

If the House legislation we are debating today does not receive a vote in the Senate, I want to make it clear that I am taking action.

Today, I have introduced H. Res. 892, a House resolution that empowers Speaker JOHNSON to bring this issue before the courts and challenge the so-called Senate payday provision as blatantly unconstitutional.

Importantly, because my resolution is a House resolution, it does not require the consent or cooperation of the Senate, which has shamefully shown no willingness to undo this egregious policy. The House does not have to wait for the Senate to act and watch idly while this payday stands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Representative SCOTT's legislation and to support my resolution so we can stand up for the integrity of Congress, uphold the Constitution, and restore public trust in this institution.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this who-wants-to-be-a-millionaire provision created by U.S. Senators for themselves, and themselves alone, is outrageous. I will, of course, be voting to repeal it today.

We also need to ask how this was allowed to happen, and I have to tell you, it doesn't help that the House wasn't even here. For 6 straight weeks, House leadership decided to cancel our sessions, every oversight hearing, every markup of legislation, everything. Why? To this day, there has been no coherent rationale offered.

Throughout this time, I warned that this was not only holding back our own legislative priorities but was also making the House irrelevant in any deal to reopen the government. Of course, that is what ended up happening. The Senate never passed our CR. They negotiated their own deal. After 50 days away, the House was brought back for one fly-by vote to ratify what the Senate had come up with as our only opportunity to reopen the government.

The Senate was so thoroughly convinced of the House's irrelevance that they thought that they could literally insert a self-enrichment scheme into the legislation and get away with it. By the way, they still might get away with it because while we are passing a bill to repeal it today, that still has to pass the Senate.

We need to pass this in the House today. We need to insist that this pro-

vision be included in a must-pass bill going forward so that it cannot actually be utilized. More than that, we need to start reasserting ourselves as a House, reclaiming our authority under Article I and giving the American people the representation they deserve.

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

Mr. Speaker, I hope today's debate was about more than simply a press release, about people trying to absolve themselves, and not just another waste of taxpayer time and money misleading the American people about the intentions of Senate Republicans.

The Senate should act on this measure. They should act on it today. Rarely in life is there a second chance to do the right thing.

I urge my colleagues here to do the right thing, and I certainly urge Members of the Senate to do the right thing, as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before we close, I just want to wrap up a few things that have been discussed today.

We were closed as a Federal Government for 43 days because Democrats in the House of Representatives voted against a clean CR and then cheered on their Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate to keep the government closed as people suffered, as individuals who were showing up to work weren't receiving payment, including law enforcement officers and Border Patrol officers. SNAP benefits weren't being paid, and that pain was getting quite real.

Finally, after 43 days, eight Democratic Senators came to the table and said we should reopen the government. Those eight voted for this bill. I didn't hear my colleagues critique those eight Democrats in the United States Senate who were involved in drafting the final legislation. In fact, my suggestion the whole time was that the Senate should have passed the clean CR the House sent to them.

□ 1340

If we look at the record, time after time after time, Democrats in the United States Senate refused to pass the clean CR, which would have avoided this mess in the first place.

If we are curious as to who caused this problem, I think the answer, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear. Democrats in the House of Representatives voted against the clean CR and then cheered on their Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate to keep this government closed.

As this came to the House, this provision was buried in it, but we had an obligation to reopen the Federal Government to make sure that law enforcement officers were getting paid, air traffic controllers were getting paid, and SNAP benefits were flowing once again, so we voted for it. Today is

the opportunity to clean up this provision.

There are far better ways to address the abuses of the Biden administration, and those abuses do need to be addressed, just not in this mechanism.

I encourage all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to vote "aye." I hope we have a unanimous vote tonight, as we pass H.R. 6019.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6019.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. STEIL. 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 motion will be postponed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Censuring Representative CORY MILLS of Florida and removing him from the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Whereas prior to serving in the House of Representatives, Representative CORY MILLS founded PACEM Solutions International, LLC, and PACEM Defense, LLC, and acquired AMTEC Corporation, now renamed as ALS, Inc., companies which engage in security and military contracting with the United States Government, as well as foreign nations;

Whereas in August 2024, the Office of Congressional Conduct found: From January 2023 to present, PACEM Defense/ALS has been actively contracting with the Federal Government, securing close to \$1 million in Federal contracts for munitions and weapons, distributed to prisons across the country. Specifically, since January 9, 2024, 94 contracts have been awarded to entities owned by Representative MILLS and went on to conclude that there is substantial reason to believe that Representative MILLS may have entered into, held, or enjoyed contracts with Federal agencies while he was a Member of Congress in violation of House rules, standards of conduct, and Federal law;

Whereas in August 2024, the Office of Congressional Conduct noted: According to its website, PACEM Solutions is currently registered and/or partnered

with trusted local firms to work in the following countries: United States, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, UAE, Australia, Kenya, Malaysia, and Kuwait. Public reports indicate companies owned by Representative MILLS sought or entered into contracts to sell munitions to foreign nations while serving as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on the Committee on Armed Services;

Whereas entities owned by Representative MILLS seeking or entering into contracts to sell munitions to the United States Government as well as foreign nations while he serves as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Committee on Armed Services represents a clear and troubling conflict of interest;

Whereas in August 2024, the Office of Congressional Conduct further adopted and transmitted to the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives a report indicating that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative CORY MILLS may have omitted or misrepresented required information in his financial disclosure statements, accepted excessive contributions to his campaign committee in the form of personal loans and contributions that may not have derived from Representative CORY MILLS' personal funds, and may have accepted through his campaign committee in-kind contributions or other contributions not lawfully made;

Whereas individuals who served in the military with Representative CORY MILLS have called into question the veracity of the account of events which formed the basis of a recommendation that Representative CORY MILLS receive an award of a Bronze Star, bestowed in 2021 or afterwards, for his service under enemy fire in Iraq in 2003;

Whereas in August 2024, Representative CORY MILLS provided The Daytona Beach News with documents purporting to prove that he earned a Bronze Star with heroism, including a Department of the Army Form 638 recommending Representative CORY MILLS for a Bronze Star, which includes a signature from then-Army Brigade Commander Arnold N. Gordon-Bray;

Whereas Retired Army Brigadier General Arnold N. Gordon-Bray has stated he did not personally write, read, or sign the Department of the Army Form 638 recommending Representative CORY MILLS for a Bronze Star;

Whereas five people who served with Representative CORY MILLS, including two men who were reported as having been personally saved by Representative CORY MILLS at great risk to his own life as a basis for the recommendation for his Bronze Star in the Department of the Army Form 638, disputed that Representative CORY MILLS was involved in their rescue or provided lifesaving care;

Whereas one private first class cited as having been involved in one of the

listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS' Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star denied that Representative CORY MILLS provided him any aid and also denied that his injuries were life-threatening;

Whereas one sergeant cited as having been involved in one of the listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS' Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star called the account a fabrication and claimed that he was not involved in any claims that CORY MILLS makes about me;

Whereas Representative CORY MILLS' employment application to DynCorp International stated he served in the United States Army 75th Ranger Regiment and attended United States Army Sniper School, claims which are not corroborated in his military records;

Whereas on February 19, 2025, Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department officers were called to resolve a private matter at Representative CORY MILLS' residence, where officers were called to the 1300 block of Maryland Avenue, SW, around 1:15 p.m. for the report of an assault;

Whereas police reports obtained by NBC4 Washington confirmed that the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department was investigating Representative CORY MILLS for an alleged assault of a 27-year-old woman that took place on February 19, 2025, at the residence of Representative CORY MILLS;

Whereas the first police report provided to NBC4 Washington by a source and confirmed by a second source familiar with the investigation said that the 27-year-old woman accused her significant other for over a year of having grabbed her, shoved her, and pushed her out the door, and also said that the woman involved showed the officer bruises on her arm which appeared fresh;

Whereas NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department identified Representative CORY MILLS as the significant other of the alleged victim of assault, which alleged victim was a 27-year-old woman who was not the wife of Representative CORY MILLS, and that the alleged victim let officers hear Subject 1—now identified by MPD as MILLS—instruct her to lie about the origin of her bruises. Eventually, Subject 1 made contact with the police and admitted that the situation escalated from verbal to physical, but it was severe enough to create bruising.

Whereas on February 21, 2025, The Washington Post also confirmed two D.C. police officials said that the alleged victim of assault initially told a 9/11 operator and police that she had been assaulted and that officers said she also had what seemed to be visible injuries, and that while a supervisor initially classified the offense internally as a family disturbance, police commanders later learned of the incident, reviewed the reports and body camera footage from the responding of-

ficers, and reclassified the case as a domestic violence assault;

Whereas on February 21, 2025, NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department determined that probable cause to arrest Representative CORY MILLS for misdemeanor assault existed and sent an arrest warrant for Representative CORY MILLS to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia;

Whereas on July 14, 2025, a different former romantic partner of Representative CORY MILLS, who was apparently in a relationship with Representative MILLS from November 2021 to February 2025, reported to authorities in Florida that Representative MILLS threatened to release nude images and other intimate videos of her and threatened to harm her future romantic partners in retaliation for her decision to end a relationship with Representative MILLS after seeing the public reports described above concerning the alleged February 2025 physical assault;

Whereas on October 14, 2025, the Circuit Court of the Third Judicial Circuit in Columbia County, Florida, issued a Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Dating Violence against Representative CORY MILLS, based on a finding that his former romantic partner was a victim of dating violence or had reasonable cause to believe she was in imminent danger of becoming a victim of an act of dating violence; and

Whereas such conduct by Representative CORY MILLS affects the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House and brings discredit upon the House: Now, therefore, be it resolved, that:

(1) Representative CORY MILLS be censured;

(2) Representative CORY MILLS forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

(3) Representative CORY MILLS be censured with a public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

(4) Representative CORY MILLS be, and is hereby, removed from the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

□ 1350

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate proceedings 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 South Carolina 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.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CASH
BAIL REFORM ACT OF 2025

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 879, I call up the bill (H.R. 5214) to require mandatory pretrial and post conviction detention for crimes of violence and dangerous crimes and require mandatory cash bail for certain offenses that pose a threat to public safety or order in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5214

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. MANDATORY PRETRIAL AND POST CONVICTION DETENTION FOR CRIME OF VIOLENCE OR DANGEROUS CRIME.

(a) PRETRIAL DETENTION.—Section 23–1322, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "with an offense" and inserting "with an offense, other than a crime of violence or dangerous crime (as such terms are defined in section 1331 of this title)."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the judicial officer shall order each person charged with a crime of violence or a dangerous crime (as such terms are defined in section 1331 of this title) be detained for the period before trial."

(b) POST CONVICTION DETENTION.—Section 23–1325, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "unless" and all that follows through "section 23–1321"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "unless" and all that follows through "section 23–1321"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) This provisions of this section shall apply with respect to a person convicted of a crime of violence or a dangerous crime (as such terms are defined in section 1331 of this title)."

(c) CHANGES TO DEFINITION OF DANGEROUS CRIME.—Section 23–1331(3), D.C. Official Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking "Burglary or attempted burglary" and inserting "Burglary in the first degree, attempted burglary in the first degree, or burglary with a dangerous weapon"; and

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking "Robbery or attempted robbery" and inserting "Robbery in the first degree, attempted robbery in the first degree, or robbery with a dangerous weapon".

(d) CHANGES TO DEFINITION OF CRIME OF VIOLENCE.—Section 23–1331(4), D.C. Official Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "burglary" and inserting "burglary in the first degree, attempted burglary in the first degree, or burglary with a dangerous weapon"; and

(2) by striking "robbery" and inserting "robbery in the first degree, attempted robbery in the first degree, or robbery with a dangerous weapon".

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REMOVAL OF CRIME OF VIOLENCE AND DANGEROUS CRIME FROM PRETRIAL RELEASE PROCEDURES.—Section 23–1322, District of Columbia Official Code, is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (A) and redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively;

(B) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Subject to rebuttal by the person, it shall be presumed that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that the person—

"(1) has threatened, injured, intimidated, or attempted to threaten, injure, or intimidate a law enforcement officer, an officer of the court, or a prospective witness or juror in any criminal investigation or judicial proceeding;

"(2) violated section 3 of the Act of July 8, 1932 (sec. 22–4503, D.C. Official Code), section 4(a) of such Act (sec. 22–4504(a), D.C. Official Code), or section 4(a-1) of such Act (sec. 22–4504(a)(1), D.C. Official Code); or

"(3) violated the Firearm Control Regulations Act of 1975 (sec. 7–2508.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) while on probation, parole, or supervised release for committing a dangerous crime or a crime of violence (as such terms are defined in section 1331 of this title) and while armed with or having readily available a firearm, imitation firearm, or other deadly or dangerous weapon as described in section 2(a) of the Act of July 8, 1832 (sec. 22–4502(a), D.C. Official Code).";

(C) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "is a crime of" and all that follows through "or"; and

(D) by striking subsection (f)(3).

(2) REMOVAL OF MURDER OFFENSES FROM PRETRIAL RELEASE PROCEDURES.—Section 23–1325, District of Columbia Official Code, as amended by subsection (b), is amended by striking subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (a) through (d), respectively.

SEC. 3. REQUIRING CASH BAIL FOR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS CHARGED WITH PUBLIC SAFETY OR ORDER OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 23–1321, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "Released" and inserting "Except as provided under paragraph (5), released";

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "or" and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) With respect to a person charged with a public safety or order crime (as such term is defined in section 1331 of this title), released only upon execution of a secured appearance bond (as such term is defined in section 1331 of this title) and subject to any requirement under subsections (b) and (c) of this section as the judicial officer may order."

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond in an amount specified by the court," and inserting "upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond in an amount specified by the court, or upon a secured appearance bond under subsection (a)(5)."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) A person who is released upon the execution of an appearance bond with a surety, under subsection (a)(5), may be arrested by the surety, and if so arrested, shall be delivered promptly to a United States marshal and brought before a judicial officer in the District of Columbia. The judicial officer shall determine in accordance with the provisions of this section 23–1322 whether to revoke the release of the per-

son, and may absolve the surety of responsibility to pay all or part of the bond in accordance with the provisions of Rule 46 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The person so committed shall be held in official detention until released pursuant to this title or any other provision of law."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) PUBLIC SAFETY OR ORDER CRIME DEFINED.—Section 23–1331, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) The term "public safety or order crime" means failure to appear when ordered to do so by a judicial officer; obstruction of justice; fleeing from a law enforcement officer; rioting; inciting a riot; destruction of property; stalking; burglary or robbery (other than burglary or robbery in the first degree or with a dangerous weapon); or a previous conviction of any such offense, or substantially similar offense, under Federal, State, or local law."

(2) SECURED APPEARANCE BOND DEFINED.—Section 23–1331, District of Columbia Official Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) The term "secured appearance bond" means an agreement to forfeit upon failing to appear as required, the designated property, including money, as is reasonably necessary to assure the appearance of the person as required, and post with the court the indicia of ownership of the property, or a percentage of the money as the judicial officer may specify; or a bail bond with solvent sureties in whatever amount is reasonably necessary to assure the appearance of the person as required."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 23–1321, District of Columbia Official Code, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "with an offense" and all that follows through "shall issue" and inserting "with an offense, other than a crime of violence or dangerous crime (as such terms are defined in section 1331 of this title), the judicial officer shall issue"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "shall" and inserting "may"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "Least restrictive further" and inserting "Further";

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking "additional or different conditions" and inserting "any additional or different condition described under this subsection".

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply with respect to an individual charged with an offense in the District of Columbia on or after the date that is 30 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.