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—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''sixteen years of age'' and inserting ''fourteen years of age''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) in the matter following subparagraph (C), by striking ''the age of sixteen'' and inserting ''the age of fourteen''.

(b) LOWERING AGE AT WHICH MINOR MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO CRIMINAL PROCEEDING.—Section 16–2307(a), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''fifteen'' and inserting ''fourteen''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''sixteen'' and inserting ''fourteen''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply with respect to criminal offenses committed on and 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 now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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. 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.

The District of Columbia has seen a staggering increase in juvenile crime since the pandemic. According to the Metropolitan Police Department, 51.8 percent of all robbery arrests in 2024 were juveniles, and 53 percent of all carjacking arrests in 2025, as of August, were juveniles.

Congress must respond to these violent crimes being committed by juvenile perpetrators. Currently, minors 16 years old and older are eligible to have their case moved up to criminal court and to be tried as an adult in D.C. This bill lowers that age to 14 years old, making 14- and 15-year-olds who commit violent crimes eligible to be charged as adults.

Violent crime refers to murder, first-degree sexual abuse, burglary in the first degree, and robbery while armed, for example. When juveniles commit crimes of this magnitude, they deserve sentencing that reflects the seriousness of the crimes they committed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BRANDON GILL for leading this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1540

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we are back with a second bill to undermine Washington, D.C., with an undemocratic and misguided policy.

Republicans in Congress are once more acting again as a city council for D.C., overriding the choices of local residents and their elected officials, while ignoring the real issues the rest of the country faces.

Nearly 700,000 taxpaying Americans in D.C. deserve the same right to self-governance as every other community including control over criminal laws.

Democrats on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform strongly oppose this bill, which would allow children as young as 14 years old to be charged as adults. Let's be clear. This bill is not about safety. It is about stripping away judicial discretion and sending more children into the adult prison system.

This bill lowers the age at which children can be tried as adults in D.C. from 16 to 14 years old for certain crimes. If a crime is committed, a person should be held accountable. We all can agree on this. A 14-year-old is not an adult. They are middle schoolers. Their brains are still developing. Treating them as adults is shameful.

We can all agree that children should be treated differently by our courts. That matters when it comes to accountability and rehabilitation. Here is what the research shows.

Youth charged as adults are more likely to reoffend than youth that go through the juvenile courts. That is not speculation. It is what decades of data show.

The CDC reviewed the evidence and found that sending kids to adult prisons increases violence and does not reduce it. The National Research Council concluded that keeping punishment in line with age is the best way to prevent future offending. Every shred of research says the same thing. Putting kids in adult prison makes us less safe, not more safe.

House Democrats know that violent crime, of course, has no place in our communities. People are right to be concerned about crime. Democrats are taking it seriously. If the goal is safer communities, this bill moves us in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, let's also talk about who this bill impacts. More than 93 percent of youth arrests in D.C. in the first half of this year were Black youth. D.C. already has the highest youth incarceration rate in the country. It is more than three times the national average. This bill would take those discrepancies and make them worse, funneling even more children into the adult system.

The bottom line is simple. The legislation in front of us would not make us safer. It does not make D.C. safer. It makes D.C. less safe. It will deepen racial disparities. It will push more kids into adult prisons where they are more likely to come out worse off than they were and not better. If we care about public safety, the last thing we should do is put 14-year-olds in adult prison.

Instead of taking power away from D.C. residents and our elected officials, Congress should focus on real national priorities like addressing gun violence that threatens communities, threatens schools, and threatens our cities every single day.

Finally, the rules in front of us have been created through the incredible work of the community, through hearings, through meetings, and through public testimony. Let's not all throw it out now. This bill is not about making D.C. safer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is the Capital of the United States. It should reflect the glory, the beauty, and the grandeur of the most powerful civilization that has ever existed on the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, that is not the case under Democrat rule. Under Democrat rule, especially in our Nation's Capital, we are forced to live under the cloud of anarcho-tyranny where criminals roam free and law-abiding families live in fear.

Mr. Speaker, under President Trump's leadership, Republicans are restoring law and order to cities that have been virtually abandoned by the left. That is why I introduced the District of Columbia Juvenile Sentencing Reform Act. It will make sure violent criminals are treated like violent criminals, no matter what their age.

Mr. Speaker, in 2021, Uber Eats driver Mohammad Anwar was murdered in D.C. during a carjacking by two teenage girls. One of the criminals was 15 years old. She was convicted of felony murder, and she was given a maximum sentence under D.C. law. She will be free when she turns 21 years old. That is 6 years for murder. That is 6 years for taking a father away from his family. This bill ensures that that travesty of justice never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of crime in D.C. is bleak. D.C.'s homicide rate in 2024 was 27.3 per 100,000. That is the fourth highest in our Nation. The first 6 months of 2025 alone, juveniles in D.C. were arrested 900 times. Many of those arrests were for repeat violent offenders. Around 200 juveniles arrested for violent crimes in 2024 had prior violent crime arrests.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't rehabilitation. This is a revolving door of crime that the left has created in this city. Meanwhile, the D.C. Council passed reforms to weaken policing and reduce penalties for carjacking and robbery. As a matter of policy, they are choosing criminals over innocent Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we hear from the other side of the aisle that locking up criminals by some weird and bizarre logic increases crime. The reality, which we all know because it is self-evident, is that when a criminal is in jail, by definition, they are not committing crimes on our streets and not terrorizing innocent Americans.

We are told that if we care about public safety, we shouldn't put criminals in prison. Mr. Speaker, this is insane. They know it. The American people know it.

If we want to live in a law-abiding society, we have to get these violent and ruthless offenders off of our streets. That is what Republicans are doing, and that is what Democrats on the other side of the aisle are fighting right now.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation lowers the age for transfer to adult court from 16 to 14 for the most heinous crimes. We are talking about murder, first-degree sexual assault, armed robbery, and burglary.

It expands the cases that can be tried by the U.S. Attorney's Office, ensuring that woke, weird prosecutors like D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb can't let violent offenders slip through the cracks. It sends a simple message. Democrats may tolerate crime, but Republicans do not.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be able to walk down our streets without fear of being murdered or raped or having their car broken into. Every parent should be able to put their child to bed without wondering if their home is going to be broken into.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GILL of Texas. This bill restores order and common sense to the laws of our Nation's Capital. The American people and every visitor in D.C., as well, deserve nothing less.

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 time.

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.

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 Mendelson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Robert White, Jr., At-Large; Councilmember

Brook 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.

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.

Ms. NORTON. While Congress has authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it does not have a duty to do so. It is a choice.

In Federalist 43, James Madison said of D.C. residents: '' . . . as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them.''

Since 1802, Congress has established various types of local government for D.C. In 1953, the Supreme Court held: '' . . . there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power.''

The local D.C. 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.

□ 1550

That is the antithesis of democracy.

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

I strongly oppose charging 14-year-olds as adults. However, whether to amend D.C. law to reduce or increase the minimum age a minor can be charged as an adult should be a decision for D.C. alone.

In a series of cases since 2005, the Supreme Court has recognized that children are ''constitutionally different from adults for purposes of sentencing.''

In these cases, the court noted that childhood is marked by ''rashness, proclivity for risk, and inability to assess consequences.'' The court said its decisions ''rested not only on common sense—on what any parent knows—but on science and social science as well.''

This bill is not only cruel, but counterproductive too. Most incarcerated people return home. The evidence shows that a minor charged as an adult is more likely to reoffend and be violent after release than a minor charged as a juvenile.

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 enter into the RECORD a letter explaining why the D.C. statehood bill 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. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority 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 of 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. 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, the 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 H.R. 5140, keep their hands off D.C. and free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, we have debated these bills in a sincere effort to work with the President of the United States to lower crime in D.C. We have heard nothing from the Democrats other than there is no crime problem in D.C., and that a solution is to make Washington, D.C., a State.

We are serious about lowering crime. We applaud the efforts of the President of the United States. We will continue to work with him to make our Capital City as safe as possible. I appreciate BRANDON GILL, the sponsor of the bill, and BYRON DONALDS for sponsoring the last bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GARCIA for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. This bill seeks to create 14-year-old prisoners in the adult criminal legal system. We know this approach doesn't improve public safety. It only traumatizes our babies. History tells us as much.

Antron McCray, 15 years old;
Yusef Salaam, 15 years old;
Raymond Santana, 14 years old;
Korey Wise, 16 years old; and
Kevin Richardson, 14 years old.

These five boys with big smiles and bright futures ahead of them went on to experience fear and manipulation that no child should. They were threatened, harassed, coerced, abused, and tried as adults, the very harm that this Republican bill would expand.

From the moment of their arrest these teenage boys, these Black boys, were treated as guilty of a horrific crime in Central Park, despite being innocent of all accusations. It was part of the hyper-punitive culture that prioritized political talking points about being tough on crime and targeted Black and Brown communities rather than investing in resources and policies that actually keep us all safe.

Does this sound familiar, Mr. Speaker?

During their trial, there was a PR campaign against the boys on TV and in newspapers. Donald J. Trump himself spent the equivalent of more than $200,000 advocating for them to get the death penalty.

These five Black and Brown children were innocent, but Trump wanted them killed. To this day, he has not even apologized, and Republicans in Congress are supporting him and his bigotry with this bill.

The story of the ''Exonerated Five'' is a tragedy and part of our shared history, but Republicans want it to be the future.

First, their rhetoric demonized their communities. Then they began weaponizing National Guard against citizens. Now they are changing laws to incarcerate more people at an even younger age. Of course, the prison industrial complex will reap the profits.

What Republicans do in D.C., they want to apply to the entire country.

This Republican bill perpetuates racism. The Department of Justice statistics show that Black kids are twice as likely to be incarcerated compared to White kids, despite committing crimes at the same rate.

This Republican bill is flawed. By treating children as adults, Mr. Speaker, you deny them protections from abuse from adults in prison, including bullying, physical violence, sexual assault, and rape.

This Republican bill makes children's lives worse. Unlike in other States, when kids in D.C. are treated as adults, the Bureau of Prisons ships them hundreds of miles away from their family and loved ones to places like South Dakota or Texas. This makes rehabilitation harder and increases the likelihood of recidivism.

Don't just take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. There is a large coalition opposing this bill.

Scientists tell us that young people's brains are not fully developed until their twenties. They don't share the same culpability for their actions as adults when they are only 14 years old.

Lawyers explain that children treated as adults, even when they are innocent, are denied age-appropriate legal protections for the rest of their lives.

Sociologists find that children who commit crimes are overwhelmingly influenced by adults and their surroundings, not their own thinking.

Of course, the people of D.C. did not vote for Trump or any Republican for that matter to be a city councilor.

Republicans are supporting this legislation not because they care about public safety. If Republicans cared about reducing crime, then they would tell Trump to stop delaying funding for community violence prevention programs that already were passed with bipartisan support.

If Republicans cared about victims, then they would stop making cuts to the crime victims fund so that people who experience harm get the help that they need.

If Republicans cared about our kids, then they would invest in restorative justice programs that teach children how to resolve their conflicts without violence.

If Republicans cared about our kids, then they would support commonsense legislation to prevent school shootings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill to keep our babies safe from trauma, abuse, and fear.

In the words of James Baldwin, ''The children are always ours, every single one.''

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to protect them all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, that is a perfect example of the difference in the two sides on how to handle crime in D.C.

You have to hold people accountable for crimes, Mr. Speaker. If you don't, then they will continue to commit crimes. That is what we have here in Washington, D.C. That is why we are here today. That is why we are here today.

Just coddling criminals, hiring therapists, hiring more social workers, and creating more government programs have failed to work in Washington, D.C., and many of the cities around the United States.

We have a President who is going to be tough on crime and tough on criminals. That is what the theme of this legislation is, Mr. Speaker. That is our way to reduce crime in Washington, D.C.

Their way hasn't worked. We are going to do it our way if we get the support in the Chamber today.

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

□ 1600

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I remind our Republican colleagues that crime in D.C. over the last few years has actually been going down. Quite frankly, the idea that we are now going to put middle schoolers in prison—this should be called the middle schoolers for prison act—is inhumane and shameful.

We can all agree that crime should be taken on, that D.C. and other cities we want to make safer, but this idea that we are going to penalize children in middle school at the age of 14 and put them in prison is irresponsible and, quite frankly, it is un-American.

I remind my colleagues that at this moment, what we are doing right now, is stripping 700,000 residents who have come together in D.C. to create laws, to bring community together, to fight for statehood and representation, we are going to strip them from their ability to manage their own city.

These efforts do nothing to reduce crime or improve public safety. Once again, I know that the President is obsessed with Washington, D.C. He is obsessed with its local laws. I ask him once again that he should step down as President and run for mayor if he is so interested. Let's not put 14-year-olds in prison.

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

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

Again, we are talking about violent crimes, violent crimes. What we have seen in Washington, D.C., is an outbreak of juvenile crime because the definition of juvenile in this city is 7 years higher than every other city in America.

With this legislation, we are talking about addressing issues of violent crime with juveniles. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is the path to try to get the crime under control in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure that violent crime, including murder and first degree sexual abuse, are taken seriously in the District of Columbia.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 4922; and

Passage of H.R. 5140.

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

DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—240

Aderholt	Arrington	Baird
Alford	Auchincloss	Balderson
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amodei (NV)	Bacon	Barrett