

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).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Madam 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 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. 884, which prohibits individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

On November 21, 2022, the D.C. Government enacted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, permitting noncitizen residents to vote in D.C. local elections. This includes illegal immigrants and even foreign diplomats whose interests may be opposed to the interests of Americans.

This radical change to Washington, D.C.'s election laws upset lawmakers on both sides of the aisle. For instance, Washington, D.C., Mayor Bowser withheld her signature on the act, something she has done only a handful of times.

Last Congress, when an identical bill was brought to the floor, 262 Members voted in favor, including 52 of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, the Senate refused to take up this bipartisan, commonsense bill to maintain election integrity in our Nation's Capital.

The right to vote is a defining privilege of American citizenship. Diluting that right by extending it to noncitizens, whether here legally or illegally, undermines the voice of Washington, D.C., residents.

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital, and the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee is charged with ensuring responsible governance in the District, including its election laws.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative AUGUST PFLUGER's bill to restore commonsense protections and ensure that only United States citizens have the right to vote in local D.C. elections.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 884, which would repeal a law duly enacted by the District of Columbia because D.C. should be free to govern its own local matters.

Republicans claim that Congress has a constitutional duty to legislate on local D.C. matters, but this is historically and legally incorrect. Republicans legislate on local D.C. matters only when they think they can score political points, such as by demonizing immigrants.

Where is this passion and work on affordable housing for D.C. residents?

Where is this impassioned work on ending gun violence for D.C. residents? They only bring it up to the floor when they think they can score political points, taking away the democratic rights of people here in D.C. and home rule.

The Framers expected Congress to establish a local government for D.C., and Congress has established various forms of local government for D.C. since 1802.

The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate to D.C. legislative authority over local D.C. matters. In 1973, Congress passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, which gave D.C. an elected chief executive and an elected legislature, the Mayor and the D.C. City Council. The purpose of the Home Rule Act is to "grant to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia powers of local self-government" and "relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters." H.R. 884 contravenes the purpose of the Home Rule Act.

D.C.'s Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 allows D.C. residents who are not yet U.S. citizens to vote only in local elections—namely, for Mayor, members of the city council, the State Board of Education, attorney general, advisory neighborhood commissioner, and ballot measures.

The D.C. law does not allow noncitizens to vote in Federal elections, which is a crime under Federal law.

Regardless of your views on the merits of noncitizen voting for local elections, we have to acknowledge that D.C. is not the first nor are they the only jurisdiction in our country to allow this. At various points throughout American history, Congress and 40 States have allowed noncitizens to vote in local, State, and territorial elections, including the home State of the sponsor of this bill.

Congress did not prohibit noncitizens from voting in Federal elections until 1996, and today, about 20 municipalities allow noncitizens to vote in local elections.

I also want to address very specific concerns that we are hearing from our Republican colleagues. Number one, they are concerned that foreign diplomats might vote in local D.C. elections. We believe, number one, that that is highly unlikely, both because they have to renounce their right to vote in their home country and because D.C. has no authority over Federal matters and has only limited local self-government.

In D.C., the penalty for voter fraud includes imprisonment for up to 5 years. To be eligible to vote in D.C., a person must maintain their residency in D.C. for at least 30 days before the election and cannot claim voting residence or the right to vote in any State, territory, or country.

In a letter to Congress, the D.C. Board of Elections made it clear that to vote in a D.C. local election, a for-

eign diplomat would have to "effectively renounce their right to vote in their country of origin." The board noted that a foreign diplomat would have to "swear under penalty of law through the D.C. registration application that that person is not claiming voting residence in another country."

The board also noted that an embassy address could not be used to register to vote since it is considered a commercial or business address and that a foreign passport cannot be used to register to vote since it does not contain a residential address in D.C.

While Republicans are concerned about foreign diplomats voting in local elections, I wonder if they are aware that currently in this country, United States citizens who are registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act are currently allowed to vote in elections at all levels of government in the United States, including Federal elections. That is right. Registered foreign agents who are currently U.S. citizens can vote anywhere in the United States.

Republicans are also concerned that undocumented immigrants might vote in local D.C. elections. That is highly unlikely because the D.C. voter roll is a public record, and undocumented immigrants likely will not want to identify themselves, including their addresses.

In closing, the House of Representatives is considering the wrong D.C. voting rights bill here today. Republicans claim that voting is a core right or privilege of American citizenship. Not only is that historically incorrect, but as I described earlier, it is also hypocritical.

Republicans have fought tooth and nail to defeat legislation that would give the American citizens who reside in D.C. voting representation in the House and Senate. We, of course, continue to push for D.C. statehood.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to reject H.R. 884 and, instead, to pass H.R. 51. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair COMER, my good friend from Kentucky, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 884, that would prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia. This is a commonsense bill.

I am going to start with a question. It is posed: For what reasons—why—would my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want foreigners to vote in local elections in Washington, D.C.? What is the purpose? Let's just pose that question of why.

I ask the American public to ask your Representative where they stand on this issue because it is a bipartisan issue, with over two-thirds of this body having voted for it last year.

Free and fair elections are a prerequisite for the healthy Republic that our Founding Fathers envisioned in the District of Columbia as the epicenter, and they entrusted its care to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.

On November 21, 2022, the D.C. City Council made a radical decision to allow noncitizens, including illegal aliens and those who are aligned with embassies of foreign countries, to vote in local D.C. elections. After the non-citizen voting law went into effect, the District actively encouraged noncitizens to vote for Mayor, attorney general, members of the State Board of Education, and more.

Some may wrongly dismiss these as merely local elections. However, the reality is that local elections are a vital part of our democratic process and have a significant impact on communities. Local elections determine critical matters, such as taxation, the criminal code, and the election of city council members who create essential ordinances, including those that dictate voting rights.

It is also important to acknowledge that many local elections are decided by razor-thin margins, underscoring their significance and the importance of active participation.

I find it unimaginable that the District, along with many across the country, would intentionally weaken the power of their constituents, citizens, many of whom come from underserved communities, in favor of noncitizens who, in some cases, have broken our laws to enter this country or could potentially be employed by a foreign adversary.

As the capital of our democracy, Washington, D.C., should be at the forefront of ensuring safe and secure elections, not encouraging illegal immigrants and others to vote for policies that we don't want.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look beyond the Democrats' claim that this bill is discriminatory or misrepresents its intended purposes. No, it doesn't. It absolutely does not. This keeps the sanctity of being a citizen of this great country at the highest possible level.

□ 1500

Madam Speaker, let's restore that sanctity, and I go back to the question. This is common sense. We have to ask ourselves: Why would we want a foreign agent, an illegal immigrant, or somebody else who is not a citizen voting for elections in D.C.? What nefarious purpose are my colleagues pushing?

As I mentioned last Congress, the House passed this bill with bipartisan support. All Republicans and one-third of Democrats supported this common-sense measure. I ask everyone in the House of Representatives to stand up and do the right thing and vote for this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman just asked our constituents to ask us what we think about this issue. I think the better thing would be for the gentleman to ask his constituents what they care about. I promise this issue will not be in the top 3 or 10 things that they want us to focus on.

At the same time, they are pushing a bill to take away healthcare from 15 million Americans. Give me a damn break.

D.C. believes in universal adult suffrage, that all adult D.C. residents, regardless of their immigration status, are subject to D.C. laws and taxation and must register with the Selective Service System. D.C. believes they deserve a say in the local laws that govern them and how their local taxes are spent.

Congress should not decide which residents are fit to govern on local D.C. matters. I promise the gentleman that if he spoke with his own constituents, they don't give a damn.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic, paternalistic bill, which would repeal a law enacted by the locally elected District of Columbia Government and impose a new law on D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from every member of D.C.'s local elected legislature, the council, opposing this bill.

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 Chief's 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.

ANITA BONDS,  
Councilmember,  
At-Large.

ROBERT C. WHITE,  
Councilmember,  
At-Large.

BROOKE PINTO,  
Councilmember,  
Ward 2.

KENYAN R. MCDUFFIE,  
Chair Pro-Tempore,  
At-Large.

CHRISTINA HENDERSON,  
Councilmember,  
At-Large.

BRIANNE K. NADEAU,  
Councilmember,  
Ward 1.

MATTHEW FRUMIN,

*Councilmember,  
Ward 3.*  
JANESE LEWIS GEORGE,  
*Councilmember,  
Ward 4*  
CHARLES ALLEN,  
*Councilmember,  
Ward 6.*  
ZACHARY PARKER,  
*Councilmember,  
Ward 5.*  
WENDELL FELDER,  
*Councilmember,  
Ward 7.*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from D.C.'s locally elected attorney general, Brian Schwalb, opposing this bill.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTOR-  
NEY GENERAL,

June 9, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington DC.*  
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*House Minority Leader, House of Representa-  
tives,  
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 inherently 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. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, Republicans introduced 26 bills or amendments to change local D.C. election laws, including 14 to prohibit noncitizens from voting in D.C. or to repeal, nullify, or prohibit the carrying out of the local D.C. law that allows noncitizens to vote in local elections.

Yet, Republicans refused to make the only election law change D.C. has re-

quested, which is to make D.C. a State so they can hold elections for voting Members of the House and Senate.

While Congress has the authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it is not required to do so. In Federalist No. 43, James Madison said of D.C. residents: "A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

In 1953, the Supreme Court held that "there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power."

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss democracy, or lack thereof, in D.C. There are 700,000 D.C. residents. D.C. residents are required to pay Federal taxes, register with the Selective Service System, and serve on Federal juries in the same manner as residents of States. Yet, D.C. residents have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has the ultimate say on local D.C. matters.

The council has 13 members. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, residents can vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote on local D.C. matters, residents cannot vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is the antithesis of democracy.

The substance of this bill is irrelevant since there is never jurisdiction for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. However, I will briefly discuss it.

D.C. allows noncitizens to vote in local elections because it believes that all adult residents deserve a say in their local government. While D.C. law allows noncitizens to vote only in local elections, 40 States and the Federal Government allowed noncitizens to vote in local, State, territorial, and Federal elections at various points, including at the founding.

The Federal Government first prohibited noncitizens from voting in Federal elections only 29 years ago. Today, nearly 20 cities allow noncitizens to vote in local elections.

As the House has considered this bill, Republicans have repeatedly said the franchise is a right of citizenship. If that is what Republicans believe, I hope they will finally grant American citizens who live in D.C. the right to vote for voting representation in Congress. I have introduced H.R. 51 to do so.

Pursuant to the Admissions Clause and District Clause of the Constitution, H.R. 51 would admit the residential and commercial areas of D.C. as a new State. Statehood would not only give D.C. voting representation in Congress, but it would also give D.C. full local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to respect the will of D.C. residents by voting "no" on H.R. 884.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the question: Why are the Democrats so obsessed with allowing noncitizens to vote in our election? Why do they go out of their way to dilute the voices of American citizens, the very American citizens who elected them to represent them?

It is incredibly frustrating to hear that they continue to double down or triple down on giving rights to people who are not citizens of this country at American taxpayers' and citizens' expense.

The lead debater on the other side of the aisle said that it is not just Washington, D.C., that is looking to allow noncitizens to vote in our elections. Mr. Speaker, 20 municipalities—and guess what? They are all run by Democrats.

In New York City, we had the same problem when the New York City Council passed legislation to allow noncitizens to vote in municipal elections. We had to sue to stop it, and we successfully did. It took not just one round in court, not just two rounds in court, but three rounds in court, where the city council and the mayor of New York used taxpayer money to continue to fight this each and every round despite being voted down in the New York State Supreme Court, the New York State Appellate Court, and, lastly, the New York Court of Appeals.

By the way, all were Democrat appointees on that panel of judges. We still won because it is illegal. It is not constitutional for noncitizens to vote in our elections.

Just like we fought this in New York City and prevailed, we will do the same here in Washington, D.C. We will make sure that they stop allowing and don't allow noncitizens to vote in their municipal elections because we are exercising our constitutional responsibility to protect our elections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to be strong and vote in support of this because we know that it passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support last year. Fifty-two Democrats sided with Republicans.

Those who continue to push for noncitizens to vote in our elections to dilute citizenship and dilute the voice of citizens in our elections should be ashamed of themselves. They should think about who actually elected them to represent their interests here today and why they continue to push to the contrary.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting because the gentlewoman who just spoke said this is about preserving "our elections."

This is not about our elections. It is not about my election. It is not about her election, being from New York. It is about the elections, the local elections, of residents of D.C. It is not

about hers or mine. It is about their local elections.

I think it is interesting because I don't know what happened. My Republican colleagues always like to talk about limited Federal Government. My Republican colleagues always like to talk about how important local governance is. Yet, they want to rip it away from the people in this city.

My question is: How many doors have they knocked on in D.C.? Have they knocked on a single door? Have they spoken with a single resident, a person who lives here, about what they care about? No, they are using this Chamber and these bills to score national political points on local issues.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing the gentlewoman said is that this is about protecting the sanctity of citizen voting. Like every other issue, Republicans want our people to believe that in order to protect us, we have to take something away from somebody else. That is how we protect the sanctity of voting for citizens. We have to take something away from D.C. that they voted for when, right in front of us, if we want to protect the sanctity of citizen voting in D.C., then we know what we have to do. It is D.C. statehood.

We have to ensure that citizens in D.C. are able to have a fully voting Representative in the United States Congress and have full representation in this country.

That is what we do to protect the sanctity of citizen voting in Washington, D.C. We don't encroach on decisions that the people here have made locally.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hear about our elections. Local D.C. elections are not my elections. They are not their elections unless they live here. The local D.C. elections are about the residents of this area.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL).

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Democrats trying to give voting rights to illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, once again, Democrats are taking the 20 percent side on another 80-20 issue. The American people do not want illegal aliens voting. They shouldn't be here to begin with. They have no claim on our resources. They certainly should not influence our political system in any respect.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of them needs to be deported. Thankfully, we have a President who is actually doing that.

For so long, Democrats have called conservatives conspiracy theorists. They have slandered us for saying that the Democratic playbook, which they themselves have articulated, is to open up our borders to ultimately provide amnesty, a path to citizenship, and voting rights to illegal aliens.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, they are doing that right now. That is exactly what they

are doing, and they are fighting for it. Allowing illegal aliens to vote is not only grotesquely unjust, but it waters down the meaning of citizenship for American citizens who are here.

Mr. Speaker, our government should represent our people, American citizens. Illegal aliens have no right to vote. They shouldn't be voting, and they need to be deported.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, my Republican colleagues want to deflect on this issue focusing on undocumented immigrants. Undocumented immigrants are unlikely to vote in local D.C. elections. Again, why?

It is because the D.C. voter roll is public record. Undocumented immigrants are not going to want to identify themselves, including their address, where they live.

Noncitizen voting, again, this is consistent in a lot of jurisdictions across the entire country. We talked about 20 municipalities doing this to allow universal adult suffrage, the ability for people to take part in local elections.

The other thing, really quick, that one of my Republican colleagues brought up that the purpose of this bill is to: "Stop diluting the voices of American citizens." What is really diluting the voice of American citizens are voter suppression laws like we see in the South and like we see in Florida where I am from: poll taxes, voter roll purges, and voter intimidation. That is what is diluting the voice of American citizens.

I haven't heard a single Republican in this debate talk about ensuring that citizens who live in D.C. can have full representation in Congress.

Where is that?

I bring it up again. In every issue Republicans want to talk about protecting us by taking away stuff from other people. They never want to talk about giving citizens what they deserve. The citizens of D.C. deserve to have full representation in the United States Congress.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINE). The gentleman from Kentucky has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his good work, and I thank my colleague, AUGUST PFLUGER, for bringing forward today's legislation.

U.S. elections should be for U.S. citizens only. It is a simple premise. When I began my work on trying to stop non-citizens from voting in the United States, I was often told by people that they didn't believe that this was actually the case. That is how radical of a provision that exists in Washington, D.C., law.

Let's set the stage for folks listening today. Let's set the stage to understand how radical this provision is in Washington, D.C.

To be eligible to vote in municipal elections in our Nation's Capital, an individual only has to reside in Washington, D.C., for 30 days. Let's walk through that.

An individual who works at the Russian Embassy holding a Russian passport in their pocket, residing in the United States Capital of Washington, D.C., for simply 30 days, could walk out of the embassy, walk to a polling location and, because Washington, D.C., does not even have photo ID, would not need to pull their Russian passport out of their pocket and would be eligible to vote for Mayor in our Nation's Capital.

What the Democrats want to do, Mr. Speaker, is use Washington, D.C., as a petri dish for liberalizing voting laws across the country. What my Democratic friends want to do, Mr. Speaker, is allow noncitizens to vote across the country.

The arguments that are being made fail on the merits when you recognize that, in fact, the law, Mr. Speaker, today, allows noncitizens who simply resided in the Nation's Capital for 30 days to be eligible to vote. Again, individuals working at embassies across this city are eligible to vote for positions like Mayor and alderman. That is the height of hypocrisy. We need to make sure that U.S. elections are for U.S. citizens only.

In our Nation's Capital, we should be looking at a whole host of election law reforms. In fact, I am of the belief that we should make Washington, D.C., the gold standard of election laws to actually show the American people what happens when we put in place provisions with strong election integrity.

My colleague across the aisle referenced legislation that Republicans are working for. Let's take an example, and let's dig into that for a moment.

Let's look at the election integrity law that was passed in the State of Georgia. This, if we recall, in 2021 was a law that then-President Joe Biden called Jim Crow 2.0. In fact, the stories that were told about that legislation earned him, I think, four Pinocchios, or whatever they call that in The Washington Post. This is how ridiculous it was.

Corporate America bought into the misstatements and the falsities of President Biden. If we recall, Major League Baseball removed the All-Star Game out of Atlanta, Georgia, following Georgia passing this piece of legislation.

Of course, two elections have passed since that legislation went into effect. So we should look at the empirical data, not at the statements that were made, the hyperbolic statements that were made by my colleagues on the left. We should look at the empirical data of what took place when those reforms were implemented.

What we saw was people increasing their confidence in our elections. That

is a good thing. That is a good thing. In the University of Georgia, Georgia State put forward a robust survey of how elections were conducted in the State of Georgia. What I saw was high voter participation and people actually having a positive view of how election results were conducted.

If I recall correctly, it was zero percent statistically of Blacks who had a poor or negative voting experience. We should champion that. We should work to instill election integrity provisions across the board. When people increase their confidence in our elections, then they are more likely to participate. Mr. Speaker, that is a good thing. What we want is U.S. citizens participating in our elections.

However, what we see from my colleagues on the left is a whole host of policies that actually weaken election integrity. We have held debates as it relates to photo identification, again, another provision that should be in Washington, D.C., law.

Photo identification is almost the touchstone of what election integrity is. It is making sure people are who they say they are. It is a simple provision.

I am often reminded of a time when I was driving back home in Wisconsin. I was heading back home, and I walked in to buy a six-pack of beer. The clerk recognized me and said: Hey, BRYAN, how are you doing?

I said: Good. It is good to see you.

I set my six-pack of beer on the counter, and she said: BRYAN, I need to see your ID.

So just like every American, what did I do?

I reached in, I grabbed my wallet, I pulled out my ID, and I handed it over to the clerk.

In my opinion, I think it is absolutely nuts that we protect our beer more than we protect our ballots in our Nation's Capital. We should be looking at ways to strengthen election integrity here in our Nation's Capital, the front door for many folks to the greatest country in the world.

Instead of fighting back and saying: Yes, in our Nation's Capital, as the Democrats will say, we should allow noncitizens to be voting in our Nation's elections. We should actually be saying: No. Let's use Washington, D.C., as the gold standard of election integrity.

What I believe we will see is exactly what we saw in Georgia. Despite the hyperbolic statements being made by past-President Joe Biden and by my colleagues on the left, what we will actually see is an increase in confidence in our elections. We will see growing participation. We will see a strengthening of our democracy.

It is why this legislation is such an important step forward in the process of strengthening the integrity of our elections, increasing Americans' confidence, and garnering additional voter participation across the country.

I think it is relevant to also note that last Congress this bill came before

us, and 52 of our Democratic colleagues voted with every Republican in the House. It will be interesting today, Mr. Speaker, to see how many of my colleagues across the aisle have the courage to stand up and to say that U.S. elections should be for U.S. citizens only.

The big difference here is now we have an opportunity to see this legislation move forward in the United States Senate. This is a bill that could actually be signed into law. We have an opportunity for the first time in a number of years to not only pass election integrity legislation here in the United States House of Representatives, we have an opportunity to pass election integrity legislation into law.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am excited about the opportunity to stand there when President Trump signs this bill into law. This is an opportunity for a major step forward in election integrity here in our Nation's Capital. It is also a statement across the country because I believe the radical Democrats want to use Washington, D.C., voting laws as a petri dish to roll out their plan across the country.

My colleagues on the radical left would like to see noncitizens voting in my home State of Wisconsin; in small communities and big communities all across this country to drive forward and assist them in advancing a radical agenda.

It is why making sure that we pass this law today is so important: to make sure that we are standing up for common sense; to make sure that we are standing up for election integrity; to make sure that only U.S. citizens have a voice in U.S. elections.

This legislation should be straightforward. To my colleagues on the left, I am afraid it won't be.

I am proud to know that I believe every Republican who votes today will vote "yes" on this important measure. That is because it is the Republican Party, my colleagues with common sense who believe that we need election integrity in our Nation's Capital. More importantly, we need election integrity across the country.

As we begin this effort, I think we have an opportunity as Americans to see increased confidence in our elections. Once again, when we increase confidence, we increase participation.

Our principles should be U.S. elections are for U.S. citizens only. This legislation does that.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Speaker, if the esteemed chair from Wisconsin would indulge me, he brought up a set of laws in Georgia, which I thought was very interesting, talking about what we need to do. However, I would yield 30 seconds to the chair if he could let me know who voted for those laws that were enacted in Georgia.

Mr. STEIL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIL. It was signed into law. It was signed into law in the State of Georgia by the Governor of the State of Georgia.

Mr. FROST. Reclaiming my time. I am curious what body wrote the legislation, voted on the legislation, and sent it to the Governor's desk?

Mr. STEIL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIL. I assume the assembly and senate of the State of Georgia prior to signature by the Governor of the State.

Mr. FROST. Reclaiming my time. The reason I ask the gentleman is he brings up a law in Georgia that was written by the elected representatives of the legislature voted into office by the people of Georgia.

My Republican colleagues would have us believe that today a lot of Democrats are going to vote for a bill to give noncitizens the ability to vote in D.C.

That is not what we are voting on. We are not voting on a bill to do something. We are voting on a bill to allow something to stay in place which was voted into action by the elected representatives of the local government of D.C.

That is what we are doing here today. We are not voting to give noncitizens the ability to vote. We are just saying: Let D.C. make their own local laws just like they did in Georgia, just like the esteemed chair brought up earlier.

The other thing I want to mention that was brought up has to do with the length of residency to vote. D.C.'s length of residency requirement is not a unique thing. To vote in D.C., yes, a person has to be a resident for at least 30 days before an election, but to vote in Kentucky, for example, a person has to be a resident for at least 28 days.

I haven't heard our esteemed chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform complain about the laws in Kentucky. In fact, under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, States cannot set a voter registration deadline for Federal elections more than 30 days before an election.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned here today, no matter what my Republican colleagues say, they want to frame this as the Democrats voting to do something here today. We are not voting to let noncitizens vote in D.C. today. What we are voting to do is allow D.C. to make their own decisions. That is something my Republican colleagues used to talk a lot about, home rule, the ability for localities and people to elect their representatives to a body and those representatives to do something.

If my friend has a problem with local D.C. laws, then pick up a damn clipboard, go knock on doors, and try to change it in D.C. To do it from this institution, I think is shameful.

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



□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the U.S. Congress has a constitutional role to oversee Washington, D.C., law and intervene as necessary.

D.C.'s noncitizen voting law is a dangerous policy. Only American citizens should be permitted to vote in this country, especially right here in the Nation's Capital city.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to prohibit those who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, 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 passage of the bill.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Matthew Hanley, one of his secretaries.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-59)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the na-

tional emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 14038 of August 9, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2025.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons, and the Belarusian regime's harmful activities and longstanding abuses, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 2025.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAWLER) at 5 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 2096; and

Passage of H.R. 884.

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

#### PROTECTING OUR NATION'S CAPITAL EMERGENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 178, answered “present” 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—235

Aderholt	Gooden	Moskowitz
Alford	Gosar	Mrvan
Allen	Graves	Murphy
Amodei (NV)	Gray	Nehls
Arrington	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Babin	Griffith	Norman
Bacon	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Balderson	Guest	Oberholte
Barr	Guthrie	Ogles
Barrett	Hageman	Onder
Baumgartner	Hamadeh (AZ)	Owens
Bean (FL)	Harder (CA)	Palmer
Begich	Haridopolos	Panetta
Bentz	Harris (MD)	Pappas
Bergman	Harris (NC)	Patronis
Bice	Harshbarger	Perez
Biggs (AZ)	Hern (OK)	Pettersen
Biggs (SC)	Higgins (LA)	Pfluger
Bilirakis	Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler
Boebert	Hinson	Riley (NY)
Bost	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Brecheen	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Bresnahan	Hunt	Rose
Buchanan	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Budzinski	Issa	Rutherford
Burchett	Jack	Ryan
Calvert	Jackson (TX)	Salazar
Cammack	James	Scalise
Carey	Johnson (LA)	Schmidt
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Scholten
Ciscomani	Jordan	Schrier
Cisneros	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Kean	Sessions
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Collins	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crank	Kim	Smucker
Crawford	Knott	Sorensen
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Spartz
Cuellar	LaLota	Stanton
Davidson	LaMalfa	Stauber
Davis (NC)	Landsman	Stefanik
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Steil
DesJarlais	Latta	Steube
Donalds	Lawler	Strong
Downing	Lee (NV)	Stutzman
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Suozi
Edwards	Loudermilk	Sykes
Ellzey	Lucas	Taylor
Emmer	Luna	Tenney
Estes	Luttrell	Thompson (CA)
Evans (CO)	Mace	Thompson (PA)
Ezell	Mackenzie	Tiffany
Fallon	Malliotakis	Timmons
Fedorchak	Mann	Tran
Feenstra	Massie	Turner (OH)
Fine	Mast	Valadao
Finstad	McCaul	Van Drew
Fischbach	McClain	Van Dwyne
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Van Orden
Fitzpatrick	McDowell	Vindman
Fleischmann	McGuire	Wagner
Flood	Messmer	Walberg
Fong	Meuser	Weber (TX)
Foxx	Miller (IL)	Webster (FL)
Franklin, Scott	Miller (OH)	Westerman
Fry	Miller (WV)	Whitesides
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	Wied
Garbarino	Mills	Williams (TX)
Gill (TX)	Min	Wilson (SC)
Gillen	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gimenez	Moore (AL)	Womack
Golden (ME)	Moore (NC)	Yakym
Goldman (TX)	Moore (UT)	Zinke
Gonzales, Tony	Moore (WV)	
Gonzalez, V.	Moran	

NAYS—178

Adams	Burlison	Cleaver
Aguilar	Bynum	Clyburn
Amo	Carbajal	Cohen
Ansari	Carson	Conaway
Auchincloss	Carter (LA)	Costa
Balint	Casar	Courtney
Barragán	Case	Craig
Bell	Casten	Crockett
Bera	Castor (FL)	Crow
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bishop	Cherfilus-	Davis (IL)
Bonamici	McCormick	Dean (PA)
Boyle (PA)	Chu	DeGette
Brown	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Brownley	Clarke (NY)	DelBene