipline to the independent Office of Employee Appeals (OEA). OEA has upheld the two termination cases it has considered under the new system—one originally overturned on a timing technicality involving a member who worked unauthorized outside employment while on duty, accepted gratuities, and made untruthful statements; and another where the member had repeated alcohol-related misconduct, including driving under the influence, public intoxication, and being the subject of a Substantial Risk Order that prohibited him from possessing a firearm. While the sample size is small, these sustained terminations are unquestionably the right outcomes for MPD, our residents and visitors, and the local and national elected officials that MPD serves.

The law enforcement disciplinary reforms implemented by the District were long overdue. They transformed a process where the determination of whether or not an officer is

fit to wear the badge rests not with an unaccountable labor arbitrator, but with the official who bears ultimate responsibility for those members' conduct—the Chief of Police. I urge you once again to reject H.R. 2096, the “Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act of 2025,” and to support the work of my Administration, including the Chief of Police, to maintain these critical accountability measures for officers that engage in egregious and criminal misconduct.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2025

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

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write to express our opposition to three pieces of legislation we understand will be considered on the House floor this week. All three bills would repeal provisions in laws that were carefully and deliberately enacted by the Council for the benefit of all District residents.

H.R. 2096 would repeal several efforts by the Council to ensure that police officers who violate the law and contravene public safety are appropriately disciplined. The bill would strip the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) of the authority to discipline officers who violate the law or MPD policy. It would also limit the MPD Chiefs discretion to impose disciplinary penalties greater than those recommended by the board investigating the allegations made against an officer. Stripping MPD management of its authority in this area would greatly undermine both MPD and public safety. A 2022 D.C. Auditor’s report catalogued cases where MPD was barred from firing officers who had committed sexual and domestic violence, who were arrested for assorted criminal activity, or who gave false statements, misused their firearms, or slept on the job. H.R. 2096 would also restore a 90-day statute of limitations for claims against police officers that, in the past, was repeatedly used by officers seeking to avoid accountability. Every MPD Chief for the past 15 years has supported this reform because it empowers police leadership—not a third-party board or arbitrator—to determine the appropriate standards of conduct and discipline for their officers. Congress should not substitute its authority for that of local elected leaders and MPD Chiefs who have examined these issues closely.

We support having a robust and strong police force and work closely with MPD leadership to provide them with the tools they need to make the city safe. Part of that effort includes ensuring that the force can appropriately remove officers who violate the law, MPD policies, and the public trust. When the public trusts that MPD can effectively police its own, residents are more likely to cooperate in investigations and more likely to assist in prosecution, making the District safer. H.R. 2096 would make it harder for law enforcement leadership in the Nation’s Capital to remove bad actors who undermine that trust.

We also oppose H.R. 884, which would repeal a 2022 law extending voting rights in local District elections to non-citizen residents. Non-citizens enjoy similar voting rights in 15 other jurisdictions, including San Francisco and Oakland, California, Montpelier, Vermont, and a number of jurisdictions in neighboring Maryland. It continues to be unlawful for non-citizens to vote

in federal elections in the District. In fact, federal law has prohibited non-citizens from voting in federal elections since 1996. Our local law cannot and does not attempt to change that.

Finally, we oppose H.R. 2056, which attempts to negate provisions in local District law governing how MPD and other District agencies participate in federal immigration enforcement efforts. This law has been on the books for 13 years and makes it clear that District officials must cooperate with any court order directing that an individual in District custody suspected of an immigration violation be detained or transferred to federal custody. H.R. 2056 would also eliminate rules governing information sharing between the District and federal law enforcement on immigration matters. In sum, the bill would scrap rules and practices that are clear and familiar and replace them with nothing. This will only cause confusion and uncertainty both for law enforcement and those suspected of an immigration violation. The Council is already considering a proposal from Mayor Muriel Bowser to reconsider the District’s laws and policies in this area. We respectfully request that you allow us to do that work.

Thank you for your consideration and your attention to these important matters. We look forward to working with you on our shared goals to advance the safety, security, and prosperity of the District.

Sincerely,

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman, At-Large.
KENYAN R. MCDUFFIE,
Chair Pro-Tempore,
At-Large.

ANITA BONDS,
Councilmember, At-Large.

CHRISTINA HENDERSON,
Councilmember, At-Large.

ROBERT C. WHITE,
Councilmember, At-Large.

BRIANNE K. NADEAU,
Councilmember, Ward 1.

BROOKE PINTO,
Councilmember, Ward 2.

MATTHEW FRUMIN,
Councilmember, Ward 3.

JANESE LEWIS GEORGE,
Councilmember, Ward 4.

ZACHARY PARKER,
Councilmember, Ward 5.

CHARLES ALLEN,
Councilmember, Ward 6.

WENDELL FELDER,
Councilmember, Ward 7.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2025.

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

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House Minority Leader, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: I write in opposition to three pieces of legislation before you today, H.R. 2096, H.R. 884, and H.R. 2056. These bills seek to repeal, explicitly or in effect, three local D.C. laws pertaining to three inher-

ently local issues, namely the administration of local elections, the allocation of finite local law enforcement resources, and the processes for disciplining local police officers if they engage in misconduct. The D.C. Council—whose members are elected by and are directly accountable to District residents—passed those laws after extensive debate and consideration. It would be undemocratic and contrary to the principles of local autonomy on which this country was founded for Members of Congress, in whose election District residents have no say, to vote to upend these purely local laws.

District residents should have the same right as all other Americans to govern our local affairs. Just like your constituents in Louisiana and New York, and indeed the constituents in all of your colleagues’ home states across the country, the more than 700,000 residents who call the District home know and care deeply about the local issues that uniquely impact our lives. Our democratically elected local officials work closely with policy experts, local law enforcement, and other community stakeholders to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of District voters and the duly elected D.C. Council for that of federal politicians is, simply put, un-democratic. Even if members of Congress might vote differently on similar local issues for their own jurisdictions, the residents of D.C. deserve to have our local laws respected without interference from the federal government.

I urge you and your colleagues to vote against advancing these proposals.

Sincerely,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, Republicans regularly introduce legislation to repeal local D.C. laws. What is different about this bill is it also overrides longstanding wishes of the D.C. police department.

For at least a quarter century, the D.C. police department has requested increased authority to discipline officers for misconduct. The Council gave the department this authority after the murder of George Floyd. This bill would take away this authority.

I will discuss the justification and timing of this bill, though it is always wrong and never the right time for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. This bill says it is necessary to combat rising violent crime in D.C. and to improve the retention and recruitment of D.C. police officers. This bill has its facts wrong.

Last year, violent crime in D.C. reached a more than 30-year low. This year, violent crime in D.C. is down 22 percent compared to the same period last year. Police departments throughout the country, in both red and blue States, are struggling to retain and recruit officers, and they have been for many years.

The timing of the introduction and consideration of this bill is stunning. It was introduced the same day Congress cut the local D.C. budget by more than \$1 billion. This fiscal sabotage did not save the Federal Government any money, since the local D.C. budget consists entirely of locally raised revenue. The Senate immediately passed the District of Columbia Local Funds Act

to reverse this cut. Although President Trump and the National Fraternal Order of Police called for the House to immediately pass the District of Columbia Local Funds Act, the District of Columbia Local Funds Act has been sitting in this House for 3 months.

Madam Speaker, I close by discussing democracy, or lack thereof, in D.C. The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on local or Federal matters, and they pay full Federal taxes while being denied voting representation in Congress.

If Republicans cared about D.C. residents or democracy, they would take up H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act. H.R. 51 would admit the residential and commercial areas of D.C. as a State, giving D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government.

Congress has the authority to admit the new State. The Admissions Clause of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to admit new States. All 37 new States were admitted by an act of Congress. The District Clause of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to reduce the size of the Federal district, which it has previously done.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to vote “no” on H.R. 2096 and to pass the D.C. statehood bill and the District of Columbia Local Funds Act.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to oppose this attack on our Nation’s Capital.

I remind everyone that 1 week ago today, Donald Trump was in the most epic breakup of probably a generation. He and Elon Musk were fighting it out on Twitter and Truth Social, going back and forth. What was Donald Trump’s response? Was it an in-earnest response to the actual attacks that were coming toward him as his actual agenda was sinking here in the House, as Elon Musk was taking to Twitter for days trying to take down his signature bill, his big abomination of a bill that would strip healthcare away from millions of Americans, Medicaid and Medicare, that would take food out of the mouths of millions of American children, that would cut programs that people across this country use to advance their education and that would blow a hole through the United States’ deficit on a scale we have never seen before?

Just a week ago, Elon Musk was tweeting “KILL the BILL,” and in the days after was posting incriminating tweets not only about the President, but about the GOP and their ability to win and hold this House.

What was the President’s response? Did he respond to these allegations?

Did he rush to stop Republicans from trying to cover their tracks who had been lying for weeks about the nature of this bill and how it would gut our healthcare to millions of Americans, and how it would cause our Nation to spend generations of debt on the backs of the American people so that billionaires could get another small tax break? No. What he did was deploy ICE to make mass arrests and terrorize families in Los Angeles.

When people went to go exercise their First Amendment rights, he deployed the National Guard and then the United States Marines against the American people.

This is not only a distraction, this is a direct abuse of power because the reality of what was actually going on in this Chamber a week ago is that these people were trying to take away Americans’ healthcare and food assistance, and Donald Trump was getting heat from his ex-boyfriend. Then what did he do? He deployed the United States military against Americans.

What is the GOP doing this week on this House floor? They are attacking the sovereignty and home rule of the people of the city of Washington, D.C.

I think it should not take anyone by surprise as Donald Trump is preparing to have the largest military parade in generations on his birthday here in this city that the three bills they are trying to pass on this House floor are directly attacking the city that is the capital of this great Nation, that is attacking policing and attacking home rule of this city. That is what these bills are all about.

They are a distraction. They are about taking over the self-governance of the city of Washington, D.C., and they are about taking away the power of the people.

I think it is important to understand that as the Washington, D.C., Delegate, Ms. NORTON, just said, this is also about stripping the people of D.C. of vital reforms that came in the wake of George Floyd’s death.

What is this all really about? What is this in service of? Is this really about making the Capital City more safe? No, it is not. In fact, it is about making it less safe for the people of Washington, D.C., who live here, who work here every day of their lives and, frankly, who take care of the rest of us who come here to work on behalf of our people.

This is not about public safety. This is about taking away vital reforms. It is about taking away home rule of Washington, D.C., and it is about taking away, once again, the rights of the people of this city.

I am proud to stand with the people of D.C. in opposing all three of these bills and to get us refocused on the real issues of this country and what is actually happening in this Chamber right now, which is that all of these guys sitting around here today are trying to take away your healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from en-

gaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1445

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, before I reserve, I want to make sure that my colleagues across the aisle know what bill we are actually debating on the floor, that the bill that pertains to law enforcement in Washington, D.C. It has nothing to do with their quest to continue to defend the rioters and illegals in California.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Deirdre Schifeling, Anthony Romero, and Deborah Archer of the American Civil Liberties Union in opposition to H.R. 2096.

JUNE 10, 2025.

Re Vote “No” on H.R. 2096 Protecting Our Nation’s Capital Emergency Act Which Would Allow Dangerous Officers Who Have Been Terminated for Criminal Conduct or Police Misconduct to Remain Employed as D.C. Metropolitan Police Officers Endangering Public Safety, Evading Accountability, and Eroding Public Trust.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Civil Liberties Union strongly urges you to oppose H.R. 2096 which would make it easier for police officers accused of criminal conduct or police misconduct to be reinstated as D.C. Metropolitan Police Department officers. H.R. 2096 removes key police misconduct oversight provisions from The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Amendment Act of 2022 which was signed into law.

H.R. 2096 repeals key portions of current local law that address the problems highlighted in recent D.C. Auditor’s report of officers being rehired despite being previously terminated for police misconduct or criminal conduct. Specifically:

1. H.R. 2096 would reinstate the ineffective, slow, and costly arbitration process for handling cases where officers are accused of crimes or police misconduct and face termination of employment.

2. H.R. 2096 would place a 90-day limit on the police department to start a disciplinary response, but this bill does not place a time limit to take a case to arbitration. From 2015-2021 officers who were fired and/or their representatives allowed years to pass before bringing a case to arbitration resulting in large awards for backpay and high administrative costs for the District.

3. H.R. 2096 would remove the transparency requirement for the police department to publish on a public website a schedule of adverse action hearings in which the proposed discipline for an officer is termination, including the date, time, and location of the hearing, the name and badge number of the officer, and a summary of the alleged misconduct or charges.

4. H.R. 2096 also removes the D.C. Metropolitan Police Chief’s ability to increase proposed penalties for officers.

H.R. 2096 Will Reinstitute Closed-Door Arbitration Hearings for Officers Accused of Criminal Conduct and Police Misconduct, A System Which Puts Dangerous Officers Back in the Metropolitan Police Department and Costs Taxpayers Millions.

H.R. 2096 will institute a police officer negotiated, non-public arbitration for cases where an officer has been or will be fired for misconduct. This system makes it nearly impossible to fire officers from the D.C. Metropolitan Police who have engaged in criminal

conduct and conduct that violates civil liberties due to the convoluted and lopsided nature of the arbitration. According to former Metropolitan Police Department Chief Peter Newsham, the arbitration system puts “very bad police officers back into our department.” In 2022, the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor issued a report studying the cases of officers fired and then reinstated by the D.C. Metropolitan Police from 2015 to 2021. Thirty-seven D.C. Metropolitan police officers were fired for allegations criminal conduct, civil rights violations, and officer conduct violations. These dangerous officers were reinstated, on average, 8 years later, and 36 of those officers were paid \$14.3 million in taxpayer dollars.

Of the 37 police officers who were terminated and then reinstated by the closed-door arbitration system that H.R. 2096 would reinstitute, 17 (46 percent) were terminated for police misconduct defined as ‘threat to safety’ which meant these officers engaged in conduct that included a risk of harm to persons through action or inaction, such as physical and sexual violence, mishandling firearms, or compromising evidence related to an arrest. The other 20 officers (54 percent) were terminated for reasons such as misrepresentation of injuries, time theft, fraud, and other misconduct that violated the Metropolitan Police rules and code of conduct (see below for examples from the 2022 audit report).

H.R. 2096 Will Protect Dangerous Police Officers from Being Fired and These Officers Will Continue Their Pattern and Practice of Civil Liberties Violations.

Officers who were fired from the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department for criminal conduct or police misconduct continue their pattern of dangerous behavior and have police misconduct complaints even after being reinstated. As of September 2022, 15 of the 37 officers that were fired and reinstated through the arbitration process which H.R. 2096 will reinstate are still working at the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department. Six of the 15 officers (40 percent) had another official misconduct complaint filed by the Metropolitan Police Department after they were reinstated. H.R. 2096’s arbitration system encourages officers to engage in civil rights violations against the public because dangerous officers know they will simply be reinstated through the arbitration process and cannot be fired.

This bill fails to learn any of the lessons of the murder of George Floyd by police officers: officers with a pattern of misconduct must be removed from employment, not simply cycled back into positions of authority and control.

H.R. 2096 Will Reinstate the 8 Year Arbitration Process That Pays Dangerous Police Officers \$374,000 on Average in Backpay and Costs the District \$895,000 Annually in Personnel Resources. H.R. 2096 does not create a timelier process for the resolution of police misconduct cases. H.R. 2096 will reinstate a termination process that is not public and overseen by arbitrators. This process is heavily skewed to protect dangerous police officers by allowing them to capitalize on a drawn-out arbitration process that does not set any time limits for officers to bring their case to arbitration.

According to a 2022 Report issued by the Office of the D.C. Auditor, from 2015 to 2021, the police officer termination and reinstatement process lasted an average of 8 years, the average amount of backpay the District paid to these officers was \$374,000, and the District personnel and resources spent on these drawn-out arbitration processes totaled an estimated \$895,000 each year for a period of five years.

H.R. 2096 sets a 90-day limit on the police department to commence corrective or ad-

verse action against a police officer or civilian employee but does not place any time limits on the fired officers, or their representatives, to bring a case to arbitration in a timely fashion. Fired officers and their representatives have allowed years to pass before bringing a case for arbitration creating a process that takes, on average, 8 years before a misconduct case is resolved resulting in costly backpay payouts for the District of Columbia. Additionally, the 90-day time limit in this legislation allows individuals engaged in criminal conduct to avoid any accountability for misconduct through a technical hurdle and one-sided timeline requirement.

The officer discipline process H.R. 2096 would reinstate has proven to be excessively slow, a waste of taxpayer money, and puts officers unfit to serve back in the Metropolitan Police Department.

H.R. 2096 Creates a Wall of Secrecy and Undermines Public Transparency and Accountability.

This legislation will remove the current requirement for the Metropolitan Police Department to publish on a public website a schedule of adverse action hearings in which the proposed discipline for an officer is termination, including the date, time, and location of the hearing, the name and badge number of the officer, and a summary of the alleged misconduct or charges.

Public access to police misconduct information is a key component of accountability and reduces the likelihood that an individual engaging in criminal behavior or police misconduct can simply resign and join another law enforcement agency. A recent study published in The Yale Law Journal found 800 officers in Florida who were fired, some even for serious misconduct, and were rehired at another police department. Police misconduct records are often inaccessible to the individuals and communities most affected by excessive use of force and police misconduct. H.R. 2096 would remove a critical tool that allows for greater transparency and accountability.

For these reasons, the ACLU strongly urges you to vote “NO” on H.R. 2096. If you have any questions, please contact Nina Patel, Senior Policy Counsel, Justice Division.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA W. ROSEBERY,
Director, Justice Division,
ACLU National.

NINA PATEL,
Senior Policy Counsel,
ACLU National.

MONICA HOPKINS,
Executive Director,
ACLU District of Columbia.

MELISSA WASSER,
Senior Policy Counsel,
ACLU District of Columbia.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I note that H.R. 2096 is endorsed by the National Fraternal Order of Police. I strongly encourage each of my House colleagues to support this bill, which will help strengthen law and order in our Nation’s Capital City, which is the responsibility of Congress and the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Again, I encourage passage of H.R. 2096, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. COMER. 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.

PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 489, I call up the bill (H.R. 884) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 884

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBIT VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.

An individual who is not a citizen of the United States may not vote in an election for public office in the District of Columbia or in any ballot initiative or referendum in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.

The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-242) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).