

Teresa, and it was her fierce spirit that allowed her to overcome so many challenges in her life, including fighting through her own health struggles.

I know that all of Staten Island is feeling the pain of losing Reverend Howard this young, but I want to close out with words of optimism that were near and dear to her heart: “No matter what happened yesterday, tomorrow can be better if we start today.”

Today, Staten Islanders are going to come together to honor and celebrate Reverend Howard’s life, and we will never forget her memory.

**RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PTSD AWARENESS MONTH**

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National PTSD Awareness Month, and this Saturday, June 27, as PTSD Awareness Day.

We need to do more to defy the stigmas surrounding mental health. PTSD treatment is a crucial tool that helps many individuals, particularly our Nation’s veterans, process, cope, and treat emotional and mental trauma.

Sadly, many of the men and women who have served in the United States military return home with injuries and scars, but sometimes, it is the invisible scars that hurt the most. Many struggle privately with PTSD and feel there is no outlet.

PTSD Awareness Month is not only an opportunity to raise awareness about this, but it is also an opportunity to raise awareness about treatment options.

The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a variety of resources to help those suffering from PTSD. Those seeking treatment should know that telemedicine may be an option as well, ensuring our veterans receive timely healthcare no matter where they live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Nation’s veterans for their service, and I encourage those who are struggling with PTSD to pursue treatment.

**CONGRESS CANNOT STOP HERE**

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The measures in this bill are long overdue and are a step forward in ensuring people, especially Black folks in our country, do not experience racist police violence.

We can’t stop here, though, Mr. Speaker. I think about Aiyana Stanley-Jones, a young girl in Detroit who would be graduating from high school this year if she had not been murdered by police when they raided her home, the wrong home, while she slept in 2010.

We can’t stop here. We must continue to push policies that will tear down structural racism, reimagine public safety, and divest from policing so we can invest more in education, healthcare, mental health, jobs, transportation, things that keep us safe and our communities thriving.

Aiyana should be here. George should be here. Breonna Taylor should be here. They all should be here.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and I continue to work toward justice for all of us.

□ 0915

**BUILD UPON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OUR FOREFATHERS**

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, leaders everywhere should decry the violent crowds toppling our statues. Our systems are the greatest ever devised by mankind. They deliver more equality, more justice, more liberty, and more pursuits of happiness than any other system throughout history.

Now, we haven’t always lived up to the ideals of our system, but we should build upon the accomplishments of our forefathers, not destroy their memories. We must bring about change by following the laws, not breaking them. We must support our police, not ambush them.

**WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT**

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 116–55, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–436, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 51

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Washington, D.C. Admission Act”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—STATE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.**

*Subtitle A—Procedures for Admission*

Sec. 101. Admission into the Union.

Sec. 102. Election of Senators and Representative.

Sec. 103. Issuance of presidential proclamation.

*Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States*

Sec. 111. Territory and boundaries.

Sec. 112. Description of Capital.

Sec. 113. Retention of title to property.

Sec. 114. Effect of admission on current laws of seat of Government of United States.

Sec. 115. Capital National Guard.

Sec. 116. Termination of legal status of seat of Government of United States as municipal corporation.

*Subtitle C—General Provisions Relating to Laws of State*

Sec. 121. Effect of admission on current laws.

Sec. 122. Pending actions and proceedings.

Sec. 123. Limitation on authority to tax Federal property.

Sec. 124. United States nationality.

**TITLE II—INTERESTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

*Subtitle A—Federal Property*

Sec. 201. Treatment of military lands.

Sec. 202. Waiver of claims to Federal property.

*Subtitle B—Federal Courts*

Sec. 211. Residency requirements for certain Federal officials.

Sec. 212. Renaming of Federal courts.

Sec. 213. Conforming amendments relating to Department of Justice.

Sec. 214. Treatment of pretrial services in United States District Court.

*Subtitle C—Federal Elections*

Sec. 221. Permitting individuals residing in Capital to vote in Federal elections in State of most recent domicile.

Sec. 222. Repeal of Office of District of Columbia Delegate.

Sec. 223. Repeal of law providing for participation of seat of government in election of President and Vice-President.

Sec. 224. Expedited procedures for consideration of constitutional amendment repealing 23rd Amendment.

**TITLE III—CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

*Subtitle A—Employee Benefits*

Sec. 301. Federal benefit payments under certain retirement programs.

Sec. 302. Continuation of Federal civil service benefits for employees first employed prior to establishment of District of Columbia merit personnel system.

Sec. 303. Obligations of Federal Government under judges’ retirement program.

*Subtitle B—Agencies*

Sec. 311. Public Defender Service.

Sec. 312. Prosecutions.

Sec. 313. Service of United States Marshals.

Sec. 314. Designation of felons to facilities of Bureau of Prisons.

Sec. 315. Parole and supervision.

Sec. 316. Courts.

*Subtitle C—Other Programs and Authorities*

Sec. 321. Application of the College Access Act.

Sec. 322. Application of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act.

Sec. 323. Medicaid Federal medical assistance percentage.

Sec. 324. Federal planning commissions.

Sec. 325. Role of Army Corps of Engineers in supplying water.

Sec. 326. Requirements to be located in District of Columbia.

**TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Sec. 401. General definitions.

Sec. 402. Statehood Transition Commission.

Sec. 403. Certification of enactment by President.

Sec. 404. Severability.

## TITLE I—STATE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

## Subtitle A—Procedures for Admission

**SEC. 101. ADMISSION INTO THE UNION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of this Act, upon the issuance of the proclamation required by section 103(a), the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth is declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever.

(b) **CONSTITUTION OF STATE.**—The State Constitution shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States or the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

(c) **NONSEVERABILITY.**—If any provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendments made by this Act shall be treated as invalid.

**SEC. 102. ELECTION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVE.**(a) **ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not more than 30 days after receiving certification of the enactment of this Act from the President pursuant to section 403, the Mayor shall issue a proclamation for the first elections for 2 Senators and one Representative in Congress from the State, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTIONS OF SENATORS.**—In the elections of Senators from the State pursuant to paragraph (1), the 2 Senate offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No such identification or designation of either of the offices shall refer to or be taken to refer to the terms of such offices, or in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators shall be assigned.

(b) **RULES FOR CONDUCTING ELECTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The proclamation of the Mayor issued under subsection (a) shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election, and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in subsection (a) shall be chosen by the qualified voters of the District of Columbia in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia.

(2) **CERTIFICATION OF RESULTS.**—Election results shall be certified in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia, except that the Mayor shall also provide written certification of the results of such elections to the President.

(c) **ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES.**—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Senators and Representative elected at the elections described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of the other States in Congress.

(d) **EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.**—Effective with respect to the Congress during which the State is admitted into the Union and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members, including any Members representing the State.

(2) **INITIAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR STATE.**—Until the taking effect of the first apportionment of Members occurring after the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives upon its admission into the Union.

(3) **APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM ADMISSION OF STATE.**—

(A) **APPORTIONMENT.**—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Con-

gress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by striking “the then existing number of Representatives” and inserting “436 Representatives”.

(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the first regular decennial census conducted after the admission of the State into the Union and each subsequent regular decennial census.

**SEC. 103. ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President, upon the certification of the results of the elections of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 102(a), shall, not later than 90 days after receiving such certification pursuant to section 102(b)(2), issue a proclamation announcing the results of such elections as so ascertained.

(b) **ADMISSION OF STATE UPON ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.**—Upon the issuance of the proclamation by the President under subsection (a), the State shall be declared admitted into the Union as provided in section 101(a).

**Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States****SEC. 111. TERRITORY AND BOUNDARIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the State shall consist of all of the territory of the District of Columbia as of the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to the results of the metes and bounds survey conducted under subsection (c).

(b) **EXCLUSION OF PORTION REMAINING AS SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES.**—The territory of the State shall not include the area described in section 112, which shall be known as the “Capital” and shall serve as the seat of the Government of the United States, as provided in clause 17 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

(c) **METES AND BOUNDS SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President (in consultation with the Chair of the National Capital Planning Commission) shall conduct a metes and bounds survey of the Capital, as described in section 112(b).

**SEC. 112. DESCRIPTION OF CAPITAL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (c), upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital shall consist of the property described in subsection (b) and shall include the principal Federal monuments, 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 and the Capitol Building (as such terms are used in section 8501(a) of title 40, United States Code).

(b) **GENERAL DESCRIPTION.**—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the boundaries of the Capital shall be as follows: Beginning at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of F Street NE and the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE;

(1) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE;

(2) thence southwest along said northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE;

(3) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE;

(4) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE;

(5) thence northeast along said southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(6) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(7) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to its intersection with the northern property boundary of the property designated as Square 760 Lot 803;

(8) thence east along said northern property boundary of Square 760 Lot 803 to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SE;

(9) thence south along said western right-of-way of 3rd Street SE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SE;

(10) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SE;

(11) thence northwest along said northwestern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(12) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of C Street SE;

(13) thence west along said southern right-of-way of C Street SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 1st Street SE;

(14) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 1st Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of D Street SE;

(15) thence west along said southern right-of-way of D Street SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street;

(16) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Canal Street SE;

(17) thence southeast along said northwestern right-of-way of Canal Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of E Street SE;

(18) thence east along said southern right-of-way of said E Street SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 1st Street SE;

(19) thence south along said western right-of-way of 1st Street SE to its intersection with the southernmost corner of the property designated as Square 736S Lot 801;

(20) thence west along a line extended due west from said corner of said property designated as Square 736S Lot 801 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE;

(21) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE;

(22) thence northwest along said northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of South Capitol Street;

(23) thence north along said western right-of-way of South Capitol Street to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of E Street SW;

(24) thence west along said southern right-of-way of E Street SW to its end;

(25) thence west along a line extending said southern right-of-way of E Street SW westward to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SW;

(26) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SW;

(27) thence northwest along said southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW;

(28) thence north along said western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street SW;

(29) thence west along said northern right-of-way of D Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW;

(30) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of C Street SW;

(31) thence west along said northern right-of-way of C Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 6th Street SW;

(32) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 6th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SW;

(33) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 12th Street SW;

(34) thence south along said western right-of-way of 12th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street SW;

(35) thence west along said northern right-of-way of D Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 14th Street SW;

(36) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 14th Street SW to its intersection with the northeastern boundary of the Consolidated Rail Corporation railroad easement;

(37) thence southwest along said northeastern boundary of the Consolidated Rail Corporation railroad easement to its intersection with the eastern shore of the Potomac River;

(38) thence generally northwest along said eastern shore of the Potomac River to its intersection with a line extending westward the northern boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806;

(39) thence east along said line extending westward the northern boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to the northern property boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806, and continuing east along said northern boundary of said property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to its northeast corner;

(40) thence east along a line extending east from said northeast corner of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to its intersection with the western boundary of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 87;

(41) thence south along said western boundary of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 87 to its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 88;

(42) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 33 Lot 88 to its southeast corner, which is along the northern right-of-way of E Street NW;

(43) thence east along said northern right-of-way of E Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 18th Street NW;

(44) thence south along said western right-of-way of 18th Street NW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue NW;

(45) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW;

(46) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 17th Street NW;

(47) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 17th Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of H Street NW;

(48) thence east along said southern right-of-way of H Street NW to its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 35;

(49) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 35 to its southeast corner, which is along the boundary of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 37;

(50) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 37 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 818;

(51) thence south along the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 818 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 40;

(52) thence south along the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 40 to its southwest corner;

(53) thence east along the southern border of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 40 to

its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 820;

(54) thence south along the western boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 820 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 39;

(55) thence south along the western boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 39 to its southwest corner, which is along the northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(56) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 15th Street NW;

(57) thence south along said western right-of-way of 15th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending northwest from the southern right-of-way of the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue NW north of Pershing Square;

(58) thence southeast along said line extending the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW, and continuing southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 14th Street NW;

(59) thence south along said western right-of-way of 14th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending west from the southern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(60) thence east along said line extending west from the southern right-of-way of D Street NW to the southern right-of-way of D Street NW, and continuing east along said southern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 13½ Street NW;

(61) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 13½ Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(62) thence east and southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 12th Street NW;

(63) thence south along said western right-of-way of 12th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending to the west the southern boundary of the property designated as Square 324 Lot 809;

(64) thence east along said line to the southwest corner of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 809, and continuing northeast along the southern boundary of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 809 to its eastern corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 323 Lot 802;

(65) thence east along the southern boundary of said property designated as Square 323 Lot 802 to its southeast corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 324 Lot 808;

(66) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 808 to its northeastern corner, which is along the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(67) thence southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 4th Street NW;

(68) thence north along a line extending north from said eastern right-of-way of 4th Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of C Street NW;

(69) thence east along said southern right-of-way of C Street NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 3rd Street NW;

(70) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 3rd Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(71) thence east along said southern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 1st Street NW;

(72) thence south along said western right-of-way of 1st Street NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of C Street NW;

(73) thence west along said northern right-of-way of C Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 2nd Street NW;

(74) thence south along said western right-of-way of 2nd Street NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW;

(75) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW;

(76) thence northeast along said northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue NW;

(77) thence northwest along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(78) thence east along said northern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW;

(79) thence northeast along said northwestern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of North Capitol Street;

(80) thence north along said western right-of-way of North Capitol Street to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NW;

(81) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NW to the southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NE;

(82) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NE to the southern right-of-way of Columbus Circle NE;

(83) thence counter-clockwise along said southern right-of-way of Columbus Circle NE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of F Street NE; and

(84) thence east along said southern right-of-way of F Street NE to the point of beginning.

(c) **EXCLUSION OF BUILDING SERVING AS STATE CAPITOL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, after the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital shall not be considered to include the building known as the “John A. Wilson Building”, as described and designated under section 601(a) of the Omnibus Spending Reduction Act of 1993 (sec. 10-1301(a), D.C. Official Code).

(d) **CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING.**—The entirety of the Frances Perkins Building, including any portion of the Building which is north of D Street Northwest, shall be included in the Capital.

#### **SEC. 113. RETENTION OF TITLE TO PROPERTY.**

(a) **RETENTION OF FEDERAL TITLE.**—The United States shall have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over, for purposes of administration and maintenance, all real and personal property with respect to which the United States holds title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) **RETENTION OF STATE TITLE.**—The State shall have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over, for purposes of administration and maintenance, all real and personal property with respect to which the District of Columbia holds title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

#### **SEC. 114. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT LAWS OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES.**

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the laws of the District of Columbia which are in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union (without regard to whether such laws were enacted by Congress or by the District of Columbia) shall apply in the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent beginning on the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall be deemed laws of the United States which are applicable only in or to the Capital.

**SEC. 115. CAPITAL NATIONAL GUARD.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In paragraphs (4), (6), and (19) of section 101, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(2) **BRANCHES AND ORGANIZATIONS.**—In section 103, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(3) **UNITS: LOCATION; ORGANIZATION; COMMAND.**—In subsections (c) and (d) of section 104, by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(4) **AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In section 107(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(5) **MAINTENANCE OF OTHER TROOPS.**—In subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 109, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(6) **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES.**—In section 112(h)—

(A) by striking “District of Columbia,” both places it appears and inserting “Capital,”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(7) **ENLISTMENT OATH.**—In section 304, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(8) **ADJUTANTS GENERAL.**—In section 314, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(9) **DETAIL OF REGULAR MEMBERS OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE TO DUTY WITH NATIONAL GUARD.**—In section 315, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(10) **DISCHARGE OF OFFICERS; TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT.**—In section 324(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(11) **RELIEF FROM NATIONAL GUARD DUTY WHEN ORDERED TO ACTIVE DUTY.**—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 325, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(12) **COURTS-MARTIAL OF NATIONAL GUARD NOT IN FEDERAL SERVICE: COMPOSITION, JURISDICTION, AND PROCEDURES; CONVENING AUTHORITY.**—In sections 326 and 327, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(13) **ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE DUTY: GOVERNOR’S AUTHORITY.**—In section 328(a), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(14) **TRAINING GENERALLY.**—In section 501(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(15) **PARTICIPATION IN FIELD EXERCISES.**—In section 503(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(16) **NATIONAL GUARD SCHOOLS AND SMALL ARMS COMPETITIONS.**—In section 504(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(17) **ARMY AND AIR FORCE SCHOOLS AND FIELD EXERCISES.**—In section 505, by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(18) **NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.**—In subsections (c)(1), (g)(2), (j), (k), and (l)(1) of section 509, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(19) **ISSUE OF SUPPLIES.**—In section 702—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”; and

(B) in subsections (b), (c), and (d), by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(20) **PURCHASES OF SUPPLIES FROM ARMY OR AIR FORCE.**—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 703, by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(21) **ACCOUNTABILITY: RELIEF FROM UPON ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY.**—In section 704, by

striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(22) **PROPERTY AND FISCAL OFFICERS.**—In section 708—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(23) **ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROPERTY ISSUED TO THE NATIONAL GUARD.**—In subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 710, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(24) **DISPOSITION OF OBSOLETE OR CONDEMNED PROPERTY.**—In section 711, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(25) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS OF CONDEMNED STORES ISSUED TO NATIONAL GUARD.**—In paragraph (1) of section 712, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(26) **PROPERTY LOSS; PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH.**—In section 715(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **CAPITAL DEFINED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 101 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”.

(B) **WITH REGARDS TO HOMELAND DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.**—Section 901 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”; and

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

“(3) The term ‘Governor’ means, with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard.”.

(2) **TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.**—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—In section 101—

(i) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(19) The term ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”;

(ii) in paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (c), by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”; and

(iii) in subsection (d)(5), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(B) **DISPOSITION ON DISCHARGE.**—In section 771a(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(C) **TRICARE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND DEPENDENTS DURING CERTAIN DISASTER RESPONSE DUTY.**—In section 1076f—

(i) in subsections (a) and (c)(1), by striking “with respect to the District of Columbia, the mayor of the District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(D) **PAYMENT OF CLAIMS: AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In paragraph (2)(B) of section 2732, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(E) **MEMBERS OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.**—In section 7401(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(F) **MEMBERS OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.**—In section 9401(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(G) **READY RESERVE: FAILURE TO SATISFACTORILY PERFORM PRESCRIBED TRAINING.**—In section 10148(b)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(H) **CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.**—In section 10502(a)(1)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(I) **VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.**—In section 10505(a)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(J) **OTHER SENIOR NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU OFFICERS.**—In subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 10506(a)(1)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” both places it appears and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” both places it appears and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(K) **NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU: GENERAL PROVISIONS.**—In section 10508(b)(1), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(L) **COMMISSIONED OFFICERS: ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT; LIMITATION.**—In section 12204(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(M) **RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY.**—In section 12301(b), by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” both places it appears and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(N) **NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL SERVICE: CALL.**—In section 12406—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(O) **RESULT OF FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS.**—In section 12642(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(P) **LIMITATION ON RELOCATION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS.**—In section 18238—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

**SEC. 116. TERMINATION OF LEGAL STATUS OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES AS MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.**

Notwithstanding section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (sec. 1–102, D.C. Official Code) or any other provision of law codified in subchapter 1 of chapter 1 of the District of Columbia Official Code, effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital (or any portion thereof) shall not serve as a government and shall not be a body corporate for municipal purposes.

**Subtitle C—General Provisions Relating to Laws of State****SEC. 121. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT LAWS.**

(a) **LEGISLATIVE POWER.**—The legislative power of the State shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation in the State, consistent with the Constitution of the United States (including the restrictions and limitations imposed upon the States by article I, section 10) and subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL OFFICES.**—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, members of executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the District of Columbia shall be deemed members of the respective executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the State, as provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.

(c) **TREATMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS.**—To the extent that any law of the United States applies to the States generally, the law shall have the same force and effect in the State as elsewhere in the United States, except as such law may otherwise provide.

(d) **NO EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.**—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect any obligation under any contract or agreement under which the District of Columbia or the United States is a party, as in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) **SUCCESSION IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS.**—The State shall be deemed to be the successor to the District of Columbia for purposes of any interstate compact which is in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(f) **CONTINUATION OF SERVICE OF FEDERAL MEMBERS ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.**—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect the authority of a representative of the Federal Government who, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, is a member of a board or commission of the District of Columbia to serve as a member of such board or commission or as a member of a successor to such board or commission after the admission of the State into the Union, as may be provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.

(g) **SPECIAL RULE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.**—The United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division may not enforce any law of the State in the State, except to the extent authorized by the State. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority of the United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to enforce any law in the Capital.

#### **SEC. 122. PENDING ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS.**

(a) **STATE AS LEGAL SUCCESSOR TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**—The State shall be the legal successor to the District of Columbia in all matters.

(b) **NO EFFECT ON PENDING PROCEEDINGS.**—All existing writs, actions, suits, judicial and administrative proceedings, civil or criminal liabilities, prosecutions, judgments, sentences, orders, decrees, appeals, causes of action, claims, demands, titles, and rights shall continue unaffected by the admission of the State into the Union with respect to the State or the United States, except as may be provided under this Act, as may be modified in accordance with the provisions of the State Constitution, and as may be modified by the laws of the State or the United States, as the case may be.

#### **SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO TAX FEDERAL PROPERTY.**

The State may not impose any tax on any real or personal property owned or acquired by the United States, except to the extent that Congress may permit.

#### **SEC. 124. UNITED STATES NATIONALITY.**

No provision of this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, to terminate nationality lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality terminated or lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

### **TITLE II—INTERESTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

#### **Subtitle A—Federal Property**

#### **SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF MILITARY LANDS.**

(a) **RESERVATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b) and notwithstanding the admission of the State into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States for the exercise by Congress of the power of exclusive legislation in

all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land located in the State that, on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(2) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.**—The power of exclusive legislation described in paragraph (1) shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(b) **AUTHORITY OF STATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The reservation of authority in the United States under subsection (a) shall not operate to prevent such tracts or parcels of land from being a part of the State, or to prevent the State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority.

(2) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—The State shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process in such tracts or parcels of land in which the authority of the United States is reserved under subsection (a) in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in the State but outside of such lands.

#### **SEC. 202. WAIVER OF CLAIMS TO FEDERAL PROPERTY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As a compact with the United States, the State and its people disclaim all right and title to any real or personal property not granted or confirmed to the State by or under the authority of this Act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or subject to disposition by the United States.

(b) **EFFECT ON CLAIMS AGAINST UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act shall recognize, deny, enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any claim against the United States, and any such claim shall be governed by applicable laws of the United States.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by Congress that any applicable law authorizes, establishes, recognizes, or confirms the validity or invalidity of any claim referred to in paragraph (1), and the determination of the applicability to or the effect of any law on any such claim shall be unaffected by anything in this Act.

#### **Subtitle B—Federal Courts**

#### **SEC. 211. RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICIALS.**

(a) **CIRCUIT JUDGES.**—Section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Except in the District of Columbia, each” and inserting “Each”; and

(2) by striking “within fifty miles of the District of Columbia” and inserting “within fifty miles of the Capital”.

(b) **DISTRICT JUDGES.**—Section 134(b) of such title is amended in the first sentence by striking “the District of Columbia, the Southern District of New York, and” and inserting “the Southern District of New York and”.

(c) **UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.**—Section 545(a) of such title is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting “Each United States attorney shall reside in the district for which he or she is appointed, except that those officers of the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York may reside within 20 miles thereof.”.

(d) **UNITED STATES MARSHALS.**—Section 561(e)(1) of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(1) the marshal for the Southern District of New York may reside within 20 miles of the district; and”.

(e) **CLERKS OF DISTRICT COURTS.**—Section 751(e) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia and”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply only to individuals appointed after the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

#### **SEC. 212. RENAMING OF FEDERAL COURTS.**

(a) **RENAMING.**—

(1) **CIRCUIT COURT.**—Section 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”; and

(B) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital; Washington, Douglass Commonwealth”.

(2) **DISTRICT COURT.**—Section 88 of such title is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**District of Columbia**” and inserting “**Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital**”; and

(B) by amending the first paragraph to read as follows:

“The State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital comprise one judicial district.”; and

(C) in the second paragraph, by striking “Washington” and inserting “the Capital”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The item relating to section 88 in the table of sections for chapter 5 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“88. Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COURT OF APPEALS.**—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) **APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.**—Section 44(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(2) **TERMS OF COURT.**—Section 48(a) of such title is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”; and

(B) in the second column, by striking “Washington” and inserting “Capital”; and

(C) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(3) **APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSELS BY CHIEF JUDGE OF CIRCUIT.**—Section 49 of such title is amended by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(4) **CIRCUIT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CERTIFICATION OF DEATH PENALTY COUNSELS.**—Section 2265(c)(2) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia Circuit” and inserting “the Capital Circuit”.

(5) **CIRCUIT COURT JURISDICTION OVER REVIEW OF FEDERAL AGENCY ORDERS.**—Section 2343 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia Circuit” and inserting “the Capital Circuit”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DISTRICT COURT.**—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) **APPOINTMENT AND NUMBER OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGES.**—Section 133(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(2) **DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OF TAX CASES BROUGHT AGAINST UNITED STATES.**—Section 1346(e) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(3) **DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER PROCEEDINGS FOR FORFEITURE OF FOREIGN PROPERTY.**—Section 1355(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(4) **DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL ACTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST A FOREIGN STATE.**—Section 1391(f)(4) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(5) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER ACTIONS BROUGHT BY CORPORATIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Section 1402(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(6) VENUE IN DISTRICT COURT OF CERTAIN ACTIONS BROUGHT BY EMPLOYEES OF EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.—Section 1413 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(7) VENUE IN DISTRICT COURT OF ACTION ENFORCING FOREIGN JUDGMENT.—Section 2467(c)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO OTHER COURTS.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES.—Section 152(a)(2) of such title is amended in the first column by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(2) LOCATION OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 173 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(3) DUTY STATION OF JUDGES OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 175 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “the Capital”.

(4) DUTY STATION OF JUDGES FOR PURPOSES OF TRAVELING EXPENSES.—Section 456(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(b) The official duty station of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall be the Capital.”

(5) COURT ACCOMMODATIONS FOR FEDERAL CIRCUIT AND COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 462(d) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(6) PLACES OF HOLDING COURT OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 798(a) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking “Washington, District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”; and

(B) by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(e) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SERVICE OF PROCESS ON FOREIGN PARTIES AT STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICE.—Section 1608(a)(4) of such title is amended by striking “Washington, District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS IN PROPERTY CASES AT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE.—Section 2410(b) of such title is amended by striking “Washington, District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(f) DEFINITION.—Section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new undesignated paragraph:

“The term ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”

(g) REFERENCES IN OTHER LAWS.—Any reference in any Federal law (other than a law amended by this section), rule, or regulation—

(1) to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the United States Court of Appeals for the Capital;

(2) to the District of Columbia Circuit shall be deemed to refer to the Capital Circuit; and

(3) to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the United States District Court for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take ef-

fect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

**SEC. 213. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**

(a) APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEES.—Section 581(a)(4) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital and Washington, Douglass Commonwealth”.

(b) INDEPENDENT COUNSELS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—Section 594(c) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking “the District of Columbia” the first place it appears and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”; and

(B) by striking “the District of Columbia” the second place it appears and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth”.

(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REMOVAL.—Section 596(a)(3) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

**SEC. 214. TREATMENT OF PRETRIAL SERVICES IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.**

Section 3152 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(other than the District of Columbia)” and inserting “(subject to subsection (d), other than the District of Columbia)”; and

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

“(d) In the case of the judicial district of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital—

“(1) upon the admission of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union, the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency shall continue to provide pretrial services in the judicial district in the same manner and to the same extent as the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency provided such services in the judicial district of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union; and

“(2) upon the receipt by the President of the certification from the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth under section 315(b)(4) of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to provide pre-trial services, paragraph (1) shall no longer apply, and the Director shall provide for the establishment of pretrial services in the judicial district under this section.”

**Subtitle C—Federal Elections**

**SEC. 221. PERMITTING INDIVIDUALS RESIDING IN CAPITAL TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS IN STATE OF MOST RECENT DOMICILE.**

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STATES TO PERMIT INDIVIDUALS TO VOTE BY ABSENTEE BALLOT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall—

(A) permit absent Capital voters to use absentee registration procedures and to vote by absentee ballot in general, special, primary, and runoff elections for Federal office; and

(B) accept and process, with respect to any general, special, primary, or runoff election for Federal office, any otherwise valid voter registration application from an absent Capital voter, if the application is received by the appropriate State election official not less than 30 days before the election.

(2) ABSENT CAPITAL VOTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “absent Capital voter” means, with respect to a State, a person who resides in the Capital and is qualified to vote in the State (or who would be qualified to vote in the State but for residing in the Capital), but only if the State is the last place in which the person was domiciled before residing in the Capital.

(3) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “State” means each of the several States, including the State.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS TO STATES TO MAXIMIZE ACCESS TO POLLS BY ABSENT CAPITAL VOTERS.—To afford maximum access to the polls by absent Capital voters, it is the sense of Congress that the States should—

(1) waive registration requirements for absent Capital voters who, by reason of residence in the Capital, do not have an opportunity to register;

(2) expedite processing of balloting materials with respect to such individuals; and

(3) assure that absentee ballots are mailed to such individuals at the earliest opportunity.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(d) EFFECT ON CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—The exercise of any right under this section shall not affect, for purposes of a Federal tax, a State tax, or a local tax, the residence or domicile of a person exercising such right.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office taking place on or after such date.

**SEC. 222. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 202 and 204 of the District of Columbia Delegate Act (Public Law 91–405; sections 1–401 and 1–402, D.C. Official Code) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS CODE OF 1955.—The District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 is amended—

(1) in section 1 (sec. 1–1001.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking “the Delegate to the House of Representatives,”;

(2) in section 2 (sec. 1–1001.02, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6),

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking “(except the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia),” and

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking “the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia.”;

(3) in section 8 (sec. 1–1001.08, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking “Delegate,” in the heading, and

(B) by striking “Delegate,” each place it appears in subsections (d), (h)(1)(A), (h)(2), (i)(1), (j)(1), (j)(3), and (k)(3);

(4) in section 10 (sec. 1–1001.10, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3), and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking “Delegate,” each place it appears in paragraph (1), and

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(5) in section 11(a)(2) (sec. 1–1001.11(a)(2), D.C. Official Code), by striking “Delegate to the House of Representatives.”;

(6) in section 15(b) (sec. 1–1001.15(b), D.C. Official Code), by striking “Delegate,”; and

(7) in section 17(a) (sec. 1–1001.17(a), D.C. Official Code), by striking “except the Delegate to the Congress from the District of Columbia”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

**SEC. 223. REPEAL OF LAW PROVIDING FOR PARTICIPATION IN ELECTION OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT IN ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking section 21; and  
 (2) in the table of sections, by striking the item relating to section 21.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall apply to any election of the President and Vice-President taking place on or after such date.

**SEC. 224. EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REPEALING 23RD AMENDMENT.**

(a) **JOINT RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.**—In this section, the term “joint resolution” means a joint resolution—

(1) entitled “A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 23rd article of amendment”; and

(2) the matter after the resolving clause of which consists solely of text to amend the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 23rd article of amendment to the Constitution.

(b) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.**—Upon introduction in the House of Representatives, the joint resolution shall be placed immediately on the appropriate calendar.

(2) **PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be in order, not later than 30 legislative days after the date the joint resolution is introduced in the House of Representatives, to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House of Representatives.

(B) **PROCEDURE.**—For a motion to proceed to consider the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the motion are waived;

(ii) such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution;

(iii) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion;

(iv) the motion shall not be debatable; and

(v) a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—When the House of Representatives proceeds to consideration of the joint resolution—

(A) the joint resolution shall be considered as read;

(B) all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived;

(C) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 10 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(D) an amendment to the joint resolution shall not be in order; and

(E) a motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(c) **EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN SENATE.**—

(1) **PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.**—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be placed immediately on the calendar.

(2) **PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 30 legislative days after the date the joint resolution is introduced in the Senate (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) **PROCEDURE.**—For a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the motion are waived;

(ii) the motion is not debatable;

(iii) the motion is not subject to a motion to postpone;

(iv) a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order; and

(v) if the motion is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) **FLOOR CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Senate proceeds to consideration of the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived;

(ii) consideration of the joint resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 30 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees;

(iii) a motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable;

(iv) an amendment to, a motion to postpone, or a motion to commit the joint resolution is not in order; and

(v) a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business is not in order.

(B) **VOTE ON PASSAGE.**—In the Senate the vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(C) **RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.**—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of this subsection or the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to the joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

(d) **RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.**—If, before the passage by one House of the joint resolution of that House, that House receives from the other House the joint resolution—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) with respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the resolution—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; and

(ii) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(2) **TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.**—If one House fails to introduce or consider the joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(3) **TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.**—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(e) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of the joint resolution, and supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

**TITLE III—CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**Subtitle A—Employee Benefits**

**SEC. 301. FEDERAL BENEFIT PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN RETIREMENT PROGRAMS.**

(a) **CONTINUATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO PAYMENTS.**—Any individual who, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, is entitled to a Federal benefit payment under the District of Columbia Retirement

Protection Act of 1997 (subtitle A of title XI of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; sec. 1–801.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall continue to be entitled to such a payment after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

(b) **OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any obligation of the Federal Government under the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists with respect to any individual or with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

(2) **D.C. FEDERAL PENSION FUND.**—Any obligation of the Federal Government under chapter 9 of the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 (sec. 1–817.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) with respect to the D.C. Federal Pension Fund which exists as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such Fund after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such chapter.

(c) **OBLIGATIONS OF STATE.**—Any obligation of the District of Columbia under the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists with respect to any individual or with respect to the Federal Government as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall become an obligation of the State with respect to such an individual and with respect to the Federal Government after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

**SEC. 302. CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES FIRST EMPLOYED PRIOR TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MERIT PERSONNEL SYSTEM.**

(a) **OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—Any obligation of the Federal Government under title 5, United States Code, which exists with respect to an individual described in subsection (c) or with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such title.

(b) **OBLIGATIONS OF STATE.**—Any obligation of the District of Columbia under title 5, United States Code, which exists with respect to an individual described in subsection (c) or with respect to the Federal Government as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall become an obligation of the State with respect to such individual and with respect to the Federal Government after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such title.

(c) **INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.**—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who was first employed by the government of the District of Columbia before October 1, 1987.

**SEC. 303. OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT UNDER JUDGES' RETIREMENT PROGRAM.**

(a) **CONTINUATION OF OBLIGATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any obligation of the Federal Government under subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code—

(A) which exists with respect to any individual and the District of Columbia as the result of service accrued prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such subchapter; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2), shall exist with respect to any individual and the State as the result of service accrued after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such subchapter as such obligation existed with respect to individuals and the District of Columbia as of the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) TREATMENT OF SERVICE ACCRUED AFTER TAKING EFFECT OF STATE RETIREMENT PROGRAM.—Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) does not apply to service accrued on or after the termination date described in subsection (b).

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—The termination date described in this subsection is the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the retirement of judges of the State.

#### Subtitle B—Agencies

### SEC. 311. PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS AND FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), title III of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1601 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State and to the public defender service of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Defender Service as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2-1605(c)(2), D.C. Official Code), the Federal Government shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State and who, pursuant to section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2-1605(c), D.C. Official Code), is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code.

(b) RENAMING OF SERVICE.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State may rename the public defender service of the State.

(c) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State as of the day before the date described in subsection (d) and who, pursuant to section 305(c) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1605(c), D.C. Official Code), is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of subsection (a) under subsection (d).

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the date described in subsection (d), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to

an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such paragraph.

(d) TERMINATION.—Subsection (a) shall terminate upon the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the operation of the office of the State which provides the services described in title III of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1601 et seq., D.C. Official Code).

### SEC. 312. PROSECUTIONS.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be), shall provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys to the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(2) ASSIGNMENTS MADE ON DETAIL WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT BY STATE.—In accordance with section 3373 of title 5, United States Code—

(A) an assistant United States attorney who is assigned to the State under this section shall be deemed under subsection (a) of such section to be on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department of Justice; and

(B) the assignment of an assistant United States attorney to the State under this section shall be made without reimbursement by the State of the pay of the attorney or any related expenses.

(b) FUNCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The functions described in this subsection are criminal prosecutions conducted in the name of the State which would have been conducted in the name of the United States by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia or his or her assistants, as provided under section 23-101(c), District of Columbia Official Code, but for the admission of the State into the Union.

(c) MINIMUM NUMBER ASSIGNED.—The number of assistant United States attorneys who are assigned under this section may not be less than the number of assistant United States attorneys whose principal duties as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union were to conduct criminal prosecutions in the name of the United States under section 23-101(c), District of Columbia Official Code.

(d) TERMINATION.—The obligation of the Attorney General to provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys under this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has appointed attorneys of the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(e) CLARIFICATION REGARDING CLEMENCY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon the admission of the State into the Union, the authority to grant clemency for offenses against the District of Columbia or the State shall be exercised by such person or persons, and under such terms and conditions, as provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State, without regard to whether the prosecution for the offense was conducted by the District of Columbia, the State, or the United States.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “clemency” means a pardon, reprieve, or commutation of sentence, or a remission of a fine or other financial penalty.

### SEC. 313. SERVICE OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

(a) PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR COURTS OF STATE.—The United States Marshals Service shall provide services with respect to the courts and court system of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Service provided services with respect to the courts and

court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall not appoint a United States Marshal under section 561 of title 28, United States Code, for any court of the State.

(b) TERMINATION.—The obligation of the United States Marshals Service to provide services under this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has appointed personnel of the State to provide such services.

### SEC. 314. DESIGNATION OF FELONS TO FACILITIES OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF DESIGNATION.—Chapter 1 of subtitle C of title XI of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-101 et seq., D.C. Official Code) and the amendments made by such chapter—

(1) shall continue to apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union; and

(2) shall apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter and amendments applied with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws for the housing of individuals described in subsection (a) in correctional facilities.

### SEC. 315. PAROLE AND SUPERVISION.

(a) UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION.—

(1) PAROLE.—The United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11231 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-131, D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised in the case of any individual described in subparagraph (A).

(2) SUPERVISION OF RELEASED OFFENDERS.—The United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority over individuals who are released offenders of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11233(c)(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(c)(2), D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall exercise authority over individuals who are released offenders of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised authority over individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(A) CONTINUATION.—Any individual who is an employee of the United States Parole Commission as of the later of the day before the date described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) or the day before the date described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4) and who, on or after such date, is an employee of the office of the

State which exercises the authority described in either such subparagraph, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this subsection under paragraph (4).

(B) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.**—Beginning on the later of the date described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) or the date described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) **TERMINATION.**—The provisions of this subsection shall terminate—

(A) in the case of paragraph (1), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the State; and

(B) in the case of paragraph (2), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise authority over individuals who are released offenders of the State.

(b) **COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.**—

(1) **RENAMING.**—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union—

(A) the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be known and designated as the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and any reference in any law, rule, or regulation to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth; and

(B) the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency shall be known and designated as the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency, and any reference in any law, rule or regulation to the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency shall be deemed to refer to the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency.

(2) **IN GENERAL.**—The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, including the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency (as renamed under paragraph (1))—

(A) shall continue to provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the District of Columbia, provide supervision for individuals who are offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia, and carry out sex offender registration functions with respect to individuals who are sex offenders in the District of Columbia, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11233 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133, D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the State, provide supervision for offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to the laws of the State, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State, in the same manner and to the same extent as the Agency provided such services and supervision and carried out such functions for individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(3) **CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.**—

(A) **CONTINUATION.**—Any individual who is an employee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as of the day before the date described in paragraph (4), and who, on or after such date, is an employee of the office of the State which provides the services and carries out the functions described in paragraph (4), shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of paragraph (2) under paragraph (4).

(B) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.**—Beginning on the date described in paragraph (4), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) **TERMINATION.**—Paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to provide pretrial services, supervise offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State.

#### **SEC. 316. COURTS.**

(a) **CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) and subsection (b), title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, as in effect on the date before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, shall apply with respect to the State and the courts and court system of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 11-1726(b) and paragraph (2) of section 11-1726(c), District of Columbia Official Code, the Federal Government shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the courts and court system of the State and who, pursuant to either such paragraph, is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code.

(3) **OTHER EXCEPTIONS.**—

(A) **SELECTION OF JUDGES.**—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall select judges for any vacancy on the courts of the State.

(B) **RENAMING OF COURTS AND OTHER OFFICES.**—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State may rename any of its courts and any of the other offices of its court system.

(C) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed—

(i) to affect the service of any judge serving on a court of the District of Columbia on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, or to require the State to select such a judge for a vacancy on a court of the State; or

(ii) to waive any of the requirements of chapter 15 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code (other than section 11-1501(a) of such Code), including subchapter II of such chapter (relating to the District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure), with respect to the appointment and service of judges of the courts of the State.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any individual who is an employee of the courts or court system of the State as of the day before the date described in subsection (e) and who, pursuant to section 11-1726(b) or section 11-1726(c), District of Columbia Official Code, is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this section under subsection (e).

(2) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.**—Beginning on the date described in subsection (e), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such paragraph.

(c) **CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.**—Section 11241 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (section 11-1743 note, District of Columbia Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State and the courts and court system of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied with respect to the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(d) **TREATMENT OF COURT RECEIPTS.**—

(1) **DEPOSIT OF RECEIPTS INTO TREASURY.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all money received by the courts and court system of the State shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

(2) **CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION FUND.**—Section 16 of the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (sec. 4-515, D.C. Official Code), relating to the Crime Victims Compensation Fund, shall apply with respect to the courts and court system of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—The provisions of this section, other than paragraph (3) of subsection (a) and except as provided under subsection (b), shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the operation of the courts and court system of the State.

#### **Subtitle C—Other Programs and Authorities**

#### **SEC. 321. APPLICATION OF THE COLLEGE ACCESS ACT.**

(a) **CONTINUATION.**—The District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-98; sec. 38-2701 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State, and to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the University of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) **TERMINATION.**—The provisions of this section, other than with respect to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to provide tuition assistance substantially

similar to the assistance provided under the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999.

**SEC. 322. APPLICATION OF THE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS ACT.**

(a) CONTINUATION.—The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10; sec. 38–1853.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State—

(1) to provide tuition assistance substantially similar to the assistance provided under the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act; and

(2) to provide supplemental funds to the public schools and public charter schools of the State in the amounts provided in the most recent fiscal year for public schools and public charter schools of the State or the District of Columbia (as the case may be) under such Act.

**SEC. 323. MEDICAID FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE.**

(a) CONTINUATION.—Notwithstanding section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)), during the period beginning on the date of the admission of the State into the Union and ending on September 30 of the fiscal year during which the State submits the certification described in subsection (b), the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State under title XIX of such Act shall be the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under such title as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The certification described in this subsection is a written certification by the State to the President that, during each of the first 5 fiscal years beginning after the date of the certification, the estimated revenues of the State will be sufficient to cover any reduction in revenues which may result from the termination of the provisions of this section.

**SEC. 324. FEDERAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS.**

(a) NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.—

(1) CONTINUING APPLICATION.—Subject to the amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3), upon the admission of the State into the Union, chapter 87 of title 40, United States Code, shall apply as follows:

(A) Such chapter shall apply with respect to the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(B) Such chapter shall apply with respect to the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) COMPOSITION OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.—Section 8711(b) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(B) four citizens with experience in city or regional planning, who shall be appointed by the President.”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—Of the four citizen members, one shall be a resident of Virginia, one shall be a resident of Maryland, and one shall be a resident of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.—

(A) ENVIRONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 8702 of such title is amended by striking “the territory surrounding the District of Columbia” and inserting “the territory surrounding the National Capital”.

(B) NATIONAL CAPITAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 8702 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(2) NATIONAL CAPITAL.—The term ‘National Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, and the territory the Federal Government owns in the environs.”.

(C) NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.—Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3) of section 8702 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the National Capital and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth;”.

(b) COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.—

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL.—Section 9102(a)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 9102 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) DEFINITION.—In this chapter, the term ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9101(d) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital”.

(c) COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL.—Section 8902 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL.—This chapter applies only with respect to commemorative works in the Capital and its environs.”.

(2) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of section 8902(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(2) CAPITAL AND ITS ENVIRONS.—The term ‘Capital and its environs’ means—

“(A) the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act; and

“(B) those lands and properties administered by the National Park Service and the General Services Administration located in the Reserve, Area I, and Area II as depicted on the map entitled ‘Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs’, numbered 869/86501 B, and dated June 24, 2003, that are located outside of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.”.

(3) TEMPORARY SITE DESIGNATION.—Section 8907(a) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia” and inserting “the Capital and its environs”.

(4) GENERAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 89 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia and its environs” each place it appears in the following sections and inserting “the Capital and its environs”:

(A) Section 8901(2) and 8901(4).

(B) Section 8902(a)(4).

(C) Section 8903(d).

(D) Section 8904(c).

(E) Section 8905(a).

(F) Section 8906(a).

(G) Section 8909(a) and 8909(b).

(5) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8901(2) of such title is amended by striking “the urban fabric of the District of Columbia” and inserting “the urban fabric of the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

**SEC. 325. ROLE OF ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN SUPPLYING WATER.**

(a) CONTINUATION OF ROLE.—Chapter 95 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§9508. Applicability to Capital and State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon the admission of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union, any reference in this chapter to the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Capital or the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, as the case may be.

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 95 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

“9508. Applicability to Capital and State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.”.

**SEC. 326. REQUIREMENTS TO BE LOCATED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

The location of any person in the Capital or Washington, Douglass Commonwealth on the day after the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall be deemed to satisfy any requirement under any law in effect as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union that the person be located in the District of Columbia, including the requirements of section 72 of title 4, United States Code (relating to offices of the seat of the Government of the United States), and title 36, United States Code (relating to patriotic and national organizations).

**TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 401. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) The term “Capital” means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112.

(2) The term “Council” means the Council of the District of Columbia.

(3) The term “Mayor” means the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(4) Except as otherwise provided, the term “State” means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.

(5) The term “State Constitution” means the proposed Constitution of the State of Washington, D.C., as approved by the Council on October 18, 2016, pursuant to the Constitution and Boundaries for the State of Washington, D.C. Approval Resolution of 2016 (D.C. Resolution R21–621), ratified by District of Columbia voters in Advisory Referendum B approved on November 8, 2016, and certified by the District of Columbia Board of Elections on November 18, 2016.

**SEC. 402. STATEHOOD TRANSITION COMMISSION.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Statehood Transition Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(A) 3 members appointed by the President.

(B) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(C) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(D) 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(E) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(F) 3 members appointed by the Mayor.

(G) 3 members appointed by the Council.

(H) The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

(2) APPOINTMENT DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not

later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) **EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.**—If one or more appointments under any of the subparagraphs of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in subparagraph (A), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made.

(3) **TERM OF SERVICE.**—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(4) **VACANCY.**—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) **NO COMPENSATION.**—Members shall serve without pay, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) **CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.**—The Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission—

(A) with respect to the Chair, from among the members described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1); and

(B) with respect to the Vice Chair, from among the members described in subparagraphs (F) and (G) of paragraph (1).

(c) **STAFF.**—

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The Commission shall have a Director, who shall be appointed by the Chair.

(2) **OTHER STAFF.**—The Director may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the Director considers appropriate.

(3) **NON-APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.**—The Director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) **DUTIES.**—The Commission shall advise the President, Congress, the Mayor (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the chief executive officer of the State), and the Council (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the legislature of the State) concerning an orderly transition to statehood for the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be) and to a reduced geographical size of the seat of the Government of the United States, including with respect to property, funding, programs, projects, and activities.

(e) **POWERS.**—

(1) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate.

(2) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(3) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(4) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the

Commission the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(f) **MEETINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(2) **INITIAL MEETING.**—The Commission shall hold its first meeting not later than the earlier of—

(A) 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed; or

(B) if the number of members of the Commission is reduced under subsection (b)(2)(B), 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(g) **REPORTS.**—The Commission shall submit such reports as the Commission considers appropriate or as may be requested by the President, Congress, or the District of Columbia (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the State).

(h) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall cease to exist 2 years after the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

**SEC. 403. CERTIFICATION OF ENACTMENT BY PRESIDENT.**

Not more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall provide written certification of such enactment to the Mayor.

**SEC. 404. SEVERABILITY.**

Except as provided in section 101(c), if any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendments made by this Act shall not be affected by the holding.

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 Reform.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 51.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only democratic country that denies both voting rights in its national legislature and local autonomy to the residents of its nation's capital.

As we approach July Fourth, it is long past time to apply the Nation's oldest slogan, "no taxation without representation," and the principle of consent of the governed to District of Columbia residents. H.R. 51 would do so, and Congress has both the moral obligation and the constitutional authority to pass the bill.

H.R. 51 would admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union and reduce the size of the Federal District. The State would

consist of 66 of the 68 square miles of the present-day Federal District.

The reduced Federal District, over which Congress would retain plenary authority, would consist of 2 square miles. The reduced Federal District would consist of the Washington that Members of Congress and visitors associate with the Nation's Capital, including the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the principal Federal monuments.

H.R. 51 has both the facts and the Constitution on its side. The Constitution does not establish any prerequisites for new States, but Congress generally has considered three factors in admission decisions: resources and population, support for statehood, and commitment to democracy.

The District pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and pays more Federal taxes than 22 States of the Union. The District's population of 705,000 is larger than those of Wyoming and Vermont, and the new State would be one of the seven States with a population under 1 million.

D.C.'s \$15.5 billion budget is larger than those of 12 States, and the District's AAA bond rating is higher than those of 35 States. D.C. has a higher per capita personal income and gross domestic product than any State.

Eighty-six percent of D.C. residents voted in favor of statehood in 2016. In fact, D.C. residents have been fighting for voting rights in Congress and local autonomy for 219 years.

The Constitution's Admissions Clause gives Congress the authority to admit new States, and all 37 new States have been admitted by an act of Congress. The Constitution's District Clause, which gives Congress plenary authority over the Federal District, sets a maximum size of the Federal District of 100 square miles. It does not set a minimum size. Congress previously has changed the size of the Federal District, including by reducing it 30 percent in 1846.

Over the last few months, the Nation, and even the world, has witnessed discriminatory and outrageous treatment of D.C. residents by the Federal Government.

In March, Congress passed the CARES Act, which deprived the District of \$755 million in coronavirus fiscal relief by treating the District as a territory rather than a State. The HEROES Act, passed by the House in May, would restore those funds.

This month, Federal police and out-of-State National Guard troops occupied D.C., without the consent of the D.C. Mayor, to respond to largely peaceful protests. Prior to this occupation of the city, there had been much more looting and property destruction in other cities, but the Federal Government did not occupy those cities. The Federal occupation occurred solely because the President thought that he could get away with it. He was wrong.

For me, H.R. 51 is deeply personal. My great-grandfather, Richard Holmes,

who escaped as a slave from Virginia on a plantation, made it as far as D.C., a walk to freedom but not to equal citizenship. For three generations, my family has been denied the rights other Americans take for granted.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Congress has two choices: It can continue to exercise undemocratic or autocratic authority over the 705,000 American citizens who reside in our Nation's capital, treating them, in the words of Frederick Douglass, as "aliens; not citizens, but subjects"; or Congress can live up to this Nation's promise and ideals and pass H.R. 51.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader STENY HOYER, Majority Whip JAMES CLYBURN, Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY, and the late Elijah Cummings, our millions of allies across the country, and, most importantly, generations of D.C. residents and officials who have refused to simply accept their treatment as second-class citizens for bringing us to this historic day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 51, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, June 18, 2020.

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
Chairwoman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 5803, the "Washington, D.C. Admission Act," that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 5803, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5803, the Washington D.C. Admission Act. As you know, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to expedite floor consideration. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee.

I would be pleased to include this letter and your correspondence in the Congressional Record during floor consideration to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, June 19, 2020.

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
Chairwoman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: I write concerning H.R. 5803, the "Washington, D.C. Admission Act," which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Committee). There are certain provisions in the legislation which concern the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state and fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 5803, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to such provisions. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of the Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provision. Such participation will be critical to allow the Committee to continue to work on the policy involving the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5803.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5803, the Washington D.C. Admission Act. As you know, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, due to provisions in the legislation which concern the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to expedite floor consideration. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee.

I would be pleased to include this letter and your correspondence in the Congressional Record during floor consideration to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,  
Chairwoman.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

There is a whole lot more to statehood than simply being a large and vibrant city. Our Nation's Founders made it clear that D.C. is not meant to be a State. They thought about it, they debated it, and they rejected it. In fact, in those early days, Alexander Hamilton himself proposed an amendment that would allow the District residents to have a voting Member in the House, and that proposal was rejected.

If the majority wishes to go against our Founders, that is their prerogative, but they should simply admit, in their opinion, the Founders were wrong. They cannot ignore the intention behind D.C.'s current status. The Constitution simply does not allow city governments to become microstates with all the rights and responsibilities of full States. The debate about the nature of Washington, D.C., is not a new debate, but it is absolutely a settled one.

My friends on the other side of the aisle may gasp and protest in outrage at the suggestion that what this is really all about is an attempt to get two more Democratic Senators. That is what this really is all about.

On our side, there is no question that we have the Constitution on our side on this whole debate. The Constitution clearly establishes a federation of sovereign States, and representation here in Washington, D.C., comes from those States, the federation of those States. This District is a unique entity. It was set apart to not be influenced by a State, but to, in itself, be governed by those representatives of the various States who are here.

Our Founders did not want this city, the seat of our Federal Government, to be influenced by any other State, but that is exactly what this proposal would do.

As James Madison expressed it himself in Federalist 43, if the Nation's Capital City were situated within a State, the Federal Government could be subject to undue influence of that State. That is not the intent of our Federal Government; that is not the intent of this District that has been set aside; and that is exactly what would happen under this bill.

My colleagues across the aisle believe that excluding a small Federal enclave from this new State would nullify the need for a constitutional amendment, but that is simply not true. The original text of the Constitution is clear.

Congress has the power to create States from two sources: a territory or

an existing State that agrees to secede its territory to become a State. Washington, D.C., is neither of these. It is the Nation's only Federal District, and it is set aside for a specific purpose. Congress does not have the authority to take this District and create a State out of it. At least one constitutional amendment would be required for that to happen.

During the markup of this bill, I personally raised these constitutional concerns and offered an amendment to provide an expedited procedure to deal with the constitutional amendment, but the Oversight Committee Democrats opposed that amendment, and they opposed, in fact, all of our amendments that were put forth.

This is not a surprise that this whole proposal has been rejected by the American people.

□ 0930

In fact, in a Gallup Poll last year, 64 percent of Americans reject the idea of D.C. being a State, only 29 percent approve of it.

Granting D.C. statehood goes against not only the American citizens' desires, but more importantly, against the Constitution itself and certainly our Framers' original intent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose the Washington, D.C. Admissions Act.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chairwoman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, and I thank her for the way she conducted hearings on H.R. 51.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and my good friend, for her years of leadership on this bill. She is not only the author of the bill, but of this historic day for our democracy.

For the first time in a generation, the House will vote today on whether hundreds of thousands of American citizens will finally have their voices counted in Congress.

We will vote to honor the most fundamental principles of this Nation and for which a revolution was launched: no taxation without representation and consent of the governed.

I can think of no more honorable or patriotic endeavor than taking up this legislation today to give the people of the District the same rights enjoyed by hundreds of millions of other Americans across our country.

The United States is a democracy, but its capital is not. The United States is the only democratic country that denies both voting rights in the national legislature and local self-government to the people of the capital. That is wrong and violates everything we stand for as Americans.

The District pays more in Federal taxes than 22 States and more per cap-

ita than any State. Think about that. It pays more than nearly half the States in this country, yet D.C. residents have no vote in Congress, and that is wrong.

The people of the District have been fighting for equal rights for more than 200 years. In 2016, an overwhelming 86 percent of D.C. residents voted for statehood.

President Trump's recent decision to deploy thousands of Federal law enforcement officers in D.C. against residents peacefully exercising their constitutionally-protected right to protest, and without the consent of the District's elected officials, demonstrated the urgent need for full local government and congressional representation.

Unfortunately, so far, Republicans have opposed our effort, and the President made clear exactly why: they would rather deny voting rights for hundreds of thousands of American citizens than even consider the possibility that representatives from the new State could be Democrats.

Now, think about that argument. They are willing to violate the core principles of our democracy merely because they may be from a different political party. This argument is anti-democratic and un-American.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The questions for Republicans are these: Do they truly believe in taxation without representation? Do they truly believe in States' rights? Do they truly believe the Federal Government should stay out of local affairs? If they do, then join us and act on these beliefs today. This bill should be bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member to vote on H.R. 51 for the soon-to-be 51st State of our great country.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the chairwoman that the entire court system of Washington, D.C., is supported by the Federal Government.

And there is representation. This District has three electoral votes. No other city in the country has that. There is a representative here.

It is just an amazing thing, too, that this whole bill does not even allow elections for the new Governor that is proposed here, so the very thing they are arguing, they reject and deny from the residents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good friend.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 51.

Voting against this legislation is not an economic, racial, or a social injustice, as my colleagues across the aisle may unfairly claim. I have no doubt

that my Democratic friends, just like Republicans, want the citizens of Washington to have political rights like every other American. However, let's talk about what is honest here. Let's just be honest.

The true goal here is to have two virtually guaranteed new Democratic seats so that D.C. can become a State. That is what it comes down to. That is the goal.

Why do I say that? Because there is a much simpler alternative that I am baffled that the Democrats do not want anything to do with. I offered an amendment to this bill that would retrocede the District of Columbia back to Maryland. That is where the land came from.

Congress ceded the west side of the Potomac, now Alexandria, from the District of Columbia back to Virginia in 1847. So there is plenty of historical precedent for this action.

Unfortunately, despite making total sense, my amendment was, sadly, blocked.

If D.C. were ceded back to Maryland, citizens can vote for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate in Maryland. They would have congressional representation in both Chambers, with the exact effect of statehood.

The move is simply unnecessary, when ceding D.C. back to Maryland is a viable, cost-effective, and common-sense option.

To further nullify this debate, the District of Columbia would require a constitutional amendment to change. The Framers of the Constitution, as has been said before, were very clear about this. The Supreme Court reaffirmed this in 1949.

So why are we trying to overturn the Supreme Court? One answer: politics, pure and simple.

Even setting aside the obvious need for a constitutional amendment, my colleagues across the aisle know that this legislation has no chance of becoming law. It is just the majority's attempt, again, to message bills to satisfy the base.

Let me be clear: Republicans do not want to attempt to stifle voices or suppress representation.

If the D.C. citizens want to have representation, then cede the land back to Maryland, because I have demonstrated it is a more hands-down, more practical solution.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the gentleman's amendment to cede the District of Columbia back to Maryland did not have the consent of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my good friend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who is managing today's bill to right a wrong, but unfortunately, because D.C. does not have a vote here in the Congress, she won't be able to cast a vote on final passage of her own bill.

Today, we are being asked to right a wrong. And you hear the contortions on the other side of the aisle to continue to justify a fundamental right being denied 700,000 fellow Americans who pay taxes, who fight in our wars and serve in government, who have families, who are Americans, but have no votes in the United States Congress. They are bigger than five States.

They hide behind the Constitution. The Constitution was written before they even knew where the capital of the United States would be, before a blade of grass was touched to construct Washington, D.C. No one at that time could have envisioned the metropolis of 700,000 Americans, let alone that they would be denied their fundamental American right.

Let's cede it to Maryland. Two problems: Maryland doesn't want D.C. and D.C. doesn't want to be in Maryland. The consent of the governed is a fundamental part of the American architecture, which you conveniently overlook.

And then there is the right to be represented, another fundamental right denied D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is partisan politics, yes. It is theirs. They want to deny 700,000 people their right to representation in this body and in the other body because of their politics, or likely politics.

When have we ever done that as America? We haven't looked at how people would vote before we decide to incorporate them into the Union as a State. We understood the right of people to petition to become a State, and Congress has that power.

Let's right a wrong, especially in the post-George Floyd world, and give people their rightful representation in the people's body and in the Senate.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), my good friend and a great member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) for his great leadership on this issue.

At a time when Speaker PELOSI is keeping Congress largely on the sidelines, it is unfortunate that we are spending precious work time debating blatantly unconstitutional legislation.

Not only is this measure unconstitutional and dead on arrival in the Senate, but it should not be a priority for this body right now. Our Nation is facing a serious need for action. We need police reform that focuses on transparency and accountability, we need to support American workers as States safely reopen their communities and economies, and we need to ensure that money we have spent to fight the coronavirus is effectively guarded against waste, fraud, and abuse.

Passing this measure today would signal a stunning lack of respect for the Constitution. Making Washington, D.C., a State would specifically violate the intentions of our Founding Fathers, who wanted the national seat of government to belong to no State.

In fact, the Constitution specifically calls for Congress, not any State government, to have authority over the District serving as the seat of Federal Government.

Granting statehood for Washington, D.C., requires a constitutional amendment, just as granting the District three electoral college votes required the ratification of the 23rd Amendment.

It is time for Congress to get back to full-time work and take up the pressing issues facing our country, not playing unconstitutional games.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my good friend and neighbor.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, when in the course of human events a relationship stops working and one party experiences a long train of abuses and indignities at the hands of the other, you scrap the old relationship and you start anew.

It is nothing personal, but I wish our GOP colleagues in the House and Senate could recognize that this just isn't working out anymore for the people of Washington. The relationship you have taken for granted for so long with the local population is dysfunctional and, frankly, abusive.

Plainly put, the people of Washington want out.

It is not just the pepper spray and the tear gas and the rubber bullets; it is not just crashing their churches and desecrating their religion with your photo-ops; it is not just the use of their sons and daughters in the National Guard to put down protests by their sons and daughters in the streets; it is not just the threats to Federalize their local police or the decision to overturn their adoption laws, their marijuana laws, and their health funding choices; or your control of their judges and prosecutors; or the constant Presidential insults leveled against their chosen leaders; it is not that the GOP Members who claim to be the attentive partners of the District never listen to the people here, never go to their local meetings, don't know the mayor or the city council or the ANC members; it is not even the \$750 million that they just cheated the people of Washington out of in the middle of this plague.

It is something deeper. It is not just something you did.

The people of Washington have found someone and something else. They have voted to break up this dysfunctional relationship with Congress to start a healthy and respectful relationship with America.

In America, States make their own local policy and budget decisions without constant tampering and interference by other people's representatives.

In America, every political community stands on equal footing through statehood. Each one sends two Senators to the U.S. Senate and voting representatives to the House, delega-

tions that guarantee no one will push their people around.

□ 0945

When you are a State, you help decide things like whether your country goes to war, who will be your judges and supreme court justices, how will your Federal tax dollars get spent, and what should be the laws of the Nation.

The only question now is whether Congress is mature enough, is man enough, to deal with the fact that Washington no longer wants to be under our thumb. A mature and faithful Congress that wants the best for all of its people is not afraid of statehood. We celebrate it. We delight in it.

America started as 13 States, but we have exercised our powers under Article IV, Section 3, 37 separate times to admit 37 new States, all of them by simple legislative acts, none of them by constitutional amendment, and each one was controversial in its own way.

I heard the gentleman say that you have to be either a territory or formally part of another State to be admitted as a State. It is not true. I have a one-word answer to that: Texas. It was its own independent country. It was a republic, and people said that was unconstitutional and Congress said: No, we are going to favor the trajectory of democratic inclusion and political equality.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. So every State has faced objections. They said Utah was too Mormon, and New Mexico was too Catholic. Hawaii and Alaska, in 1959, of course, they weren't contiguous; they couldn't be admitted.

Yes, the District exists now under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, but the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia proposes to shrink the Federal district the way it was shrunk in 1847 because the slave masters of Virginia wanted the land back in advance of congressional abolition of the slave traffic in the District.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district to placate the slave masters in the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district in the 21st century to grant statehood and equal rights to the people of Washington, D.C.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will just remind my good friend, listen, we share the concern if people are upset, if it is not working. But the reality is, if it is not working, we have a system in this government, in our system, to deal with it. And in this case, it is called a constitutional amendment.

Why the Democrats are not presenting a constitutional amendment to

deal with the problem is beyond me, but it is what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my good friend.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 51 and its affront to the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers did not intend for Washington, D.C., to be a State. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution provides Congress with exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. The enclave clause was included for specific reasons, notably the fact that the operation of the seat of the Federal Government of the United States, whose laws now affect approximately 330 million Americans, should not be impeded by local ordinances, actions, or taxation.

The Framers of the Constitution had good reason for this concern, having witnessed the reluctance of local authorities to police disorderly conduct by protesters in June of 1783, conduct that forced the adjournment of Congress and the flight of its Members to neighboring States. We see similar situations playing out in the streets today, right here in Washington, D.C.

Passage of this vote today violates the Constitution in two different ways: first, withdrawing specifically enumerated powers granting Congress control of the Federal district; and, two, ignoring the constitutional amendment process the Framers outlined to make changes to our founding charter.

Yesterday, I testified on my amendment to the Rules Committee, which reaffirmed and enhanced congressional leadership over the District provided in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. Unfortunately, my colleagues did not accept this amendment, which was crafted in the spirit of the Constitution, pushing this legislation and the legal thought behind it even further away from our founding tradition.

The last few months have been very difficult times in this country, with unrest spanning throughout our Nation, including right here inside Washington, D.C., itself. In the face of willful disregard for the rule of law, it is irresponsible for this body to follow in these footsteps by blatantly taking action against our Constitution.

The democratic and legal wisdom of our Founders is unprecedented, and their calls for a legal charter, which granted and preserved individual liberties and good governance, stand true today. Going against their intentions now is neither prudent nor in the best interest of the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership over time to remove obstacles of participation to our democracy, whether it is a voting

rights act for all, or whether it is observing the 100th anniversary of women having the right to vote, and whether it is about giving full participation in our democracy to the District of Columbia.

I am proud to join her in wearing this mask. It says "51st," and that is why this legislation is H.R. 51, D.C. statehood, which I will talk about now.

But Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has been brilliant, relentless, persistent, dissatisfied about the lack of full participation for her constituents in the work of Congress. So I salute her as the patron saint and guiding star of D.C. statehood, even before she came to Congress, but since she came to Congress, she has worked tirelessly and relentlessly to build historic support for this bill. She gives us the honor of participating in this historic vote, wherein the House of Representatives, for the first time, will vote for statehood for the District.

D.C. statehood, Mr. Speaker, is both an official and a personal priority for me. My colleagues have heard me say this, but I will say it again. When I was born, my father was a Member of Congress from Baltimore, Maryland. He was on the Appropriations Committee, and he served as the chair of the D.C. appropriations subcommittee.

At that time, they tell me, that person would be regarded as the mayor, unofficial mayor, of Washington because that Appropriations Committee made all the decisions, so many decisions, for the District of Columbia. He was a big supporter of home rule, seeing from that perspective the unfairness of it all, a big supporter of home rule.

In any event, he did his job in a way to try to make a path, and it passed; then later, home rule; then later a mayor and the rest; and now, to where we are now.

Yesterday, someone said: Can you find middle ground? This is middle ground, the status quo. We have to go forward.

I later had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee, on the District of Columbia subcommittee, and I saw the obstacles to home rule that some in our Congress would put forth, diminishing the self-determination that the people of the District of Columbia should have.

Statehood for the District is about showing respect for our democracy. It is not just about the District. It is about our democracy, for the American people and for our U.S. Constitution, yes.

The Constitution begins with our beautiful preamble, "We the People," setting out our Founder's vision of a government of, by, and for the people of the United States. It doesn't say, "except for the District of Columbia."

Yet, for more than two centuries, the residents of Washington, D.C., have been denied their right to fully participate in our democracy. Instead, they have been dealt the injustice of paying

taxes, serving in the military, and contributing to the economic power of our Nation, while being denied the full enfranchisement that is their right. Serving in the military, fighting, risking their lives for our democracy, fundamental to that democracy is representative government. They were willing to risk their lives for a principle, for a value, for our democracy, while where they lived was being denied that full opportunity.

Today, by passing H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—to the Union—that would be Frederick Douglass, from Maryland but who lived in the District of Columbia, an abolitionist and a suffragist, actually. He was in Seneca Falls at the Conference of Women, coming together for women having the right to vote, so much about our democracy and voting for all Americans.

In doing so today, we will bring our Nation closer to the founding ideals that all are created equal and all deserve a say in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a bipartisan vote, I hope, again, but a strong vote in the House for this very important legislation, legislation important to our democracy, to our Constitution.

I thank, again, and salute ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her leadership, working with our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER, for whom this has been a priority. I am proud that this is on the floor today.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just say again that our Constitution has representation here in our Capitol from the Federation of the States, and this district was set apart, not to be a State, nor to be influenced by one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), a great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, if there is a constitutional way to turn D.C. into a State, this bill is not it. This bill is a farcical exercise in legislative virtue signaling because it contains a fatal constitutional flaw.

Let's talk about what this bill doesn't do. This bill doesn't magically convert all of D.C. into a State. This bill doesn't create a new State containing a city called D.C. Because both of these clearly violate the Constitution.

Some overly clever legislative artists think they have found a new loophole, a way to create a State in D.C. without violating the Constitution. What this bill does is it seeks to shrink the city

of D.C. into a tiny city, and then creates a State from the territory that is left over.

The problem with that is there is the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution that gives the city of D.C. presently three electoral votes. Paradoxically, the bill itself acknowledges the constitutional flaw within because it contains an expedited procedure to vote on the repeal of the 23rd Amendment in this Chamber and the Senate Chamber.

The problem is, the bill keeps plowing forward and would create a new State, even if the 23rd Amendment is not repealed. This creates the farcical situation where the few residents, which are the residents at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the First Family, would control three electoral votes. This is crazy.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Constitution today and vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the last thing we have to be concerned about is whether or not the 23rd Amendment will be repealed, and the bill, H.R. 51, contains an expedited procedure for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my good neighbor and good friend, the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave my mask on, not only because it is the safe thing to do for all of you—not for me, for you—but also because it represents the best of America.

I am from Maryland. Maryland was a slaveholding State. I represent the district that probably had the most slaves, along with my friend from the First Congressional District.

□ 1000

In fact, there were many sympathizers for the Southern cause that would have had Marylanders join the Confederacy. They were, of course, wrong. But I want to tell my friends from those States that withdrew and whose States tried to destroy the Union that they ought to remember that this Nation took them back without condition with full citizenship and the right to vote. Surely we can do the same for our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I thank Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in her extraordinary quest keeping her eye on the prize to make sure that the citizens she represents have full citizenship and have our respect. I am proud to stand with her in supporting statehood for the people of the District of Columbia.

On this mask, there is a drawing of the outline of the District of Columbia. That is Maryland before the 1789 and subsequent actions. That was Maryland. I daresay, there is not a Marylander who voted on that secession of that land for the Capital of the United States who thought to themselves they were disenfranchising those who lived in that District.

I want to thank Mayor Bowser, with whom I have been proud to work to move this issue forward with the leadership of Delegate Holmes Norton. I made clear when we announced that the House would consider this bill today that the people who call our Nation's Capital home have been disenfranchised and shortchanged too long.

Martin Luther King said: How long?

Too long.

Not only have the residents of one of America's most historically African-American cities—let me repeat that—historically, it is one of our largest African-American cities. It is not exclusive. It is a diverse city. Very frankly, it does not make a decision, if you don't vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

Hear me: If you don't vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

But President Trump says that my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, would be foolish to vote for this bill. Why? Because we are too Democratic and we wouldn't vote for you.

What do you think the North would have done with the 11 States that tried to destroy the Union if we had said: You are not going to vote for us, so you can't come back—at least, you can't come back with voting rights, and we will keep you as subjects, not as citizens?

I hope every Member who represents one of those States thinks about that proposition as you vote to exclude 706,000 of your fellow citizens from full participation in our democracy.

Not only have the residents of one of America's great cities been prevented from having full citizenship, but they have also been shortchanged in the money that we give them. Just recently, COVID-19, we gave them 40 percent of what we gave Wyoming, an entity 200,000 people smaller than the District of Columbia.

I see no heads shaking on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker. I see no agreement on that.

Should we say Wyoming is too small and that we ought to exclude Wyoming, it is not big enough to be a State?

Yet Wyoming, more than 10 times smaller than the State of Maryland and, as opposed to 40 million people in California, 500,000, one-eightieth of the size, have two United States Senators.

Stand up if you think Wyoming ought not to have a vote.

I see no one standing.

This constitutional argument is a Don Quixote windmill argument. These are 706,000 American citizens. At the same time, their elected leaders can be overruled by Congress and by the President when it comes to local issues, as we saw when President Trump ordered Federal law enforcement and the National Guard to suppress peaceful and legitimate protest against the killing of Black men and women in encounters with the police and with others. George Zimmerman comes to mind and Trayvon Martin.

This is about human rights. This is about democracy. This is about our Nation being better than that.

I see my colleague from Maryland shaking his head. We disagree.

The people of D.C. deserve not only real self-government, but also full representation in the Congress of the United States.

Are these 700,000 people less than the 500,000 people in Wyoming?

If we ask somebody to come to the District of Columbia and work for our government, is the condition that they lose their citizenship, that they lose their full voting rights? Is that the condition we put on them? If so, I respectfully disagree with my colleagues who believe that is what America is about.

That is what this historic legislation would do, admit Washington, D.C., as the 51st State. That would provide residents of the District of Columbia with a voting House Member and two Senators, as every other group of Americans who lives in a jurisdiction called a State has the right to have.

It would right a historical wrong to ensure that our Founders' vision of representative government will be enacted for all Americans, no longer excluding the 706,000 in the District of Columbia.

The House will take action today to make the District of Columbia a State. It is an historic day.

Be on the right side of history. So many voted against the Civil Rights Act of the 1960s and years thereafter. They were on the wrong side of history.

The gentleman is absolutely right. Somebody mentioned it was Democrats. We were a segregationist party. And guess what? We said we do not want to be that kind of party, and Hubert Humphrey got up in 1948 in New York at a Democratic convention and said that we need to come out of the dark shadows of slavery and segregation into the bright sunlight of justice and equality.

Yes, I understand that was our party. We said to them: We do not want to be that party.

Don't you be that party. Don't you have Lincoln turn over in his grave and say: That is not our party.

Yes, I heard the gentleman over there. Sadly, in the denial of democracy, the Republican-led Senate has indicated, Mr. Speaker, it will not act, just as it has not acted on 275 bipartisan bills that we have sent to the United States Senate. They will not act.

The majority of the Senate is elected by 18 percent of the American people. That is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because this is more than just a local issue for the District of Columbia. It is a civil rights issue for our country, as yesterday was a civil rights issue for our country.

It is something that ought to concern all Americans, because when some Americans are denied the full rights and representation of citizenship, it diminishes the meaning of citizenship for

all. Statehood is not merely a status; it is a recognition by the rest of the States of the sovereign equality of the people who live there that they are part of the main, not simply an island, as the poet reflected, and that they cannot be treated as lesser by their fellow citizens.

By admitting Washington, D.C., as a State, we will admit what we already know to be true: that its people are our fellow Americans, equal in their pursuit of happiness and their enjoyment of the full rights and privileges of American citizenship, including representation in the Congress of the United States.

Our patriot forebears in the 18th century used to cry out, "No taxation without representation."

The citizens of Boston stole some tea, a criminal act, and they threw it into the Boston Harbor. Why? They said: Because we will not be taxed without representation and that King George cannot tell us what to do without consulting us.

Be on the right side of history. Washington residents correctly still use that battle cry in the 21st century. Let us make it ring true at last. Let us make our Union of States a more perfect one by adding to its number as we have 37 times consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for America, stand up for democracy, and stand up for the premise of America that every person counts. Vote "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel like the arguments on the other side of the aisle are so weak that they respond by yelling louder.

We have just heard a great, passionate speech about something that is totally irrelevant. In fact, the point was highlighted that the condition for statehood is not population; otherwise, we would not have States like Wyoming or Alaska or other States that were ever admitted. That is not the issue. The issue was that Washington, D.C., was set apart as a seat of government not to be the same as the federation of States that our Constitution grants us.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his respect.

Is the gentleman aware that the District of Columbia was reduced in size historically a while back so that the land was reduced?

This is what is happening here. There is clear precedent for doing this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who is my good friend and a great leader.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this important issue and the question the gentleman from Maryland just asked. I hear the question.

Yes, their District boundary lines have changed in the past, but what the majority wants to do today is fundamentally alter what Washington, D.C., is. That is what is at stake here.

I would love to hear the gentleman from Maryland expound on his support and belief in our electoral college since, suddenly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a newfound respect for the power of States and the importance of States. I would love to hear them expound on that.

I would love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about what is critical about community and about respecting the ability of people to live differently in order for us to agree to disagree, to allow Texas to be Texas, California to be California. I would like love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle expound on these principles.

This is about power. That is what this is about. Let's make no mistake about it. D.C., I do not believe, should become a State—and I use that word importantly, should not become a State.

We can talk about the constitutional infirmities with what the majority is trying to do. My colleagues are doing that, and they have laid that out.

The Constitution speaks to creating the Federal city in Washington, D.C. The Founders wanted to do that for a reason. We wanted this seat to be completely unintertwined and separated from other States. We wanted it to be special and unique and not subject to the powers and the struggles that go on about the people in a certain State. That is what is at stake here.

I would note that my friends, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BEYER, are the first to rattle—the very first to rattle—if we dare go down the road of potential shutdown, if we dare go down the road of limiting the size and scope of the Federal Government. Why? Because the jurisdictions they represent are wholly and heavily dependent on this Federal Government.

I am a proud Texan dating back to the 1850s, but I grew up in Loudoun County, Virginia, and went to the University of Virginia. When I grew up in Loudoun County, it was 80 percent dirt roads. There was one stoplight in my entire school district. It was a rural county fully separated from Washington, D.C., and now it is the richest per capita county in the United States of America because leviathan grows.

□ 1015

It is because leviathan continues to separate from the real Americans out there—the people throughout the entire country who are not being represented by this body.

If we want to talk about representation, then let's talk about this body doing its job to represent the people,

the forgotten man. The American people are tired of watching their country burning to the ground, statutes being toppled, people getting killed in the streets. And we are spending time here today on an unconstitutional effort to create a State out of a Federal city that the Constitution contemplated being separated so that it could be unique and be the power seat of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this is about.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland State (Mr. SARBANES), my good friend, that ceded land in perpetuity out of which the District of Columbia was formed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague across the aisle a moment ago talked about the District of Columbia being special. There is nothing special about being second class, which is what has happened to the residents of the District. For two centuries, the people of the District of Columbia have been disenfranchised, denied fair representation, excluded from our great democratic experiment. Over 700,000 residents—who just like my constituents and your constituents—work hard, pay their taxes, and contribute every day to the betterment of our society. Yet, they do not have an equal voice in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to remedy this great injustice. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON should have the same opportunity that every one of our Members does: To see her name on that board for every vote, to walk into the well and cast her "yea" or "nay" on behalf of the constituents she represents.

We thank Congresswoman NORTON for her service and for her tireless fight to bring dignity to the residents of Washington, D.C.

House Democrats committed to this moment when this body passed H.R. 1 more than a year ago. We observed then and we reiterate today: There are no constitutional, historical, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia should not be granted Statehood.

At a time when Americans of all political stripes are demanding a greater voice and participation in the political town square, the residents of D.C. are being forcibly kept out of the town square by this bizarre and indefensible anachronism.

Today, we are declaring enough is enough. It is time to give a voice and a vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 51.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, to somehow try to paint a picture that D.C. is a second-class city is absolute absurdity. Without question, this is the most influential city in this country—perhaps in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, a little comment, maybe clearing things up. I will point out to everyone in the room that when we say the Pledge of Allegiance, the phrase “to the Republic for which it stands” is in the pledge. And I think we all remember the memorable comment of Benjamin Franklin at a time around when the Constitution was drafted. He talked about he was giving us “a Republic, if we can keep it.”

Now, at the time the Constitution was drafted, our forefathers did include a district, which would be the capital for the country. Our forefathers put together the United States and reached a compromise between the 13 States. They realized at the time it would be ridiculous to break apart a State and give it two Senators, like all of the other States. In part, that is because it is so different and has such a different interest in the States.

All of the States, the 50 States, to a variety of degree, have been given an amount of agriculture. There is virtually no agriculture—maybe no agriculture—maybe somewhere there is a greenhouse or something in the District of Columbia. There is no manufacturing. There is no mining or logging. Or if there is, it is so tiny we can barely see it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a unique city because it is based on government jobs and tourist jobs connected to people coming and visiting those government buildings. It is not like any other State out there. If it were to become a State, its representatives would have spent all their time almost devoted to getting more money for the city. And already the Federal Government puts a great deal of money into the city. You couldn't complain that they do not have enough funds for their schools or their city. I believe their schools are somewhere in the top—if you considered it a State—somewhere in the top three or four in the country, as far as funding per person.

Mr. Speaker, it would make no sense, say, for Wisconsin to break off and give two Senators to Milwaukee and give two Senators to the rest of the State. Milwaukee is not a State.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51.

For more than 200 years, Americans living in the District of Columbia—many of whom serve the people of this great Nation as public servants—have been denied the right to self-government. That is a founding principle of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, today, D.C. is home to more than 700,000 Americans and, yet, they have no voting Members of Congress and no voice in the Senate.

Establishing Washington, Douglass Commonwealth would not create our

Nation's smallest State by population, nor would it be reliant on the Federal Government to survive.

There are States with smaller populations and many other States that are far more dependent on Federal assistance.

Despite paying more in total Federal income tax than the residents of 22 other States, D.C. is continually treated like a territory instead of a State in funding bills. These calculations starve the local government of the funds they rightly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues listen to the voice of our Founding Fathers, who we keep hearing about. “No taxation without representation.” Well, D.C. pays its taxes. It deserves a voice in Congress. And let's be clear about who is playing politics.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my good friend and a great leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to hear people that have been trained in the Constitution disregard it so. But we are taught at law school the ability to rationalize absolutely anything. But the fact is, Article I, Section 8, there is not one of the 37 States that have been brought in by Congress that is addressed in the Constitution like this district is. And it says specifically—this is the right of Congress—“To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square)—that is this one—“as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.”

And if you go back and look at Federalist Paper 43, you look at the debate at the time, they understood. We have had the capital in New York City. We have had it in Philadelphia. And that is dangerous. Because it means if you are surrounded by a State and the capital is part of that State or in the middle surrounded by the State, then pressure can be brought to bear that would be so unfair. Look at the debate. That is why that is in there, to protect that.

Mr. Speaker, now, one of the things that we agree on is that it is wrong to make the residents of the District of Columbia pay income tax. I have been filing a bill since 2008, I think it was, that would eliminate the Federal tax. None of the territories—who also don't have full voting Members of Congress—pay Federal income tax. D.C. shouldn't either. That is a legislative fix we can do.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington, D.C. has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, paying Federal taxes, that says everything about the desire of citizens of Washington, D.C. to be equal, that we are quite willing to continue to pay Federal income tax.

And I appreciate his amendment. We have rejected his amendment because we want to be full citizens. That means paying our share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), my good friend.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, as a Member representing the territories, I would rather pay taxes than have the treatment that this body gives to those that live in the territories. I believe it is the greatest scam and an okey-doke that you have allowed us not to pay taxes and hold that against us to ask for our equal treatment. So keep paying those taxes and you will get your Statehood one day.

Mr. Speaker, the United States territories that I represent are also not on equal footing with the rest of the Nation. There is no representation in the U.S. Senate. No equal voting representation in the House of Representatives. Unlike D.C., we cannot vote for President. We know what it is like to be part of the greatest country in the world but not a full participant, and it feels incomplete.

As Americans, we strive to be productive citizens and an asset to the Nation. Statehood for D.C. is a matter of fairness that has been slow in coming. This city, built by African Americans with the use of forced labor, contributes more in Federal taxes on a per person basis than many States. It is a punishment to Americans living in the capital, including those working in policy or public service for the good of the Nation, to be disenfranchised when they establish a home in the District.

This body changed the boundaries in the 1800s to ensure that slave owners could keep their slaves. We have changed the boundaries in the committee to allow for the Federal city to still exist and the residents of D.C. to become a State. It has been done by this body before. Don't make it seem like it is something that can't happen again. At this very moment, citizens across this Nation are clamoring for change, equality, and justice. With one vote, we can deliver that for the people of D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do what is right and allow the people of this city to feel whole, to feel complete, to feel like they matter. Support H.R. 51.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it certainly can happen. It just requires a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my good friend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope America is watching what is going on on the floor today, and they are paying careful attention to this debate.

We hear speaker after speaker from the other side of the aisle say things like, “It has been done before.” The majority leader: “Clear precedent.”

Yeah, there is clear precedent. We know the person who was in the Chair just before comes from the State that actually was the clear precedent: In

1847, when retrocession occurred. You know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this isn't politics. This is about getting voting rights. This is about things like this. I would suggest that perhaps the people watching go to Wikipedia and see what the history is about the support for retrocession back to Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, because, you see, this is not Congress's land. This is Maryland's land. Maryland gave it to the United States for the sole purpose of a permanent, Federal enclave. The nerve of hundreds of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thinking it is their land. It is Maryland's land. And if you want voting rights, it is simple: Do exactly what occurred in 1847 and give the land back to Maryland.

But, whoa, wait a minute. That is not what this debate is about, because retrocession has been proposed many times with no Democrat supporters. In fact, the majority leader was in Congress when these bills were proposed. If what he really wants is voting rights, he should have cosponsored the bill.

Mr. Speaker, you know that if retrocession occurs, every single resident—except those ones in the White House—because of the amendment to the Constitution they actually get three electoral votes under this proposed legislation, every single one of those residents would have representation in Congress. And, yes, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON could sit in Congress representing people from the State of Maryland.

□ 1030

This is a pure political ploy. That is why none of my colleagues from Maryland are going to vote against this bill today. That is why none of my colleagues from Maryland have put in a retrocession bill. That is why all of my hundreds of colleagues across the aisle are going to pretend this is Congress' land. This is not.

The Constitution is clear. If this land is given back to Maryland, Maryland has to accept.

Well, the argument is that Maryland doesn't want it back. That is interesting. I sat in the Maryland legislature with my colleague, who is sitting across the aisle right now. If our representatives from Maryland are so concerned about getting voting rights, it is very simple. Go to their colleagues in the Maryland General Assembly, fully controlled by the Democrats, and say: "Let's take it back. Let's give those 700,000 people voting rights."

Mr. Speaker, that is the correct approach. Don't steal this land from Maryland.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, important to note that Maryland permanently ceded the land that now is part of the District of Columbia. You can't get back what you permanently ceded.

And it is important to note that we have had several Members from Maryland speak.

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

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished Delegate, the congressperson from Washington, D.C., for her steadfast leadership on this.

I had the opportunity to work with her predecessor back in the late 1980s in this Chamber, Delegate Walter Fauntroy, who passed the torch, and the Delegate has done a great job.

It took 27 years to get this vote back onto the floor. I was there in 1993 when we came up short. Today, I am hoping and praying that this bill passes.

I want to congratulate you on that and to remind others that this is not going to go away because, at the end of the day, this is really about taxation without representation, one of the original 27 colonial grievances filed against the King, which was a major cause of the Revolutionary War.

So when people in Boston had the Tea Party and threw tea in the Boston Harbor in December of 1773, they were making a statement and setting an example for people across this Nation to understand that we just can't tax people without allowing them to be represented.

You have heard the great discussions, the cogent points about the fiscal side of this, that D.C. residents pay more taxes per capita than any other State, that they pay more general taxes than 22 States, that they have a budget larger than 11 States, and a bond rating better than almost 30 other States.

I have heard this discussion when it comes to fiscal matters about the constitutional federation of States, the great words of Hamilton and the Federalists and the Federalist Papers. I understand that.

But one thing we have to remember when we raise Hamilton and talk about the Federalists is that their stated belief was the Constitution was meant to evolve, that it was a living document. That is not my impression. That is the impression and the opinion of the Federalists.

If that were not true, I could not be here as a descendant of a slave without the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. The distinguished woman couldn't be here. She had not the right to vote under the Federalist Papers. Alaska and Hawaii, when I was born, were not States.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution can change by amendment only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I will never vote to give Washington, D.C., separate statehood status. Washington, D.C., is a city, not a State. Its population is roughly one-seventh that of Alabama.

To add perspective, giving D.C. statehood is the equivalent of giving Jefferson County, Alabama, or the Tennessee Valley separate statehood status. That is nuts.

History is in order. The District of Columbia originally was 100 square

miles, 10-miles square. Part of D.C. was in Maryland; part was in Virginia.

In 1847, the Virginia part of the District of Columbia was given back to Virginia, leaving only the Maryland portion of D.C. still in D.C.

These former D.C., now Virginia, residents gained the right to vote on U.S. Senators once Senators became elected rather than appointed.

If D.C. residents want to vote on U.S. Senators, fine. That can be done by following historical precedence and giving the residential portion of D.C. back to Maryland, keeping the Federal Government portion, the Capitol, White House, monuments, The Mall, Federal buildings, and the like in D.C.

But this option won't be offered by Democrats because they don't care one twit about D.C. residents voting on U.S. Senators. Rather, their goal is to have two more guaranteed leftwing Senators.

If offered, I will vote to return residential portions of D.C. to Maryland, thus giving D.C. citizens the power to vote on Maryland's two U.S. Senators. That option is consistent with historical precedence.

But I will never vote to give a single middling-size city the same political power as one of America's great 50 States. I will never support this sham that is motivated by crass partisan political power, not a desire to let citizens of the District of Columbia vote on U.S. Senators.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), my friend and the chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, which would end centuries of taxation without representation and make Washington, D.C., the 51st State.

And nobody is giving back anything. Washington, D.C., is the home to more Americans than two States, and more than 46 percent of its 700,000 residents are Black.

Make no mistake, race underlies every argument against D.C. statehood, and denying its citizens equal participation and representation is a racial, democratic, and economic injustice we cannot tolerate.

It must be acknowledged that the chance to right these wrongs with today's vote would not be possible without my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. We were both elected at the same time, and she has been dogged and consistent every single year since then in her fight for this bill and D.C. statehood.

I am so pleased to join my friend in today's milestone vote, and I am hopeful that ELEANOR's long effort will finally give D.C. the rights they deserve.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her years of leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, from 1910 through 1970, thousands of African Americans from my district, and from your district, Mr. HICE, migrated to Washington, D.C., seeking employment and better opportunities than existed in the segregated South. They work and worship, and they pay their taxes. They own and operate businesses here in D.C. They teach in the public schools. They are Capitol Police. They clean our offices.

I know very well that some of Ms. HOLMES NORTON's ancestors originated in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, D.C. residents pay the highest per capita Federal income taxes in the country. They pay more Federal taxes than residents of 22 States. It is a grave injustice that they don't have representation in this body.

It is time to say to the citizens of this city that they, too, are American citizens and deserve to be part of this great Union, with full rights of citizenship.

What they don't need to hear on this floor today is for Members to say, "I will never vote for D.C. statehood." That is irresponsible.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Article IV, Section 3.1, provides that new States may be admitted by Congress into this Union. There is absolutely no requirement for a constitutional amendment.

I was born and raised in Washington, D.C., spending my formative years in this great domain, and I grew up knowing that my parents paid taxes but had no voting representation in Congress.

It was paradoxical that I learned in school that the cries of patriots, "No taxation without representation," did not apply to the people of this great domain.

We obeyed the same laws and paid the same taxes as our fellow Americans, but we had no hope in taking part in the governance of America.

I thank the Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for keeping hope alive.

I am here today to say that it is time to end the legal disenfranchisement of a population larger than the States of Vermont and Wyoming. This vote is long overdue, and I intend to vote in favor of D.C. statehood, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. HICE of Georgia. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed and tireless colleague from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman HOLMES NORTON.

In this very Chamber, we have, throughout our Nation's history, long debated statehood for many lands and many people, and adding new States we have.

In 1837, Michigan statehood was passed by Congress as the 26th State and signed by President Jackson, who proudly stated Michigan was "admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects."

In 1959, as we added Hawaii to the Union, the Secretary of the Interior declared: "The great statehood of Hawaii will be granted and prove to the world . . . that we practice what we preach."

Now, as we add Washington, D.C., and recognize the over 700,000 people, hundreds of thousands of Federal tax-paying people, to this Union, we reaffirm, we restore, and we continue to flourish our democracy that manifests to promote the general welfare.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from the District of Columbia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to give all acknowledgment to the outstanding gentlewoman, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

President Washington said: "The Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon." Nothing in the Constitution says that we cannot make the Washington State the Douglass Commonwealth. Frederick Douglass said there is no power without struggle.

The sons and daughters of Washington, D.C., laid down their lives for this country in World Wars. They stand for this country in service to this government. Why are we denying them their rights?

Alaska has 700,000-plus people. There is no population requirement. Make Washington, D.C., a State now.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as an original co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 51, the "Washington, D.C. Admission Act," which declares the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, to be a State of the United States of America, and declares its admission into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatsoever.

George Washington, the nation's first Chief Executive, and the President of the Constitutional Convention which met in Philadelphia, said: "The Constitution is a guide which I will never abandon."

The action we are taking today to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, as the 51st state of the Union is consistent with the authority vested in the Congress by the Constitution in Article IV, section 3, clause 1.

The Constitution does not specify a minimum population or acreage test that a state must meet to gain admission to the Union, rather leave the determination to be made in the sound judgment of the Congress, which admitted Wyoming which has more than 200,000 fewer persons than the District of Columbia, and Alaska, which had only 224,000 persons when it was admitted as a state in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, in doing passing this legislation, we remove a stain that has blighted our nation for more than 200 years.

I thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my colleague and the representative of the 706,000 residents of the District of Columbia, for her tireless and relentless efforts in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, in his famous 1857 oration in Candaigua, New York, the great abolitionist, Frederick Douglass, said: "If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate agitation are men who want crops without plowing up the ground; they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters."

The vote we are about to cast today is long time in coming but shows that struggle can lead to progress, that truth crushed to earth shall rise again, that justice cannot be denied.

Today, we vote to end two centuries of shame and correct an injustice to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of one indisputable and shameful fact: over 700,000 people living in the District of Columbia lack direct voting representation in the House of Representatives and Senate.

Specifically, the citizens of the District of Columbia pay more in federal taxes than 22 states and pay more in federal taxes per capita than any state.

The District of Columbia's population (705,000) is larger than the populations of Wyoming and Vermont, and seven states had populations under one million in the last census.

The District of Columbia's annual budget (\$15.5 billion) is larger than the budgets of 14 states.

The District of Columbia has a higher per capita personal income and gross domestic product than any state.

District of Columbia residents have fought and died in every American war, including the Revolution itself, and almost 200,000 District residents have served in the military since World War I alone.

Approximately 30,000 veterans live in the District of Columbia, and it should be noted that during the Vietnam War, 243 District residents were casualties of war, a casualty figure greater than that observed by 10 different states.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is undisputable that residents of the District of Columbia serve in the military, pay billions of dollars in federal taxes each year, and assume other responsibilities of U.S. citizenship.

But for over 200 years, the District of Columbia has been denied voting representation

in Congress—the entity that has ultimate authority over all aspects of the city's legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

Mr. Speaker, if a person can be called upon to pay federal taxes and serve in the armed forces of the United States, then he or she should at least have the opportunity to vote for a representative who could at least cast a symbolic vote in this chamber on critical matters facing our nation.

Issues like war and peace, equality and justice.

And tear-gassing peaceful protestors in Lafayette Square exercising their First Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, taxation with representation is tyranny.

H.R. 51 would create a state from essentially the eight hometown wards of the District of Columbia and provides that the new state would be equal to the other 50 states in all respects, and that the residents of the State of Washington, D.C. would have all the rights of statehood, including voting representation in Congress and full local self-government.

Under the legislation this new state would have no jurisdiction over the reduced federal district, which would consist of the area that Members of Congress and visitors associate with the capital of our country: the U.S. Capitol, the U.S. Supreme Court, the White House, the principal federal monuments, and the federal buildings and grounds adjacent to the National Mall and the U.S. Capitol.

It is unconscionable that 700,000 Americans are being unconscionably denied a vote and a voice in the most important legislative body in the world.

As a supporter of freedom, democracy, and equality, I believe that it is long overdue for the citizens of the District of Columbia to have representation in the House and the Senate to advocate for their interests on vital matters coming before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong that we must be reminded daily by license plates in the District of Columbia that "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

The people in Boston felt so strongly about this in 1775 that they rebelled in Boston Harbor, launching the "Boston Tea Party."

The principle that political authority derives from the consent of the government is no less applicable when it comes to the District of Columbia.

Let us be clear, there is no dispute that hundreds of thousands of American citizens reside in the District of Columbia.

We all agree that universal suffrage is the hallmark of a democratic regime, of which the United States is the world's leading exemplar.

None of us believes it is fair that citizens of the District of Columbia pay federal taxes, risk life and limb fighting wars abroad to protect American democracy and extend the blessings of liberty to people living in foreign lands.

In short, there is no moral reason to deny the citizens of the District of Columbia admission as a state in the United States and the right to full representation in Congress.

The only question is whether Congress has the will and the constitutional authority to do so.

Congress has always had the constitutional authority but for much of the last 200 years, it has not had the will.

Let us change that, beginning today with our vote to pass H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

□ 1045

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued listening to my colleagues waxing eloquent about the divine creation of the District of Columbia. Give me a break. It was old-fashioned horse trading between Hamilton, Madison, and Jefferson like the declaration of enslaved people being three-fifths of a person without being able to vote for themselves, just simply power for White people.

It is time to recognize the reality of what I think was a corrupt bargain and give the District of Columbia the statehood it deserves.

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

Despite the passionate arguments that we have heard today regarding H.R. 51, the plain truth is that Washington, D.C.'s status as the Capital of the United States is exactly as our Founders intended.

To be clear, Washington, D.C., is a vibrant and special city holding a unique position in our Nation's Federal system. Our Nation's Capital does not exist within one State, and therefore, it is free from the influence of any State. That is exactly the intention of our Constitution and our Founders.

But not only is the Constitution proposal going to be a violation of our Constitution, but practically speaking, D.C. is not prepared financially and otherwise as a microstate.

Currently, Washington, D.C., only raises about half of its annual budget through local taxes, despite the fact that they have some of the highest taxes in the Nation. This shows a lack of financial readiness for the responsibility of statehood.

Congress has already dealt with this in the past, and D.C.'s financial situation, we bailed it out in the 1990s after 20 years of troubled self-rule.

The majority's bill does not take into account how these budgetary shortfalls would be remedied or how the taxpayers would be relieved. Statehood first, the details later, that is the majority's proposal.

In seeking to gain an extra two seats in the Senate, Democrats would strip this great historic city of its special status and make it a shell state. The Democrat's statehood proposal leaves us with a State in name only, and a tiny remnant of a Federal district. This is far from the intent of our Founding Fathers.

We live in a federation, a federation of States. I would say there is no one who is a greater supporter of States' rights than I am, but because I believe in States' rights, I cannot support this city becoming a State.

D.C. is simply not equipped to shoulder the burden of statehood. If Democrats were serious about granting representation to the citizens of D.C., they

would consider retroceding the land back to Maryland, as has been proposed, but that has been rejected over and over. If D.C.'s citizens rejoin Maryland, they would gain the Senate and House representation that supposedly is what this bill is after.

But this statehood proposal is about politics all dressed up in noble arguments about disenfranchising and taxation without representation. It is just a big sham.

The Constitution is clear. A new State can be formed from Federal territories or from existing States with their permission. But the current Federal district is not an existing State, nor is it a territory. It is unique, and our Framers specifically crafted the Constitution with a maximum size for the District, so as to prevent it from becoming a State.

We have been over this time and again, but H.R. 51 changes the clear intentions of our Founders. By making the District a State, we are going exactly against the intent of our Framers and the intentions of our Constitution. The Framers crafted our Constitution with the direct intent that we would have a unique district, the seat of our Federal Government that is not influenced by a State. That is what we have, and that is what we need to keep.

H.R. 51 disregards the Constitution, and we cannot take this lightly. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 30 seconds remaining.

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

This bill allows our country to live up to its claim to be a democracy. We stand out as the only democracy which denies democracy to the residents of its own Capital City.

Our claim to world leadership is marred until, with this bill, the residents of our Capital are equal in citizenship to the citizens of every Member of the House of Representatives.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—a bill long overdue and exceedingly necessary.

This is a measure that I have supported since my inaugural term in the House of Representatives, 27 years ago, when I cosponsored Representative HOLMES NORTON's second-ever statehood bill. Her continued leadership and tenacity on this issue as the Delegate from Washington, D.C. is nothing short of extraordinary, and it is because of her efforts that today we vote on a statehood bill for the first time in almost three decades.

For too long, the over-700,000 residents of the District of Columbia been denied voting representation while still paying taxes, serving in our military, and adhering to federal laws. Think of that—here, in the greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world, we routinely prevent hundreds of thousands of our

citizens, half of which are African American, from having their voices heard. The admission of D.C. as a state and redesignation as the Douglass Commonwealth will not only extend rights and liberties to its residents but, in doing so, honor the memory of the iconic abolitionist and D.C. native Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Speaker, as over half of the Members of the House of Representatives are already co-sponsoring H.R. 51, I do not doubt that it will pass. I urge those remaining who have not co-sponsored this bill to stand on the right side of history and support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of D.C. statehood. Today's affirmative vote in the House of Representatives to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as the 51st state in the Union is long overdue for the more than 700,000 disenfranchised American citizens who currently live in the District of Columbia. This is the first time a chamber of Congress has voted to approve D.C. statehood. I have long been a proponent of D.C. statehood and was the only member of the Virginia delegation to vote for D.C. statehood the last time it came before the House in 1993. And during my service as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, I introduced the resolution for Virginia to ratify the Constitutional Amendment to grant full Congressional voting rights to the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, neither my resolution nor the Constitutional Amendment were ultimately successful.

Today's vote marks a historic victory for the indefatigable advocates for statehood including my colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who has been a tireless advocate for the disenfranchised citizens of our nation's capital. Supporting D.C. statehood is about our nation's core constitutional principles of self-determination, opposition to taxation without representation, and giving an equal voice to all Americans regardless of where they live. I hope my Republican colleagues in the Senate put aside politics and pass this bill and finally end the historic injustice that has persisted for more than 200 years for the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51—the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—introduced by my colleague, Del. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. This bill would not only establish the District of Columbia (“D.C.”) as the 51st state of the United States, but it would also grant long overdue voting representation at the federal level to the residents of D.C.

I remain committed to the principles this country boasts: democracy and representation. Since 1801, the residents of D.C. have been denied federal representation. They pay their taxes and have fought and died in every American war, yet those armed service members and their families are deprived of the freedoms they have fought to protect. Statehood is the only remedy that provides full representation in Congress for the residents of Washington, D.C.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Keller moves to recommit the bill H.R. 51 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, insert before line 1 the following:

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The admission of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as a State under this Act requires the President to issue a proclamation prior to the new State's admission to the Union.

(2) To assure the interests of the rest of the Nation that up until now have had shared ownership of the Nation's capital through their representation in Congress, this Act requires the constitution of the new State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth to contain certain provisions before the President issues a proclamation recognizing it as a new State in the Union.

(3) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State does not require a fee or assessment in order to carry a concealed firearm in the state.

(4) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any statute, ordinance, policy or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from enforcing national immigration laws.

(5) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution, in order to protect the history and integrity of so many of the Nation's monuments and landmarks that will exist within the boundaries of the new state of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, any law that alters or affects any of the authorities of Federal planning commissions.

(6) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State enact and enforce laws to prohibit the destruction of any property of the United States within the State and laws to prohibit the destruction of any military memorials within the State.

(7) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State enact and enforce laws to prohibit secession from the State or the obstruction of law enforcement officers.

(8) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any use of State taxpayer funds for campaign activity for public office.

(9) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that—

(A) the new State require in its State constitution that the new State ensures dedicated and priority funding for law enforcement and public safety; and

(B) the Mayor provides a certification to the President that the District of Columbia has enacted laws providing for adequate and permanent funding of law enforcement and public safety.

(10) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in the State constitution that the State will continue to participate in the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results program under the

terms and conditions in effect as of the date of admission.

Page 6, line 18, strike “The President” and insert “Subject to subsections (c) and (d), the President”.

Page 7, insert after line 2 the following:

(c) REVISIONS TO STATE CONSTITUTION.—The President may not issue the proclamation under subsection (a) until the Mayor provides the President with a written certification that the District of Columbia has adopted each of the following amendments to the State Constitution:

(1) RIGHT TO CONCEALED CARRY.—An amendment that prohibits the State from requiring a fee or assessment in order to carry a concealed firearm in the State.

(2) SANCTUARY CITY STATUS.—An amendment that prohibits the State from having in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from—

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

(B) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

(3) AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS.—An amendment prohibiting the laws of the State or members of executive offices of the State from acting to alter or affect any of the authorities of Federal planning commissions, including the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, or the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, as such authorities are amended by section 324 of this Act.

(4) PROHIBITING DESTRUCTION OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND MILITARY MEMORIALS.—An amendment requiring the State to enact and enforce laws to prohibit the destruction or the attempted destruction of any property of the United States within the State and laws to prohibit the destruction or the attempted destruction of any structure, plaque, statue, or other monument on public property within the State commemorating the service of any person or persons in the armed forces of the United States.

(5) PROHIBITING SECESSION FROM STATE OR OBSTRUCTING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—An amendment requiring the State—

(A) to enact and enforce laws to subject any person who incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion, secession attempt or claim, or insurrection against the authority of the State or the laws thereof, or gives aid or comfort thereto, to a fine or a term of imprisonment of not less than 10 years, or both, and to prohibit any such person from holding any public office in the State; and

(B) to enact and enforce laws to make it a felony to obstruct a law enforcement officer, and to provide that a person commits such a felony if the person willfully hinders, delays, or obstructs any law enforcement officer in the discharge of his or her official powers or duties.

(6) PROHIBITING USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.—An amendment requiring the State to enact and enforce laws that prohibit any revenue collected (or otherwise generated or procured) by the State from being used to finance, directly or indirectly, any candidate, or candidate committee supporting a campaign, for election for public office.

(7) REQUIRING DEDICATED AND PRIORITY FUNDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—To protect the life, property, and

welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions by ensuring the adequate and continued funding of law enforcement and public safety agencies—

(A) an amendment requiring the State Chief Financial Officer, or the equivalent State official, to appropriately prioritize law enforcement and public safety in the State budget and in the administration of the State's cash management and payroll operations; and

(B) an amendment prioritizing access to the State budget emergency and contingency reserve funds, or their equivalents, to assure uninterrupted spending to cover the operational expenses related to law enforcement and public safety.

(8) PARTICIPATION IN OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—An amendment requiring the State to continue to participate in the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results program under the terms and conditions in effect as of the date of admission.

(d) BUDGET CERTIFICATION FOR FUNDING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—The President may not issue the proclamation under subsection (a) until the Mayor provides the President with a written certification that the District of Columbia has enacted laws sufficient to provide for a dedicated source of locally-raised revenue to provide adequate and permanent funding for law enforcement and public safety agencies to enforce the laws of the State and protect the life, property, and welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions.

Page 85, line 10, strike “shall apply as follows:” and all that follows through line 24 and insert “shall apply with respect to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union”.

Page 86, line 6, strike “four citizens” and insert “five citizens”.

Page 86, line 11, strike “four citizen members” and insert “five citizen members”.

Page 87, line 2, strike “means the” and insert “means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, the”.

Page 87, line 10, strike “and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth”.

Page 87, line 13, strike “LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL” and insert “CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL”.

Page 87, line 20, strike “the term ‘Capital’ means” and insert “the term ‘National Capital’ means”.

Page 88, line 3, strike “Capital” and insert “National Capital”.

Page 88, line 5, strike “LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL” and insert “CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL”.

Page 88, line 9, strike “LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL” and insert “CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL”.

Page 88, line 14, strike “CAPITAL” and insert “NATIONAL CAPITAL”. In the matter proposed to be amended by paragraph (2) of section 324(c), insert “National” before “Capital” each place it appears in the heading and the text of the new paragraph (2) of section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code.

Page 88, line 15, strike “Capital” and insert “National Capital”.

Page 89, line 6, strike “Capital” and insert “National Capital”.

Page 89, line 12, strike “Capital” and insert “National Capital”.

Page 89, line 23, strike “urban fabric of” and insert “urban fabric of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and the”.

Mr. KELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about how for over 200 years lawmakers have come from every State in the Union to work and live in this District.

The city was not meant to be a prize of conquest like the ancient walled cities of Europe. It was not meant to be the hub of trade like the early American cities. Above anything, it was meant to represent a center of the federation created by our Constitution.

The city is tied to the idea of the American Republic, a living piece of collaboration, the star on the map representing the 50 stars on the flag.

With the creation of a 51st State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, a State the size of a small county, that collaboration will be gone. The majority believes it is a small price to pay for two Senators.

Republicans need assurances that the interests of our constituents will be reflected in this new State that will have undue influence over the Nation's Federal Government.

So, my motion contains reasonable additions to H.R. 51 that will require the President to ensure certain amendments to the State constitution are incorporated before granting statehood. These provisions reflect the entirety of the Nation's views, not just those of cities controlled by Democrats.

There is provision that prohibits the former capital from being a sanctuary city. These are provisions that prohibit taxpayer funds being used for political campaigns. These are provisions to protect Americans' Second Amendment rights. These are provisions that provide full funding for law enforcement, that prohibit the destruction of our national monuments, that prohibit the creation of so-called autonomous zones.

Since early entry of new States into the Union, Congress has required that constitutions of the new States reflect certain considerations before granting admission. Nevada and West Virginia were required to prohibit slavery. Various Western States were required to prohibit polygamy.

These requests do not violate the Supreme Court's equal footing doctrine, but the idea of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth containing wholly within it the entirety of the Federal Capital does, in fact, violate this doctrine.

A State with a controlling influence over the Nation's Federal Government and Capital is simply not on equal footing with the other 50 States. It is above them.

A vote for the majority's design for D.C. statehood is a vote for D.C.'s superiority. The Founders recognized the

status of Washington, D.C. House Republicans do not support deviation from their vision.

However, if the Democrats insist on creating this new State, it is only fair that it be established as a State with policy values that more closely reflect the rest of the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this weak and unconstitutional motion to recommit.

The motion proposes to condition the admission of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth on either the imposition of the whimsical policy preferences of the minority or simply banal restatements that the State will follow Federal law, which, obviously, it must do already under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. All of the States must.

But the paradigm example here, and the thing that really appears to be really on their mind, and I am glad we at least have boiled it down to this issue, is they want to make sure that the new State doesn't come in without an amendment written by the people of Washington, D.C., saying that they will not charge people a fee for carrying a concealed weapon.

Now, that is not in the U.S. Constitution, and it is not a matter of Federal law obligating the 50 States to do it, so you cannot selectively impose that on the new State of Washington, D.C. That is the equal footing doctrine, which the Supreme Court has emphasized repeatedly throughout our history, that every new State that we have granted admission to since the original 13, all 37 have entered on the exact same plane of political and constitutional equality as the original 13.

So, they want to impose their various policy preferences on different things, like concealed carry weapons and so on.

If you want to do that, then try to pass it for the entire country, and it would apply within the new State, as well. I don't think you can do it constitutionally, but that is a separate matter. Or, resign your seat from wherever you happen to be from. If you are from Georgia, resign your seat in Georgia, move to the new State, and then campaign as a Member of Congress from here or campaign for Governor or State legislator in the new State and get them to change their law because that is a matter of local policy.

I would think that the great champions of federalism and State rights would want to allow every State to make a decision for itself.

Mr. Speaker, a number of things have been said that need to be corrected.

For one thing, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) said that we should legislate for the real Americans, and he is going to speak for the real Americans, not the people who live in Washington. I would hope he would reflect on that and issue an apology to the people of Washington, D.C.

But it seemed that the logic of the argument was that the only people who live here are Federal employees, and they are different from the rest of America.

Now, think about that for a second. In the first place, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees do not live in Washington, D.C. As far as I could tell, less than 8 percent of Federal employees live in Washington, D.C., which means 92 percent of them live in our States in the rest of America.

Should those people be disenfranchised? Should people who work for the post office lose their right to representation in Congress? Should members of the Armed Forces be disenfranchised? The Supreme Court already said no in *Carrington v. Rash*. Check it out.

So, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees don't live in D.C., and the overwhelming majority of people who live in Washington, D.C., and are the constituents of Representative NORTON are not Federal employees. They do other things.

Yes, they are real Americans, too. They are bus drivers. They are schoolteachers. They are businesspeople and entrepreneurs. I mean, come on, get real, be serious, get out and meet the people in Washington.

The gentleman from Georgia said Washington, D.C., was set aside in the Constitution as a Federal district, and that was echoed by the former judge from Texas. But here, our friends just advertised their unfamiliarity both with the Constitution and with American history.

The Constitution does not fix the geographic site of the so-called seat of government, the district that is set aside for the seat of government. That is why after the Constitution was adopted, the capital was in New York for a while. Before that, it was in Trenton, New Jersey. It was in Princeton. It was in Annapolis. We have a whole room in Annapolis set aside for where Congress met.

So the idea that you can look up the Constitution and see the boundaries or the map of Washington, D.C., is just absurd.

Now, does Congress have the authority to modify the boundaries of the Federal district as proposed by Ms. NORTON? Of course it does. We voted to do that in 1846 at the behest of a couple hundred slaveholders in Virginia who were afraid that this Congress would follow the advice of Representative Lincoln from Illinois, who said abolish the slave traffic in Washington, D.C.

□ 1100

And they were afraid it was going to happen, so Alexandria, Arlington, and

Fairfax county were given back to Virginia, and it was perfectly constitutional. And there is no legal authority to the contrary in any way.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to placate a couple hundred slave masters from the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to grant statehood and political equality for the people of Washington, D.C.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MURPHY of Florida). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3094) to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3094

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

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, is designated as the “National Pulse Memorial”.

(b) *EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.*—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System and the designation of the National Pulse Memorial shall not require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to that national memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a gunman shot and killed 49 people and injured 53 others in the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida. It was the single deadliest known violent attack on the LGBTQ community, the deadliest violent attack in America at that time, and an attack on our Latino community, our African-American communities, and so many others.

After this tragedy, our city came together. Doctors, first responders, and friends rushed to save the wounded; others donated funds, supplies, even their blood. Countless works of art, gifts, and letters were left at impromptu memorial sites paying tribute to the victims and survivors.

We came together in candlelight vigils across the globe to grieve and remember. We became truly Orlando Strong in the face of adversity for the whole world to see.

As we continue to honor 49 angels, we remind the world that love will always conquer hate in the end. The designation of the Pulse nightclub as a national memorial honors the lives taken, as well as the survivors, first responders, and an entire central Florida community. Together, we will open minds and hearts and make the Pulse Memorial a national symbol of hope, love, and change.

I thank my Orlando area colleagues, Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS and Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, for joining me in leading this important bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3094, offered by our colleague from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

A little over 4 years ago, on June 12, 2016, the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, became the scene of the worst terrorist attack on American soil since September 11, 2001.

Forty-nine Americans died and 53 were injured that terrible night at the hands of an ISIS-inspired coward who turned on the very country where his parents had sought refuge from the violence in Afghanistan. Instead of gratitude, he unleashed hatred and violence upon this country that had sheltered his family and made it possible for him to be born into a land of freedom and opportunity.

The poisonous political ideology that infected and animated him in his attack—and to which he pledged allegiance just before the attack—is a familiar nemesis to the founding principles of our country.

that students who have been defrauded will now have to pay if this resolution fails.

According to the fraud formula from the Department of Education, even those who can prove fraud can expect relief, on average, to go from about 50 percent of their debt down to 3 percent of their debt. Many, because of that formula, will get absolutely nothing.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, now is the time that we have a choice. We can give relief to students, especially veterans who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, or make them pay student loans even though they received a worthless educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to side with the students and vote “yes” on this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—238

Adams	Cunningham	Horn, Kendra S.
Aguilar	Dauids (KS)	Horsford
Allred	Davis (CA)	Houlahan
Axne	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Barragán	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Bass	Dean	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bera	DeGette	Jeffries
Beyer	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Blumenauer	Delgado	Kaptur
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Katko
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Keating
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
F.	Dingell	Kennedy
Brindisi	Doggett	Khanna
Brown (MD)	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kilmer
Bustos	Engel	Kim
Butterfield	Escobar	Kind
Carbajal	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Españat	Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN)	Evans	Kuster (NH)
Cartwright	Finkenauer	Lamb
Case	Fitzpatrick	Langevin
Casten (IL)	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Frankel	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Cisneros	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clay	Garcia (TX)	Lewis
Cleaver	Golden	Lieu, Ted
Clyburn	Gomez	Lipinski
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Loeb sack
Connolly	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Cooper	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Correa	Grijalva	Lowe y
Costa	Haaland	Lujan
Courtney	Harder (CA)	Luria
Cox (CA)	Hastings	Lynch
Craig	Hayes	Malinowski
Crist	Heck	Maloney,
Crow	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Cuellar	Himes	Maloney, Sean

Matsui	Porter
McAdams	Pressley
McBath	Price (NC)
McCollum	Quigley
McEachin	Raskin
McGovern	Rice (NY)
McNeerney	Richmond
Meeks	Rose (NY)
Meng	Rouda
Mfume	Roybal-Allard
Moore	Ruiz
Morelle	Ruppersberger
Moulton	Rush
Mucarsel-Powell	Ryan
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez
Nadler	Sarbanes
Napolitano	Scanlon
Neal	Schakowsky
Neguse	Schiff
Norcross	Schneider
O'Halleran	Schrader
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier
Omar	Scott (VA)
Pallone	Scott, David
Panetta	Serrano
Pappas	Sewell (AL)
Pascarell	Shalala
Payne	Sherman
Perlmutter	Sherrill
Peters	Sires
Peterson	Slotkin
Phillips	Smith (NJ)
Pingree	Smith (WA)
Pocan	Soto

NAYS—173

Aderholt	Graves (LA)
Allen	Graves (MO)
Amash	Green (TN)
Amodei	Griffith
Armstrong	Grothman
Arrington	Guest
Bacon	Guthrie
Baird	Hagedorn
Balderson	Harris
Banks	Hartzler
Bergman	Hern, Kevin
Biggs	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Hill (AR)
Brady	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth
Buchanan	Hudson
Buck	Huizenga
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)
Budd	Johnson (LA)
Burchett	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Johnson (SD)
Byrne	Jordan
Calvert	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Joyce (PA)
Chabot	Keller
Cheney	Kelly (MS)
Cline	Kelly (PA)
Cloud	King (NY)
Cole	Kinzinger
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)
Comer	LaHood
Conaway	LaMalfa
Cook	Lamborn
Crawford	Latta
Crenshaw	Lesko
Davidson (OH)	Long
DesJarlais	Loudermilk
Diaz-Balart	Lucas
Dunn	Luetkemeyer
Estes	Marshall
Ferguson	Massie
Fleischmann	Mast
Flores	McCarthy
Fortenberry	McCaul
Foxx (NC)	McClintock
Fulcher	McHenry
Gaetz	McKinley
Garcia (CA)	Meuser
Gianforte	Miller
Gibbs	Mitchell
Gohmert	Moolenaar
Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)
Gooden	Murphy (NC)
Gosar	Newhouse
Granger	Norman
Graves (GA)	Nunes

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Curtis
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Duncan
Barr	Carter (TX)	Emmer

Spanberger	Gallagher
Speier	King (IA)
Stanton	Marchant
Stevens	Mullin
Suoizzi	Rogers (AL)
Swalwell (CA)	Rooney (FL)
Takano	Sensenbrenner
Thompson (CA)	Spano
Thompson (MS)	
Titus	
Tlaib	
Tonko	
Torres (CA)	
Torres Small	
(NM)	
Trahan	
Trone	
Underwood	
Van Drew	
Vargas	
Veasey	
Vela	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters	
Watson Coleman	
Welch	
Weston	
Wild	
Wilson (FL)	
Yarmuth	
Young	

Olson	Rogers (KY)
Palazzo	Rose, John W.
Palmer	Rouzer
Pence	Roy
Perry	Rutherford
Posey	Scalise
Reed	Schweikert
Reschenthaler	Scott, Austin
Rice (SC)	Shimkus
Riggleman	Simpson
Roby	Smith (MO)
Rodgers (WA)	Smith (NE)
Hice (GA)	Smucker
Roe, David P.	Staubert
Rogers (KY)	Stefanik
Rose, John W.	Steube
Rouzer	Stewart
Roy	Stivers
Rutherford	Taylor
Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Schweikert	Thornberry
Scott, Austin	Tiffany
Shimkus	Timmons
Simpson	Tipton
Smith (MO)	Turner
Smith (NE)	Upton
Smucker	Wagner
Staubert	Walberg
Stefanik	Walden
Steube	Walker
Stewart	Waltz
Stivers	Watkins
Taylor	Weber (TX)
Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Thornberry	Wenstrup
Tiffany	Williams
Timmons	Wilson (SC)
Tipton	Wittman
Turner	Womack
Upton	Woodall
Wagner	Wright
Walberg	Yoho
Walden	Zeldin
Walker	
Waltz	
Watkins	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	

Gallagher	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
King (IA)	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
Marchant	Sensenbrenner	
Mullin	Spano	

□ 1327

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. YOUNG changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have “nay” on rollcall No. 120.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Kirkpatrick	Payne
Cárdenas	(Gallego)	(Wasserman)
(Gomez)	Langevin	Schultz
DeSaulnier	(Lynch)	Pingree (Kuster
(Matsui)	Lawson (FL)	(NH)
(Evans)	(Evans)	Sánchez (Roybal-
Deutch (Rice	Lewis (Kildee)	Allard)
(NY)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Serrano (Meng)
Engel (Titus)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Speier (Scanlon)
Frankel (Kuster	Lofgren (Boyle,	Watson Coleman
(NH)	Brendan F.)	(Pallone)
Garamendi	Lowenthal	Welch
(Boyle,	(Beyer)	(McGovern)
Brendan F.)	Lowey (Meng)	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (Beyer)	(Hayes)
(Jeffries)	Napolitano	
Khanna (Gomez)	(Correa)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 227, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—182

Aderholt	Brindisi	Collins (GA)
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Comer
Amodei	Buck	Conaway
Armstrong	Bucshon	Cook
Arrington	Budd	Craig
Bacon	Burchett	Crawford
Baird	Burgess	Crenshaw
Balderson	Byrne	Cunningham
Banks	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bergman	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Biggs	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Cheney	Dunn
Bishop (NC)	Cline	Estes
Bost	Cloud	Ferguson
Brady	Cole	Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann King (NY)  
 Flores Kinzinger  
 Fortenberry Kustoff (TN)  
 Foxx (NC) LaHood  
 Fulcher LaMalfa  
 Gaetz Lamb  
 Garcia (CA) Lamborn  
 Gianforte Latta  
 Gibbs Lesko  
 Gohmert Long  
 Golden Loudermilk  
 Gonzalez (OH) Lucas  
 Gooden Luetkemeyer  
 Gosar Marshall  
 Granger Mast  
 Graves (GA) McAdams  
 Graves (LA) McCarthy  
 Graves (MO) McCaul  
 Green (TN) McClintock  
 Grothman McKinley  
 Guest Meuser  
 Guthrie Miller  
 Hagedorn Mitchell  
 Harris Moolenaar  
 Hartzler Mooney (WV)  
 Hern, Kevin Murphy (NC)  
 Herrera Beutler Newhouse  
 Hice (GA) Norman  
 Higgins (LA) Nunes  
 Hill (AR) Olson  
 Holding Palazzo  
 Hollingsworth Palmer  
 Horn, Kendra S. Pence  
 Hudson Perry  
 Huizenga Peterson  
 Hurd (TX) Posey  
 Johnson (LA) Reed  
 Johnson (OH) Reschenthaler  
 Johnson (SD) Rice (SC)  
 Jordan Riggelman  
 Joyce (OH) Roby  
 Joyce (PA) Rodgers (WA)  
 Katko Roe, David P.  
 Keller Rogers (KY)  
 Kelly (MS) Rose, John W.  
 Kelly (PA) Rouzer

NAYS—227

Adams DeFazio  
 Aguilar DeGette  
 Allred DeLauro  
 Amash DelBene  
 Axne Delgado  
 Barragán Demings  
 Bass DeSaulnier  
 Beatty Deutch  
 Bera Dingell  
 Beyer Doggett  
 Bishop (GA) Doyle, Michael  
 Blumenauer F.  
 Blunt Rochester Engel  
 Bonamici Escobar  
 Boyle, Brendan Eshoo  
 F. Espallat  
 Brown (MD) Evans  
 Brownley (CA) Finkenauer  
 Bustos Fletcher  
 Butterfield Foster  
 Carbajal Frankel  
 Cárdenas Fudge  
 Carson (IN) Gabbard  
 Cartwright Gallego  
 Case Garamendi  
 Casten (IL) Garcia (IL)  
 Castor (FL) Garcia (TX)  
 Castro (TX) Gomez  
 Chu, Judy Gonzalez (TX)  
 Cicilline Gottheimer  
 Cisneros Green, Al (TX)  
 Clark (MA) Grijalva  
 Clarke (NY) Haaland  
 Clay Harder (CA)  
 Cleaver Hastings  
 Clyburn Hayes  
 Cohen Heck  
 Connolly Higgins (NY)  
 Cooper Himes  
 Correa Horsford  
 Costa Houlihan  
 Courtney Hoyer  
 Cox (CA) Huffman  
 Crist Jackson Lee  
 Crow Jayapal  
 Cuellar Jeffries  
 Davids (KS) Johnson (GA)  
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (TX)  
 Davis (CA) Kaptur  
 Davis, Danny K. Keating  
 Dean Kelly (IL)

Rutherford Norcross  
 Scalise O'Halleran  
 Schweikert Ocasio-Cortez  
 Scott, Austin Omar  
 Shimkus Pallone  
 Simpson Panetta  
 Smith (MO) Pappas  
 Smith (NE) Pascrell  
 Smith (NJ) Payne  
 Smucker Perlmutter  
 Stauber Peters  
 Stefanik Phillips  
 Steil Pingree  
 Steube Pocan  
 Stewart Porter  
 Stivers Pressley  
 Taylor Price (NC)  
 Thompson (PA) Quigley  
 Thornberry Raskin  
 Tiffany Rice (NY)  
 Timmons Richmond  
 Tipton Rose (NY)  
 Torres Small Rouda  
 (NM) Roy  
 Turner Roybal-Allard  
 Upton Ruiz  
 Van Drew  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walt  
 Watkins  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Wright  
 Yoho  
 Young  
 Zeldin

Ruppersberger Suozzi  
 Rush Swalwell (CA)  
 Ryan Takano  
 Sánchez Thompson (CA)  
 Sarbanes Thompson (MS)  
 Scanlon Titus  
 Schakowsky Taib  
 Schiff Tonko  
 Schneider Torres (CA)  
 Schrader Trahan  
 Schrier Trone  
 Scott (VA) Underwood  
 Scott, David Vargas  
 Serrano Veasey  
 Sewell (AL) Vela  
 Shalala Velázquez  
 Sherman Visclosky  
 Sherrill Wasserman  
 Sires Schultz  
 Slotkin Waters  
 Smith (WA) Watson Coleman  
 Soto Welch  
 Spanberger Wexton  
 Speier Wild  
 Stanton Wilson (FL)  
 Stevens Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Abraham Curtis  
 Babin Duncan  
 Barr Emmer  
 Bishop (UT) Gallagher  
 Brooks (IN) Griffith  
 Buchanan King (IA)  
 Carter (TX) Marchant

□ 1408

Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio changed his vote from “nay” to “yea”.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin) Kirkpatrick  
 Cárdenas (Gallego)  
 (Gomez) Langevin  
 DeSaulnier (Lynch)  
 (Matsui) Lawson (FL)  
 Deutch (Rice) (Evans)  
 (NY) Lewis (Kildee)  
 Engel (Titus) Lieu, Ted (Beyer)  
 Frankel (Kuster) Lipinski (Cooper)  
 (NH) Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)  
 Garamendi Lowenthal  
 (Boyle, Beyer) Lowey (Meng)  
 Johnson (TX) Moore (Beyer)  
 (Jeffries) Napolitano  
 Khanna (Gomez) (Correa)

Case Hoyer  
 Casten (IL) Huffman  
 Castor (FL) Jackson Lee  
 Castro (TX) Jayapal  
 Clay Jeffries  
 Cleaver Johnson (GA)  
 Clyburn Johnson (TX)  
 Cohen Khanna  
 Connolly Kildee  
 Cooper Kilmer  
 Correa Kim  
 Costa Kind  
 Courtney Kirkpatrick  
 Cox (CA) Krishnamoorthi  
 Craig Kuster (NH)  
 Crist Lamb  
 Crow Langevin  
 Cuellar Larsen (WA)  
 Cunningham Larson (CT)  
 Davids (KS) Lawrence  
 Davis (CA) Lawson (FL)  
 Davis, Danny K. Lee (CA)  
 Dean Lee (NV)  
 DeFazio Levin (CA)  
 DeGette Levin (MI)  
 DeLauro Lewis  
 DelBene Lieu, Ted  
 Delgado Lipinski  
 Demings Loeb sack  
 DeSaulnier Lofgren  
 Deutch Lowenthal  
 Dingell Lowey  
 Doggett Luján  
 Doyle, Michael Luria  
 F. Lynch  
 Engel Malinowski  
 Escobar Maloney,  
 Eshoo Carolyn B.  
 Espallat Maloney, Sean  
 Evans Matsui  
 Finkenauer McAdams  
 Fletcher McBeth  
 Foster McCollum  
 Frankel McEachin  
 Fudge McGovern  
 Gabbard McNerney  
 Gallego Meeks  
 Garamendi Meng  
 Garcia (IL) Mfume  
 Garcia (TX) Moore  
 Golden Morelle  
 Gomez Moulton  
 Gonzalez (TX) Mucarsel-Powell  
 Gottheimer Murphy (FL)  
 Green, Al (TX) Nadler  
 Grijalva Napolitano  
 Haaland Neal  
 Harder (CA) Neguse  
 Hastings Norcross  
 Hayes O'Halleran  
 Heck Ocasio-Cortez  
 Higgins (NY) Omar  
 Himes Pallone  
 Horn, Kendra S. Panetta  
 Horsford Pappas  
 Houlihan Pascrell  
 Payne

NAYS—180

Aderholt Chabot  
 Allen Cheney  
 Amash Cline  
 Amodei Cloud  
 Armstrong Cole  
 Arrington Collins (GA)  
 Bacon Comer  
 Baird Conaway  
 Balderson Cook  
 Banks Crawford  
 Bergman Crenshaw  
 Biggs Davidson (OH)  
 Bilirakis Davis, Rodney  
 Bishop (NC) DesJarlais  
 Bost Diaz-Balart  
 Brady Dunn  
 Brooks (AL) Estes  
 Buchanan Ferguson  
 Buck Fitzpatrick  
 Bucshon Fleischmann  
 Budd Flores  
 Burchett Fortenberry  
 Burgess Foxx (NC)  
 Byrne Fulcher  
 Calvert Gaetz  
 Carter (GA) Garcia (CA)

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

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—232

Adams Beyer  
 Aguilar Bishop (GA)  
 Allred Blumenauer  
 Axne Blunt Rochester  
 Barragán Bonamici  
 Bass Boyle, Brendan  
 Beatty F.  
 Bera Brindisi

Brown (MD) Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright

Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez (OH)  
 Gooden  
 Gosar  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green (TN)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guest  
 Guthrie  
 Hagedorn  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hern, Kevin  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice (GA)  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill (AR)  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson

Huizenga	Moolenaar	Stauber
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (NC)	Steil
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Steube
Johnson (SD)	Norman	Stewart
Jordan	Nunes	Stivers
Joyce (OH)	Olson	Taylor
Joyce (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Katko	Palmer	Thornberry
Keller	Pence	Tiffany
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Timmons
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Tipton
King (NY)	Posey	Turner
Kinzinger	Reed	Upton
Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Van Drew
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Wagner
LaMalfa	Riggleman	Walberg
Lamborn	Roby	Walden
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Walker
Lesko	Roe, David P.	Waltz
Long	Rogers (KY)	Watkins
Loudermilk	Rose, John W.	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Marshall	Roy	Wenstrup
Massie	Rutherford	Westerman
Mast	Scalise	Williams
McCarthy	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Scott, Austin	Wittman
McClintock	Shimkus	Womack
McHenry	Simpson	Woodall
McKinley	Smith (MO)	Wright
Meuser	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Miller	Smith (NJ)	Young
Mitchell	Smucker	Zeldin

Sánchez (Roybal-Allard)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Serrano (Meng)	Welch	
Speier (Scanlon)	(McGovern)	

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. I yield to my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate. I would repeat that because it is unusual. On Monday, we are meeting at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business, with votes expected to occur as early as 2:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider H.R. 1425, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act. This bill will significantly increase the ACA's affordability and subsidies, lower prescription drug prices, expand coverage, and crack down on junk plans, while strengthening protections for people with preexisting conditions and addressing racial health disparities.

The House will also consider, Madam Speaker, H.R. 7301, which is the Emergency Housing Protection and Relief Act of 2020. This bill would authorize nearly \$200 billion for the dire housing needs arising due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

H.R. 7301, which was included in the HEROES Act, would help renters and homeowners by extending the eviction and foreclosure moratoria and providing \$100 billion for emergency rental assistance; \$75 billion for homeowners assistance to cover mortgages, property taxes, and utilities; and more than \$11 billion for homeless assistance programs.

I would again reiterate that that bill passed as a part of the HEROES Act, which is now pending in the Senate.

Lastly, the House will consider H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act. This bill would invest more than \$1.5 trillion in modern, sustainable infrastructure, while creating millions of good-paying jobs; combating the climate crisis; and addressing disparities in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

The bill includes a 5-year reauthorization of the surface transportation program, invests in schools with the Reopen and Rebuild America's Schools Act, invests over \$100 billion in our Nation's affordable housing infrastructure, delivers affordable high-speed broadband internet access to all parts of the country, and promotes new clean renewable energy infrastructure.

We expect, at that point in time, to be out on Thursday for the July Fourth break. I would tell the House that the 2 weeks that will follow the July

ESTABLISHING JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 38

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.

There is established a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies (in this resolution referred to as the "joint committee") consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively. The joint committee is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

The joint committee—  
 (1) is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between the joint committee and the heads of those departments and agencies, in connection with the inaugural proceedings and ceremonies; and

(2) may accept gifts and donations of goods and services to carry out its responsibilities.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1459

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Duncan	Rogers (AL)
Babin	Emmer	Rooney (FL)
Barr	Gallagher	Sensenbrenner
Bishop (UT)	King (IA)	Spano
Brooks (IN)	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Carter (TX)	Marchant	
Curtis	Mullin	

□ 1441

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall No. 120 (Veto message to accompany H.J. Res. 76—Borrower Defense CRA); "yes" on rollcall No. 121 (MTR on H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act); and "no" on rollcall No. 122 (Final Passage of H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 26th, I was unable to be present in the House Chamber to cast my vote on two pieces of legislation. If present, I would have voted "nay" on passage of H.J. Res. 76 (RC 120), "yea" on the Motion to Recommit (RC 121), and "nay" on passage of H.R. 51 (RC 122).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 26, 2020, due to not being in D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "no" on rollcall No. 120; "yes" on rollcall No. 121; and "no" on rollcall 122.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Johnson (TX)	Lofgren (Boyle,
Cárdenas	(Jeffries)	Brendan F.)
(Gomez)	Khanna (Gomez)	Lowenthal
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick	(Beyer)
(Matsui)	(Gallego)	Lowe (Meng)
Deutch (Rice	Langevin	Moore (Beyer)
(NY)	(Lynch)	Napolitano
Engel (Titus)	Lawson (FL)	(Correa)
Frankel (Kuster	(Evans)	Payne
(NH)	Lewis (Kildee)	(Wasserman
Garamendi	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Schultz)
(Boyle,	Lipinski (Cooper)	Pingree (Kuster
Brendan F.)		(NH)