

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his inquiry.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, my understanding under "Jefferson's Manual," is that the Speaker has the ability to disclose in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the source of the objection. The minority does not object to this unanimous-consent request.

Will the Speaker tell the House and the American public, is it Speaker Johnson that opposes this?

Who opposes unanimous consent to this resolution denouncing the attack?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous-consent request.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT OF 2025

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 489, I call up the bill (H.R. 2056) to require the District of Columbia to comply with federal immigration laws, 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, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 119-151, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2056

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 "District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SERVING AS SANCTUARY JURISDICTION.

The District of Columbia may not have in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any entity or official of the District government from—

(1) sending, receiving, maintaining, or exchanging with any Federal, State, or local government entity information regarding the citizenship or immigration status (lawful or unlawful) of any individual; or

(2) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Na-

tional Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

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. Mr. 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.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2056, the District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act.

The House Oversight Committee has held multiple hearings on the failings of the Biden-Harris administration to secure our borders and protect our citizens. In March, the committee heard from sanctuary city mayors, who offered carefully crafted, lawyerly statements defending their decisions not to work with the Trump administration as it works to remove criminal aliens as quickly as possible.

At the end of the day, illegal alien criminals who threaten our communities have no right to be here in the first place. State and local governments must work with the Department of Homeland Security to share information on individuals they arrest. They must also honor lawful detainers. When they do not, Congress must act.

H.R. 2056 ensures that the District of Columbia cooperates with Federal immigration agencies, including ICE, to protect our citizens and nullifies prior attempts by the District to make itself a sanctuary city.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) for his work on this important topic, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 2056, which would effectively nullify laws, policies, and practices duly enacted by the District of Columbia because I strongly support the ability of the residents of the District of Columbia to govern themselves on local matters.

This is one of two D.C. bills that the House is considering this week to demonize immigrants. Let's be clear: The District of Columbia is in full compli-

ance with Federal law. It does not obstruct ICE from carrying out its duties.

D.C., like many other jurisdictions, limits its cooperation with Federal immigration agencies to what Federal law actually requires. Why do jurisdictions limit such cooperation other than the fact that immigration is a Federal responsibility? Let us ask the police chiefs for an explanation.

The Major Cities Chiefs Association opposes such cooperation for four reasons:

"Enforcement of routine civil immigration by police would undermine the trust and cooperation with immigrant communities which are essential elements of community-oriented policing.

"Courts have held that the lack of legal authority to enforce Federal civil immigration statutes exposes police to liability for unlawful arrest and detention.

"Local agencies do not possess adequate resources to enforce these laws in addition to the added responsibility of homeland security.

"Immigration laws are very complex, and the training required to understand them and to properly prosecute them significantly detracts from the core mission of local police to create safe communities."

Let's be clear again: D.C. is in full compliance with Federal law. It does not obstruct ICE from carrying out its duties, and it is backed by evidence demonstrating that limiting cooperation keeps people safer. Counties with laws that do not honor extrajudicial civil detainers have significantly lower levels of violent crime than counties that don't have such laws.

Mayors, police chiefs, sheriffs, and local leaders across the country have made clear that the way to combat violent crime is allowing local police to do their job of ensuring public safety in their own communities, not commandeering local police to spend limited time and resources rounding up and detaining nonviolent immigrants who pose no threat.

Forcing the District of Columbia to carry out the Federal Government's immigration duties also discourages residents from coming forward to share information with the police about violent crimes for fear that they or someone close to them will be detained or deported. This is simply bad policy and will hurt the residents of the District of Columbia.

The House should reject H.R. 2056 and stop interfering in local D.C. matters. Instead, it should pass the District of Columbia Local Funds Act, and H.R. 51, Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, let's have a candid conversation if we could, sir, with my colleague across the aisle about what is happening here.

Congress and America, we need to clarify for the citizens watching, Mr. Speaker, Congress has a unique authority, and therefore, responsibility for our Nation's Capital as opposed to other municipalities across the country. Why not Phoenix, New Orleans, Atlanta, et cetera? It is because they are not the Nation's Capital, that is why. It is because it is not reflected in the responsibilities that are enumerated for Congress for the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital.

With the pendular swing of majority control that we observe in our Nation, from Democratic majority to Republican majority, my Democratic colleagues feel responsible to make changes when they have the majority, as do we.

When we were under Democratic majority control in recent years, since I have been in Congress, the Democrats supported and did not oppose some policy and legislative decisions at the municipal level in our Nation's Capital that we knew would injure our Nation's Capital in the realm of law enforcement.

That is where we are. Republicans have majority control in the House, the Senate, and the White House, so of course we are going to respond to the threat that we face within our Nation's Capital toward law enforcement.

This is my bill, and this is how simple it is: It requires the District of Columbia to comply with Federal immigration law. What is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? My colleague stated two or three times in his opening statement that the District of Columbia does not obstruct Federal law enforcement. That is not true.

America has to read between the lines. When he says they do not obstruct, it means they don't, like, physically stop ICE from executing a warrant. What he is not saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the District of Columbia does not comply with Federal immigration law enforcement warrant detainers, which is the safest, most widely accepted means by which a human being that is in the custody of one jurisdictional authority is transferred to another jurisdictional authority safely and within the parameters of the law for the benefit of the individual and the community.

D.C. doesn't do that for Federal immigration detainers. If they have somebody in custody, Mr. Speaker, for whatever purposes, and that guy has a warrant for ICE, they know that there is a warrant for that man. Under normal circumstances, the custody of that individual would be transferred safely once the District of Columbia was finished with that individual. They don't do that with ICE. They subject their communities to dangerous circumstances and law enforcement to absolutely unnecessary danger.

My bill just mandates that the District of Columbia is the one city that Congress has authority over, and therefore, responsibility to be involved with things like this.

We shouldn't have to have this law.

Why? Because the District of Columbia should be following the Federal law in the first place. We shouldn't have to bring this to the floor. We shouldn't have to engage in this debate. I shouldn't have to explain these things. However, we are going to, by God, require that our Nation's Capital comply with our Nation's Federal law.

I encourage my colleagues to take a deep breath, step back and say, yes, our Nation's Capital will be subject to the very laws that this body passes. I appreciate the chairman's advocacy for my bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's take up that challenge. Let's make sure the laws that we have passed in this House apply and are complied with in Washington, D.C.

The gentleman may forget, this isn't the first debate we have had about Washington, D.C., or the District of Columbia. We have had this debate through history ever since the Founders of this country created the District. It is a special district in addition to being our National Capital.

Most recently, in 1973, this Congress created the Washington, D.C. Home Rule Act. I will explain to the gentleman what that requires. The Home Rule Act in D.C. says because there is shared jurisdiction within this District that the people of Washington, D.C., the residents here, may govern their local affairs as they please. I emphasize: as they please, for local affairs.

The performance of their local police force is an area within their local control. That is number one. Let's enforce the laws that have been passed in this House respective to the people of the District of Columbia.

Number two. Violent crime, the special circumstances about keeping Washington, D.C., safe. Violent crime in D.C. reached a 30-year low this year, this past year, a 30-year low. Compare that to any city in the country, and it is a favorable comparison.

The police department in Washington, D.C., is doing an amazing job, and the political leadership of D.C. has stepped up. There were years many years ago when there were deep and serious questions about the leadership in Washington, D.C. They have improved dramatically over the last few decades.

This year, violent crime in D.C. is down 22 percent compared to the same period last year, and studies show that handling law enforcement the way they have, with community policing and getting to know the people in the neighborhoods, has been a key element. This is according to the last five police chiefs in this city. That spans over about 50 years. This is what they say, that this is the way to keep the people safe, work with the local community.

I know the gentleman is from law enforcement. I am just asking to afford the same respect and deference to our local law enforcement leaders here in

this community, give them the benefit of the doubt of how they provide safety in their own city. They know it best. They know the people. They know the streets. They know the challenges.

It is a special place. There is a protest every couple of days, a major one in this city, people for various causes marching through the city take it over, and the local law enforcement has to be part of that effort to keep those people safe so they can express their rights.

It is a special place, but I think we should give deference to the local law enforcement community that they know how best to provide that safety, especially with the record that they have, a 30-year low on crime in this city, 22 percent less violent crime this year compared to the same period last year.

The gentleman's argument was correct. He shouldn't have to bring a bill up here to do this. He shouldn't have to interfere with local control in this city. He shouldn't have to bring a bill up here to tell the local people how to run their city when Congress has already, in 1973, given them that power in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. I shouldn't have to defend that right that has already been granted by previous Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the Delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic, anti-immigrant bill, which would nullify laws, policies, and practices enacted by the locally elected District of Columbia Government. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of local self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters, one from every Member of D.C.'s locally elected legislature, the Council; and one from D.C.'s locally elected Attorney General, Brian Schwalb, 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.

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.

□ 1445

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, D.C. residents are treated as second-class citi-

zens by Congress. They are required to pay Federal taxes, serve on Federal juries, and register with Selective Service in the same manner as residents of the States. They have served in the military since the Revolutionary War, which was fought to end taxation without representation and to give consent to the governed. Yet, Congress has denied them voting representation in Congress and full local self-government over the past 200 years.

Last Congress, 100 bills and amendments were introduced to repeal or block local D.C. laws and policies. This Congress, 28 such bills and amendments have already been introduced, including bills to abolish the locally elected D.C. Government.

Three months ago, Congress passed a bill that cut over \$1 billion from the local D.C. budget, which consists entirely of locally raised revenue. While Congress has the authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it does not have a duty 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."

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. This 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.

Congress has the authority to grant D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government. It simply needs to pass H.R. 51, the D.C. statehood bill, which would make the residential and commercial areas of D.C. a 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.

The substance of H.R. 2056 is irrelevant since there is no justification for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters, but I will briefly discuss it.

Consistent with Federal law, the position of the Major Cities Chiefs Association and D.C.'s values, D.C. limits cooperation with Federal immigration agencies. D.C. concluded that cooperating with Federal immigration agencies would make D.C. less safe for all residents by diverting police resources

States, cities, and counties have reached the same conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to respect the will of D.C. residents by voting “no” on this bill.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS).

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2056, the District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act.

I have to be honest. I am kind of disappointed in the debate right now. My colleague from Massachusetts is talking about how we have previously granted the authority to the District of Columbia to do X, Y, and Z. He is correct, but with us granting power, there comes responsibility.

My colleague from Washington, D.C., is talking about the home rule and this and that. This city makes me sad. I mean, I have hope now that President Trump is here that the D.C. Government is starting to do things that they should have been doing all along.

What about Representative CUELLAR, who was mugged, robbed at gunpoint in a carjacking?

What about the RAND PAUL staffer who was stabbed in a bar five blocks from here? I don't go there anymore. I don't go there anymore because it is not safe.

What about BRAD FINSTAD, who got robbed at gunpoint?

What about the staffers who got robbed 6 months ago?

Justice Sotomayor's detail shot an 18-year-old multiple times because he was trying to rob the Supreme Court Justice.

In what world are you living in that you think that the power that we granted to the District of Columbia is being executed responsibly?

We are talking about something very simple: Abide by Federal detainers. If the Federal Government says you have arrested an illegal immigrant who has a criminal detainer, you have to follow the law.

We didn't give the billion dollars to the District of Columbia because they need to understand that actions have consequences. When I don't feel safe at night, when my constituents come here and I tell them to be careful, when my commanding officer stays at a hotel three blocks from here and I tell him not to walk to the baseball game, to take an Uber, what world are you living in? This is unacceptable.

We will have law and order in this city. The President has said so much. We are going to use every tool in our toolbox to make this District what it should be.

A nation's capital in decline is a nation in decline. We are not a nation in decline.

The city of D.C. needs to live up to its obligations to keep us safe.

Get the homeless people help. Letting them live in the streets is not helping them. You are hurting them. Get them mental health counseling.

Get them a shower. Get them a job. Get them help. Letting them live under bridges is not helping them. It is wrong. The fact that I have to sit up here and tell you this makes me sad.

We are going to make this city safe. We are going to show the world that we are not a nation in decline. We are going to not only Make America Great Again, but we are going to make the United States Capital great again.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about crime in D.C. Let's talk about crime in D.C., as the gentleman mentioned. Let's talk about that.

Let's talk about January 6. We had 1,500 people ransack the Capitol. Let's talk about what happened to them in consequence. They were rewarded. They were pardoned.

Yet, to this day, the Speaker of the House refuses to hang the plaque honoring the over 150 police officers who defended the people in this Chamber, who defended the Republicans.

I know all the Republicans didn't feel safe that day because I saw them running from the crowd, running in fear, until the President told them, no, that was just a tour of the Capitol. They all made excuses for what happened that day. Not one of those people who ran out of the Capitol for safety that day came back to say that they should be held responsible. Now, all of those people have been pardoned.

Mr. Speaker, when they talk about crime in D.C., holding people accountable, and feeling safe, do they think that day was making democracy great again when the elected leaders had to hide, being chased out of this Chamber doing the people's business?

Is this an example of how the Republicans are going to bring the rule of law to D.C.? Give me a break. You have to be kidding me.

To this day, Officer Sicknick's family—there were three officers who eventually died of causes related to the attack on the Capitol on January 6. Those families would hope that the people who were saved that day might be grateful. Those families lost their husbands, fathers, and sons. They simply want to have their sacrifice and law enforcement recognized by the people who were rescued.

I know there are a number of my colleagues on the other side who had exemplary careers in law enforcement. They understand better than any that when you have a son, daughter, husband, or wife who gives their life in service of protecting the people in this Chamber, you would hope for at least just a small gesture, a plaque to commemorate that heroism and service to their country. That is not happening, and that is a shame.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2056, the District of Columbia Federal Immigra-

tion Compliance Act, introduced by my good friend from Louisiana, Mr. CLAY HIGGINS.

Bringing in and harboring illegal aliens is not only a crime under Federal law, but it is also an absolute affront to the American people.

As a matter of fact, it already says in our law, under title 8, section 1324, that there are criminal penalties for any person who “knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of transportation.”

This is already our law, but not here in Washington, D.C. Prohibiting officials from cooperating with Federal immigration agencies and preventing the release of an individual in custody for the purpose of transferring them to a Federal immigration agency is shielding and concealing illegal aliens, for my Democratic colleagues.

Sanctuary cities protect and defend these criminal illegal aliens, and by definition, if they have broken our immigration laws, they are criminals and must be held accountable.

Due to the Democrats' last 4 years of wide-open borders, this country has experienced one of the greatest national security threats in our entire history as a country. Democrats welcomed over 13 million people from all over the world to come across our border and then made the American people pay for them.

This was outrageous. These are people who came into our country, invaded our country, raped our women and children, and murdered our own people.

Then, the cartels traffic fentanyl across from China, which killed an average of 300 people a day.

They set historic records by allowing the highest number of border encounters ever recorded in a single day and a single month. It was over 3 million illegals in fiscal year 2023, which was the highest ever recorded in history.

Democrats set records. They sure do. They set records by supporting criminals to invade our country.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, instead of defending the American people, the Democrats defend illegal alien criminals, gangs, and cartels at all costs.

Take, for example, their favorite MS-13 gang member, Kilmar Abrego Garcia. This MS-13 gang member and wife beater was deported to El Salvador for countless violations of our laws. Democrats labeled him as a “wrongfully deported Maryland man,” oh, boo-hoo, and they flew to El Salvador to speak with him.

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

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

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Speaker, Democrats couldn't wait to go on vacation to go down and pretend like they cared about this MS-13 gang member as if they really actually do.

He is now charged on multiple felony counts for human trafficking. As a matter of fact, we are thrilled to bring him back and prosecute him and make the Democrats continue to own him.

I would remind my colleagues he is their Maryland man.

According to the indictment, his transporting of illegals spans decades and includes children and MS-13 gang members. He is alleged to have participated in more than 100 trips. That is impressive. That is the faith of the Democratic Party.

This is who they defend. This is who they fight for. They do not fight for the American people, not their districts, not the people's hard-earned tax dollars, and not disobeying the law. They fight for illegals.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 2056.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the gentleman that the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) was referencing is the same gentleman that two members of the House Oversight Committee requested authorization travel to go down to El Salvador and defend. I think that she was very factual in everything she said, especially her criticism.

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

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

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

The title of this bill is misleading. The District of Columbia already complies with Federal immigration law, including warrants and orders related to immigrants issued by Article III courts.

It is ironic that the Republican leadership is cutting or denying the ability of the District of Columbia to spend a billion dollars of the money that they have raised within the District to meet their obligations here in the city. Yet, while they are cutting their budget by \$1 billion, they are saying, even though Federal law doesn't require cities to do all this stuff, we want them to do the Federal Government's job, as well. That is the irony here.

Federal immigration law doesn't require the States or cities to inquire about citizenship or immigration status or manage immigration policy. They don't require cities to do that, especially a smaller jurisdiction like Washington, D.C.

What my colleagues want to do is they want to shift the burden of the Federal responsibilities onto the District of Columbia and their political leadership, at the same time when they are cutting \$1 billion of the budget from Washington, D.C. It is adding insult to injury.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because I strongly support D.C. home rule. For this reason and at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would have been the text of S. 1077, the District of Columbia Local Funds Act. I would have tried to put that \$1 billion back into their own budget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I must note that it has been nearly 3 months since the Senate passed the bipartisan District of Columbia Local Funds Act, which would undo the \$1 billion cut to the local D.C. budget in the House Republican-drafted fiscal year bill.

The Republican-led Senate understood immediately the cut's harms and passed the District of Columbia Local Funds Act within 4 hours of its introduction by the Republican Senator, SUSAN COLLINS, the chair on the Committee on Appropriations.

The local D.C. budget consists entirely of revenue raised by D.C. It is raised by the District of Columbia, which is why the Congressional Budget Office concluded that the District of Columbia Local Funds Act would have zero effect on the Federal budget.

For the prior two decades, Congress had allowed the District of Columbia to spend under its current local budget for the duration of every continuing resolution. However, the fiscal year 2025 full-year continuing resolution forced D.C. to revert to its fiscal year 2024 local budget.

It did so halfway through the fiscal year. In doing so, the continuing resolution sabotaged the D.C. local budget. There was no time to respond.

On March 28, President Trump called on the House to pass the District of Columbia Local Funds Act immediately. Last month, Speaker Johnson said the House had been too busy to act on the District of Columbia Local Funds Act, while it worked on the reconciliation bill. The House somehow found time to rename the Gulf of Mexico.

The House passed the reconciliation bill on May 22. The House has found time this week to take up three bills to overturn the ability of the people of Washington, D.C., to govern themselves. The House is now out of excuses on the District of Columbia Local Funds Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's electoral mandate includes his promise to

the American people that Republicans would resolve the criminal illegal alien crisis across our Nation.

This bill is a necessary step in ensuring our Nation's Capital is an ally, not an opponent, in the fight to end this crisis.

Specifically, H.R. 2056 represents an important step in codifying President Trump's executive order on making the District of Columbia safe and beautiful by directly supporting the directive for enhanced coordination between the Federal Government and law enforcement regarding illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage each of my colleagues to support this critical legislation sponsored by Mr. HIGGINS.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2056 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LYNCH is as follows:

Mr. LYNCH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2056 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Local Funds Act, 2025".

SEC. 2. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOCAL FUNDS.

Local funds are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia ("General Fund") for programs and activities set forth in the Fiscal Year 2025 Local Budget Act of 2024 (D.C. Law 25-218) and at rates set forth under such Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 450A of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 1-204.50a, D.C. Official Code), sections 816 and 817 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (secs. 47-369.01 and 47-369.02, D.C. Official Code), and provisions of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2025 by this section shall not exceed the estimates included in the Fiscal Year 2025 Local Budget Act of 2024, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act or the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated may be increased by proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs: *Provided further*,

That such increases shall be approved by enactment of local District law and shall comply with all reserve requirements contained in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets these requirements, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2025, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LYNCH. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, RESCISSIONS ACT OF 2025

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 499 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 499

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on June 3, 2025, in accordance with section 1012(a) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1017 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall not apply to a bill or joint resolution introduced with respect to the special message transmitted under section 1012 of that Act on June 3, 2025.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 492 is hereby adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying legislation. Yesterday, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 499, providing for the House's consideration of H.R. 4, the Rescissions Act of 2025.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4 under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their respective designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides that House Resolution 492 is hereby adopted.

Mr. Speaker, before we get into the substance of the bill today, I would like to clear up any confusion about any remarks I made in the Rules Committee last night.

Let me be crystal clear. I encourage all Members to support the rule before us today. My comments last night were lacking in context. Democrats made the argument throughout the hearing that this process is somehow another vote on H.R. 1. That is false.

The resolution today makes purely technical changes to protect the privilege of the reconciliation bill as it heads to the Senate.

□ 1515

It is not a redo or relitigation of any underlying policy issues in the bill.

Let me repeat: There are no policy decisions included in this engrossment correction.

That is what the Senate is working through, and I look forward to considering H.R. 1 when the bill returns from the other Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain on a positive, forward moving trajectory in delivering upon the American people's mandate from November. Just a few short weeks ago, we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill Act.

This week, we are taking up a nearly \$10-billion rescissions package, and soon we will be moving into the appropriations process.

Discretionary waste is about to be put through the congressional shredder.

Mr. Speaker, the American people demand that this happens. Now our colleagues across the aisle will leap to their feet and scream bloody murder about how the waste we are targeting simply doesn't exist and how we are laying siege to everything under the Sun.

Au contraire. We have the receipts to back everything up.

Here is just a small sampling of the mind-boggling discretionary waste that we will be slashing in foreign funding:

\$158 million from the Lebanon peacekeeping mission which has been fraught with waste and abuse as evidenced by its abject failure to contain Hezbollah;

\$3 million for an Iraqi Sesame Street; \$833,000 for services for transgender people, sex workers, and their clients and social networkers in Nepal; and

\$500,000 for electric buses in Rwanda.

These examples barely skim the surface, Mr. Speaker, and it is really no wonder why Americans are outraged that their tax dollars are being squandered.

It is the American people's money. A single dollar of taxpayer money wasted is \$1 too many in our view.

Then there is NPR. I honestly don't even know where to begin on that one. Even if someone were to accept the premise that we need to finance a public radio outlet, then certainly we can all agree that it simply cannot be NPR any longer. NPR's own CEO testified before Congress that she has never seen any political bias at NPR. I don't know what reality she is living in, but it clearly isn't this one.

Here is the kicker: NPR does harbor political bias. It took a \$1.9 million grant to improve objectivity and diverse viewpoints.

There is the proof, and it is a concrete example that NPR's CEO was giving false testimony to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, you either understand that you are biased and need help, apparently in the form of taxpayer grants, or you haven't witnessed any bias. You can't have it both ways.

Then there is PBS. Again, I honestly don't know where to begin. On top of the concrete, statistically proven bias against conservatives, Republicans, and the Trump administration, this is the 21st century. We have Sesame Street now streaming on private services so the taxpayers are now subsidizing for-profit companies. We have seen private celebrities like Ms. Rachel who are engaging in crossover with Sesame Street which, again, leveraged taxpayer dollars to concentrate wealth to private individuals.

It is clear that we must slash this tranche of wasteful spending and continue down a path to fully restore fiscal sanity in our Nation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before we even get to the rescissions, let's be really, really honest about what is going on here. This isn't just a debate about cuts, because in this rule, Republican leadership snuck in a rewrite of their big, ugly bill.

Yes, that is right. A vote on this rule is effectively a revote on their reconciliation package, a do-over. It is a