floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 4922) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY). Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–10 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4922

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 ''D.C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act of 2025'' or the ''DC CRIMES Act of 2025''.

SEC. 2. YOUTH OFFENDERS.

(a) LIMITING YOUTH OFFENDER STATUS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.—

(1) LIMITATION.—Section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24–901(6), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''24 years of age or younger'' and inserting ''under 18 years of age''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) REPEAL OF CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUALS 18 THROUGH 24 YEARS OF AGE IN STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FACILITIES, TREATMENT, AND SERVICES.—Section 3(a–1) of such Act (sec. 24–902(a–1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(B) COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDER ORDER OF PROBATION.—Section 4(a)(2) of such Act (sec. 24–903(a)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''15 to 24 years of age'' and inserting ''15 to 18 years of age''.

(b) PROHIBITING ISSUANCE OF SENTENCE LESS THAN MANDATORY-MINIMUM TERM.—Section 4(b) of such Act (sec. 24–903(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b)(1)'' and inserting ''(b)'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE CRIME STATISTICS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION.—Subchapter I of chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 16–2340a. Website of updated statistics on juvenile crime

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE.—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish and operate a publicly accessible website which contains data on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, including each of the following statistical measures:

''(1) The total number of juveniles arrested each year.

''(2) The total number and percentage of juveniles arrested each year, broken down by age, race, and sex.

''(3) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for petty crime, including the following crimes:

''(A) Vandalism.

''(B) Theft.

''(C) Shoplifting.

''(4) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for crime of violence (as defined in section 23–1331(4)).

''(5) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who were arrested for their first offense.

''(6) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who had been arrested previously.

''(7) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year who had been arrested previously, the total number and percentage of the number of arrests.

''(8) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the declination rate for prosecutions by the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

''(9) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage who were tried as adults.

''(10) Of the total number of juveniles prosecuted each year, the number and percentage who were not sentenced, who were sentenced to a misdemeanor, and who were sentenced to a felony.

''(11) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage of the length of time that will be served in a correctional facility as provided by the sentence.

''(b) UPDATES.—The Attorney General shall update the information contained on the website on a monthly basis.

''(c) MAINTAINING ARCHIVE OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained on the website is archived appropriately to provide indefinite public access to historical data of juvenile arrests and prosecutions.

''(d) FORMAT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained in the website, including historical data described in subsection (c), is available in a machine-readable format available for bulk download.

''(e) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Attorney General shall ensure that the website does not include any juvenile's personally identifiable information.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'crime' has the meaning given the term 'offense' in section 23–1331(2); and

''(2) the term 'juvenile' has the meaning given the term 'youth offender' in section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24–901(6), D.C. Official Code).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AUTHORIZED RELEASE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) JUVENILE CASE RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16–2331, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h–2) the following new subsection:

''(i) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile case records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16–2340a.''.

(2) JUVENILE SOCIAL RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16–2332, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile social records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16–2340a.''.

(3) POLICE AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS.—Section 16–2333, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in law enforcement records and files concerning a child to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16–2340a.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish the website under section 16–2341, District of Columbia Official Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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 California (Mr. GARCIA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4922, a bill providing commonsense reforms to the District of Columbia criminal code.

It is clear to Members of the committee and the public that D.C.'s soft-

on-crime policies have failed to keep D.C. residents and visitors safe.

The DC CRIMES Act overturns targeted portions of the D.C. Council's Youth Rehabilitation Act by amending the definition of a ''youth offender'' from a person under the age of 25 to under the age of 18.

Let me emphasize Washington, D.C.'s current law. Currently, D.C. code allows a criminal under the age of 25 to be given the same leniency that is afforded to minors. This bill requires that we treat adult criminals as adults, like the rest of the country. It also removes judicial discretion to sentence youth offenders under the minimum sentencing structures in place.

Our Capital cannot continue to let criminals freely roam the streets and expect this crime crisis to end.

As juvenile crime soars in the District, the bill also requires the D.C. Attorney General to create a publicly available website that better tracks juvenile crime data. This data will inform Congress, the District's elected officials, the Metropolitan Police Department, the public, and others of the severity of juvenile crimes in the city.

Citizens of D.C. and visitors to our Nation's Capital deserve to feel safe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) for leading this effort again in this Congress, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today the first of four bills which represent a serious violation of the rights of Washington, D.C., and the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, we know that D.C. has more residents than two States; D.C. taxpayers pay more Federal taxes per capita than any State; and D.C., as a whole, contributes more Federal taxes than 12 States. There are over 700,000 active residents here who deserve a voice.

D.C.'s government is accountable to the people who live here, and local leaders should and are empowered to solve local problems without Congress interfering.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this many times: If Donald Trump wants to run D.C., he should resign as President and run for Mayor. If my colleagues here want to legislate for D.C., there are plenty of opportunities to run for the D.C. Council.

Mr. Speaker, I was a mayor of my city for 8 years before I came to Congress, and I love local government. A lot can get done and accomplished. Yet, let's not sit here in Congress and pretend to be a super city council, imposing our pet policies on residents who reject this agenda.

□ 1510

Now, the bill before us right now is the so-called DC CRIMES Act. This bill will impose longer sentences on young people who commit crimes.

How does it do this?

It eliminates the ability for judges to make the best sentencing decisions for young adults. It will lead to worse outcomes, more reoffenders, and less safety.

Now, let's be clear: This bill is not about making anyone safer or D.C. safer. It is about stripping decision-making away from the people and the judges of D.C., and instead handing the power of judges over to politicians in this room who don't live here, who don't vote here, and certainly don't answer to D.C. residents.

This bill amends D.C.'s Youth Rehabilitation Act, or the YRA as it is known.

Now, the YRA is not radical. It has been in place since 1985, and it actually mirrors laws in States like Florida and Michigan. Its purpose is simple: to give judges discretion in sentencing young adults.

Now, judges can punish some young people, when appropriate, in ways that reduce their risk of reoffending, but this bill would rip away discretion.

It eliminates a judge's ability to waive mandatory minimums, even when the facts show a one-size-fits-all sentence makes no sense.

Judges, not politicians, should decide sentences. Now, individuals whose convictions are set aside under the YRA are less likely to reoffend. That means the law works, and it keeps communities safer.

Now, we also know that in nearly 80 percent of cases, judges impose a mandatory minimum sentence anyway. These waivers are rarely granted and only when a judge determines it is appropriate. This bill is an undemocratic attack on D.C., its residents, and is also just bad policy.

Now, Republicans in the majority claim D.C.'s policies are too soft, but we know that the sponsor of this bill is also from Florida, which has allowed judges to waive mandatory minimums for decades.

Florida even caps youth offender sentences at 6 years, something D.C., by the way, has never done. Let's be clear: We can all agree that violent crime has no place in our communities. People are rightly concerned about crime in D.C. and back home in their communities. Democrats, of course, want safe streets, but we believe in investing in solutions that actually make people safer, not political stunts or short-term gimmicks or cheap tough talk.

We know what works: supporting local police departments, investing in community-based partnerships, and creating economic opportunity to drive down shootings, homicides, and burglaries.

Now, getting guns out of the hands of violent criminals keeps us all safer. Instead of doing that work, Republicans are wasting time attacking the District while ignoring the crises in their own backyards.

Now, President Trump is doing nothing to address violent crime in States with some of the highest crime rates in the country. In fact, his administration has made things worse.

Trump has opposed efforts to expand criminal background checks. He has blocked attempts to reduce ghost guns and machine gun conversion devices. His Department of Justice has gutted the number of inspectors who stop businesses from selling guns to criminals, cutting that workforce down by two-thirds.

On top of that, Trump illegally froze or canceled $3.8 billion in DOJ grant programs, including COPS grants for our police departments that, of course, help communities hire and train police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided power grab, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS), sponsor of the bill.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4922, the DC CRIMES Act.

Now, in reference to what the gentleman was just talking about, Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution is quite clear. It grants Congress the power to exercise exclusive, exclusive jurisdiction over the Federal District, which all Americans know now is Washington, D.C., and it is the Nation's Capital.

That is in the Constitution that was ratified by several States. Congress does have the constitutional authority to regulate activities within the Federal District. When it is said that somehow Congress is now eroding local control, that is simply not true.

Any local powers by the D.C. Council have been granted to the D.C. Council by Congress, and Congress is the seat of authority when it comes to the Federal enclave.

He also talked about Florida's laws. Let's be very clear: Florida has established itself as a beacon of law and order, making sure that our citizens are safe throughout all of our jurisdictions. If there are some abilities for some measures of flexibility, Florida has proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it knows how to keep its people safe, which is very different with respect to the D.C. Council and with respect to escalated crime here in the Nation's Capital.

Our great Nation's Capital has been plagued by violence, destruction, disorder for far too long, and decades of weak, pro-crime leadership has turned this once great city into a dystopia.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that some of their colleagues have been victimized by the crime here in Washington, D.C. Rather than prioritizing the safety of law-abiding citizens and protecting the lives of innocent residents and visitors, District officials have actively facilitated dysfunction and chaos through

their progressive, soft-on-crime policies.

Instead of addressing the clear epidemic of youth crime in this city, the D.C. Council increased the age of youth offenders to individuals 24 years old and younger. Meaning fully grown, legal adults in the District of Columbia can receive sentences meant for children.

This is simply insane, and that is why I introduced the DC CRIMES Act, which lowers the definition of youth from under the age of 25 to under the age of 18, removes the ability of judges to sentence youth offenders below mandatory minimum guidelines, and requires the D.C. attorney general to establish a public website containing much-needed statistics on juvenile crime in D.C.

The Trump administration's efforts have shown that lawlessness is a choice, and it is time for Congress to step up, adhere to our constitutional duty, and firmly address crime in the Nation's Capital.

For the citizens of D.C., I would say, we wish your Council did this the right way, but they did not and we will act.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic and paternalistic bill, which amends D.C. law. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, the entire D.C. Council, and D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule:

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Bogging down legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nomination Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to up end our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

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

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is scheduled to markup fourteen bills tomorrow related to the operations of the District of Columbia. With the exception of H.R. 2693, the District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal Act, I write in strong opposition to these bills. They address inherently local issues and laws that were passed after careful consideration by the District's elected representatives, who are directly accountable to District residents. Members of this very Committee have long advocated for the principles of federalism on which this nation was founded. They have consistently condemned federal overreach and fought forcefully and convincingly for the uniquely American values of local control, freedom, and self-governance. These principles should apply to the more than 700,000 people who call Washington, DC home, just as they do for your constituents across the country.

I specifically want to call attention to the significant incursion on local self-governance reflected in two bills, the District of Columbia Attorney General Appointment Reform Act and the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. Both laws would displace the ability of District residents to have a voice in the selection of local leaders who wield significant power over local judicial matters: the judges on our local courts and the Attorney General for the District. The judges on the DC Court of Appeals and DC Superior Court rule on inherently local matters such as criminal prosecutions, landlord-tenant cases, probate proceedings, civil cases, and divorce proceedings, all of which have profoundly important impact on our community. For more than 50 years, the Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC) has successfully allowed DC residents to have a voice in judicial appointments, while also granting the President and Senate a role in confirming our judges. I urge the Committee not to overturn that well-established process.

The DC Attorney General, as the District's chief law officer, is also responsible for local legal issues, namely, protecting the District and its residents in a wide range of matters, such as enforcing child support laws, handling abuse and neglect proceedings in the child welfare system, enforcing our housing code, and defending District agencies and officers when they are sued. In no other place in the United States are such local issues determined by a federally appointed person with no local accountability. The proposed legislation would be especially undemocratic in light of the fact that, in 2010, an overwhelming majority of District voters (76 percent) exercised their right to amend the District Charter to make the DC Attorney General an independent, elected office, rather than a position appointed by and subordinate to the Mayor. With that vote, District residents clearly expressed their desire that the Attorney General should be independent and accountable to them. The pending bill would displace that choice in favor of installing an Attorney General accountable not to District residents, but to the President. Given that the U.S. Attorney for the District is already appointed by the President, if passed, this bill would concentrate all criminal and civil litigation authority in the President, divesting the District and its residents of any local control over these essential functions.

No one knows or cares more about keeping DC safe than DC residents who work, live and raise their families here. Our democratically elected officials work closely with local law enforcement, policy experts, and community leadership to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of DC voters with the whim of federal politicians is undemocratic and un-American.

I urge you to reject these measures and uphold the values Congress sought to advance more than 50 years ago when it passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: that

District residents should enjoy the ''powers of local self-government'' that all other Americans enjoy. *See* DC Code § 1–201.02.

Respectfully submitted,

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

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chair, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The Council of the District of Columbia is aware that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is planning to mark up more than a dozen proposed measures that would severely and negatively impact the operations, public safety, and autonomy of the District of Columbia. We ask that you oppose these measures in full, save one, H.R. 2693, District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal of Legislation Act. While we have not seen the final text of this legislation, the public summary of H.R. 2693 is consistent with the long held request by the District of Columbia to allow the ability to electronically transfer legislative acts to Congress, rather than only allowing physical copies be transferred. The challenge and barriers created by this current requirement were clearly exposed during both the recent COVID pandemic restrictions as well as the Capitol campus restrictions following the January 6, 2021 attacks on the Capitol.

The other 13 measures that have been shared with us would do direct and serious harm to the District of Columbia and we urge you to reject these measures completely. These bills represent an unprecedented attack on the autonomy and home rule of our local government and the more than 700,000 Americans that call it home. The breadth of these bills is remarkable, and if passed, would result in an erosion of accountability and public safety for the District of Columbia. They range from eliminating and replacing our elected and accountable Attorney General for the District of Columbia with a President's hand-picked and unaccountable associate requiring no confirmation by the U.S. Senate and no local ties, to a full repeal of multiple local DC laws that have been in place for many years, if not decades, that are tested, proven, and effective components of our public safety infrastructure and ecosystem. The effect of these Congressional repeals would put our legal and Court system into chaos and directly undermine successful tools that focus on serious accountability and effective rehabilitation when a crime occurs. As always, when revisions or amendments to DC laws are necessary, those changes should only take place within our local legislature which has the best capacity to provide effective oversight and accountable actions for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We respectfully request that all members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and all members of Congress, reject these harmful measures whether in committee mark up or before the full House of Representatives. Given the breadth of the multiple measures before you, we also request an opportunity to provide a more in-depth discussion of each bill before the Committee's mark-up, especially in light that the Committee will not hold public hearings on these measures.

Sincerely,

Chairman Phil Mendleson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Robert White, Jr., At-Large; Councilmember Brooke Pinto, Ward 2; Councilmember Janeese Lewis George, Ward 4; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Trayon White, Sr, Ward 8; Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, At-Large; Councilmember Christina Henderson, At-Large; Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1; Councilmember Matthew Frumin, Ward 3; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the local legislature, the Council, has 13 members. If D.C. residents do not like how 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 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 should be irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. Nevertheless, I will discuss it.

Republicans claim D.C.'s Youth Rehabilitation Act treats adults as juveniles. They are wrong. They either do not understand the act or are misleading the public about it intentionally. The act's sentencing and set aside provisions apply only in adult court, not juvenile court.

Let me repeat: The provisions apply in adult court, not juvenile court. A judge may, but is not required to, sentence a person under the act, and certain crimes are ineligible under the act.

□ 1520

D.C. is not the only jurisdiction with a so-called young adult offender law. Alabama, Florida, Michigan, New York, South Carolina, and Vermont have such laws. The sponsor of this bill is from one of those States.

D.C. residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with the Selective Service, yet Congress denies them full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter explaining why D.C. statehood is constitutional from leading constitutional scholars, including Larry Tribe.

MAY 22, 2021.

Re Washington, D.C. Admission Act, H.R. 51 and S. 51 (the ''D.C. Admission Act'').

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: As scholars of the United States Constitution, we write to correct claims that the D.C. Admission Act is vulnerable to a constitutional challenge in the courts. For the reasons set forth below, there is no constitutional barrier to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth (the ''Commonwealth'') entering the Union through a congressional joint resolution, pursuant to the Constitution's Admissions Clause, just like the 37 other states that have been admitted since the Constitution was adopted. Furthermore, Congress's exercise of its express constitutional authority to decide to admit a new state is a classic political question, which courts are highly unlikely to interfere with, let alone attempt to bar.

The D.C. Admission Act. The House passed the Act, as H.R. 51, on April 22, 2021, and as of this writing, the substantively identical companion bill (S. 51) is under consideration by the Senate. The Act provides for the issuance of a congressional joint resolution declaring the admittance as a State of most of the territory currently comprising the District of Columbia, while the seat of government (defined as the ''Capital'') will fall outside of the boundaries of the new State and remain under federal jurisdiction. The Act also repeals the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment; and provides for expedited consideration of the repeal of that Amendment.

The Admissions Clause grants Congress constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. The starting point for a constitutional analysis of the Act is the Constitution's Admissions Clause (Art. IV, Sect. 3), which provides that ''New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.'' The Clause ''vests in Congress the essential and discretionary authority to admit new states into the Union by whatever means it considers appropriate as long as such means are framed within its vested powers.'' Every State admitted into the Union since the Constitution was adopted has been admitted by congressional action pursuant to this Clause; no State has been admitted pursuant to a constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court has broadly construed Congress's assigned power to admit new states and has never interfered with Congress's admission of a state, even when potentially legitimate constitutional objections existed. For example, in 1863, Congress admitted into the Union West Virginia, which had been part of the State of Virginia, in potential violation of a provision of the Admissions Clause that bars the formation of a new State out of a portion of the territory of another State without the consent of the ceding State. The Supreme Court, however, did not bar West Virginia's admission; to the contrary, it later tacitly approved of it.

Some critics of the D.C. Admission Act have suggested that Maryland's consent might be required under the foregoing provision of the Admissions Clause. This objection mistakenly presupposes that Maryland retains a reversionary interest in the territory currently composing the District of Columbia, which Maryland ceded to the federal government when the District was established in 1791. In fact, Maryland expressly relinquished all sovereign authority over the territory at issue when the federal government accepted it. The express terms of the cession state that the territory was ''for ever ceded and relinquished to the congress and government of the United States, in full and absolute right, and exclusive jurisdiction.

. . . As Viet D. Dinh, who served as an Assistant Attorney General during the presidency of George W. Bush, has explained, because Maryland's cession of the territory now constituting the District was full and complete, it severed D.C. residents' now far distant ''political link with'' Maryland. The current District is not part of Maryland, and Maryland has no claim on any portion of the District's territory. There is accordingly no basis to require Maryland's consent for the establishment of the new State.

The Constitution's District Clause poses no barrier to admitting the Commonwealth into the Union. The Constitution's District Clause grants Congress power to ''exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States.'' Based on this Clause, Congress established the current District of Columbia, which (as explained) was taken from territory ceded by Maryland, as well as Virginia.

The D.C. Admission Act complies with the District Clause because it provides that the Capital—which is defined in the Act to include (among other things) the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, and the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall—will not become part of the new State and will remain under the sovereignty of the federal government.

Some critics have argued that the District Clause somehow mandates that the District of Columbia permanently retain all of its current territory, and that its size may neither be increased or reduced by Congress. The plain language of the District Clause says no such thing; it does not mandate that the District be any size or shape, except it limits the maximum size of the federal enclave to ten square miles.

Historical practice confirms that Congress can change the size of the District. In 1791, Congress altered the District's southern boundary to encompass portions of what are now Alexandria, Virginia and Anacostia. Then, in 1846, Congress retroceded Alexandria and its environs back to Virginia. As a result, the territory composing the District was reduced by a third.

At the time of the 1846 retrocession, the House's Committee on the District of Columbia considered, and rejected, the very argument that critics of the D.C. Admission Act are raising today, reasoning that the ''true construction of [the District Clause] would seem to be solely that Congress retain and exercise exclusive jurisdiction'' over territory comprising the ''seat of government.'' The language of the District Clause, the legislators observed, places no mandate on the size, or even the location, of that seat of government, other than preventing the government from ''hold[ing] more than ten miles for this purpose.'' The House's judgment was correct in 1846, and remains so today.

The Twenty-Third Amendment does not prevent Congress from granting the Commonwealth statehood. Opponents of statehood have suggested that the Twenty-Third Amendment bars Congress from exercising its constitutionally enumerated authority to grant statehood to the Commonwealth. In fact, the Amendment poses no barrier to the admission of the Commonwealth into the Union through an act of Congress, in accordance with the plain language of the Admissions Clause, just as Congress has done in connection with the admission of several other States, including most recently Alaska and Hawaii.

Section 1 of the Twenty-Third Amendment, which was ratified in 1961, provides:

The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State.

By its plain terms, the Amendment poses no barrier to Congress's admission of the Commonwealth into the Union. Indeed, it is entirely silent on the matter.

The only question raised by the existence of the Twenty-Third Amendment is a practical, not a constitutional one: How best to address the Twenty-Third Amendment's provision for the assignment of presidential electors to what will become a vestigial seat of government, with virtually no residents? The Act satisfactorily addresses this question by providing for the repeal of the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment, as well as by commencing the process for repealing the Amendment itself.

Initially, the Act provides for an expedited process for repeal of the Twenty-Third Amendment, a process that should move forward to ratification swiftly and successfully once the Commonwealth is admitted as a State. None of the other 50 States has reason to seek to retain three electors for a largely unoccupied seat of government.

But the Act also addresses the possibility that the Twenty-Third Amendment is not promptly repealed by mandating the immediate repeal of the provision of federal law that provides the current mechanism for District residents to participate in federal elections.

In 1961, following the adoption of the Twenty-Third Amendment, Congress exercised its enforcement authority by enacting legislation (codified at 3 U.S.C. §21), providing that the District residents may select presidential electors; the votes of the electors are currently awarded to the ticket prevailing in the District's presidential election.

The existing statutes, fall within the broad authority granted to Congress by the Twenty-Third Amendment to define the terms of, and effectuate, the District's participation in presidential elections. The Amendment allows for the appointment of a number of Electors ''in such manner as the Congress may direct.'' The Amendment also allows Congress to select the number of Electors the District may receive, subject only to a maximum: The District may participate in the presidential Electoral College through the appointment of no more electors than those of the smallest State, ie., three. And section 2 of the Amendment grants Congress the power to ''enforce'' the provision ''by appropriate legislation,'' as it did in 1961.

But once Congress acts again, pursuant to its express grant of constitutional authority, and repeals the legislation that creates the existing procedure for District residents to select presidential electors, that will remove the legislative provision providing for the District's participation in presidential elections. Without such a provision, there is no mechanism for identifying the Capital area's electors or allocating their votes.

Some scholars have questioned whether that approach is satisfactory. They contend that the Twenty-Third Amendment is self-enforcing, and effectively mandates the appointment of electors on behalf of the District of Columbia, regardless of whether such appointment is called for under a federal statute. Some of us disagree; indeed, the very existence of Section 2 of the Amendment makes clear that enabling legislation is required to effectuate the District's participation in the presidential election process. And Congress's 1961 enforcement legislation supports this interpretation.

Even if this self-enforcement argument were to be accepted, however, Congress could easily address it by replacing the current law mandating that the Capital area's electors vote in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District with a new legislative mandate that the Capital area's electors vote in other ways. For example, Congress could require District electors to vote in favor of the presidential ticket that receives the most Electoral College votes (of the remaining 538 electors). Or, alternatively, Congress could require that District electors vote for the winner of the national popular vote winner.

A recent Supreme Court decision confirms that a legislative directive to the Capital area's electors would be enforceable. The Twenty-Third Amendment provides that the District ''shall appoint'' electors ''in such manner as Congress may direct''; this language is a direct parallel to the Constitution's grant of broad authority to each of the States to appoint and instruct their respective electors. In its recent decision in Chiafalo v. Washington, the Supreme Court held that electors do not have discretion to decide how to cast their Electoral College votes, but rather are legally bound to follow the instructions given by their respective states.

As Columbia Law School Professors Jessica Bulman-Pozen and Olatunde Johnson have observed, it follows from the Court's holding in Chiafalo that Congress could legally bind any electors to vote in accordance with the overall vote of the Electoral College or the national popular vote, just as the existing enabling statute currently binds them to vote in the Electoral College in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District.

In sum, none of the critics' constitutional objections to the D.C. Admission Act are meritorious; and the contention that a constitutional amendment is required to admit the Commonwealth into the Union is incorrect. The D.C. Admission Act calls for a proper exercise of Congress' express authority under the Constitution to admit new states, a power that it has exercised 37 other times since the Constitution was adopted.

Courts are unlikely to second-guess Congress's exercise of its constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. Apart from the fact that the legal objections to admission of the Commonwealth as a State are without merit, it is also unlikely that the courts will ever consider those objections. As Mr. Dinh has observed, the decision whether to admit a state into the Union is a paradigmatic political question that the Constitution expressly and exclusively assigns to Congress. The Supreme Court has long, and strenuously, avoided adjudicating disputes respecting matters that the Constitution makes the sole responsibility of the coordinate, elected branches.

The remaining objections to Statehood do not concern applicable constitutional law, but rather matters of policy.

For example, some have argued that the District should not be admitted to the Union because it is a single city and have instead proposed that most of the District's territory be retrocessioned to Maryland. There is, however, no constitutional barrier to a large, diverse city, with a population comparable

to that of several existing States, joining the Union. Furthermore, the Maryland retrocession proposal is subject to many of the same supposed constitutional objections raised by those who object to statehood for the District. For example, retroceding the District to Maryland would decrease the size of the remaining federal enclave, which objectors to District Statehood have claimed is constitutionally impermissible. A forced merger of the District and Maryland would also do nothing to address the purported constitutional objection to leaving the residual seat of government with three potential electors, pursuant to the terms of the Twenty-Third Amendment, prior to the Amendment's repeal.

Opponents also argue that Congress should not grant the District statehood because it will lead to a lawsuit. But any court challenge will be without merit, and indeed likely will be dismissed as presenting a political question. We respectfully submit that Congress should not avoid exercising its express constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union because of meritless threats of litigation.

Sincerely yours,

Caroline Fredrickson, Georgetown University Law Center; Erwin Chemerinsky, University of California, Berkeley School of Law; Stephen I. Vladeck, University of Texas Law School; Franita Tolson, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Jessica Bulman-Pozen, Columbia Law School; Leah Litman, University of Michigan Law School; Laurence H. Tribe, Harvard Law School; Paul Smith, Georgetown University Law Center; Geoffrey R. Stone, University of Chicago Law School; Peter Edelman, Georgetown University Law Center,

Kermit Roosevelt, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School; Eric Segall, Georgia State College Law; Trevor Potter, Campaign Legal Center; Gregory P. Downs, University of California Davis; Larry Sabato, University of Virginia; Aziz Huq, University of Chicago Law School; Jennifer Hochschild, Harvard University; Neil S. Siegel, Duke University School of Law; Beau Breslin, Skidmore College; David C. Vladeck, Georgetown University Law Center; Sanford Levinson, University of Texas at Austin School of Law; Ira C. Lupu, George Washington University Law School; Peter M. Shane, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law; Ira P. Robbins, American University Washington College of Law; Michael Greenberger, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law.

David Pozen, Columbia Law School; Mark Tushnet, Harvard Law School; Michael C. Dorf, Cornell Law School; Miguel Schor, Drake University School of Law; David S. Schwartz, University of Wisconsin Law School; Caroline Mala Corbin, University of Miami School of Law; Jonathan Askin, Brooklyn Law School; Aziz Rana, Cornell Law School; John Mikhail, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard Ford, Stanford Law School; Richard Primus, University of Michigan Law School; Joseph Fishkin, University of Texas Law School; Kate Masur, Northwestern University; Chris Edelson, American University.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, grants D.C. residents full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. H.R. 51 reduces the size of the Federal district from 68 square miles to 2 square miles, consisting of the White House, Capitol, the Supreme Court, and The National Mall and remaining under the control of Congress. The new State consists of the residential and commercial areas of D.C. The new State has a larger population than two States, pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State, and pays more total Federal taxes than 21 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the D.C. CRIMES Act, keep their hands off D.C. and free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the D.C. CRIMES Act, legislation that builds on the extraordinary progress we have seen under President Trump's leadership to restore law and order in Washington, D.C.

Thanks to President Trump and his administration, we are finally seeing real results in this city. Crime is down, homicides are down, carjackings are down, and most importantly, people feel safer in their Nation's Capital.

President Trump has handed us the blueprint to restore safety in America's cities. Families are safely going out to restaurants, businesses are seeing life return to their neighborhoods, and tourists feel secure, knowing law enforcement officers are empowered to do their job and enforce the law.

The D.C. CRIMES Act ensures that the gains we have made are not rolled back by more Democratic pro-crime policies. Republicans are the party of safe cities. We are the party that stands with our police and responds to our communities that demand law and order.

This bill sends a simple message: Criminals will be held accountable, victims will be protected, and Washington, D.C., will remain on the path to becoming the safe, thriving Capital our Nation deserves.

I urge my colleagues to support the D.C. CRIMES Act and keep our Capital safe, strong, and beautiful.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. CROCKETT).

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, as I sat and listened to the beginning of this debate, my heart simply broke, and many people know me for being able to do alliterations, and all I could think about was: Amnesia allows adolescents accountability avoidance agility from across the aisle.

Work with me for a second. Imagine being a young man born to Jamaican and Panamanian parents who messed up not once but twice. Imagine standing in front of a judge with your whole future hanging in the balance. Instead of prison, you are given a promise of mercy. Your record gets wiped clean, and you get a second chance at life.

Now imagine taking that promise and turning it into promotion. You go to college. You get a job and even become a Member of Congress. That is what redemption looks like. That is what America is supposed to be about, and that is exactly the story of the next wannabe Governor from Florida.

As a young man, he went through pretrial diversion for misdemeanor marijuana possession. As an adult, yet younger than 24, he was charged with and ultimately placed on probation for felony bribery charges, which ultimately were, too, expunged.

He was given a third chance, and now he is the face of a bill that would not afford young people in Washington, D.C., the same opportunities afforded to him.

Let me be real. If he had grown up under Donald Trump's America or under the very D.C. crime bill he is pushing today, he wouldn't be standing here as a Member of Congress. He would still be living with the weight of those charges.

Let's call this what it is: Opportunities for me, but not for thee. He climbed the ladder of redemption, and now he is yanking it right up from under D.C. youth. Most of us were taught to lift as you climb, but clearly some have forgotten to lift as they climb. Now they are committed to telling the next generations to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I will not sit quiet while a man who was saved by grace turns around and tries to snatch grace away from others.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. If we are going to be real about crime, about communities, about second chances and even third chances, then it needs to start with us looking in the mirror and remembering that even the author of this bill has a story, too, before he tries to lecture D.C. on safety.

It would be complete hypocrisy to have, hypothetically, someone convicted of 34 felonies to lecture D.C. on what to do with youthful offenders who have been scientifically shown not to have fully developed brains under the age of 25, especially if said multi-count convicted felon was in his seventies when he was convicted. What would be his excuse since his brain would be fully developed?

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in disbelief over the fact that in our own Nation's Capital, prosecutors are allowed to prosecute criminals as old as 25 years old as minors.

While President Trump has restored law and order to the District, I am not surprised that D.C.'s local government continues to protect the criminals and ignore victims. The D.C. CRIMES Act puts an end to this madness and ensures safety and security across D.C.

At 18 years old, you are given adult responsibilities, like being able to vote or sign up for the military. At 18 years, you become responsible for your

choices and your decisions and should be treated as such. At 21 years old, you are able to legally consume alcohol. At 25 years old, you can become a Member of Congress.

This is why the D.C. CRIMES Act is essential to ensuring the long-term safety and security of our Nation's Capital so that violent offenders are not just handed any more get-out-of-jail-free cards. The bill also orders judges to stop sentencing youth offenders below the minimum sentencing guidelines.

It is time to bring back justice in America. It is time for fair punishment for the people who interfere with people's daily lives, specifically those with prior convictions. The revolving door of justice ends today. I cannot thank Representative DONALDS enough for his vital work on this legislation.

It is time to push back against soft-on-crime judges and DAs. We are a nation of laws, Mr. Speaker, and Washington, D.C., should be a model for justice across our great Nation.

In no way, shape, form, or fashion should we be charging adults as minors and allowing them to return to commit similar or more violent crimes. The citizens, tourists, businesspeople, and every other member of this city deserve safety and security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which will ensure just that.

We will restore D.C. to become the shining city on the hill that our Founders envisioned it to be. I again thank my dear friend Congressman DONALDS. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman COMER and the free State of Florida's next Governor, BYRON DONALDS, for introducing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4922, the D.C. CRIMES Act, which is sponsored by Congressman DONALDS. This critical legislation is a direct response to the failed pro-crime policies that have turned our Nation's Capital into a war zone.

Under failing leftist policies, Washington, D.C., has seen an epidemic of violence: carjackings surging 300 percent, homicides ravaging communities, and young thugs, some as old as 24, treated as juveniles, slapped with lenient sentences below mandatory minimums.

□ 1530

It endangers young families and small businesses struggling in this crime-ridden city. Innocent residents live in fear, while criminals roam free, mocking the rule of law.

H.R. 4922 cuts through this madness. It ensures adults face adult consequences. It repeals judges' abilities to dodge mandatory minimums for youth crimes. Crucially, it blocks the D.C. Council from gutting sentencing laws, reclaiming Congress' constitutional oversight over this Federal District, as it should be.

As President Trump declared in his March 2025 executive order, if D.C. won't act, we must, restoring order, beauty, and safety to our Capital.

This bill isn't about politics. It is about protecting lives. Republicans are delivering real reform, tougher accountability, transparent juvenile crime data via a public website, and a safer D.C. for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us and pass H.R. 4922 now to make America and this District safe again.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4922 so that we may redefine what is considered to be a youth offender from 24 years to 18 years and repeal the D.C. criminal court provision that allows youthful offenders to receive sentences less than the mandatory minimum required by law.

There is no question that there has been a crime epidemic across the District of Columbia, and the citizens of this great city deserve better. President Trump recognized this fact and has exercised his authority to restore safety. It is now time for Congress to build on his good work.

H.R. 4922 is designed to begin to address many of the problems that stem from the D.C. courts and their refusal to hold criminals accountable. We need to start with recognizing that 19- to 24-year-olds shouldn't be treated as youthful offenders.

Local news has recently reported that the number of juveniles arrested in Washington, D.C., has increased every year since 2020 and that 60 percent of carjackings in the District in 2025 so far are for those over 20 years old.

Knowing that the District of Columbia currently classifies anyone 24 years or younger as a youth offender, it is fair to ask how many of these so-called youthful offenders running rampant, terrorizing the hardworking people of Washington, D.C., are actually adults and should be tried as such. The situation is untenable and should not be tolerated in a civilized society.

I am, therefore, pleased to support the solutions presented by H.R. 4922, including the establishment of a website on District of Columbia's juvenile crime statistics.

Passage of this bill will go a long way to correcting the broken, soft-on-crime policies here in Washington, D.C., that coddle criminals and place at risk the good, honest, and hardworking people who call the District home.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DONALDS for sponsoring this important legislation and applaud Chairman COMER for his steadfast leadership on this critically important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4922.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I oppose passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation to ensure that citizens of Washington, D.C., and the many visitors to our Nation's Capital feel safe.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 707, 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. GARCIA of California. 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.

LOWERING AGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 5140) to lower the age at which a minor may be tried as an adult for certain criminal offenses in the District of Columbia to 14 years of age, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–12, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5140

Be it enacted by the Seante and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. LOWERING AGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) LOWERING AGE AT WHICH MINOR MAY BE EXCLUDED FROM JURISDICTION OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16–2301, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—