

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.

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, cashless bail allows dangerous and violent criminals on our streets. For far too long, dangerous criminals have been allowed to roam the streets of Washington, D.C., posing a threat to the general public. Progressive, activist judges are currently allowed to release criminals to D.C.'s streets with only a promise that they will not reoffend and will return to court for their trial date.

The District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act would take away a judge's ability to release these violent criminals. It would require judges to hold anyone charged with a violent crime before trial, and it would impose cash bail or bail bonds on anyone charged with a range of public safety or law-and-order offenses.

This is a smart and long overdue reform that rectifies the ill-conceived policies currently enacted in the District.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense public safety bill, and I thank Representative STEFANIK for her leadership on this issue and the National Fraternal Order of Police for their support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the legislation which is in front of us, which is another completely unacceptable attack on the District and on democratic principles.

We know that D.C. has more residents than two States. D.C. pays more Federal taxes than 26 States. D.C.'s government is accountable to the people who live here. Local leadership should be empowered to solve problems without Congress constantly interfering.

I have said many times if Donald Trump wants to run D.C., he should resign and run for Mayor. If Republicans want to get tough on crime, they should stop protecting the criminals in the Epstein files and demand transparency from Donald Trump. Let's talk about the bill in front of us today.

We know the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act is unfair and bad policy. Under this bill, if someone is charged with certain crimes, he will automatically be locked up before his trial. For other crimes, this bill would require cash bail or bond.

This will make D.C.'s local law much more strict than even Federal law. Pretrial release should be based on a judge's determination of flight risk and danger to the community. We should let trained judges and prosecutors do their jobs and consider each fact of each case.

A person shouldn't automatically be locked up based on a criminal charge

before he is even proven to be guilty. We know in our system that a person is innocent until proven guilty. We know that should be true whether that person is rich or poor.

This bill will lock up more low-income people and more people who are also innocent. It will reinforce an unfair system where the rich get perks, while the poor suffer.

Democrats are fighting for a system where wealthy elites aren't above the law but where the justice system is fair for all. We are fighting for democracy.

We should let the council, the Mayor, and the District's justice system work together as they balance the public safety needs of the people. When D.C. residents don't like local policies, they can demand different policies from their elected leaders and certainly vote them out of office.

This bill is not about safety but about Congress once again interfering in local safety decisions by D.C. residents who are perfectly capable of making these decisions on their own.

□ 1400

We should be clear. This bill is also opposed by the Mayor, the city council, and many in the community. It is an overreach by the Republican majority to try to control the District.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is unnecessary. It undermines home rule, and it can make D.C. less safe. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. As a former prosecutor here in Washington, D.C., I had a chance to use these statutes frequently with respect to the bail determination that is made in all of these criminal cases at some point or another.

My colleague talked about this being commonsense legislation, but the D.C. bill is patterned on the Federal Bail Reform Act. I note that there is no effort to amend that here or change it in the way that has been proposed in this bill.

In addition to that, roughly 40 States in the Union are patterned after the Federal Bail Reform Act, just like the D.C. bill is, but there is no effort to change those. Many of those 40 States are represented by Members on the other side who support this bill.

The main point I want to raise right now is that it appears to me that this bill, as drafted, would create a scenario that is unconstitutional. As I read it, it strikes a 5-day provision. In other words, when somebody is initially arrested, they can be held for 5 days, and so, Mr. Speaker, you can have the full-scale hearing.

The way this is drafted is it eliminates the 5 days, and it says:

Notwithstanding any other provision, the judicial officer shall order that the person who is charged with this crime be detained for the period before trial.

I think that says that no matter what, whoever is arrested for any of these charges, there is a mandatory requirement that they be held for the entire pretrial period. That would certainly be unconstitutional.

Under Salerno, the Supreme Court case which ruled on the constitutionality of this language over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court said that there are a variety of safeguards that have been put in place: right to counsel, detention hearing, and the chance to offer opposing evidence and the like, that provides the safeguards that permit the statute to be found to be constitutional.

However, the way this bill is drafted, none of those safeguards could come into play because the initial provision as it is written makes all of those superfluous and says that no matter what, if these charges arise, then the person has to be detained for the entire pretrial period.

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

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

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would say at this point, though, that because it is unconstitutional, I urge my Republican colleagues to oppose this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I would note that Salerno was written by Chief Justice Rehnquist, no liberal advocate, and Justice Scalia supported it, as well.

This is a provision that has key safeguards that are excluded. By the way this is drafted, it has to be revised. I oppose it even if you do the revision piece, Mr. Speaker, because I think it violates the rights of the District of Columbia to make their own determinations.

At a minimum, Mr. Speaker, please send constitutional law forward.

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

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill which amends the District of Columbia's pretrial release and detention law.

Last year, violent crime in D.C. was down 35 percent, reaching an over-30-year low. This year, violent crime in D.C. is down 28 percent compared to the same period last year.

I suspect most of my Republican colleagues do not know that D.C.'s longstanding pretrial release and detention law is substantially the same as the longstanding Federal pretrial release and detention law, or that the same well-respected Federal agency provides pretrial services for both the local and Federal trial courts in D.C.

This bill requires, in the case of certain crimes, pretrial detention based solely on a charge and financial conditions for pretrial release. However,

mandatory pretrial detention based solely on a charge is unconstitutional and financial conditions for pretrial release criminalize poverty.

Neither D.C. nor Federal law requires pretrial detention or financial conditions for pretrial release, but both laws permit each. Under both D.C. and Federal law, pretrial release and detention are based on a judge's assessment of a defendant's risk of not appearing in court and danger to the community. In contrast, 18 States, the majority of which are red States, have a constitutional right to bail, meaning, except in capital cases, a defendant cannot be detained pretrial based solely on flight risk or dangerousness.

Pretrial detention is a severe restriction on the liberty of an individual who is presumed innocent. This bill requires detention for the period before trial based solely on a charge, with no adversary hearing. That is unconstitutional. The Due Process Clause of the Constitution requires an adversary hearing to detain a defendant for the period before trial.

In 1987, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Federal pretrial release and detention law. In its ruling, the Court stressed the law's procedural protections for defendants.

Chief Justice Rehnquist said:

In our society liberty is the norm, and detention prior to trial or without trial is the carefully limited exception. We hold that the provisions for pretrial detention in the Bail Reform Act of 1984 fall within that carefully limited exception. The act authorizes the detention prior to trial of arrestees charged with serious felonies who are found after an adversary hearing to pose a threat to the safety of individuals or to the community which no condition of release can dispel. The numerous procedural safeguards detailed above must attend this adversary hearing.

Studies show that whether a jurisdiction requires financial conditions for pretrial release has no effect on the crime rates of that jurisdiction. Instead, even small financial conditions for pretrial release often force poor defendants to remain in jail, which can cost them their jobs and housing and leads to more convictions and longer sentences.

The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves. If residents do not like how the D.C.'s local legislature votes, residents can vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is called democracy.

If D.C. residents do not like how the Members of Congress vote on local D.C. matters, residents cannot vote them out of office. That is the antithesis of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from the D.C. Mayor, the entire D.C. Council, and the D.C. Attorney General, all of whom were elected by D.C. residents.

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

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 Over-
sight 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%) 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. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this undemocratic and paternalistic bill. It is long past time for Congress to pass the D.C. statehood bill. Free D.C.

□ 1410

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WALKINSHAW).

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5214, which erodes the self-governance of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, I was a local government official not far from here, in Fairfax County. In the 6 years I spent in that role, I learned that the people best positioned to make decisions about the local policies in their local communities are local leaders after listening to that local community.

My colleagues across the aisle who are advocating for these bills, with due respect, know very little about the District of Columbia, know very little outside of perhaps their walk from their apartment in Navy Yard to this Capitol complex. They don't know the history, neighborhoods, communities, and chal-

lenges that folks in the District are facing.

While my colleagues espouse the virtues of self-governance, they simultaneously advocate for bills like this that strip self-governance from 700,000 Americans.

In 1973, Congress passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to grant the inhabitants of the District powers of local self-government. This bill is just one of many in this House that erodes those powers to help President Trump consolidate power over our Nation's Capital.

Meanwhile, the American people are confronting crisis after crisis that demands action from this Congress. Our national economy is struggling under President Trump's leadership. Tariffs are driving up prices. Looming healthcare cuts are about to result in skyrocketing premiums for Americans across the Nation.

In the midst of this, how does the majority choose to spend its time? It is spending its time by meddling in D.C.'s local affairs and further disenfranchising 700,000 taxpaying Americans.

I strongly oppose this bill and encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, just to respond to our new colleague here who hasn't worked in Congress very long, this bill passed constitutional muster with the House Legislative Counsel, CRS, and various outside stakeholders. None of our Democrat colleagues brought up these concerns during the markup.

Let me say this. For those of us who have worked here in Washington, D.C., for a decade, we are very aware of the crime, the repeat offenders, and the juvenile crime rates in Washington, D.C., so we are taking action to try to make our Capital City a safer place. That is why I strongly support this bill.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, Free D.C.

To my colleagues across the aisle, I appreciate the debate, but I have to say I thought we were going to try to fix healthcare, to address costs, try to fix the economy, and get the country back on track. Isn't that what the promise at the end of the shutdown was when we came back into session?

Yet, here we are, 1 week after the end of the shutdown, after a truly harrowing several days dealing with the Epstein petition, and what are you guys putting on the floor to eat up precious floor time as we are headed into the holidays? We are debating bills to micromanage D.C. affairs, bills to open public land and Tribal sacred sites to oil and gas drilling, and a ridiculous political resolution that I heard your own Members last night on the floor talking about. They called it stupid

and kind of crazy. Those are their words, not mine, but I don't disagree, so don't get me wrong.

After 54 days of the House of Representatives being shut down, all you guys really seem to have time to do is run bills like this?

What I find particularly offensive is that in a week that we should be working to address the healthcare crisis in a bipartisan manner, you are trying to pass bills today that would undo local police reforms that our Nation's Capital put into place after George Floyd's murder to ensure that the people of this city are safe and that the justice system is fair for them.

If it is not clear, I am a hard "no" on these bills, not just because I believe they represent congressional overreach and abuse of power, but because they will harm the people of our Nation's Capital.

Also, and I think this is where the conversation needs to be had, if we actually want to address public safety and help communities across this country that elected us to do this work, we need to be addressing real solutions. We need to be addressing the addiction crisis; investing in behavioral health and addiction recovery programs; investing in diversion and community-based programs that help people who are hurting and living on the edge get back on their feet; investing in our children and pipelines for young people to have lives that they can only dream of; fixing a broken system that makes it difficult for people who are living on the edge to survive; raising wages; lowering the costs of housing, food, energy, and healthcare; and, yes, fixing the broken healthcare system that you all said you were going to come back to address.

These are the systems that are broken and that are hurting our people, especially in New Mexico. It is not just the cost of healthcare that is going up, but our hospitals, clinics, and providers who are struggling to make sure that they can stay afloat, especially after the big, ugly bill gutted and promised to take \$1.5 trillion out of the public healthcare system.

It is why I have been working to champion bipartisan healthcare and health solutions, like bills to invest in urban, rural, and Tribal healthcare; to invest congressional funds into building clinics; to sponsor legislation to address the fentanyl crisis; to recruit and train more nurses and healthcare professionals; to recruit more counselors to fix the Medicaid and Medicare system; to expand telehealth and broadband; and, yes, to finally put this country on a track to universal healthcare.

I believe that healthcare is a human right. I believe that access to food, water, shelter, and safety is a human right. I believe that justice, freedom, and access to the criminal justice system are human rights. I believe that basic dignity is a human right. That is why I implore my colleagues to stop

with these divisive political tactics every day and these bills attacking our communities and focus on the issues that matter and that the American people are asking us to do. That is why we were elected.

Real lives are on the line, so let's get back to work on real issues. Stop attacking Washington, D.C. Stop attacking our public lands. Stop attacking the basic dignity and human decency of our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to individuals.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentlewoman that we believe on this side of the aisle that lowering the crime rate is a big issue. It is a priority for the American people.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico mentioned the government shutdown. I would like to remind the gentlewoman from New Mexico that she voted to shut the government down. Then, she had an opportunity 43 days later to reopen the government, and she voted against reopening the government. That is something that I think she must have mistakenly omitted from her remarks.

Again, we support every measure that can be done to reduce crime and to get criminals that have committed crimes and keep them in jail. They deserve due process, but we can't continue this trend in these cities, especially the Capital City, of letting violent criminals out back on the streets.

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

□ 1420

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

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge our colleagues to oppose this bill. D.C. has a right and its residents have a right to govern themselves and elect mayors and council members that choose to pass laws to support the District. Congress should not be undermining local laws.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to make it easier to lock up poor defendants pretrial, undermining the fundamental American principle of innocent until proven guilty, all while stripping 700,000 residents of self-rule. Congress should not dictate local judicial policy.

Mr. Speaker, we should oppose these bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5214 will ensure that violent offenders remain off of the streets of D.C. while awaiting their trial and that those charged with public safety or order offenses will face further deterrence from committing such crimes through the reinstatement of required cash bail and bail bonds.

Overall, D.C. residents, workers, and visitors to our Nation's Capital should feel safe, and it remains the constitu-

tional duty of Congress to reform Washington, D.C.'s laws when necessary to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation to bring law and order to D.C. by ensuring that dangerous criminals will not re-offend before their trial date.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 879, 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.

COMMON-SENSE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY NOW IN DC ACT OF 2025

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 879, I call up the bill (H.R. 5107) to repeal the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 enacted by the District of Columbia Council, 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. 5107

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 "Common-Sense Law Enforcement and Accountability Now in DC Act of 2025" or the "CLEAN DC Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-345) is hereby repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act is restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

(b) *EXCEPTION.*—The repeal under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

(1) subtitle S of title I of such Act (sec. 5-365.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code); and