

# OVERSIGHT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

### COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

### U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 18, 2025

**Serial No. 119-50**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: [govinfo.gov](https://www.govinfo.gov), [oversight.house.gov](https://www.oversight.house.gov) or [docs.house.gov](https://www.docs.house.gov)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

61-736 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Chairman*

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| JIM JORDAN, Ohio                | ROBERT GARCIA, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i> |
| MIKE TURNER, Ohio               | ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia               |
| PAUL GOSAR, Arizona             | STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts                           |
| VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina   | RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois                             |
| GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin       | RO KHANNA, California                                     |
| MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas            | KWEISI MFUME, Maryland                                    |
| GARY PALMER, Alabama            | SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio                                       |
| CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana         | MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico                             |
| PETE SESSIONS, Texas            | MAXWELL FROST, Florida                                    |
| ANDY BIGGS, Arizona             | SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania                                  |
| NANCY MACE, South Carolina      | GREG CASAR, Texas   |
| PAT FALLON, Texas               | JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas                                   |
| BYRON DONALDS, Florida          | EMILY RANDALL, Washington                                 |
| SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania       | SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia                               |
| WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina | YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona                                  |
| TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee         | WESLEY BELL, Missouri                                     |
| MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia | LATEEFAH SIMON, California                                |
| LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado        | DAVE MIN, California                                      |
| ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida      | AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts                            |
| NICK LANGWORTHY, New York       | RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan                                   |
| ERIC BURLISON, Missouri         | JAMES WALKINSHAW, Virginia                                |
| ELI CRANE, Arizona              |   |
| BRIAN JACK, Georgia             |   |
| JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia          |   |
| BRANDON GILL, Texas             |   |

---

MARK MARIN, Staff Director  
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director  
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel  
RYAN GIACHETTI, Deputy General Counsel and Parliamentarian  
ALAN BRUBAKER, Senior Advisor  
ASHLII DYER, Senior Counsel  
DANIEL FALCONE, Professional Staff Member  
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk  
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

ROBERT EDMONSON, Minority Staff Director  
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

---

# C O N T E N T S

## OPENING STATEMENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Hon. James Comer, U.S. Representative, Chairman .....         | 2    |
| Hon. Robert Garcia, U.S. Representative, Ranking Member ..... | 3    |

## WITNESSES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| The Honorable Murial Bowser, Mayor, District of Columbia<br>Oral Statement .....   | 6  |
| Mr. Phil Mendelson, Chairman, D.C. City Counsel, District of Columbia<br>Oral Statement .....  | 7  |
| The Honorable Brian Schwalb, Attorney General, District of Columbia<br>Oral Statement .....  | 9  |
| Mr. Gregory Jackson, Jr. (Minority Witness), Former Deputy Director, White<br>House, Office of Gun Violence Prevention and Special Assistant to the<br>President<br>Oral Statement ..... | 11 |

*Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of  
Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.*

## INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- \* Article, *Fines and Fees Justice Center*, “A Real Task Force Can Get DC Moving in the Right Direction”; submitted by Rep. Perry.
- \* Traffic Data, MPDC; submitted by Rep. Perry.
- \* Article, *The Washington Post*, “A Congressman Spared Prison as a Teen Tells DC to be Tough on Youth”; submitted by Rep. Ansari.
- \* Article, *NPR*, “Criminal Records of Jan. 6 Rioters Pardoned”; submitted by Rep. Ansari.
- \* Article, *CNN*, “GOP Governors are Sending Troops to DC”; submitted by Rep. Bell.
- \* Article, *LA Times*, “MAHA Child Health Report Ignores Gun Violence, the Leading Cause of Child Death”; submitted by Rep. Bell.
- \* Article, *The Washington Post*, “Trump Administration Cuts School Mental Health Grants Created After Shootings”; submitted by Rep. Bell.
- \* Article, *AP News*, “U.S. Attorney Will No Longer Bring Felony Charges Against People For Carrying Rifles or Shotguns in DC”; submitted by Rep. Bell.
- \* Article, *Fox News*, “‘Radical’ DC Officials Treated Officers ‘Like Crap,’ Police Leader Says”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Article, *ABC News*, “Murdered Congressional intern’s mom says Trump should take over Washington, DC”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.

- \* Article, *Fox News*, “Trump DC Crime Crackdown Busts Another Alleged Tren De Aragua Gang Member”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Article, *Fox News*, “Trump Executive Order Targets DC Crime As City Hits 12 Days Without Homicide”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Article, *NSSF*, “Yes—Prosecuting & Arresting Criminals Would Have Immediate Impact on D.C.’s Crime”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Letter, from Committee to AG-Schwalb re Gun Store Litigation; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Memorandum, *Maryland—v—Engage—Armament*, Decision and Order; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* H.R. 5371 Continuing Resolution; submitted by Rep. Comer.
- \* Article, *Yahoo News*, “Charlie Kirk Suspect’s Grandma Says Family Is All MAGA”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Democracy Docket*, “I Couldn’t Care Less’ Trump’s Downplaying of Right-Wing Violence”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Newsweek*, “Map Shows US Cities Where Homicide Rates Are Highest”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Third Way*, “The 21st Century Red State Murder Crisis”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *American Prospect*, “The GOP States With Guards Deployed to DC Have Urban Murder Rates Higher Than DC”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Time*, “Trump Called for a Crackdown on the ‘Radical Left.’ But Right-Wing Extremists Are Responsible for More”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *The Washington Post*, “The Good News About Murder”; submitted by Rep. Frost.
- \* Post from Phil Mendelson, X; submitted by Rep. Greene.
- \* Article, *USA Today*, “DC National Guard Deployment to Cost \$200M as Soldiers Pick Up Trash, Blow Leaves”; submitted by Rep. Min.
- \* Article, *WTOP*, “DC Still Waits for Congress to Restore \$1 Billion in Funding During Crime Crackdown”; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Letter, from Donald Sherman, to Subcommittee in Support of HRes 115 CREW DC; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Letter, to Subcommittee in Support of Constitutionality of Statehood for Washington D.C.; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Letter, from NUL—GWUL, to Subcommittee in Support of DC; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Letter, from DC Vote Coalition, to Subcommittee in Support of DC Statehood; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Letter, from Brady, to Subcommittee Opposing Restricting Autonomy of DC; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Sign-on Letter, from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, to Subcommittee on DC Policing Takeover; submitted by Rep. Norton.

- \* Statement for the Record from Burger; submitted by Rep. Norton.
- \* Article, *The Hill*, “Most Oppose Trump Deploying National Guard to DC—Other Cities—Poll”; submitted by Rep. Simon.
- \* Article, *Reuters*, “US Justice Dept Grant Cuts Valued at \$811 Million”; submitted by Rep. Simon.
- \* Article, *Vox*, “Laboratories of Democracy Washington, DC Showed How to do Universal Pre-K Right”; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- \* Article, *ABC News*, “Prosecutors Already Have Dropped Nearly A Dozen Cases From Trump’s DC Crime Surge”; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- \* Article, *The Washington Post*, “We Asked 604 D.C. Residents About Trump’s Takeover. Here’s What They Said”; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.

*The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.*

#### ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

- \* Questions for the Record: Hon. Muriel Bowser; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- \* Questions for the Record: Mr. Phil Mendelson; submitted by Rep. McGuire.
- \* Questions for the Record: Attorney General Schwalb; submitted by Rep. Biggs.

*These documents were submitted after the hearing, and may be available upon request.*



# OVERSIGHT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2025

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
*Washington, D.C.*

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., Room HVC-210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. James Comer, [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Cloud, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, Fallon, Donalds, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, Boebert, Luna, Langworthy, Burlison, Crane, Jack, McGuire, Gill, Garcia, Norton, Lynch, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Brown, Stansbury, Frost, Lee, Casar, Crockett, Randall, Subramanyam, Ansari, Bell, Simon, Min, Walkinshaw, Pressley, and Tlaib.

Chairman COMER. This hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will come to order. I want to welcome everyone here today.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

The first order of business is to welcome our newest Member to the House Oversight Committee, Representative Walkinshaw of Virginia, to the Committee. Congressman Walkinshaw has recently joined the House, taking the seat of our dear friend, the former Ranking Member, Gerry Connolly. Congressman Walkinshaw served Mr. Connolly as his chief of staff for ten years, from 2009 to 2019. He then continued his public service as a member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, which he served on from 2020 to 2025.

Gerry Connolly will always be remembered fondly by both sides of the aisle for his service, and I welcome Congressman Walkinshaw as he follows those footsteps. Welcome, sir.

I now recognize Ranking Member Garcia for brief remarks on Walkinshaw.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, also, of course, want to welcome our new Congressman and, of course, our new Representative here on Oversight Democrats, but also just for the people of Virginia. This is someone, of course, that has got great experience in the Congress, having served as the chief of staff, of course, to the late Gerry Connolly, and we welcome him to Oversight and are excited about his work.

So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Next order of business is ratifying the new Subcommittee roster. The clerks have distributed the roster electronically. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee approve the appointments and assignments as shown on the roster. Without objection, the Subcommittee roster is approved.

I would also like to congratulate Mayor Bowser and the D.C. Council on yesterday's passage of the RFK Stadium deal to bring the Washington Commanders back home to Washington, D.C. Congratulations. That is a big deal. This historic private investment will bring crucial jobs and opportunities to the District. I look forward to working with the District on other issues moving forward, including the critical crime crisis we are discussing here today.

I now recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JAMES COMER  
REPRESENTATIVE FROM KENTUCKY**

Chairman COMER. It has been one week since the conclusion of President Trump's historic crackdown on crime in our Nation's capital, and the results are in. Since President Trump mobilized the National Guard and took control of the Metropolitan Police Department, violent crime has decreased 39 percent, robberies are down 57 percent, and carjackings are down 75 percent. Over 2,300 people have been arrested. Nearly 950 illegal aliens have been detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), including 20 gang members from violent terrorist organizations. Sex offenders have been taken off the streets. Major drug trafficking operations have been foiled. Authorities thwarted a planned school shooting, cleared 50 illegal tent encampments, and rescued seven missing children. President Trump's operation was a resounding success and a shining example of how smart-on-crime policies can keep the residents of and visitors to our Nation's capital safe.

Prior to President Trump's crackdown on crime, Washington, D.C., was suffering from soaring crime rates as high as the violent 1990s. According to 2024 data, Washington, D.C., has the second highest homicide rate, behind only to Detroit among U.S. cities with under a million people. That rate is also higher than many capital cities across the globe.

These high crime rates are largely driven by historically high rates of juvenile crime, which were enabled by ultra-progressive, soft-on-crime policies enacted by the D.C. Council and supported by the D.C. Attorney General. In 2018, the D.C. Council amended the Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act of 1985, allowing for adults 24 years of age and under to be prosecuted as juveniles for many, even violent, crimes, leading to more lenient sentences. The D.C. Council also passed laws in recent years that lowered statutory penalties for violent crimes, eliminated mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes except first-degree murder, and eliminated life sentences entirely.

The D.C. Council recently passed laws that greatly hampered the ability of the Metropolitan Police to pursue and apprehend criminals. Officers cannot execute their duties as effectively, leaving morale, retention, and recruitment numbers at historic lows for the Metropolitan Police Department. These actions send every signal to

criminals, especially juveniles, that they can commit crimes in the District without accountability.

D.C. residents overwhelmingly agree that juveniles who commit violent crimes should face sentences that are proportional to their crimes. Yet, the D.C. Attorney General has far too often declined to prosecute juveniles who commit these crimes, justifying his dangerous decisions by saying “We cannot prosecute our way out of this,” and that “kids are kids.”

Recently, when asked about out-of-control juvenile crime in D.C. and the Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act, the D.C. Attorney General said, and I quote again, “Our laws are working, and the prosecution is working.” Victims of violent crimes and their families might disagree with that assessment. Congressional intern Eric Tarpinian-Jachym was viciously murdered in June while he was simply walking down the street, an innocent bystander caught in the crossfire. Two 17-year-olds were finally arrested just the other week for killing Eric, while a third suspect, an 18-year-old, is still at large. The U.S. Attorney for D.C. revealed that all three of these vicious murderers have prior violent juvenile records. Had they been accountable, Eric’s murder might have been prevented.

Members of Congress and staff have been assaulted, carjacked, and have witnessed violent and traumatic criminal acts. One Member of Congress was assaulted in her residence. Another was carjacked at gunpoint. Congressional staff have been victims of armed robbery and carjackings, threatened at knifepoint, assaulted at gunpoint while walking home, and stabbed in the head while leaving dinner. One of my former professional staff members for the Oversight Committee personally witnessed not one but two separate murders in the District during his tenure with us, one at a Navy Yard restaurant in 2022 and another at a Metro station on his way into the office in 2023.

The left-wing politicians who say that D.C. does not have a crime problem are either delusional or simply lying to the American people. This body must ensure that the progress made by the President’s recent actions endures. That is why last week, this Committee passed 14 vital pieces of legislation to restore public safety to the residents and visitors of D.C.

While we urge final passage of these bills, the Committee also recognizes that the witnesses before us need to do their part to help ensure D.C. residents and visitors are safe. I look very forward to hearing from each of our witnesses as to how they plan to work with Congress and the Trump Administration to do so.

I now yield to the Ranking Member for his opening remark.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER ROBERT GARCIA  
REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA**

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Chairman Comer.

Of course, Mayor Bowser, Mr. Chairman, Mr. AG, Mr. Jackson, thank you all for being here today, and of course, most importantly, for your service to Washington, D.C., and to the country.

And I want to start just by setting the record straight. Washington, D.C., is a great American city of over 700,000 residents. D.C. has more residents than we know than two states. D.C., as a whole, contributes more Federal taxes than 12 states, and it pays

more in Federal income tax than 19 other states. More than 8,000 Washington, D.C., residents serve in our military, and we thank them for their service. But these servicemen and women also do not have full democratic representation. They deserve the right and the ability to govern themselves.

Now, we also know that crime in D.C. has fallen for the last two years, and we all here support public safety. We all want cops to patrol our streets. We all want communities to feel safe. And we also know that flooding the city with troops is not sustainable. So, look—and I have said this many times—President Trump is obsessed with trying to run Washington, D.C., and if President Trump wants to run Washington, D.C., he should resign as President and run for Mayor.

Now, I was a mayor of Long Beach, my hometown, before I came to Congress for eight years. I love local government. We should, of course, all of us, spend our time working with local elected officials. And Congress should not be undermining the elected representatives and the people of Washington, D.C. And if the Majority today wants to talk about crime in D.C., in the District, we are happy to talk about crime in D.C.

We know that some of the worst crime and corruption in D.C. is actually found at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. President Trump is profiting from his office more than anyone in history. Through his crypto gifts, he has profited \$1.2 billion. He has denied the rights of American citizens and deported people illegally without due process. He has broken the law to deploy soldiers on the streets of Los Angeles. He has abused his power and canceled Federal spending and intimidated Americans who disagree with him, whether you are a scientist, an elected official, or a late-night talk show host. And he is trying to illegally grab control of the Federal Reserve. He has illegally imposed tariffs. He is ripping away healthcare from 17 million Americans. All the while, he pretends to be tough on crime. And we know that in his first days in office, Donald Trump pardoned hundreds of his followers who beat, tased, and attacked brave D.C. and U.S. Capitol Police.

And right now, since we are talking about crime and corruption in D.C., as we speak, Trump is leading a White House coverup of the Epstein files. Now, just yesterday, Trump's FBI Director falsely claimed that he could not release the files, which we know is false.

And let us review the facts. Epstein told the reporter that Trump was his closest friend for ten years. One survivor also said that Epstein's biggest brag was he was very good friends with Donald Trump. In fact, there was an 8x10 picture framed of Trump on his desk. We know the two are very close.

And just last week, our Committee released the birthday note that Trump personally wrote to Epstein. It is right here. The note said, by the way—and I will read it—"May every day be another wonderful secret." That is a disgusting message to send to a sex trafficker.

Now, the cover-up of this note might be just as bad as the crime since we are talking about crime in Washington, D.C., today. Trump filed a \$10 billion lawsuit to punish *The Wall Street Journal* for reporting on the birthday book, which he claimed did not exist. Now, of course, we have verified that to the world.

Now, experts have looked at this. Of course, this is Donald Trump's signature. It certainly looks like the signature to me. At the same time, his Administration is cutting deals with a criminal, Ghislaine Maxwell. We know who she is exactly. She is a monster who participated in crimes against up to over possibly 1,000 women.

Now, Trump and our Attorney General have not turned over the full Epstein file to our Committee, despite a bipartisan subpoena signed by our Chairman and this Committee. If we want to get tough on crime, if we want to talk about crime in D.C., we need to stand up to where the crime and corruption is happening, and that is at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and hold Donald Trump accountable for his record and his actions. It is time for the House Majority and Republicans to stand up for the Constitution and take on the biggest crime happening in this country. It is time to release the Epstein files.

And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Our witnesses today include three current District of Columbia government officials and one former official from the Biden Administration. First of all, we are very honored to have Washington, D.C. Mayor, Muriel Bowser, here. Mayor Bowser was sworn into office on January 2, 2015, and began her third term on January 2, 2023. Welcome, Mayor Bowser.

Next, we have Phil Mendelson, Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia. He was sworn into office as Chair on June 13, 2012. His fifth term as chair began on January 2, 2023. Mr. Mendelson has been a member of the D.C. Council since 1999. Welcome.

Next, we have Brian Schwalb, Attorney General of the District of Columbia. He was sworn into office on January 2, 2023. Welcome, sir.

And finally, we have Gregory Jackson. Mr. Jackson served as the Deputy Director of the White House of Gun Violence Prevention and Special Assistant to the President during the Biden Administration.

Again, thank you all for joining us. I look forward to this discussion today. I will say again, the purpose of this hearing is to try to determine solutions to the crime crisis in Washington, D.C., and how we can work together to make sure that the District is safe for all the residents and all the visitors who come here on a daily basis from all over the world.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative, and thank you all. You may take a seat.

We appreciate you being here today and look forward to your testimony. Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statement, and they will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statement to 5 minutes.

As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes have expired, and we would ask that you please wrap up.

I now ask Mayor Bowser to begin the opening statement segment of this hearing. And Mayor Bowser, the floor is yours.

**STATEMENT OF MURIAL BOWSER  
MAYOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Garcia, and Members of the Committee, I am Muriel Bowser. I am Mayor of Washington, D.C., and I am joined by the Chairman of the D.C. Council, Phil Mendelson; and the Attorney General for the District, Brian Schwalb.

I am pleased to be here today to report on the state of the District. First, a bit of a primer about my hometown. As you know, in 1973, Congress passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, creating a local government with an elected Mayor and elected City Council. We are represented in this body by a mighty warrior, Eleanor Holmes Norton, but she does not have a vote, and we have no representation in the Senate.

D.C. residents are full-blooded, tax-paying Americans. We are a donor state. We give more to the Federal Government than we get back. We have all the responsibilities of citizenship but not the most important benefits, representation and full autonomy.

I am proud to report that the state of the District is strong, and while we face macroeconomic headwinds, with our continued sound financial management and your help, our economic growth outlook can improve.

I recently sent to the Council our 30th consecutive balanced budget with no new taxes or fees, a budget that reflects the sober reality of our time, declining revenues due to the unfortunate continuation of remote work, the reduction and relocation of D.C.-based Federal workers, and other macroeconomic shifts. In 2024, we had the fastest-growing population in the Nation. Our schools grew in enrollment and achievement. Our parks system was rated number one. Over 27 million people visited our city, besting our previous record. Our Metro system rebounded faster than other transit systems in the Nation, and we drove down violent crime by 35 percent.

Let me say something about our public safety ecosystem. It is unique. Like what happened in most jurisdictions across the country post-COVID, we experienced a violent crime spike in 2023. When I was last here, I explained how we would drive down those trends, and it is working. Today, compared to 2023, burglaries are down 34 percent; theft, motor vehicle theft 37 percent; homicide down 44 percent, robberies down 60 percent; and carjackings are down 71 percent. Overall, violent crime is down 53 percent compared to 2023. And in the recent Federal surge, we accelerated those gains, including a one-month reduction in carjackings of 75 percent.

In my last visit, I also explained the peculiarities of our system. We are very proud of the men and women of The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) who commit their lives to protecting the Nation's capital, and they have my commitment to get back up to 4,000 officers with critical changes to our policy environment, a 13 percent raise, and enhanced recruitment efforts.

MPD makes arrests. Most adult cases, however, are prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney for D.C., who is part of the United States Department of Justice. Our youth offenders are prosecuted locally by our attorney general, and our Department of Youth and Rehabilitation Services, a local agency, is responsible for their commitment.

But our youth and adult offenders are supervised by Federal agencies. D.C. jail is local, but most of our residents who are committed to detention are in Federal facilities across the Nation. Our judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. We currently have 13 vacancies.

As I have told you, we are putting every resource necessary toward public safety. I have authorized the Chief to use the overtime necessary to make sure we have adequate police on the streets. We spent 1.8 million hours of overtime last year at a cost to us of \$75 million.

I have also reported to you previously that we engage regularly with regional and Federal partnerships, including the United States Attorney, the FBI, and the ATF. And that is why we will continue to use enhanced Federal resources, as outlined in my Mayor's order, creating the D.C. Safe and Beautiful Emergency Task Force.

In 2023 and in the years since, we pushed for legislation to rebalance our public safety ecosystem, including the Secure D.C. Omnibus.

I am out of time now, Mr. Chairman, but throughout the questions, I hope to also explain to you other ways that the Congress can be helpful, including helping us get back to 4,000 officers, fully funding the President's—when it comes—request for beautification and safety efforts in D.C. to support America250, helping with our homeless services, especially bridge housing that is working to get people off the streets.

And finally, as we were able to do, Mr. Chairman, with the RFK legislation, there are finance and economic resilience opportunities, like creating an opportunity zone, or D.C.'s Act 60, like Puerto Rico's, to ensure the economic resilience of the Nation's capital.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. Very good.

I now recognize Chairman Mendelson for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF PHIL MENDELSON, CHAIRMAN  
D.C. CITY COUNSEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. MENDELSON. Thank you, Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Garcia, Congresswoman Norton, Members of the Committee. I am Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia. Our form of government is nearly identical to yours. The Council's relationship to the Mayor is the same as yours to the President. I am pleased to testify and to finally present our views on matters that are clearly of concern to the Committee.

We are a beautiful city. Our public parks are well maintained. Our roads are in good condition. We have a world-class public transit system. Our public education system is a leader in the country in terms of choice and a leader among large city systems in terms of growth and academic achievement.

Political rhetoric notwithstanding, criminal activity has been on the decline, with violent crime dipping to a 30-year low last year and even lower this year. The percentage of our citizens with health insurance is one of the highest in the country. Public lands, public transit, public education, public safety, public health, core functions of government, and we are doing well.

And we are well-managed. We adopt a balanced budget on time every year. We spend within our budget every year. We have had clean audits every year. We continue to maintain strong cash reserves. All of our pension programs are fully funded. And we continue to maintain AAA and AA-plus financial ratings despite Wall Street's express concern over the negative economic impact of Federal actions.

Despite these pluses, we are a city under siege. It is frustrating to watch this Committee debate and vote on 14 bills regarding the District without a single public hearing, with no input from District officials or the public, without regard for community impact, nor a shred of analysis including legal sufficiency or fiscal impact.

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, less competitive, and less responsive to the needs of a highly complex, unique local government that serves local, county, and state functions. The SOAR Improvements Act would actually hurt 50,000 schoolkids in the District by defunding the D.C. public school system by approximately \$17.5 million. It also would void a longstanding compromise agreed to by Congress with District officials.

H.R. 5140, the Juvenile Sentencing Reform Act, is actually criminogenic. Data suggests that juveniles tried as adults are not scared straight, but rather are more likely to reoffend sooner and more often than those treated in the juvenile system. Moreover, you criticize the Council for being soft on crime, but the current age thresholds this bill repudiates were enacted by Congress.

Over the last several years, the Council has taken steps to strengthen our criminal laws, and I will note that we have been able to pass these bills while Congress has not. For instance, we have strengthened the probability of pretrial detention. Even before we did that, the re-arrest rate for individuals released pretrial was among the lowest in the country.

We have strengthened, by clarifying and imposing new penalties, the criminal laws including shoplifting, carjacking, strangulation, and felony endangerment with a firearm. We have reinstated police resource officers in our schools, and we have taken a number of steps to support our police, including approving, just yesterday, a 13-percent pay raise for police officers and approving hiring incentives to increase the ranks of our police force. And we are about to adopt a deferred retirement option program to make service more attractive and to incentivize officers to stay longer.

Instead of blaming the Council, there are tangible actions we need from you because our public safety system is part Federal.

For instance, the greatest deterrents to crime are “arrest and prosecute,” but the U.S. Attorney prosecutes our criminals. And the best way to reduce recidivism is prison programming, but the U.S. Bureau of Prisons is responsible for this. And to further reduce rearrests for ex-offenders and pretrial suspects, we need two Federal agencies, The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) and Pretrial Services, better resourced.

If Congress really wants to further reduce crime in the District of Columbia, here is what you can do: fill Offices of United States Attorneys (USAO) vacancies, double the funding we already provide for MPD hiring bonuses, adequately fund CSOSA and the Pretrial Services Agency, fully reimburse MPD for protecting the Federal presence. The underfunding by Congress over the last four fiscal years totals \$83 million. Submit and confirm our judicial nominees. Our courts have a 20-percent vacancy rate in judges, backlogging the criminal docket. Amend the Federal Privacy Act so that more data can be shared between Federal and local law enforcement agencies. Allow our local attorney general to prosecute all misdemeanors because the United States Attorney usually does not. And help us pay for a new jail, which houses Federal prisoners, just as Congress helped pay for a new forensic lab 15 years ago.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I appreciate the Committee’s attention, and I also want to welcome Congressman Garcia as the new Ranking Member.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

I now recognize General Schwalb for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF BRIAN SCHWALB  
ATTORNEY GENERAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. SCHWALB. Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Garcia, Congresswoman Norton, Members of the Committee, I am Brian Schwalb, D.C. Attorney General, and I am pleased to testify about the work my office is doing to advance the District’s interests and to make Washington, D.C., safer and more affordable for everyone.

I am a third-generation Washingtonian. My wife and I raised our three daughters here. I love this city. Just like your home districts, D.C. is made up of vibrant neighborhoods, hardworking, talented people who are the backbone of our culture and our economy. We are small business owners, veterans, teachers, nurses, and police officers, committed civil servants. We are Americans who deserve the same freedom to govern ourselves as your constituents enjoy.

But unlike your constituents who benefit from having you here to advance their interests, the more than 700,000 residents who call D.C. home have no vote in Congress. We do, however, have elected local leaders, including an elected attorney general.

As Attorney General, I am committed to ensuring Washingtonians have a first-rate public law office, enforcing their laws, protecting their taxpayer dollars, and advancing the public interest. My office handles thousands of matters across an array of issues, from enforcing child support orders and protecting domestic violence victims to holding companies accountable for fueling the opioid crisis. We protect seniors and consumers from scams. We go after slumlords. We defend district agencies, including our police

department, securing and saving hundreds of millions of dollars every year. Nothing is more important to the work we do than making the District safer for everyone who lives here, works here, and visits here.

As you have heard, D.C.'s criminal justice system is unique, and its structure is often a source of confusion. Unlike anywhere else in the country, the responsibility for prosecuting local crime in the District is divided between the Federal Government; the United States Attorney's Office, which handles all adult felonies and most adult misdemeanors; and my office, which prosecutes juvenile delinquency cases and certain adult misdemeanors. Because the vast majority of crime in the District of Columbia is committed by adults, not juveniles, it is the U.S. Attorney's Office that handles the vast majority of prosecution.

Despite our limited jurisdiction, we take our responsibility over juvenile prosecution seriously. Our attorneys aggressively prosecute violent juvenile offenses whenever there is sufficient evidence to meet the burden of proof. Kids must face consequences, swift and certain consequences, when they break the law. And our prosecutors work every day to hold them accountable and ensure victims receive justice.

Last year, we prosecuted 84 percent of all violent juvenile cases, including over 90 percent of homicides and attempted homicides, 87 percent of carjackings, and 86 percent of gun cases. Crime rates last year reached 30-year lows and have continued to decline this year, but there is more work to be done. We must continue to pursue a comprehensive public safety strategy. Effective policing and prosecution are critical, so too are preventive efforts designed to stop crime before it happens. Keeping people safe is not a choice between law enforcement or prevention. We must do both.

As the Nation's capital, public safety in the District has always required a strong working partnership with Federal law enforcement, regardless of who is in the White House. We have worked and will continue to work closely with our Federal law enforcement partners every day. But declarations of emergency and unilateral Federal actions, taken without coordination or advance warning, do not promote long-term public safety.

Sending masked agents in unmarked cars to pick people off the streets, flooding our neighborhoods with National Guardsmen who are untrained in local policing, attempting a Federal takeover of our police force, none of these are durable, long-lasting solutions for driving crime down. In fact, they threaten to destroy critical trust between local communities and the police, trust which is essential to effective, efficient policing and prosecution.

There are constructive ways the Federal Government can work with us to continue driving crime down. For example, Congress can help combat the flood of illegal guns pouring into our city. Ninety-five percent of illegal guns that end up on our streets come from outside the District. We also need help filling long-standing judicial vacancies, confirming our highly qualified nominees. The vacancy crisis has led to severe case backlogs, with felony cases being scheduled into 2027, resulting in delayed justice for crime victims and the community. Finally, Congress could help by investing desperately needed services in facilities like a psychiatric residential

treatment facility for youth with serious mental and behavioral health issues that often contribute to crime.

All of us, D.C.'s elected officials, Members of Congress, we have a shared goal, a shared goal of continuing to make durable improvements to public safety in the District of Columbia. I and my office are ready to have serious discussions on how best to do that with anybody who is willing in good faith and in the spirit of partnership to have them with us.

Thank you for having me here today.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, General.

And I will recognize Mr. Jackson for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF GREGORY JACKSON, JR. (MINORITY WITNESS)  
FORMER DEPUTY DIRECTOR, WHITE HOUSE  
OFFICE OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION  
AND SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT**

Mr. JACKSON. All right. Thank you, Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Garcia, Congresswoman Norton, and the Committee for having me. I am Greg Jackson, a D.C. resident, a survivor of gun violence, and the former Deputy Director for the first-ever White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention. This was an office that coordinated Federal resources, implemented lifesaving policies, and coordinated with local leaders to achieve a 13.2 percent reduction in violent crime and a 31 percent reduction in homicides nationwide in just two years.

I spent the last decade of my life working to address this crisis, from consoling a mother who lost her 10-year-old who was buying ice cream in D.C., to walking the hallways in Parkland with families that lost their loved ones to school shootings. And we have seen firsthand how this is destroying too many families in our country. This is now the leading cause of death for youth in America, the leading cause of death for pregnant women in America, and now the leading cause of death for newly disabled Americans.

With one in five Americans being impacted by this violence, this is also personal for me. I am a survivor of gun violence. When I was shot, the bullet hit two arteries. I have also lost my teenage mentee, DeMarcos, from a shooting. And I have also sat with families throughout this district.

Despite this crisis we face, the last few years have shown us that we do have solutions that work. In the previous two years, D.C. and cities across the country have seen historic reductions in gun violence without the deployment of masked agents or the military. We did this by investing in prevention and intervention efforts to communities at risk and strategically investing in law enforcement to keep illegal guns off of our streets and to close homicides.

Recently, even the current FBI Director, Kash Patel, celebrated historic levels—or historic reductions in violent crime, but we know that is not the product of a few months of troops or FBI actions. They are the result of billions in prevention resources, law enforcement and community leaders risking their lives every day, as well as the transformative policies implemented over the last few years.

Without masked agents and troop deployments, we have seen homicides drop 54 percent in Baltimore, 20 percent in Atlanta, 41 percent in Phoenix, 27 percent in Los Angeles, and as shared by

district leadership, violent crime in D.C. is down by 53 percent. We got here in major part because Republicans and Democrats came together to enact a bipartisan law that provided historic resources for violence prevention, law enforcement strategies, as well as enhanced our background check system for those under 21, preventing domestic abusers from accessing guns, making the largest investment in youth mental health in history, as well as community violence intervention, and making gun trafficking a Federal crime, prosecuting those who are flooding guns into our communities. These strategies, in partnership with local leaders, reduced homicides, again, by 31 percent and mass shootings by 20 percent in our country.

As our communities have been fighting our way out of this crisis, we find ourselves at a dangerous crossroad. Instead of adding more Federal resources to solutions that work, the Trump Administration has dismantled and defunded bipartisan strategies passed into law to reduce violence. They shut down the White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention. They defunded law enforcement, including the ATF. They cut over \$1 billion in mental health resources for our schools, terminated \$812 million in funding for community violence intervention programs, defunded gun violence research, shut down the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Firearm Injury Center, dismantled important regulations like the zero tolerance policy for gun dealers, and now plans to further defund critical resources to address the root causes of violence, like housing, employment, and healthcare.

And here in D.C., the Administration and Congress' actions have been extremely harmful, withholding over \$1 billion of D.C. local tax dollars, undermining our leadership, and flooding our neighborhoods with military to instill fear in everyday Americans.

Look, I live in Ward 8, a community that the White House has called a slum. But for us, this is a neighborhood where we walk our dogs, we listen to jazz on Sundays, we grill out during the summers, and most importantly, like any neighborhood, we support each other. But since this D.C. Trump takeover, we hear sirens nightly, we have seen buildings raided daily, like the building of young Makai, who is sitting behind me. We have seen elderly harassed on their porch, and now even traffic jams from the flood of police and military on our streets. This deployment of Federal troops that is essentially making us feel hostage in our own homes is not the Federal support we need. And most importantly, it is costly, costing our country an estimated \$200 million for one city alone.

To be tough on crime, we need a different approach. We need a Federal law enforcement that focuses on keeping guns out of our communities in the first place. We need to be tough on crime by fully funding the ATF to catch gun traffickers, to shut down rogue gun dealers, to disrupt dangerous black markets of firearms. To be tough on crime, we need to protect and fund the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act that was passed and is working. To be tough on crime, we must hold the billionaires accountable that have put weapons from the battlefield into our backyards. And to be tough on crime, we must fund resources for communities that are most at risk to prevent violence before it happens.

We have real solutions to save lives from gun violence and reduce violent crime, and now is the time to protect that progress and continue to build on that momentum.

Thank you.

And Chairman, if you will, I do want to request, we had a really terrible tragedy last night where five officers were shot and three were lost, and I would kindly like to request we honor them with a moment of silence if you will.

Chairman COMER. Absolutely. Join me in a moment of silence.

[Moment of silence.]

Chairman COMER. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Jackson.

That concludes our opening statements. We are now going to proceed with questions. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Dr. Gosar, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mayor Bowser.

I often say that trust is a series of promises kept, and it has been made clear that Congress cannot trust a swamp to enforce the rule of law. Last week, this Committee passed my bill, the District of Columbia's Home Rule Improvement Act, to ensure our Nation's capital is safe, stable, and governed responsibly.

Congressional oversight is vital to rehabilitate the District of Columbia from its chronic crime epidemic and restore law and order. Failed leadership, soft-on-crime policies, rampant corruption has left D.C. more dangerous than war-torn Baghdad. This Committee's investigation reveals Metro PD falsified crime statistics, while the Attorney General's Office seals the juvenile criminals' records to protect those so-called minors. But let us be honest, they are not kids. These are 24-year-old criminals.

By allowing adults to be tried as minors, Washington, D.C., is aiding and abetting criminal activity that threatens the lives of residents, visitors, and everyone who works in our Nation's capital. Washington, D.C., must earn back the trust of President Trump and Congress, but it does not happen just by blatantly manipulating crime statistics, seeking politically motivated litigation, and spending irresponsibly.

Mayor Bowser, I must tell you, I have never felt safer in D.C. There is a record-low crime rate and increasing gang-related arrests and friendly National Guardsmen patrolling the streets. Why is D.C. safer now than it was 38 days ago?

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you for the question, Congressman. And as I explained, and as I explained when we were here two years ago, it is true that we experienced, like many places, a spike in 2023. I can say unequivocally, this is not 2023. In each of the past two years, we have driven down crime. In 2023, we finished the year 35 percent down. Last year, we finished the year, I believe, 24 percent down. And all throughout this year, we were driving down to more than a 20 percent decrease in violent crime.

I have also testified that, during the surge, we experienced many hundreds of Federal officers, Federal officers and agencies that we typically work with. And we did experience further decreases in all categories. The most substantial was in carjackings.

Mr. GOSAR. Got it. Now, Chairman Mendelson, you voted in favor of the Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act of 2013, right?

Mr. MENDELSON. Correct.

Mr. GOSAR. Okay. Now, if this bill allows adults under 25 years of age to be prosecuted as minors, in 2023, you testified before this Committee that there was no crime crisis in D.C. Now, if there is no crime crisis, then why did you establish the D.C. Violence Fatality Review Committee back in 2018, right before passing the Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act? In fact—hold on. I am not done yet.

Mr. MENDELSON. Sure.

Mr. GOSAR. In fact, this review Committee, according to the D.C. Code, chapter 14A, is tasked with examining crimes against adults 19 years old and older. This makes no sense.

So, Chairman, are 19-year-olds only considered adults when they are victims, not the criminals creating more and more violent crimes? Your Juvenile Curfew Emergency Declaration Resolution of 2025 states, “Since 2023, the District has seen a rise in unruly behavior by juveniles.” Which is it? Yes or no? Do you admit that there has been a rise in juvenile crime here in D.C. under President Trump’s declared public safety emergency?

Mr. MENDELSON. That there has been an increase in juvenile crime in the last month? I have not seen the data. I do not think so, though.

Mr. GOSAR. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. But let me just say that the Youth Rehabilitation Act does not allow minors to be—excuse me, adults to be prosecuted as minors. They are still prosecuted as adults.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, I mean, it is very confusing when you have the definition of a minor is 25 and under. And then your statistics—actually, you look at victims at 19 years and younger, so it has to be a statistic—see, statistically, you can make anything work with statistics.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well—

Mr. GOSAR. So, it has got to be one way or the other.

Mr. MENDELSON. As you know, each law sometimes has its own definition. So, for purposes of YRA sentencing, we define younger adults under 24. But that is not the same as they are being prosecuted as juveniles. Our criminal code is quite clear that anyone who is under 18 is prosecuted as a juvenile unless they are for the most serious crimes, murder and sexual crimes, they are, by the U.S. Attorney, chosen to be prosecuted as adults.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia from California.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Chairman Comer.

I want to just, also, say this clearly, and I know that we all believe this. Violent crime, we know, has no place in our communities. People absolutely have a right to be concerned about crime. As a former mayor—and a lot of us have been in local government—we know that those concerns are real on the ground.

Now, Democrats believe in investing in solutions that actually make people safer. Now, Mayor Bowser, Chairman Mendelson, Attorney General Schwalb, now can each of you just confirm with a yes or a no that you agree with me that, one, we need to make sure that we have local officers on the beat; that two, that we are investing in community partnerships and organizations on the ground; and three, that we are building trust with law enforcement. Are those things important, Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. AG Schwalb?

Mr. SCHWALB. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Now, Mr. Jackson, is it also true that President Trump has actually destroyed and eliminated many of the programs which fight gun violence and save lives?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARCIA. And did President Trump also not eliminate the Office of Gun Violence Prevention, of which, of course, you were very involved in leading?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. And also, Mr. Jackson, is it not true that the Office of Gun Violence Prevention and the other work in the Administration was literally focused on making this country safer?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. GARCIA. Now, Mayor Bowser, as a former mayor, I know how hard, of course, you are working to keep people safe. You have said that masked ICE agents on the streets of D.C. are not helping, which I appreciate and all of us appreciate. And of course, today, we could be talking about more community policing. We could be talking about illegal guns. We could be talking about real partnerships and fully funding Washington, D.C., but we cannot do that, of course because the Majority continues to ignore the crimes and corruption at 1600 Pennsylvania and the corruption of this Administration.

Now, we cannot pull out a full map of Washington, D.C., but there are other corruption hotspots across the District. Now, let us look right next door to the White House. Here is the headquarters of the Office of Management and Budget, just next door. OMB ordered the unlawful freezing of more than \$425 billion in congressionally authorized funds. This obviates the law. It is corruption. It is a crime. This has hurt communities in D.C. and across the country. They are blocking funds for energy, education, law enforcement, and much more.

Now, let us go down the map a few miles south. Here is the Department of Homeland Security, where Secretary Noem has ordered unlawful deportations and unleashed masked Federal agents to harm innocent people across the country. And we have no idea, by the way, of who is following and who is not. Who is following what rule? Who is not? What we do know is that the legal rights of people and due process is being ignored.

If we go up the map back to the north on Maryland Avenue, we have the Department of Education, also in D.C., more crimes and

corruption. Here, the Trump Administration illegally froze billions of dollars of K-12 and adult education funding. They even froze funding for mental health. And they are trying to illegally dissolve the agency in violation of the law, again, more crimes and corruption in Washington, D.C. This would devastate children across the country, especially those with disabilities.

Now, if we go back downtown, here is the Department of Commerce, where Trump and the Secretary are breaking the law by illegally imposing tariffs without congressional approval. And all is being done in violation of the law, according to the U.S. Court of Appeals.

And finally, if we go across the river, another part of D.C., to the Pentagon, Secretary Hegseth is politicizing the military. He leaked classified information, putting Americans in uniform at risk. And he has illegally seized control of the National Guard and ordered soldiers to illegally engage in law enforcement activities.

And so, we can map D.C. We can map where crimes are happening. We can map where corruption is happening. This, of course, as all we know, is just the tip of the iceberg.

Now, we could list nearly every agency across the government and every Federal building on a map at where crimes and corruption are happening in the District. But we will not, in this process, be silent where this crime and corruption is happening.

I want to thank, again, all of our witnesses for your work to lower crime in the District and to lower the temperature across your population. I thank you all very much.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Grothman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you very much.

I will point out this idea of crime going up or down, crime, it depends what year you take as your base here. I guess in Washington, D.C., the all-time high was in 1992, where we had 482 murders. That is just almost beyond belief. Last year, we had 187. If you go back ten years to 2014, we had 105. So, you could say the murder rate almost doubled or you could look at, you know, what we were at 220 and say it fell dramatically. But in any event, I think the number of murders in Washington, D.C., is an embarrassment. The amount of crime is an embarrassment.

Now, I guess the thing is what we are doing to solve it, and we just heard four experts apparently on the topic give their opinion. I, sometimes, when I am back in my district, which is not Washington, D.C., do ride-alongs with local police, local sheriffs, local police, what have you. And I ask them what the cause is of crime. And almost uniformly, they talk about the breakdown in the family and how families are not as strong as they once were. It is how there are not fathers in the family. And I think if you look at statistics, which are hard to find on the background of people committing crimes, you frequently look at, what I would describe as, weak families and fatherless families.

Nevertheless, four of you in your prepared statements have talked about what we are doing to reduce crime. Not one of you mentioned the decline of the role of the father in the family over the last—it has been just getting worse over the last 60 years. I

would like to ask you, are any of you doing anything to try to keep more fathers at home and being mentors for these kids? The vast majority of murders are committed by males. Are you doing anything along the line to get the fathers back in the home?

Ms. BOWSER. Congressman, let me answer that by saying we—and I know that I focused a lot on our law enforcement efforts, but we commit to and invest in a lot of prevention efforts as well, from incredible and effective funding of our public schools to our—

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes, I only got 5 minutes.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, to—

Mr. GROTHMAN. We have got to address the topic.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. What are we doing to get fathers in the home?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, sir, we take the position that we support families in whatever form they come in, and we make investments that the government is responsible for, great schools, great healthcare, safe streets.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Jackson, do you want to try to answer that question? Are you doing anything—

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. GROTHMAN [continuing]. To talk about the importance?

Mr. JACKSON. A major priority for funding for community violence intervention programs focus directly on mentorship with young men. In D.C., we have a program called Pathways. We work directly with those who are most at risk. And it is about everything from not just preventing violence, but how to strengthen their ability to be fathers, to be leaders, to be providers and protectors in the home.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Are we doing anything to make sure that a higher percentage of children born in the District are born in families in which there is a father in the home? Are we doing something to address that problem, which to me is the big problem. And again and again, we have these hearings on crime, and none of the witnesses seem to be addressing the root cause of the whole problem.

Mr. JACKSON. If I can, that \$812 million that was terminated by the Trump Administration cut community violence intervention programs. Many of them do precisely that. So, if that is a priority, we should be funding, doubling down, and scaling out that work.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I am not sure that is true, but any other guys? Mr. Schwalb, are you aware of anybody doing anything to talk about the importance, with Washington's youth, of having a dad at home when that child is born? Is anybody addressing that problem in the city?

Mr. SCHWALB. Every day, all day, sir, people are talking about how do we strengthen the family, how do we strengthen communities for young people, how do we make sure that young people have role models, family members, and others.

Let me mention one other thing that is important from the work that my office does that does not make a lot of press. One of the things we have a responsibility to do is do child support enforcement.

Mr. GROTHMAN. No, that is not the problem.

Mr. SCHWALB. Noncustodial—

Mr. GROTHMAN. The problem is we do not need a guy paying child support or having his wages garnished. The problem is we need a guy in the home, so what are we doing about getting the guy in the home?

Mr. SCHWALB. We are trying to make sure in the enforcement of our child support rules that we are lowering the friction between noncustodial parents and custodial parents—

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. So—

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. So that kids raised in the home have both parents engaged.

Mr. GROTHMAN. So, we are not addressing the problem. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I do not agree that we are not addressing the problem at all. We are trying to increase family stability. We—the government—no government can force a couple to be together too. But we are, for instance, we have vigorous programs with regard to reducing teenage pregnancy. We are trying to reduce—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. The cycle of poverty.

Chairman COMER. And the Chair recognizes Ms. Norton from Washington, D.C.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter from 60 groups led by D.C. Vote, a letter from 150 groups led by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and a letter from the National Urban League and the Greater Washington Urban League.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. NORTON. District of Columbia residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with selective service. Yet, Congress denies them full self-government and voting representation in Congress. The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter from leading constitutional scholars explaining why D.C. statehood bill H.R. 51 is constitutional.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. NORTON. The admissions clause of the Constitution gives Congress authority to admit new states. All 37 new states were admitted by Congress. The District clause of the Constitution gives Congress authority to reduce the size of the Federal District, which Congress did by 30 percent in 1846. H.R. 51 reduces the size of the Federal District from 68 square miles to two square miles, consisting of the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the National Mall, and the remaining under the control of Congress. The new state consists of residential and commercial areas of D.C.

The admissions clause does not establish any prerequisites for the admission of new states, but Congress generally has considered three factors, support for statehood, commitment to democracy, and resources and population. Eighty-six percent of D.C. residents voted for statehood in 2016. D.C. residents have demanded democratic rights for more than 220 years. D.C. has a larger gross do-

mestic population than 16 states and a higher per capita gross domestic product than any state. D.C. has the higher per capita personal income than any state. D.C. has a larger population than two states. Republicans do not like that D.C. votes for Democrats, so they deny D.C. statehood.

Mayor Bowser, Chairman Mendelson, and Attorney General Schwalb, my question for you is, why should D.C. be a state?

Mr. SCHWALB. Representative Norton, across the globe, Washington, D.C., symbolizes the power and the virtue of a representative democracy, a government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people. And yet, the 700,000 of us that live here in the District of Columbia are the only residents of the capital of a democratic country that do not have a voice in our national legislature. That is wrong. That is un-American.

D.C. residents are Americans, too. The lack of voting representation harms the District of Columbia. We, at this moment in our country, should be expanding democracy, not constraining it.

Ms. BOWSER. And Congresswoman, if I can add to Attorney General Schwalb's remark because, frequently, people focus on our lack of representation, and that is certainly an affront to us as tax-paying Americans. What gets less focus, but has come into focus over the last several weeks, is that we lack full autonomy.

So, for all intents and purposes, we function like a state. I function as our jurisdiction's Governor and county executive and mayor. We perform the duties that all states are asked, and we do not do anything less. But we do not have control of our National Guard, and a peculiarity of our Home Rule Charter, a President can declare an emergency in the District.

So, lack of full autonomy also prevents us from using the money that we raised in taxes, like happened this year, taxes that we raised in the District cut from our approved budget, which forced us to cut services, including the pay raises that our police officers are due being delayed until this October.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Now, the Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Jordan from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mendelson is crime up or down in the last month here in D.C.?

Mr. MENDELSON. It is down.

Mr. JORDAN. Down significantly, right? Robberies down 42 percent, deadly weapon assaults down 13 percent, carjackings down 85 percent, car theft down 24 percent, violent crime down 25 percent. That is pretty good, right?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes, that is correct. Before last year, excuse me, before the surge, violent crime was down 26 percent. After the surge, violent crime was down 27 percent.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, I thought you would say that before the surge, that violent crime was down, but the Chairman of the Fraternal Order—in fact, you said—I think you tweeted out or, excuse me, you put a statement out on August 12, "Violent crime in the District is at its lowest levels we have seen in 30 years."

Mr. MENDELSON. Correct.

Mr. JORDAN. But the head of the Fraternal Order of Police, Mr. Pemberton said, "When our members respond to the scene of a felony offense, inevitably, there will be a lieutenant or a captain that will show up on the scene and direct those members to take a report for a lesser offense." Are you guys cooking the books?

Mr. MENDELSON. I think we are not, but I also know that there are a couple of investigations run by this Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, you settled a case, too, didn't you? You just settled a case where someone said you were cooking the books. Is that right?

Mr. MENDELSON. I cannot speak to that case. I do not have familiarity on it.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, we know it was settled. It has been reported.

Mr. MENDELSON. But I do know there are collateral statistics that affirm the reduction in crime.

Mr. JORDAN. Is Mr. Pemberton lying?

Mr. MENDELSON. I—

Mr. JORDAN. The head of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP)?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. You think he is lying? Wow. Well, let me just read from the court case that was settled. This is the transcript of Mr. Randy Griffin, who is the Commander of the Metro Police Department. And he was asked a question in his deposition. He says, "Lieutenant Andrew Zabavsky came up with a classification of taking property without right, correct?" He responded yes. Question, "So, he is saying that you told him to come up with a solution for the theft problem, which is driving up crime statistics for the District, correct?" He responded yes. Sounds like you guys are cooking the books there, according to—this is under oath from the deposition from this case that was just settled with the person who brought the action, a sergeant in your police department. But you are not cooking the books?

Ms. BOWSER. Congressman, may I?

Mr. JORDAN. No, no. Mr. Jordan. The question was to Mr. Mendelson.

Mr. MENDELSON. As I said, there are two investigations. I know there is one internal in the Metropolitan Police Department. I know that there is an investigation by this Committee. I think that the three of us here—

Mr. JORDAN. What is taking—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Welcome that investigation.

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. Property without right? What is taking property without right?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, that would be theft.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, why not call it theft? Why come up with this designation? In fact, that is what he says. He is asked the question—

Mr. MENDELSON. Congressman, I cannot speak—

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. The solution—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. To that particular case.

Mr. JORDAN. The solution from Mr. Zabavsky was to come up with this TPWR, taking property without right. What is that? Taking property without right is what again?

Mr. MENDELSON. If you are speaking to the particular charges, I cannot speak to that. And as I have said several times here, I cannot speak to that particular case. I think the issue is whether there is widespread—

Mr. JORDAN. I am asking a simple question. You have a classification for crime called taking property without right. What does that mean? What does that mean?

Mr. MENDELSON. It means just what it said, if that is what the crime is.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, why not call it—I mean, what would a normal person call taking property without right?

Mr. MENDELSON. Are we talking about what the criminal code and the specific crimes are?

Mr. JORDAN. No, I am just talking about that statement that you have that has grown 500 percent in the last several years, that specific category of crime. I am just wondering, what does that exactly mean?

Mr. MENDELSON. So, if we look at collateral data such as ShotSpotter, we know that gunshots are down 29 percent from 2023 to 2024.

Mr. JORDAN. Taking property without right was the question. What does that mean?

Mr. MENDELSON. I have already answered you, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. And what did you say again?

Mr. MENDELSON. I said that if you are speaking to a particular offense in our criminal code, I cannot speak to that particular offense.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, why not just call it stealing? That is what we would all—someone comes and takes something that belongs to me or someone comes and takes something that belongs to you, we call it stealing.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Why create this new category that grows 500 percent that I think allows you to cook the books—

Mr. MENDELSON. Sir, as you know—

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. As the head of the FOP—

Mr. MENDELSON. As you—

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. In your city said so.

Mr. MENDELSON. As you know, as the Chair of the Judiciary Committee, there are, for many offenses, a range of possible charges from misdemeanor to felony and different shades of felony. So, I am not—I am not familiar with that—

Mr. JORDAN. Is it—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Particular offense.

Mr. JORDAN. Is it a good thing that, are you against having the National Guard here, or do you think that has been helpful to the citizens and the families and the people who live in the D.C. area?

Mr. MENDELSON. We think that the D.C. National Guard is a very valuable and wonderful asset to the city. That is a little bit different than having thousands of guard troops stationed around the city when they are not trained in law enforcement. And my understanding is that many of them were looking kind of bored with what they were doing.

Mr. JORDAN. My time has run out. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. I want to thank the witnesses for your willingness to come before the Committee and help us with our work.

Mayor Bowser, back in March, the Republican leadership here in the House cut \$1.1 billion from the D.C. budget.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. Is that correct?

Ms. BOWSER. That is correct.

Mr. LYNCH. So, I live in Boston. We have about 700,000 people in our city, pretty much the same size as D.C. I know taking \$1 billion out of our budget would kill us, you know, in terms of our ability to deliver services and fund a police department. Can you talk about what that meant? It is ironic, it is ironic, that the same people who cut \$1.1 billion out of your budget four months later are saying, we are going to take over the city because you are not taking care of law enforcement.

Ms. BOWSER. That is correct, Congressman. And it was especially problematic because it came midyear. To cut \$1 billion with 12 months is bad enough, but to cut it with six months, it is almost impossible.

Mr. LYNCH. And Mayor, tell me where that \$1.1 billion, where did it come from?

Ms. BOWSER. It came from every one of our sectors. And when you have to cut that much money—

Mr. LYNCH. But, I mean, the source, was that from D.C. taxpayers?

Ms. BOWSER. One hundred percent local dollars.

Mr. LYNCH. Okay. So, they cut \$1.1 billion of the tax money paid by D.C. residents.

Ms. BOWSER. That is correct.

Mr. LYNCH. They cut that from your budget so that you cannot provide as much law enforcement and police officers to patrol these streets. Is that right?

Ms. BOWSER. That is right.

Mr. LYNCH. And Chairman Mendelson, you mentioned earlier that it had about \$83 million underfunding of the police department directly. Is that correct?

Mr. MENDELSON. That is correct. There is an emergency planning and security fund that Congress appropriates every year for. It is supposed to fully reimburse our MPD for its work in connection with the Federal presence—

Mr. LYNCH. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Whether it is demonstrations or escorts for the President.

Mr. LYNCH. I get it. There is a protest down here every couple of days, so—

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH [continuing]. You know, I compliment you—

Mr. MENDELSON. And it has been underfunded.

Mr. LYNCH [continuing]. On your ability to try to deal with that. And that is not D.C.'s problem. That is the country because this is the place we come to exercise our First Amendment rights to peti-

tion our government. So, that is a lot of your problem is the fact that you are our Nation's capital, and this is where we come to complain, right? We complain to our Federal Government, and you have to deal with that.

Attorney General Schwalb, are you familiar with the Posse Comitatus Act?

Mr. SCHWALB. I am, sir.

Mr. LYNCH. Your mic is not on.

Mr. SCHWALB. Yes, the Posse Comitatus Act is a law, a long-standing law in our country that makes clear that in our country, military are not engaged in policing American citizens on American soil.

Mr. LYNCH. Absolutely. But isn't that what President Trump is doing right now, bringing in the military to police the civilian population in this district? That is exactly what he is doing. Is that your view as well?

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, sir, I filed a lawsuit that involves that very issue in terms of the legality.

Mr. LYNCH. I read that. That is why I asked you the question.

Mr. SCHWALB. And so, while the lawsuit is pending, I am not going to talk about the specifics—

Mr. LYNCH. Okay.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Of the lawsuit or the—

Mr. LYNCH. Okay.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Merits of it, but I am very concerned about the law of our country being followed, especially when it puts the District and District residents in harm's way.

Mr. LYNCH. Fair enough. Fair enough. Look, so now we have armed military on the streets here in D.C. because they cut your budget so you cannot hire more police and also to recruit more police officers. That is suffering as well. And yet I see that not only is the military being politicized coming in here and supporting one President's agenda, but they are also suffering the humiliation of having to go pick up trash and do landscaping and spreading mulch, things like that. That is not what we ask of our sons and daughters when they put on that uniform. We should treat them with more respect than this President is treating them right now.

Madam Mayor, how many additional police officers do you think you could hire with that \$1.1 billion that was cut from your budget?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, we think we can safely hire up to 300 officers per year. We know that we can add to our recruitment bonuses. We know that we can invest in the types of things that young officers want, like take home patrol cars, like updated training facilities and improved district headquarters.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Dr. Foxx from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor Bowser, I am going to ask you a simple question based on the question you were just asked. Do you commit to use all that money to hire law enforcement people?

Ms. BOWSER. We commit to using it for law—where it was cut primarily. We have a—

Ms. FOXX. No, I just need to know yes or no because you are making a big deal about wanting that money for law enforcement. Would you use it for law enforcement, yes or no?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, Congressman, we want the money because it was approved by this Congress—

Ms. FOXX. Okay.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. And it is our money.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. Thank you. I take that—

Ms. BOWSER. We want it for law enforcement.

Ms. FOXX. I take that as a no.

Ms. BOWSER. We want it for fire and EMS.

Ms. FOXX. Mayor Bowser, I am going to change—

Ms. BOWSER. We want it to support—

Ms. FOXX [continuing]. The way I am asking you questions.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Our city.

Ms. FOXX. Mayor Bowser.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. FOXX. It is my time. It is my time.

Chairman COMER. There will be order in here. Dr. Foxx has the time. Let Dr. Foxx proceed. Dr. Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. Mayor Bowser, do you agree that a key part of reducing juvenile crime is by improving education outcomes for students in Washington, D.C.?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Ms. FOXX. Good. So, you believe that education is important for reducing juvenile crime. Do you also agree that the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, or DCOSP, which expands educational opportunities for low-income families, plays a part of helping us reach that goal?

Ms. BOWSER. We have a system of choice here that includes opportunity scholarships, public charter schools, and traditional public schools.

Ms. FOXX. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. All three.

Ms. FOXX. I am quite familiar with that.

Ms. BOWSER. Yep.

Ms. FOXX. So, we know students in the DCOSP can receive a high-quality education while they may be otherwise left behind in the horribly underperforming schools in D.C. This program provides real school choices for families that have been repeatedly studied and evaluated. The results show that participants in the program thrive and see higher rates of high school graduation in the pursuit of higher education.

Mayor Bowser, given the recent spike in juvenile crime in this city, I hope we can agree it is more important now than ever that schoolchildren have pathways to succeed and learn in safe, high-performing schools. What is your administration doing to ensure students have access to alternative education programs, including the DCOSP, to keep them engaged and on track?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, we have been very supportive of the SOAR Act, and we encourage this Congress to continue to support SOAR where we invest in all sectors, including the Opportunity Scholar-

ship Fund. We are also very proud that when we look back over 15 years in our investments in school reform with mayoral control of the schools and Council oversight of the schools, we have seen enrollment in our schools nearly reach 100,000. We have seen achievement outpace our peer schools across the Nation, and our children have rebounded from COVID learning loss faster than most.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

Ms. BOWSER. And——

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

Ms. BOWSER. Our residents are responding.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mayor. Thank you.

Ms. BOWSER. Okay. I just was going to add that our residents are responding by sending their children to their neighborhood schools——

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. And that is a marker of success.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

Chairman Mendelson, given that better educational opportunities are strongly correlated with reducing reductions in juvenile crime, what immediate steps is the City Council taking to ensure that D.C. youth have the best educational opportunities and are not left behind in failing schools?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, Congresswoman, thank you for that question. We actually, the Council, has actually taken a number of steps to ensure that funding is not cut to our local schools, that the individual schools in District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and in the charter schools are fully funded. We have been very aggressive about assuring that, but I want to note that the legislation that was passed would have the effect of cutting DCPS by \$17.5 million a year. That is hurting kids, hurting 50,000 kids in our DCPS system because they will get \$17.5 million less, and that is substantial.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. AG Schwalb, what evidence does your office have that designated juvenile curfew zones have successfully reduced incidents of teenagers roaming or causing disturbances in residential neighborhoods, and how are those results measured?

Mr. SCHWALB. We have seen, and I support the Chief's use of curfew with respect to juveniles. The way the curfew has been used here in the District is a tool for the MPD to ask young people to disperse if there are large groups of them. That has been largely successful.

If youth have not dispersed in response to the MPD request, MPD will occasionally pick those youth up and bring them to what is called our Youth Services Center where their parents are called, and they are brought home. We have not seen an increase in prosecution related to curfew, but we know anecdotally that the curfew, at least as a short-term measure, has been effective in dispersing large crowds of young people.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. Before I recognize——

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record an article from *Vox News* entitled, "Laboratories of Democracy: Washington, D.C., showed how to do universal pre-K right. D.C. offers free pre-K for toddlers. The ripple effects have helped K through 12 schools." This is the first—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. City in the United States to have universal—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Pre-K in the country.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—

Ms. STANSBURY. They are innovating—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Krishnamoorthi.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. And leading the way.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury, no tryouts for MSNBC.

And before I recognize Mr. Krishnamoorthi, if I may, that \$1 billion is restored in the continuing resolution that we are going to vote on tomorrow.

Mr. LYNCH. It has not been taken up. The Senate took it up a long time ago, and this House—

Chairman COMER. Well, I have been a proponent—

Mr. LYNCH [continuing]. Has refused to take that up.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. For that, and I have—

Mr. LYNCH. So, let us not talk about what we are going to do. Let us talk about what we have done.

Chairman COMER. Well, are you going to vote for the CR, Mr. Lynch? Are the Democrats going to vote for the CR that restores—

Mr. LYNCH. I have not read it.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. That \$1 billion funded?

Mr. LYNCH. I have not read it yet.

Chairman COMER. Okay.

Mr. LYNCH. Let me know what it says.

Chairman COMER. All right. We will send you the text.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Krishnamoorthi.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Though we are here today to discuss President Trump's takeover of D.C. law enforcement, Chicago, which I represent, is also on Trump's hit list. President Trump has demonized and called Chicago a "hellhole."

Attorney General Schwalb, in August, the President called D.C. a hellhole as well, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. Yes, he did.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. He also said "Chicago is the murder capital of the world." And just yesterday, he called Chicago "a death trap." I have here a list of states, a list of states that, based on FBI data, have the highest number of violent crimes per capita. Four of the top five states on this list are run by Republicans. And if you are talking about total murders in absolute terms, it turns out Texas is number one. In this particular list here, Illinois is number 29.

Now, Attorney General, you see Alaska tops this list. To your knowledge, the President has not called Alaska a hellhole, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. I have not heard that.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And Arkansas is number four here. He did not call Arkansas a hellhole, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. I have not heard that.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And you have not heard the President talk about deploying the National Guard in Texas, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. I have not.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Folks, this is not about crime. It is about politics. Just this week, Trump said, "I am going to Chicago early against Pritzker. Pritzker, Pritzker is nothing." That is not how a President should be talking about any Governor or any state.

I would like to talk about the National Guard deployment here in D.C. and the cost of it. Now, Mr. Jackson, as you said, I believe that the D.C. deployment is going to cost over \$200 million, correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Correct. That is a projection.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Let us see how this money is being used. Trump says it is for fighting crime, but here is a guardsman carrying trash. Here is a guardsman mowing the lawn. Here is a very nice gentleman, a guardsman, carrying a leaf blower. Honorable work, certainly, but this is not why the taxpayers fund the National Guard. If Trump was serious about crime, he would not cut nearly \$4 million in Federal funding for local violence prevention groups in Chicago.

Attorney General, you would agree the President should be funding these crime prevention programs not cutting them, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. As I said in my testimony, sir, prosecution and prevention are both essential to making sure cities are safe, and we have to do both crime intervention work. Violence intervention work has been successful here in the District of Columbia in terms of driving gun violence down.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. You should not be cutting that work, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. We need to invest in it.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Not cut it, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. Correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I want to turn to another topic. In Elgin, a Chicago suburb in my district, an American citizen was pulled from his home, cuffed, and detained by ICE. And another U.S. citizen in Des Plaines, also in my district, was tased in the face and detained in another ICE operation. This is shameful, and I am extremely concerned about the safety and well-being of my constituents.

I am also concerned about the devastating impact that out-of-control ICE raids and the deployment of the National Guard will have on the economy and jobs back in the Chicago area. Let us look at a couple stats. Foot traffic for Chicago's second-most profitable business corridor on 26th Street is down 60 percent since ICE raids began. And this is not just a hypothetical concern that the same would happen with the deployment of National Guard.

Let us look at what has happened to D.C.'s economy. Mr. Schwalb, *CNN* has reported restaurant reservations decreased by

as much as 31 percent, and foot traffic in retail stores is down 81 percent. Those reports show that the President's unilateral deployment of the Guard is hurting the local economy, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. That is consistent.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Folks, our economy is softening. Unemployment and prices for necessities like vegetables are soaring. Mr. President, let us put aside politics and hostility toward Governors and elected officials. Let us not take actions that hurt families and the economy.

I would like to turn to my final topic, and that is domestic violence. Attorney General Schwalb, according to *The Hill*, President Trump suggested that "a little fight with the wife should not count in D.C. crime stats." You do not dispute *The Hill* reported this, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. I saw that.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. But there is nothing little about 12,000 victims of domestic violence in D.C. or nothing little about 50,000 Illinoisans experiencing domestic violence, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. No, it is a very serious crime.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. There is nothing little about more than 12,000 children who witnessed domestic violence in Chicago either, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. It is traumatizing.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. It is abhorrent that the President routinely dismisses violence faced by women. And given his friendship with Jeffrey Epstein, this attitude, unfortunately, comes as no surprise.

Let us be clear. There is nothing little about domestic violence, not the scale of the problem or the courage of the survivors. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On August 11, 2025, the day the President took action here in D.C., Councilman Allen said this, "The President taking over local control of the MPD, and putting the U.S. military onto the streets of D.C. under the guise of public safety is wrong. It is an extreme, outrageous, and dangerous move for our city and the safety of our residents."

Do you agree with that statement by Councilmember Allen, Attorney General Schwalb?

Mr. MENDELSON. I do believe that the presence of thousands of armed troops in the District has been a problem and counterproductive for public safety in the District.

Mr. JORDAN. Counterproductive, dangerous. He said the second sentence, "dangerous move for our city and the safety of our residents." How is 85 percent reduction in carjackings dangerous for the city's residents?

Mr. MENDELSON. I do not believe that.

Mr. JORDAN. Chairman Mendelson, do you agree with Councilman Allen's statement?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, if the question is about the National Guard reducing carjackings, I do not think the National Guard was involved in reducing carjackings. They were——

Mr. JORDAN. I am asking about the statement. Do you agree with——

Mr. MENDELSON. Could you——

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. Councilman Allen's statement?

Mr. MENDELSON. Could you repeat the statement again?

Mr. JORDAN. "President taking over local control of the MPD and the U.S. military on the streets of D.C. under the guise of public safety is wrong. It is dangerous, outrageous, and an extreme move for our city and the safety of our residents."

Mr. MENDELSON. If you will recall at the time that he said that, the order from the Attorney General.

Mr. JORDAN. He said that the day it happened.

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes, the order from the Attorney General was that all orders within MPD would have to be approved by——

Mr. JORDAN. How about you, Mayor? Do you agree with the councilman's statement?

Mr. MENDELSON. It would have to be approved by——

Mr. JORDAN. I am asking the Mayor now.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).

Mr. JORDAN. I am asking the Mayor now.

Mr. MENDELSON. I know, but I did not finish my sentence.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, I am asking the Mayor——

Mr. MENDELSON. It has to be approved by the DEA.

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. The question. We control the time. Mayor Bowser, do you agree?

Mr. MENDELSON. It is complete disorganization.

Chairman COMER. The Mayor——

Ms. BOWSER. Mr. Jordan, I think the statement is not what happened, actually. So, the Home Rule Charter allows the President to make requests of MPD through the Mayor. It does not allow the President to take over MPD, which at no time happened.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, I will just point out that it seems to me you disagree because you said just two weeks ago, "we greatly appreciate the surge of officers that enhance what MPD has been able to do with the city. We know that when carjackings go down, when gun use goes down, when homicidal robbery go down, neighborhoods feel safer." It seems like Councilman Allen does not know what he is talking about, looks like you definitely disagree with him.

Ms. BOWSER. We, having more officers enhance the effectiveness of MPD allowed us to accelerate crime reduction.

Chairman COMER. Representative Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Good. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

We are constantly at odds with the leadership of D.C. as a body, Congress, from the Republican side of the aisle because there is a fundamental difference between the ideological perspective of the elected officials of D.C. and the majority of Americans across the country. And this is our Nation's capital. We can admit that. It is

okay to have ideological variances. The city of D.C. plays a special role, and it is our Nation's capital.

So, there need not be this level of friction when we are discussing variances of political and social opinion that exist within our own family. But this battle about the authority of Congress within our Nation's capital and over our Nation's capital, that does not have to be a fight. The Congress shall have the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district. The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government carries its own evidence with it. This is baked into the birth of our country.

And I have respect for the process that has elected you, good lady, and you, gentlemen. And I very much respect you, sir, Mr. Jackson, of everybody here. You are plugged into the reality of the street, and I would like to talk to you further about some of the programs that you embrace. That is a different conversation. That is not elected guys with scripted answers scrubbed by attorneys. You are for real, and I would like to talk to you more.

I was happy to yield much of my time to the gentleman from Ohio, and Mr. Chairman, thank you for convening this hearing. And I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I request unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Okay.

Mr. BELL. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this August 22, 2025, article from *CNN* titled, "GOP Governors are sending troops to D.C. Their states have ten cities with higher crime rates," which shows the blatant hypocrisy of the GOP when their states have higher crime rates than we see—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BELL [continuing]. And yet choose to pretend—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank you and the Vice Chair for convening us—the Ranking Member, I should say.

Madam Mayor, good to see you again.

Ms. BOWSER. Good to see you.

Mr. MFUME. You have a very tough job, and it goes without saying that the 800-pound gorilla in this room is a realization that you are fighting with one hand tied behind your back, and you are strapped in as a result of policies and rulings and law that prevents you in many instances from being the Mayor that you want to be every day without being constrained. So, I just want to say that on the record.

It is easy for a lot of people to point fingers, but until you sat in that seat and had to make those decisions, it is very difficult. And one of your arms has been tied behind your back. Let us make no mistake about that.

I want to thank all of you who are here, but one thing that I want to do is to go back and underscore the comments of Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton. I brought this up at the last meeting that we had here on the District of Columbia, and that is, the fact that, at the end of the day, so much of this can be traced back to the imposition of policy on a governed people without their participa-

tion. Let me repeat that. The imposition of policy without participation by the citizens, the Americans, it is just as it was with the Boston Tea Party. It comes down to taxation without representation. When you cannot even fight for yourself, stand for yourself, vote for yourself, that is wrong. That is wrong.

In 1973, and let us get some of this on the record so that we have some perspective, D.C. got the Home Rule Act, and you were able to elect your first Mayor and your first City Council. And Walter Washington transitioned from his previous position to be that first elected Mayor.

In 1978, some of you will remember that full congressional representation was in the form of an amendment, and that amendment failed because you could not get, not you, the District, but the Nation could not get the requisite number of states to ratify it.

In 1982, voters here in the District of Columbia voted to approve a constitution for a new state. Some of you will recall that was called the New Columbia, and yet it was ignored by this Congress over and over and over again. Marion Barry came up here on this Hill so many times to make the argument for the people of Washington that fairness has to be fair. It just cannot be proportioned out when we feel like it.

In 1990, Congressman Walter Fauntroy, myself, Marion, Jesse Jackson, and so many others put together Freedom Train rides from D.C. to New England, making a stop in each city along the way, making the case for statehood and urging Americans up and down the coast to support it.

In 1993, I was proud, along with your current delegate, to vote for the first D.C. statehood bill here in the Congress. And let me just point out one thing. Not one Republican voted for that bill. And that bill went down. It went down after a great deal of fight by a vote of 153 to 277.

In 2016, D.C. voters voted to approve a statehood referendum. The people voted, 86 percent, to approve that. This Congress ignored it.

In 2020, in 116th Congress, H.R. 51 became the next statehood bill. It was defeated. And the following year, in the 117th Congress, we came back with the same bill. It was defeated again without any votes or representation from the other side.

So, at some point in time, you have to ask yourself, if this is so partisan, what is the issue? Now, some people argue the issue is racial. I know I should not say that, but I am going to say it because people feel that way. They think that if this was any other population, majority population, that this would not be taking place. We all know that it is partisan, even though some people will say it is not partisan because the District tends to vote Democratic.

So, let us not play games here. Let us be honest and true. And if we are true about making sure that Americans, no matter where they are, but especially here in this district, have rights that others do not have, stop treating the District of Columbia like a donor state. They donate their taxes. They donate their military officers. They donate their brain trust. And they give of themselves. And at some point in time, we, as a body, have to give back.

Taxation without representation is as wrong today as it was when the Boston Tea Party exploded over the same issue.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Mfume.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, all of the witnesses, for coming in today.

Attorney General Schwalb, do you remember the case *State of Maryland and District of Columbia v. Engage Armament, LLC, et cetera*?

Mr. SCHWALB. I do.

Mr. BIGGS. And in that case, just for anybody who is not aware of it, the District joined Maryland and sued three Maryland firearm retailers for allegedly making straw purchases. In your lawsuit, you engaged two outside counsel. One firm, I think it is called Everytown Law and another was Perkins Coie. Do you remember that?

Mr. SCHWALB. I do.

Mr. BIGGS. And how much did you pay Perkins Coie, and how much did you pay Everytown Law, sir?

Mr. SCHWALB. Both of those outside firms are on a pro bono basis, so no money has been paid to them.

Mr. BIGGS. You did not pay them anything? Okay. You know, that lawsuit was baseless, right? You would agree with that now after you have read the verdict of the district court. And I am going to go through that with you pretty clearly.

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, Mr. Biggs, as you know, that case has been dismissed and is on appeal. And given the fact that—

Mr. BIGGS. Right.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. It is still part of active litigation.

Mr. BIGGS. You do not want to talk about it. I do not blame you.

Mr. SCHWALB. I am not going to talk about the merits while it is in active litigation.

Mr. BIGGS. Right. I do not blame you for not wanting to talk about it because I go through here, and at least ten times, the judge said there is absolutely no basis. There is no factual basis for bringing that lawsuit. So, that is pretty damning. And not only that, under Maryland law, and basically Arizona is the same way, most cases is every bit of deference is going to be given to a party who is defending against a motion to dismiss or motion for summary judgment, right? I mean, that is normal. That is Maryland law, right?

Mr. SCHWALB. Yes, that is the standard.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. And in this particular case, the judge made some very interesting comments. This is what he said. "Ordinarily, leave to amend in Maryland is freely granted, particularly when a case is in an early stage, unless leave to amend would be futile or inappropriate for other reasons. This case presents such an occasion to deny the request." I do not know. I used to practice. I used to do a lot of trial work. I do not remember ever seeing something like that. That is pretty damning stuff from the court.

And then the judge goes on to say, "At bottom in the court's view, the plaintiffs hope to use the discovery process in order to construct

a case.” And the court correctly notes, “Through that discovery, the plaintiff wants to find sufficient facts to state a viable claim for relief.” But right then, in the complaint, failed to state any claim for relief.

And so, the question that is begged here is why wasn’t a rule 11 sanction brought against you and the other plaintiffs’ attorneys? Was a rule 11 sanction brought?

Mr. SCHWALB. No, sir. And while we obviously disagree with that ruling, we are pursuing an appeal, as the rules allow us to do, and I am confident that we will get it turned around at the court of appeals.

Mr. BIGGS. Of course, you were confident you were going to win the case when you did not have jack squat. But you went after three Federal Firearms Licenses (FFL)s because you had a political agenda. There were no sanctions. Did you have to pay attorney’s fees or costs? Were any of those ordered? I did not see them ordered in here. I assume they were not ordered.

Mr. SCHWALB. There were no sanctions. There were no costs.

Mr. BIGGS. So——

Mr. SCHWALB. The important thing is we were working as hard as we can, in this city, to keep illegal guns out of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BIGGS. No, no. The important thing is——

Mr. SCHWALB. And the way in which——

Mr. BIGGS. No, no, sir. No, listen to me for a second.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Guns come into our District.

Mr. BIGGS. Listen to me for a second.

Mr. SCHWALB. Too often is——

Mr. BIGGS. The important thing——

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Straw purchases.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Attorney General Schwalb, the important thing was that you were using your office to abuse FFLs because you do not like them. And that is the deal. Because, as the judge said, you basically did not have a case whatsoever, but you decided to use your power and your authority and make the process the punishment. That is what you chose to do.

Mr. SCHWALB. Respectfully, sir, that——

Mr. BIGGS. That is what you chose to do.

Mr. SCHWALB. That is not——

Mr. BIGGS. And there is no question before you.

Mr. SCHWALB. That is not true, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. That is exactly what this says, and that is a shame because that is an abuse of power right there. And so, you come in here, sit here, and tell us all this righteousness about power, but I am telling you, when you are using the process itself to go after political opponents, which is exactly what you are doing, this is a philosophical issue that you have. And you used them and you went and you used two firms that you know and I know that that is their motive. The law firm, Everytown, that is their job. That is what they want to do. They solicit funds to go out there and sue FFLs because they do not want the Second Amendment to even exist. Read their statements. And you joined with them.

Mayor Bowser, it is good to see you again. I know you do have a tough job. I am the first to admit it.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. BIGGS. But it is good to see you again.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. BIGGS. And I am out of time, so I cannot ask any questions, but I do have some things I want to—Mr. Chairman, I have some UCs.

Chairman COMER. Yes, proceed.

Mr. BIGGS. First of all, I wanted to introduce the memorandum decision and order from the case *State of Maryland, D.C., v. Engage Armament, et al.*

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. The letter from the Committee to Hon. Brian L. Schwalb dated June 11, 2025—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. Which we are still waiting for answers for.

This one, “Mayor Muriel Bowser says Trump’s surge of Federal law enforcement has lowered crime in D.C.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. “Trump’s D.C. crime crackdown busts another alleged Tren de Aragua gang member. Make D.C. safe again.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. This one, “Trump’s executive orders target D.C. crime as the city hits 12 days without a homicide.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. This one is “Radical D.C. officials treated officers like crap, police leader says.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. “Murdered congressional intern’s mom says Trump should take over Washington, D.C.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. “Yes, prosecuting and arresting criminals would have immediate impact on D.C.’s crime.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Brown from Ohio.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

So, we want to talk about abuse of power, huh? Well, let me start here. President Trump’s only expertise on crime is committing it, not preventing it; enabling it, not ending it; and covering it up, not cleaning it up. He is a convicted felon. He has illegally frozen Federal funding. He has assaulted the rule of law at every turn. He has consistently violated constitutionally protected due process rights. And he has unleashed a corporate agenda to enrich himself and his wealthy donors.

Right now, as we sit here, Trump is bending over backward to protect Ghislaine Maxwell, a convicted sex trafficker who preyed on children and blocking the release of the Epstein files to shield criminals from accountability.

In the last ten months alone, he has pardoned countless white-collar fraudsters who ripped off the American people, often conveniently, after they cozied up to him. And let us not forget, Trump

pardoned every single person charged or convicted in the January 6 insurrection. That included 172 people who pleaded guilty, pleaded guilty, to assaulting law enforcement. It included dozens of repeat offenders, people with prior convictions for rape, manslaughter, and sexual abuse of a minor. And it included at least ten individuals who have already, already been rearrested for new crimes.

So spare us. Spare us the talk of law and order because under Trump, that only means lawlessness for his friends and punishment for everyone else.

Now, let me be clear. I care deeply about public safety in my district, in every district across America. Every person deserves to feel safe in their neighborhood, at their job, and their school. And if I may, there is some good news. Violent crime has been consistently decreasing across America. And yes, we have more work to do, but we also know what works to keep it that way.

So, if you are really serious about public safety, let us increase funding for violence prevention programs. Let us pass common-sense gun safety bills. And let us provide additional Federal resources to our local partners to recruit and train local law enforcement.

But what has this Administration done instead? Rolled back gun safety reforms, gutted DOJ programs tasked with addressing violent crime, and blocked funding to local law enforcement and community violence prevention agencies like the one you served, Mr. Jackson.

Earlier this year, Cleveland Peacemakers Alliance, a local violence prevention organization, had its community violence prevention grant funding frozen by this Administration. Mr. Jackson, I know you cannot speak to this specific grant, but can you talk about the importance of grants funded through the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act and how freezes like this impact public safety?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, we know from Cleveland Peacemakers to Advance Peace to Safe Streets Baltimore to Life Camp in New York City that these organizations that are doing violence intervention work are saving lives every day. And every study we have seen to focus on how impactful community violence intervention has been has shown promise.

But this Trump Administration has not stopped at terminating violence intervention programs. They also terminated \$1 billion in youth mental health resources that we know can help our youth that are in crisis before a school shooting, before a suicide attempt, before any violent harm. They have also made major cuts to the ATF. And we know that the ATF now has lost two-thirds of its inspectors, so they do not even have the capacity to inspect gun stores to decide whether or not they are violating the law.

He also reversed the zero-tolerance policy for gun dealers where they violate the law, they lose their license. And even if you go to the Department of Justice website, there is an invite for previous violating gun stores to come back and get their licenses again.

So, he is not only defunding programs that we know are preventing violence that are working with youth that are working in schools and working with homes. He is also stripped and disman-

tled and defunded Federal law enforcement to keep guns out of our communities.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you so much. Instead of funding proven public safety solutions, my Republican colleagues want to pull political stunts like weaponizing the National Guard against the American people. Let us be clear. That only sidelines local law enforcement, sows chaos, and distracts from real emergencies. So, yes, it is political theater, but worse, it is dangerous political theater that puts communities more at risk, not less.

Chairman COMER. All right. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning.

The government of the District of Columbia under the leadership sitting in front of us today has become a poster child for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) and gender madness. This has led to government—Mr. Chairman, this is not a concert. This audience can just settle down.

Chairman COMER. Yes, stop the clock.

Ms. MACE. I want to reclaim my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady is right. Under the Rules of the House, the Chairman is responsible for maintaining order, preserving decorum in the committee room. I expect audience members to be respectful of the Committee. So.

Ms. MACE. I would like to reclaim my time too, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. You reclaim, absolutely. Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. This has led to government-sanctioned racial discrimination and the erasure of women. Article 1, section 8, clause 17 provides Congress plenary authority over the District of Columbia. Using this authority today, I will be introducing the No DEI in D.C. Act. This bill will rip the DEI and gender bender nonsense out of the D.C. government root and branch and restore common sense and equal treatment under the law.

As the individuals charged with writing D.C. laws, signing D.C. laws, and enforcing D.C.'s laws, we have some questions for you on the meanings of some of the curious terms we have found in the D.C. Code. My first question for Mayor Bowser, it is yes or no. The D.C. Code makes numerous references to “structural or institutional racism.” Do you believe the D.C. government is structurally or institutionally racist, yes or no? Yes or no? Is D.C. government racist, institutionally racist, yes or no?

Ms. BOWSER. Well—

Ms. MACE. All right. You cannot answer the question. So, my next question for Mayor Bowser, since you are going to sit there and placate or just be quiet, in section 7—

Ms. BOWSER. I forgot to push the button.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. 1234.02 of D.C. Code, you use the phrase “child welfare involved birthing people,” child welfare involved birthing people. Can you explain to me what this means?

Ms. BOWSER. I am not that familiar with that part of the code.

Ms. MACE. Okay. So, you do not know. In section 7–1234.02 of D.C. Code, you use the phrase “justice-involved incarcerated and homeless birthing people and their non-birthing partners.” Can you explain to this Committee what that means?

Ms. BOWSER. I, again, I would have to see—

Ms. MACE. You do not know.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. The whole section.

Ms. MACE. You are literally the Mayor of D.C., and you do not know your own code of laws.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, I do not know them—

Ms. MACE. All right. One thing we noticed—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Verbatim.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. The D.C. Code struggles to define is the term “woman.” So, Mayor Bowser, what is a woman?

Ms. BOWSER. I am a woman. Are you a woman?

Ms. MACE. A hundred percent.

Ms. BOWSER. Okay.

Ms. MACE. A hundred percent.

Ms. BOWSER. I am a woman. You are looking at one.

Ms. MACE. Okay, good. You actually, in section 3-703 of the D.C. Code, you use the phrase “the intersectionality of gender and race to create unique dynamics and effects.” Can you explain what this means to the Committee?

Ms. BOWSER. Where is that, ma’am?

Ms. MACE. Section 3-703 of the D.C. Code, do you know what that means?

Ms. BOWSER. Could you give me—

Ms. MACE. No, you do not know what that means.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. The title of the—

Ms. MACE. So, chapter 14D of the D.C. Code establishes—

Ms. BOWSER. Mr. Chairman?

Ms. MACE [continuing]. The commission—

Ms. BOWSER. I am happy to answer questions, but I cannot—

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to reclaim my time. This is not her time. It is my time. You can be quiet as I ask you questions.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—

Ms. BOWSER. Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. And then you can answer them.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. And then you can answer them.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Mace.

Ms. BOWSER. If you would give, if you—

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, this is my time, not hers. I would like to reclaim my time.

Ms. BOWSER. Let us make good use of the time, Ms. Mace.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—

Ms. MACE. I am making very good use of my time.

Ms. BOWSER. And so, if—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Ms. Mace.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. There is—

Chairman COMER. Ms. Mace has the floor.

Ms. MACE. And you are making my point. You are the Mayor of D.C., and you do not even know your own code of laws. What is a birthing person?

Ms. BOWSER. I would assume it is someone who gives birth.

Ms. MACE. All right. Why don’t you use—are these women? Are these moms? Do you think it is appropriate to call them birthing person? Can a man birth a person, be a birthing person?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, that is what I would call it, but I do not write all the laws, and I am not familiar with every section.

Ms. MACE. Can men get pregnant?

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Ms. MACE. Can men become women?

Ms. BOWSER. Can a man become a woman?

Ms. MACE. Yes, can a man become a woman?

Ms. BOWSER. If you are—Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Yes or no. Can a man become a woman, yes or no?

Ms. BOWSER. Ms. Mace, I am not here—

Ms. MACE. Okay. My next question—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. To talk about that.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Chapter 14D of the D.C. Code establishes the Commission on Reparations and a reparations fund to provide eligible African Americans monetary reparations or other forms of redress. Is it the position of D.C., government benefits should be provided to individuals on the basis of race?

Ms. BOWSER. I believe that the legislation requires a study.

Ms. MACE. Okay. I am asking you. Is it the position of the D.C. government that government benefits should be provided on the basis of race is the question?

Ms. BOWSER. If you are referring to that legislation, I believe it requires a study.

Ms. MACE. Okay. I am asking you a question. Do you believe that government benefits should be given out on the basis of race? That is the question. This is the third time I am asking.

Ms. BOWSER. We have any number of benefits programs, and eligibility is—

Ms. MACE. Okay.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Established—

Ms. MACE. You are not answering any of—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Per program.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. These questions. I will give it to you. You are slick.

In section 2-1383 of the D.C. Code, you use the phrase “social value of the LGBTQ community business economy to the District.” Can you explain what this means to the Committee?

Ms. BOWSER. It means that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) businesses provide economic benefit to the District’s economy.

Ms. MACE. Do you think all businesses provide economic benefit to the D.C. economy?

Ms. BOWSER. They should, or they would be out of business.

Ms. MACE. Yes, of course.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good morning, everyone. I just want to take a moment to decompress after that. And I do want to just take a moment of personal privilege for our witnesses and for the members of the public who are here today to apologize for the behavior of my colleagues—

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. For the disrespectful language—

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. That has been deployed for the personal assaults on your character and professionalism. We know that you are representing the people of this city and doing an excellent job, and we support you.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Ms. STANSBURY. Now, I want to turn to where the Ranking Member went at the beginning of this hearing and talk about the real crime wave here in D.C. I think it is very demonstrable and the data shows that the largest crime wave that we have had over the last nine months began on January 20. And the epicenter of that crime wave, one might call it a white-collar, or in this case, an orange-collar crime wave, is the White House because we have seen a slew of illegal firings that have resulted in millions of Americans being without vital programs, the withholding of millions of dollars of funds, violations of the Constitution, rule of law, separation of powers, due process rights, illegal arrests, illegal deportations, hundreds of lawsuits, grift that has resulted in billions of dollars in crypto schemes lining the pockets of the President and his family, government contracts to his friends, and an epic cover-up of the largest-known sex trafficking scandal in American history with the Director of the FBI lying under oath in this chamber just yesterday.

And I just want to say this, that it is a felony under the U.S. Code to lie under oath in front of Congress. So, if you want to talk about crime in D.C., then look no further than your own damn hearings. Let us talk about that. That is the real crime wave.

Now, Mr. Jackson, I really appreciate you bringing forward as part of this discussion this morning the impact that it has had on real people in the community because I think for people who do not live in Washington, D.C., who have never stepped foot in front of City Hall, gone to a City Council meeting, have never met with the Mayor in her chambers, have never talked to the people of Washington, D.C. They do not understand how this is impacting the communities who live here of having this occupation in their midst.

And this is not about public safety. You know, last week we heard our colleagues accusing us of not wanting to solve crimes, not wanting to address public safety issues. I mean, I am trying to swear less, but that is just total bullshit. I mean, that is just a lie. That is just not true. We care a lot about addressing public safety. It is one of our top priorities.

But that is not really what this is about because if this was really about addressing public safety, you would not have had the Vice President and Stephen Miller walking into Union Station, making fun of, deriding, and putting down the people of D.C. while they are deploying National Guardsmen from across the south to stand on street corners to talk to their friends and be on their iPhones all day. I mean, I want to be real. Like, this is not law enforcement.

I come from a veteran family. I support our law enforcement. I support our military. But this is not about law enforcement. And if you talk to any cop on the D.C. streets right now, you know, thank them for their service because in addition to actually dealing with real crime on the streets as trained law enforcement profes-

sionals, they have had to spend the last month dealing with the bullshit of the Trump Administration and a bunch of people who are standing around in the way of them actually doing their jobs. So, if this Administration actually wants to address public safety issues, stop holding the city of Washington, D.C., hostage.

Now, this is just exhausting to listen to this all day. And so, I would love to hear from you, Mr. Jackson. You have shared already this morning. With my remaining time, I would love to hear from you what you think Congress can do to help support the communities that you work with in D.C.

Mr. JACKSON. Just first of all, it is devastating what is happening in our communities. The first day of the D.C. takeover, we had to go into our communities and teach young people how to navigate law enforcement when their rights might be violated. Instead of teaching them about going to school and studying math and playing sports, they are trying to figure out how to navigate masked agents raiding their neighborhoods multiple times a day. Elderly folks that are getting arrested for petty crimes, 55 and plus, are now coming to us and saying, what can I do when these masked agents run into my neighborhood?

And that is not how we solve crime. We do not scare and incarcerate our way out of this issue. We tried that in the 1990s. It failed. The way that we address a public health crisis is we invest in prevention strategies. We look upstream to keep guns from pouring into our communities. You know, 95 percent of guns in this city come from outside of the District. We only have one gun store, but yet the FBI Director is bragging about apprehending guns in D.C. while President Trump's son is literally profiting with a smarter gun, buy a gun, smart gun company.

And so, what we really need in this moment is for Federal Government to do its job to keep guns from getting into our communities by cutting down on gun traffickers, by going after rogue gun dealers, by holding the gun manufacturers accountable and being tough on crime, specifically on those who are profiting off of the pain and death in our neighborhoods.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. Time has expired.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Cloud from Texas. Oh, is it Palmer or Cloud? Cloud from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Oh, the great State of Texas, as we like to say.

Thank you for being here. Thank you, Chairman, for holding this Committee [sic].

There is a lot of consternation today about President Trump deploying the National Guard to help crack down on crime. I can remember it was not that long ago where the Biden Administration had deployed the National Guard to block access to the people's Capitol. I would much more be in favor of helping solve the crime situation here in D.C. There did not seem to be a lot of consternation coming from the left during COVID when our Capitol was surrounded by barbed wire, and the National Guard were camped out.

Over the last three weeks, it is pretty undeniable. I mean, I remember what D.C. looked like, and it was just a couple months ago when Trump was elected. You can go by Union Station. There were homeless camps camped out. We had two staff members who had

to deal with situations at gunpoint where they were accosted at gunpoint. We had another staff member who had to move out of their apartment after being threatened. I took a train into Union Station and missed being present for someone getting shot. My chief of staff at the time was sitting out front and saw it happen, missed it by three minutes myself.

You know, and you look at the stats of what has happened, and it is important to, you know, there is a lot of comparing today apples to oranges and trying to, you know, you put up charts, and the numbers do not—but if you compare the 3-weeks this time to the 3-weeks last time, it is dramatic, 38 percent decrease in homicides, 44 percent decrease in sex abuse. I mean, this is extraordinary. If those trends were to continue, that is 50 people walking around the city alive, 50 families that have not been broken up over the course of a year. That is extraordinary.

Chairman Mendelson, can you not agree that D.C. is a safer place than it was five weeks ago?

Mr. MENDELSON. There is no question, but if you look at the data, the crime statistics, that there was a reduction in crime during the surge.

Mr. CLOUD. Yes, okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. But as we have said, if you want to add 500 officers working with our MPD, of course we are going to see a reduction in violence. That is not the same as ICE raids, masked men.

Mr. CLOUD. It is important—

Mr. MENDELSON. It is not the same as the National Guard, who is landscaping on the Mall.

Mr. CLOUD. Do I need to go back to my National Guard point? You did not have a problem when the National Guard was blocking access to the Nation's capital, prohibiting people from coming here. And to that point, D.C. is different than other cities. D.C. is unique. Our Founders—there was mention of the Boston Tea Party. The ones who were actually there wrote the Constitution and said that D.C. should not be a state because it houses the Federal Government. And it would be important for a state not to give undue influence over the Federal Government. We saw this during COVID—

Mr. MENDELSON. If you read the Federalist Papers—

Mr. CLOUD. Excuse me. I am talking.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. They say nothing about—

Mr. CLOUD. Excuse me, sir.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Denying us the franchise.

Mr. CLOUD. Sir. On September 20, Capitol Hill Baptist Church was denied a permit to worship outside because of COVID-19, yet we had a number of Black Lives Matter protests in this community. The concern I have is, when Washington, D.C., access to the Nation's capital is prohibited or curtailed in any way. Could you explain to me, Mayor, why the church was not able to have a worship service outside, but yet the Black Lives protests were being able to go on?

Ms. BOWSER. You are talking about the public health emergency?

Mr. CLOUD. I am talking about during COVID, Black Lives Matter protests continued to happen in Washington, D.C., with no ret-

tribution from the city, yet churches were not allowed to worship or worship outside even.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, I think that matter was litigated, and it is resolved.

Mr. CLOUD. Well, yes, COVID is over, but the point is is that you have a city basically defining who has access to the Nation's capital. And there were times where there were going to be a Trump rally, and somehow restaurants got closed down that weekend and those sorts of things. Why was this church not allowed to worship outside, yet Black Lives Matter protests were encouraged by the city?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, my recollection is that—

Mr. CLOUD. I mean, you went as far as to paint Black Lives Matters across the street. This is—

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, you—I wanted to answer your question. My recollection, and why I do not remember the specifics of that case, is that it fell under our large gathering prohibition in the early stages of COVID. When we—

Mr. CLOUD. But Black Lives Matters were okay? Were they not large enough? They were not violent enough?

Ms. BOWSER. You are probably referring to—

Mr. CLOUD. Or too violent maybe?

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Outdoor First Amendment gatherings that were not—

Mr. CLOUD. A worship service falls under the First Amendment.

Ms. BOWSER. And as I mentioned, this question has been litigated.

Mr. CLOUD. I only have a couple of minutes left and so I will just point out that the billion dollars you are asking for is in the CR that is on the House Floor this week. And everyone over there, I would encourage you to encourage the people up here to vote for that because if you want your dollars, they can help us provide it for you.

Ms. BOWSER. And Congressman, might I just add—

Mr. CLOUD. My time is up.

Ms. BOWSER. And I just, and I hope that that is the case, that the Fiscal Year 2025 fix is attached to the CR We worked very hard with the Administration and with you, Mr. Comer, to make sure that the anomaly was included moving forward in 2026. But the House, following Senator Collins' bill in the Senate, can still fix the Fiscal Year 2025 CR problem that was \$1.1 billion. And it is not too late, and it will help us balance.

Mr. CLOUD. The CR extends funding that our folks here have already voted for it. It also adds security features—

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. CLOUD [continuing]. And then adds that for D.C. So.

Ms. BOWSER. Got it.

Mr. CLOUD. I expect unanimous support over there, right? Okay.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I request—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Frost—

Mr. BELL [continuing]. Unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. From Florida.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I request—

Chairman COMER. Oh, Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Thank you. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this August 20, 2025, article from the *AP News* titled, "U.S. Attorney will no longer bring felony charges against people for carrying rifles or shotguns in D.C.," which shows that U.S. Attorney—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BELL [continuing]. Jeanine Pirro is outright ignoring gun crimes and making the city less safe.

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Chair, I have UCs. May I be recognized.

Chairman COMER. Yes, Ms. Simon.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, sir.

I request unanimous consent to enter into the record on April 24, 2025, an article from *Reuters* that was titled, "Exclusive: U.S. Department Of Justice cuts grants valued at \$811 million, people and records say," which shows how the President's DOJ cuts will affect police and correctional facility funding.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

And I have a unanimous consent request. This is the CR, and it does restore that \$1 billion in funding. So, we will be voting on that tomorrow. I am going to vote for it. I have been very vocal in trying to get that included. I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have mentioned it several times. So, there are a lot of people in Washington, D.C.—I assume this is on TV in Washington, D.C. Are you all going to vote for it tomorrow? I mean, that is a question I think the people in Washington, D.C., especially the people that are testifying here today would probably like to know, but I am going to vote for it. So.

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Without objection, we will enter that into the record.

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Chair, I have another UC, sir.

Chairman COMER. Yes, go ahead.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, sir.

I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this September 7, 2025, an article from *The Hill* entitled, "Most oppose Trump deploying National Guard to D.C., other cities: poll." Say that—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. SIMON. 57 percent of respondents said that they are against Donald Trump's decision to deploy the National Guard—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. SIMON [continuing]. Into the Nation's capital. Thank you, sir. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Frost from Florida.

Mr. FROST. I yield ten seconds to Mr. Mfume.

Chairman COMER. To Mr. Mfume?

Mr. FROST. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am sorry that my colleague from Texas has left the room. I just want to say that he pointed out in his remarks that the Founders of the Constitution said that D.C. should be a Federal district and never a state, as if they were right. And I would just simply call to his attention those same persons at that same Constitutional

Convention and for 200 years afterwards said that Black people in this country were property, not citizens. And then the Dred Scott decision said that we were three-fifths of an individual. So, just because they said it clearly does not make it right, and it does not make it right with D.C.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Yes, no, I really appreciate you bringing that up. And also they are wrong about what is in the Constitution in the first place. The Constitution does not say that we cannot make Washington, D.C., a state. It does not say that. You claim to know the Constitution, and you have not read it. Nowhere in the Constitution does it say that we cannot do that. What it says is there should be a Federal district. And the legislation put forth by Representative Norton and supported by House Democrats would make the Federal district encompass the places that we work, the White House, the U.S. Congress, the Supreme Court, and not include the 700,000 people who live in D.C. who pay taxes but do not have proper representation.

You know, usually, when we are talking about D.C. in this Committee, you know, usually, we have just folks who can watch in the audience. But I am happy that today is different because we have representatives from the District's local government and Mr. Greg Jackson, Jr. here to give voice to what is going on in Washington, D.C.

Greg, you called the District home for decades. You bring the perspective of the D.C.'s people to this Committee. You bring years of expertise and experience in crime reduction to this hearing, and of course, a survivor of gun violence yourself. Before President Trump started playing dictator with the people of D.C., he started dismantling important community safety and violence crime prevention programs, most notably the White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention, not a partisan office, an office that worked at reducing crime in all of our districts. As a former Deputy Director of that office, can you describe some of the important work that has stopped due to this Administration?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. One of the most critical things was we were coordinating the response to mass shootings and concentrations of violence, and so without that coordination, cities, states, and local jurisdictions are on their own to navigate these mass tragedies. We implemented 54 executive actions, including adding \$2 billion to the Victims of Crime Act Fund. And I will note that on August 2025, multiple states, I believe 24 states, sued this Administration for withholding \$1 billion in resources for victims of violent crime. But we were the ones that were pushing more resources to victims.

We also fully implemented the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act that each party came together on and voted for in 2022.

And then lastly, we worked directly with local leaders to make sure that we are elevating strategies that work across the country.

Mr. FROST. You also prevented serious crimes by ensuring that we prevent access to illegal guns, correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Correct. We partnered with agencies to do that.

Mr. FROST. You know, between 2017 and 2021, over 11,000 criminal firearms were recovered in D.C. Most of them, as you noted be-

fore, come from outside Washington, D.C. And an interesting statistic, too, is a third of those guns traveled over 300 miles, over 300 miles to come here. Do you want to know where they came from? South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Ohio. These are the states where these guns are coming from, states that do not have good gun laws, states that are not keeping their people safe, and as a result and byproduct, have wreaked havoc on the people of Washington, D.C.

Trump's total disregard for American safety is obvious from his current budget requests. Having already fired a majority of the Federal gun dealers inspectors, now he wants to slash another billion dollars that could be used to crack down on these guns. Congressional Republicans are also doing their part to make us less safe. They are trying to remove restrictions on silencers, trying to remove restrictions on rifles, even on firearms designed to look like everyday objects. And we even know that they are insincere in this because I just listed states that have some of the highest murder rates in the Nation.

I asked this question last time and I will ask it again. Where is their bill? If this is the way to end crime and this is the thing everybody wants, why don't they have a bill to invite the military to occupy their states which have the highest crime rates in this nation? They are not going to do it because they do not want the military to occupy their communities in their states because they know it is a load of crap, and they are insincere about it.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, I have a unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Who said that? I am looking.

Mr. FROST. Frost.

Chairman COMER. Oh yes, Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. This is a *Washington Post* piece by E.J. Dionne, Jr., "The good news about murder. Homicides are way down. What happened, what we can learn, and how progressives became crime fighters."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Attorney General Schwalb, are you aware that the FBI requires that all states and local governments, police departments report crime to the National Incident-Based Reporting System?

Mr. SCHWALB. I think that is correct, sir.

Mr. PALMER. Okay. Washington, D.C., has not done a good job at that. As a matter of fact, you have been accused of cooking the books. And it is not just a problem in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, when this went into effect, Illinois only reported 30.6 percent of their police departments reported; New Jersey, only 28.7 percent; New York, 13.8 percent; Maryland, 9.5 percent; California, 1.9 percent. I would argue that when you are presenting crime statistics, that these are highly suspect because state and local police departments are not reporting the data. We have known this for a long time that the homicide rates are under-reported. The FBI has made that clear.

I want to move to something else. We do have a crime surge. Violent crime, property crime, particularly vehicle theft. Washington, D.C. has a truancy problem. Almost 33 percent of the students are chronically truant, second only to Baltimore. What are you doing to resolve that, Mayor Bowser? And I want to add that 18,000 truancy cases went uninvestigated over the last three full school years.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, first and foremost—

Mr. PALMER. I am just asking, are you doing anything?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. What?

Ms. BOWSER. We have in place a regime where schools report, and we have most recently updated it to focus more on our human services department, a department that—

Mr. PALMER. Ma'am?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes?

Mr. PALMER. When I am asking you about investigating truancy cases, that means going out and finding the kid and getting them back in the classroom.

Ms. BOWSER. Oh, we do that. The police do that every day.

Mr. PALMER. Okay. Eighteen thousand went uninvestigated.

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Mr. PALMER. Half of your carjackings are by juveniles.

Ms. BOWSER. So, if you are—

Mr. PALMER. You have got five times more middle school students truant than you did a decade ago. That is a crisis. Do you believe that kids that are chronically truant are going to wind up becoming dropouts or undereducated, that it might lead to an increase in crime in that population?

Ms. BOWSER. We think the best place for kids is in school.

Mr. PALMER. No, no, no. No, no, no. How does it impact their life going forward? Because I am a big believer in getting kids out of failing schools. My wife and I support two private schools that are targeting inner city kids. These kids do not show up truant. They come to class. They graduate. They get jobs. They go to college. What are you doing to find these kids? And I am not talking about giving them a free lunch. I am talking about getting them back in the classroom. I mean, you said something about the National Guard mowing lawn. Maybe the National Guard ought to be helping find these kids and get them into school.

Mr. MENDELSON. Congressman, if I may, the Council has had hearings at least once a year. We have a hearing scheduled next month.

Mr. PALMER. Well, it is not doing any good.

Mr. MENDELSON. With regard to attendance and what we are doing—

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. To reduce truancy—

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MENDELSON. I agree with you that—

Mr. PALMER. How about all these kids that you have already lost?

Mr. MENDELSON. I agree with you—

Mr. PALMER. Because you sat on your butt and did not do anything about it?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well.

Mr. PALMER. Eighteen thousand went uninvestigated.

Mr. MENDELSON. I agree with you that attendance is important, and truancy is a problem. Truancy is actually down. It is down 22 percent since school year 2021, 2022. And serious—

Mr. PALMER. It is still—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Absenteeism, which is 30 percent—

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. Almost 33 percent.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Of days is down 43 percent since—

Mr. PALMER. It is down five percent in Baltimore—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. School year 2021, 2022.

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. From 54 percent to 49 percent. That is half your kids.

Mr. MENDELSON. So, it is down below that at this point. We get a report every fall. I do not know if you have seen the reports from the Attorney General, from Child and Family Services.

Mr. PALMER. Let me ask the Mayor this. Do you plan to take full advantage of the \$1,700 tax credit scholarship program that can go to scholarship-granting organizations to help kids get into schools where they are safe and where they can learn?

Ms. BOWSER. We do take advantage of the Opportunity Scholarship Program.

Mr. PALMER. That was in the One Big Beautiful Bill, by the way. We are committed to trying to help kids get a good education.

Ms. BOWSER. So are we.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Lee from Pennsylvania.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Every single time the Republicans call one of these overseer hearings on the District, we get the same paternalistic, infantilizing, just racially coded drivel. We are hearing the same old fearmongering, the same misdirection and misinformation today, off-topic claims, including getting rid of DEI in D.C. And it is crazy to say, because you can introduce DEI laws, but at the end of the day, you are not going to erase Black people from the District of Columbia or any other place, and I just wanted to start with that. And let us be real that is what is at the heart of all of these same conversations that we keep having about crime and underfunded and under-resourced Black communities while they ignore crime in the White House and in their own houses, so I just wanted to establish that as we go through this.

But Washington, D.C., we know, is in a unique situation. You are especially vulnerable to Trump's power-hungry overreach. Their elected officials do not have the same resources and also do not get the same respect, incidentally, from members of this panel that they would give to their own elected officials. But you do not have the same protections, congressional voting power or representation

as other states. That is why Trump is using D.C. as a test kitchen for all of the horrible policies that they are cooking up.

As Members of Congress representing those other states and cities, we need to be concerned about where he is going to target next. And we cannot roll over, shrug our shoulders, and say that at least the National Guardsmen are gardening or picking up trash. We have to push back on this right now, in this moment, before he comes for all of our districts.

To be clear, none of Trump's actions have made D.C. any safer. And just as a reminder, crime had already been dropping in the District without his involvement. He has been terrorizing D.C. residents with these mass and unaccountable Federal agents and armed National Guardsmen, armed National Guardsmen. He has completely broken any small amount of trust these communities have with local law enforcement. Many of the National Guard troops are from out of state, they do not know D.C. any more than you all do, and they do not know the communities.

D.C. residents deserve to govern themselves and have elected officials that are accountable to them, who uniquely understand D.C.'s needs and their concerns. But instead, Republicans want to micromanage people who did not vote for them and do not support their policies.

Chairman Mendelson, we marked up 14 bills on D.C. last week, 13 of which you opposed. Was the D.C. Council consulted on any of those 13 bills?

Mr. MENDELSON. We were not.

Ms. LEE. Have you taken any of the Members on this Committee on a full tour of D.C. neighborhoods?

Mr. MENDELSON. I have tried to meet with different Members without success.

Ms. LEE. Yes, because we all know they talk a lot about D.C., and they pretend to know D.C., but the reality is that very few of them have ever left any of the communities that are in walking distance of the Capitol itself. And I bet they probably have never even been—I remember last term we had a Member talk about, well, the unique part of D.C. is that you all get access to every Member of Congress. But I have never seen a Member of Congress in any of the carry-outs in D.C. I have not seen them at any of the Ethiopian restaurants or at a Caribbean joint, but that is neither here nor there.

Do you think it is necessary to work with local officials to improve public safety?

Mr. MENDELSON. Absolutely.

Ms. LEE. Has the Trump Administration reached out to the Council to ask you all what you need to help keep D.C. safe?

Mr. MENDELSON. They have not.

Ms. LEE. Crime is especially easy to exploit and use as a political tool. Everyone, regardless of how they vote, cares about safety. We care about community safety. That is why I launched the Community Safety Agenda and Caucus because we have community-based, evidence-backed solutions that we know work. But instead of offering real solutions to prevent crime, to respond to people in crisis and stop violence, which D.C. and many other cities have invested

in, Trump's scare tactics and political theater only makes these communities safe.

These proactive investments in communities that actually bring down crime, the data could not be any clearer. The programs that work to stop crime before it can happen, rather than just responding afterwards, yet D.C. is struggling to fund these types of programs because you all have not restored and passed the \$1 billion that Congress owes them.

Attorney General Schwalb, you have made stable housing for D.C. a priority, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. I have.

Ms. LEE. You have implemented programs that improve nuisance properties, after-school programs for kids, victims of domestic violence, and the goal to make D.C. safer, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. I have.

Ms. LEE. Mayor Bowser, we know that these litany of proactive investments actually drive down crime. Has Trump promised you any funding for any of these things?

Ms. BOWSER. No, not yet.

Ms. LEE. Great. The cost of having a National Guard is about \$1.8 billion a day. We are up to about \$40 billion, they say about \$200 billion. A bunch of these out-of-state guards roaming the street is not a sustainable solution that is not more sustainable than actually investing in these things, investing in our communities. We know that if you really want lifelong safe communities, then we need to invest the same way that these people invest in their people, in their communities, and their loved ones. Invest in these folks the same way, and stop talking about crime and fearmongering these people.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry from Pennsylvania.

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Yes. I am sorry.

Ms. ANSARI. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record the January 30, 2025, article from *NPR*. It is titled "Criminal records of January 6 rioters pardoned by Trump include rape, domestic violence," which highlights how President Trump released January 6 rioters with records of violent crime back onto our streets, including—

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. Sexual assault of a child, production and possession of child pornography—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. Forcible rape, and conspiracy of murder of Federal employees and threatening Federal officials.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor, thanks for being here. Thanks for being in the arena. We know it is difficult. I think the case that we are trying to make today is that there is a crime problem, and when you prioritize solutions, you can actually make a difference. And I am just going to quantify that statement because I think that Washington, D.C.,

has a crime problem. Should not just say that, but if it is true, it would be evidenced.

And the House Budget Committee reported in early 2024 that crime surged by nearly 40 percent last year, which is 2023, with over 270 murders, 950 carjackings, and 106 children shot, reminiscent of the 1990s crack epidemic. And of course, you know, you have heard the stories of staff members here. We all, believe it or not, know somebody that had been a victim of crime right in the Nation's capital.

As of October 2023, the violent crime rate in D.C. hit 664.2 per 100,000 people. For comparison, New York City had a violent crime rate of 184.4 per 100,000 people, so that is dramatic, right? 184.4 versus 664.2 for D.C., dramatic. In 2024 in Washington, D.C., 72 percent of all property crimes were larceny, theft, and motor vehicle theft, burglaries, et cetera. Washington, D.C., had 3,693 offenses per 100,000 people, which would rank it first among all states in terms of highest property crime rates per USAFacts, and that is if it were a state.

So, that is what I am saying. I think D.C. does have a crime problem. And look, there has been a lot of complaining here, not necessarily by you, about, you know, what the President's actions are, the guard being in D.C. In one case, they are claiming that they are policing D.C. In the next case, they are, you know, blowing the leaves away. It is one or the other, but it is not both.

But let me ask you this. You have got a problem. You are the Mayor. You probably know. You are living here, too. Did you ever reach out to the President, to any President, and say, look, we have got a problem here. Will you deploy the Guard? Will you help us with police? We are not handling it. We cannot fill our ranks. We cannot afford to. Have you ever done that?

Ms. BOWSER. I have called on the National Guard in D.C. I called on them during COVID. I have called on them in other weather emergencies, yes.

Mr. PERRY. What about as a general—look, the crime stats I just related to you are ongoing, right? This is not just a surge. This is not a momentary COVID thing.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. This is a daily thing for the people of Washington, D.C., to endure—

Ms. BOWSER. And—

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. And the people of the country that want to come to their Nation's capital who are afraid to come to endure. So, have you ever done it on a consistent basis, saying to the President of the United States, this is the Nation's capital. You reside here. Can you send me the Guard to help assist with law enforcement or assist with policing? Have you ever done that other than episodically?

Ms. BOWSER. No, I described to you the times that we have done it. And we have—

Mr. PERRY. Yes, it is just episodic. And so, my point is, is that the problem has to be focused on, and it has to be fixed—

Ms. BOWSER. But Mr. Perry, can I answer you a different way?

Mr. PERRY. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. Because we do not regard the Guard as a law enforcement agency.

Mr. PERRY. It is not a law enforcement agency.—

Ms. BOWSER. And we—

Mr. PERRY. But it can assist—

Ms. BOWSER. And so, we would not—

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. In law enforcement.

Ms. BOWSER. We would not, we would not call on them—

Mr. PERRY. But you would agree—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. To police our neighborhoods.

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. That right now, crime has dropped—

Ms. BOWSER. But let me—

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. Dramatically—

Ms. BOWSER. Let me finish, Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. Since they have been present.

Ms. BOWSER. Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. What has worked is not the National Guard in helping enhance MPD services. What has worked is more DEA, more FBI—

Mr. PERRY. So, you are saying the Guard—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. More law enforcement.

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. Has had no impact in D.C.?

Ms. BOWSER. No, what I am saying is the Guard is not, as has been—

Mr. PERRY. And how do you—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Described to us.

Mr. PERRY. Can you quantify that? Can you quantify that?

Ms. BOWSER. I cannot quantify a causal—

Mr. PERRY. Okay.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Relationship.

Mr. PERRY. You cannot quantify it, so you cannot make the claim. But I can quantify something. Listen, I want to talk to you about something else, which is—

Ms. BOWSER. But I do want to make the point.

Mr. PERRY. Let me ask you—I want to ask you this question. I am running out of time.

Ms. BOWSER. Okay.

Mr. PERRY. And I want to be respectful of everybody here.

Mr. MENDELSON. But I do not think the Guard has made any arrests.

Mr. PERRY. I want to ask you—so, you have employed a bunch of traffic cameras, a whole pile of them, hundreds and hundreds of them. Are traffic cameras for safety or for revenue generation?

Ms. BOWSER. They are for safety.

Mr. PERRY. But it says here that you plan to fill a hole, a \$580 million revenue hole in your budget shortfalls using traffic cameras, right?

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Mr. PERRY. You said that.

Ms. BOWSER. No, what we said is that our budget includes revenue generated from traffic cams.

Mr. PERRY. Expected at \$580.

Ms. BOWSER. We do not—

Mr. PERRY. You said this, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. We want to drive—

Mr. PERRY. It is per the *Fines and Fees Justice Center*. Let me just, because I want to quantify this as well. In 2006, you had 43 fatalities, traffic fatalities. But in 2023 and 2024, you had 52 each of those two years. The traffic cameras are not making your people safer, and particularly in Wards 7 and 8, where it is predominantly a Black population, 20 percent below the poverty line, these fines imposed on them hurt the worst for people. So, traffic cameras and automatic traffic enforcement, it should be about safety, but it is unfortunately about revenue generation, and it is imposed on the people that can least afford it in the District of Columbia, the people that you represent.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, Mr. Perry—

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. I wish that you had also pointed to this year's traffic fatality and collision information. So, in addition—

Mr. PERRY. Ma'am, this year is not done yet.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, it is trending in the right direction, yes.

Mr. PERRY. But this time last year, you were already at 52.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, but the trend is so that we would be at—well below those numbers. And our traffic cameras are a part of that equation. The engineering—

Mr. PERRY. The traffic cameras, ma'am—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Fixes—

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. With all due respect, you have the worst traffic in the country by city, according to Consumer Reports, and that includes L.A. And not allowing people to turn right on red is a contributor to that, and then fining them, especially in the places where people can least afford it is grifting on the people that support your city, and it should not be done. It should be about safety. The fourth most populated city in the country, Hoboken, has zero cameras and zero fatalities, ma'am.

I yield.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Simon.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Ranking Member.

Before my remarks, I just have a couple of questions. My first question is to the elected AG of the District of Columbia. Can you talk very briefly and educate all of us on the victim services that your office provides to victims?

Mr. SCHWALB. In virtually every case where we have a victim that has been harmed by a violent crime, the specialists in our office are working with them, not just to make sure they are available to be witnesses in prosecution but to make sure they access the services they need, both economic and financial support, as well as emotional and counseling support, to make sure they are taken care of.

Ms. SIMON. And AG, would you say that your victim services division is adequately funded?

Mr. SCHWALB. We can always use more money to make sure that we are providing that critical service, but the team I have is doing an extraordinary job with what we have.

Ms. SIMON. And what you all provide is not only protection for witnesses. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. We certainly do more than just protecting the witnesses, yes.

Ms. SIMON. Is it also making sure that victims of domestic violence have opportunities to leave their abusers and save their own lives?

Mr. SCHWALB. One of the things that we do every day is making sure victims of domestic violence are getting protective orders and making sure that they are protected from people who may be putting them in a dangerous place.

Ms. SIMON. Isn't it true that you work with mothers of murdered children?

Mr. SCHWALB. We do.

Ms. SIMON. Isn't it true that you provide burial and counseling assistance for folks in our communities who have been victimized by violence?

Mr. SCHWALB. We do.

Ms. SIMON. And I want to thank you for that work. AG, would you also say that in the District of Columbia, the young people that you are prosecuting do not have readable access to mental health supports in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SCHWALB. We know that we have a job to do, which is holding young people accountable when they commit crimes, and we are doing that every day. But too often, we see the young people that are coming into the criminal justice system struggling with terrible trauma, mental health, behavioral health challenges, and we cannot ignore that need, too.

Ms. SIMON. That is right.

Mr. SCHWALB. We have got to do both. And while we will do the prosecution work, and we will continue to do that, we cannot ignore the fact that there are causes that lead to repeat offenders, violent offenders, and sometimes it is the mental health and trauma that young people are carrying around. If we do not ignore it and—if we do ignore it and do not address it, we are going to be continually fighting this issue.

Ms. SIMON. Wouldn't you also agree, AG, that reentry services create opportunities for young people who have been convicted and have served time in the juvenile detention facility the opportunity to stop the pattern of committing crime?

Mr. SCHWALB. A hundred percent.

Ms. SIMON. Would you agree that the defunding of reentry services increases the likelihood of young people not being able to do the rehabilitative work to be able to maintain their civility and their opportunities to do right by all of us?

Mr. SCHWALB. If we do not take care of kids after they have been committed, after they have faced consequences, with getting back into community and making sure that they have healthy, hopeful pathways—kids with hope are safer to everyone around them.

Ms. SIMON. I would say that that is not soft on crime. Would you agree that if you have to charge every 14-year-old and put them

in an adult cage, that when they get out—because they will get out—that they will be worse than when they came in?

Mr. SCHWALB. We know that to be true.

Ms. SIMON. We know that to be true. Over 40 percent of young people who are charged as adults, they do get out, and they are more likely to offend than if they were processed and rehabilitated in the juvenile court. Is that not fact?

Mr. SCHWALB. We need to make sure that young people, when they commit crimes, are held accountable with swift and certain consequences, and we are doing that. Long prison sentences or putting kids into the adult criminal justice system does not make us safer in the long run. And that is what I am committed to. I want our D.C. to be safer now and into the future, and we can do both.

Ms. SIMON. One of the reasons why I abandoned my prepared remarks, I spent almost 30 years working with some of the most troubled young people in my community. And in the programs that I developed and implemented, we reduced crime and recidivism by almost 70 percent of young women who are in the juvenile justice system. And that work was not done by prosecuting them as adults and putting them into cages to rot. What we did was invest deeply in their rehabilitation but also in their accountability and ensuring that the victims were made whole.

So, I want to thank you all for your assertion that D.C. not only can govern itself, but if we were to do right by victims and right by children and right by families, we would fund education. We would have free childcare. We would ensure that every person who was seeking healthcare could get it. We are so far from that vision. So instead of problematizing the elected leaders of this city, I would hope that in the future that folks who have no experience in law enforcement on this body listen to the experts.

Thank you so much. And I yield back.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. MENDELSON. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The witnesses have requested a recess, but we are going to recognize one more Member. Then we are going to have a 15-minute recess.

So, the Chair recognizes Mr. Crane from Arizona.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say thank you to the guests for showing up today. Since I only have 5 minutes, my first question is going to be a yes or no. Does D.C. have a crime problem, Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. Any crime is too much crime, Mr. Crane, but—we are trending in the right direction.

Mr. CRANE. Sorry, just yes or no?

Mr. MENDELSON. It is not a yes or no question.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. Chairman Mendelson, does D.C. have a crime problem, yes or no?

Mr. MENDELSON. There is more crime than we want, but it is significantly—

Mr. CRANE. All right. I am—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Less.

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. Moving on since you cannot follow the instructions. Attorney General, does D.C. have a crime problem, yes or no?

Mr. SCHWALB. One crime is one too many.

Mr. CRANE. Okay.

Mr. SCHWALB. We got to keep working at it.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. One crime is one too many, I agree.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you. Do you guys know where D.C. ranks amongst U.S. cities in crime? Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. In what category?

Mr. CRANE. Crime rates.

Ms. BOWSER. You have to be more specific. And I do not—

Mr. CRANE. It is okay.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Have a list—

Mr. CRANE. It is okay.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Of other cities—

Mr. CRANE. You guys—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Or states.

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. Actually rank number seven.

Ms. BOWSER. Okay.

Mr. CRANE. So, you are in the top ten of most violent cities in the United States. And this is, as other Members have pointed out, our city, our Nation's capital, a lot of people come here. And Mayor, I know, like many of my colleagues have already mentioned, you got a very tough job, and we all appreciate that.

Mr. MENDELSON. It all depends on how you crunch the numbers.

Mr. CRANE. Hold on a second. I am not—

Mr. SCHWALB. *U.S. News and World Report*—

Mr. CRANE. I did not ask you a question. Has crime gone down?

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Did not place us in the top 25.

Mr. CRANE. Hey, hold on a second. I am asking the questions here.

Has crime gone down since the President deployed the National Guard and other Federal agencies, Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. I already mentioned, Congressman, the numbers during the Federal surge.

Mr. CRANE. So it has gone down?

Ms. BOWSER. It accelerated, yes.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mendelson, you said in criticism to the National Guard being present in D.C., you said that they look bored. I am going to ask you a question, sir. Would you rather have National Guardsmen standing posts around D.C. looking bored but driving down crime or continue to be ranked in the top ten in the country in violent crime?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, as I was trying to say, depending upon how you look at the data, we do not even place in the top 25. Now, I, in my testimony, I outlined eight ways—

Mr. CRANE. That is definitely not the reporting that I have seen. You guys are ranked—

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, *U.S. News and World Report*—

Mr. CRANE. You guys are ranked number seven.

Mr. MENDELSON. *U.S. News and World Report*.

Mr. CRANE. You guys are ranked number seven.

Mr. MENDELSON. You can see that study.

Mr. CRANE. All right. Moving on. Councilman Mendelson, did you vote with the rest of the City Council to defund the police by \$15 million in 2020?

Mr. MENDELSON. I do not believe that is the correct amount, but I did vote—

Mr. CRANE. Yes, you did.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. For the budget then.

Mr. CRANE. You did. Okay. Councilman, did you call the police in July 2025 because of a protest outside of your home?

Mr. MENDELSON. I called 911.

Mr. CRANE. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. It was at midnight. In fact, it was 12:30 in the morning.

Mr. CRANE. Right.

Mr. MENDELSON. And it was a number—

Mr. CRANE. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Of individuals who were actually breaking the law, the Residential Tranquility Act, with how loud they were.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. So, you voted to defund policing by \$15 million in 2020 with the rest of the Council. This is what the police union, police officers, had to say about your interaction—

Mr. MENDELSON. I know what you are—

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. With the police.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Going to say, and I have already said it to Mr. Pemberton.

Mr. CRANE. Well, I am going to say it, so you are not going to interrupt me. “Over the weekend, Chairman Mendelson called the police because there were peaceful protesters at his house. Because he decimated the police department with horrible legislation, and our staffing has now 800-plus vacancies, there was a delay in responding to his home. Because of the delay, Chairman Mendelson called and screamed at Office of Unified Communications (OUC) and MPD staff. There is now a permanent security detail at his home, staffed by an MPD officer who should be handling more important matters.

We currently have 3,100 total sworn members, the lowest in 50 years, and we now have to dedicate one of them to be a security blanket for a man who hates cops, while other people calling 911 for real emergencies will have to wait. This nonsense must end immediately.” So, that is what the police department had to say about you and that incident.

Mr. MENDELSON. No, police union, not police department, sir.

Mr. CRANE. Yes, the police union, the union that represents police officers.

Mr. MENDELSON. I am aware of that statement, and it is false on numerous points.

Mr. CRANE. Do they represent police officers, Mr. Mendelson, the police union?

Mr. MENDELSON. It is the union President.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. Attorney General Schwalb, do you agree that all legal measures should be on the table to combat crime and lawlessness in the city?

Mr. SCHWALB. I do.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. Then why historically has the D.C. Attorney General declined to prosecute crimes? According to media reports, D.C. declined to prosecute crimes in 67 percent of arrests in 2023 under AG Graves. The D.C. quarterly clearance reports from your office show a similar trend in 2025 through Q1 and 2. You are only prosecuting 53 percent of gun-related homicides, 50 percent of sex abuse cases involving a knife, and 37 percent of nonfatal shootings. There is also an ongoing investigation into if the D.C. crime data was manipulated under Joe Biden so that historic level of crime did not look as bad on paper. And I look forward to the outcome of this investigation.

Now——

Mr. SCHWALB. Mr. Crane, if I can answer your——

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. Going back to your——

Mr. SCHWALB. Can I answer your question?

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. Initial answer, is that doing everything you can to protect this city?

Mr. SCHWALB. The statistics that you just read are the statistics not from my office, but from the Federal U.S. Attorney's Office. The prosecution rates from the Office of Attorney General have been in excess of 84 percent for violent crime over the last two years. So, the statistics you rely on to malign my office do not come from my office. They come from the Federal U.S. Attorney's Office.

Mr. CRANE. So, you are prosecuting all of these crimes is what you are saying?

Mr. SCHWALB. The jurisdiction of the Office of Attorney General in the District of Columbia is to prosecute juvenile delinquency crimes. And last year, we prosecuted more than 84 percent of the violent juvenile crimes that MPD brought to us. We prosecute every violent crime where we have sufficient evidence to meet our burden of proof. Kids need to face consequences——

Mr. CRANE. I agree.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. And be held accountable, and we are doing that. The rates speak for themselves.

Mr. CRANE. Are you in support of moving the age of minors here in D.C.? That is one of the bills that we have this week.

Mr. SCHWALB. The residents of the District of Columbia, the 700,000 of us who live here, know more and care more about how we are going to make our city safe than anybody else. The residents——

Mr. CRANE. You did not answer my question.

Mr. SCHWALB. The residents of the District of Columbia and their elected officials do not believe we are going to make ourselves safer——

Mr. CRANE. Why do you think the rest of the country considers somebody at 18 years old no longer a minor? What is it here in D.C.?

Mr. SCHWALB. The age of anyone younger than 18 is a juvenile in the District of Columbia, just like the rest of the country.

Mr. CRANE. Don't you guys consider people that are 25 and below minors?

Mr. SCHWALB. I think you misunderstand the law, sir.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired, but feel free to answer that, General.

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, I think you are misunderstanding the law, and I think you are referring to the Youth Rehabilitation Act. But in our city, youth younger than 18 are treated as juveniles. The Youth Rehabilitation Act involves a totally different set of adult defendants in criminal cases and involves a different issue that the city has confronted. And I think that issue has been conflated in some of the laws that this body has put forth. And I really wish we could have had a conversation beforehand so we could have explained better what the YRA does, relative to all of the other laws that we have in our city, that we are working every day to help drive juvenile crime and violent crime down.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. So, you support the Youth Rehabilitation Act? I think that was one of the questions he was asking. Do you support that?

Mr. SCHWALB. The question was whether or not we—

Chairman COMER. Do you support the Youth Rehabilitation Act? That is part of what we are repealing.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, we are two and a half minutes over.

Chairman COMER. Okay. All right. Time has expired.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. We plan to reconvene in 15 minutes at the request of the witnesses. The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come to order. Before we resume the questioning part of the hearing, I want to recognize Ms. Norton from Washington, D.C., for some unanimous consent requests. Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a unanimous consent request to enter into the record a statement from Donald Sherman from CREW regarding the takeover of D.C. local law enforcement, a letter from Brady on restricting the autonomy of the District of Columbia, and a statement from the Project on Government Oversight regarding the militarizing of law enforcement in the District of Columbia, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

All right. I will recognize myself for 5 minutes.

I want to touch up on something that Mr. Frost said. He kept asking, where is your bill, where is your bill? And, you know, there are two schools of thought up here as we try to address the crime crisis in Washington, D.C. and try to come to solutions. And I feel like one thing that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle constantly say, you have to have a bill to do this. They said you had to have a bill to secure the border. Well, President Trump secured the border within days of assuming the Presidency. It was not the lack of a bill. And their bill, by the way, had a lot of amnesty in there, which made it a toxic bill. And that was a poison pill, as we say often about bills.

So, there is also a school of thought that to alleviate poverty or to control poverty, you have to have a bill. You have to have government programs. You have to hire a bunch of government bureaucrats. You have to have government funding, and it has to in-

crease by ten percent every year, every year, year after year, year after year. Many of us, myself included, believe that the best way to end poverty is to try to help grant access to a good-paying job, a good-paying job. And we do not think you get good-paying jobs through government bureaucracies, through government agencies, through never-ending creation of new government programs.

And with respect to alleviating crime in Washington, D.C., we had, as we all know, an aggressive markup last week. And, you know, the bills addressed, many of them, juvenile crime. So, General Schwalb, do you agree or disagree that there is a juvenile crime problem in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. SCHWALB. I think we need to make sure that when kids commit crimes, particularly violent crimes—

Chairman COMER. But is there—it seems like, looking out the window at night, there were a lot of kids running around. You know, a lot of the carjackings were committed by juveniles, just an excessively high juvenile crime rate, if you define juvenile as, you know, the way your definition under 24 is.

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, here in the District, Mr. Chairman, juvenile is defined as younger than 18. My office is addressing every violent juvenile crime that we have.

Chairman COMER. So, there is no juvenile crime crisis in Washington? Is that what you want to say?

Mr. SCHWALB. One crime from a young person—

Chairman COMER. Okay.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Is one too many.

Chairman COMER. So, Chairman Mendelson, is there a juvenile crime problem in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, the challenge, Mr. Chairman, is that what does problem mean? So, if I were to say yes—

Chairman COMER. Okay. So that is—

Mr. MENDELSON. No, there is too much—

Chairman COMER. I mean, if you cannot say there is a juvenile crime problem in Washington, D.C., that is why we have to come in—

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I am trying to give you an honest—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And help out a little bit.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I am trying to give you an honest—

Chairman COMER. And many of us believe that the juvenile crime problems were created by excessive, excessive criminal justice reform. Now, I supported criminal justice reform back when it first became a thing in Kentucky. So did another Republican, Rand Paul. At that time, it dealt with incarcerating young people because of possession of marijuana. And I believed then, and I still believe, that, you know, that was an excessive penalty to pay for what is now legal in most states, marijuana. And it did appear to me by the numbers to have a trace of racism in it, that it seemed like many times White kids that got possession of marijuana somehow got out of it over Black kids. I believe that. I said that publicly in Kentucky.

But over time, the activists, you know, continued to expand that and expand that to, you know, no bail, cashless bail, raise the age of what is a juvenile, and, you know, treat juveniles to where they

got a slap on the wrist even if they committed a serious crime. And that is why we stepped in.

So, you all have said—and I am talking about Chairman Mendelson and General Schwalb—that you oppose every bill that we passed out of this Committee, I will assume. I believe Ms. Norton read letters of opposition from you all on the bills. What is the answer to juvenile crime? And I mean, do you think it is working if we do nothing, which is what the Democrats in here want to do, and which is what I think you all want to do? Is it going to get better on its own?

Mr. MENDELSON. Mr. Chairman, if you want a conversation, a yes or no is difficult for a conversation. What do I think we can do to reduce juvenile crime? Because I do think there is more of it than there should be by far. I think, for one thing, we have to address public education and attendance. We have to look at kids who are missing school and see that as an opportunity to identify why they are missing school. There may be something dysfunctional in the home or with that juvenile that needs to be addressed.

Chairman COMER. And I will let you answer—

Mr. MENDELSON. I am interested in reducing—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. A lot of questions, Mr. Mendelson. But we believe that the message has been sent that if you are a juvenile and you commit a crime in Washington, D.C., you will not be held accountable.

Mr. MENDELSON. And that is a mistake if that is the message because that is not the message that any of the three of us take.

Chairman COMER. Well, we are not saying you—that is the unintended consequence of the laws that the Council passed. And to the Mayor's credit, she vetoed several of those laws. And I do not think, you know, another thing—they always say, and I think Mr. Jackson said—a takeover, you know, from the National Guard in Kentucky when we had the Breonna Taylor riots and stuff in Louisville. Louisville is Democrat mayor, and we have a Democrat Governor in Kentucky. Without hesitation, the Democrat Governor, along with the support of the mayor, allowed the National Guard to come in and restore order. No one in Kentucky complained about the National Guard coming in. No one said it was a takeover and they were going to have to train and educate the youth on how to respond to the National Guard. That was just what was done to restore order.

So, we support what the President is doing. We want to work with the Council and the Mayor's office and the AG to try to come up with solutions to the problem. But doing nothing is not working. And that is kind of what my colleagues over here want to do, creating more government programs, hiring more government bureaucrats. That is not work. That has been the business model in the past, and it has not worked. It has not worked in Washington, D.C., and it is not working in a lot of other cities. So, hopefully, we can continue to have dialog and come up with solutions to solve the crime crisis, especially the juvenile crime crisis in Washington.

Now, the Chair recognizes Mr. Khanna from California.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairman, this Administration has initiated the largest assault on the First Amendment and free speech in modern history.

They are making comedy illegal. Brendan Carr pressured ABC to cancel Jimmy Kimmel, and Disney cancels Jimmy Kimmel, this canceling from an Administration that lectured us about cancel culture.

That is why today I am introducing a motion to subpoena Brendan Carr to bring him in front of this Committee to stop the intimidation of private businesses and to stand up for the First Amendment.

Now, it is not just Brendan Carr. Attorney General Pam Bondi is prosecuting hate speech, even though hate speech is constitutionally protected, and even though we have had so many lectures from my friends on the other side of the aisle not to prosecute hate speech.

And then what about our Vice President, the champion of free speech, as he told us during the campaign? The Vice President is telling Americans to snitch on fellow Americans who have offensive posts and to call their employers so they can be fired. And the Vice President is threatening to prosecute political organizations that he disagrees with.

Look, we are article 1 of the Constitution, not foot lackeys for Donald Trump and J.D. Vance. It is time that we stand up for our constitutional role to defend the freedoms of Americans. People are tired of us just giving our power to Donald Trump and J.D. Vance. We have an obligation to our Constitution, not to Donald Trump and J.D. Vance, as they ride roughshod over the First Amendment.

So, in the name of all those who are being censored in Washington, D.C., and around the country; in the name of all those who are being intimidated in Washington, D.C., and around the country; in the name of Americans, Republicans, Independents, and Democrats, who believe in the First Amendment and free speech, I motion today to subpoena Brendan Carr and to have him explain to the American people why he is bullying private individuals and private businesses.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Pursuant to this rule—and I will get the exact language so we make it official. Pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(6), I motion to subpoena Brendan Carr to come before this Committee and testify in front of the full Oversight Committee. And I hope that my motion to subpoena him will be voted on as soon as possible.

Chairman COMER. A motion is made. The Committee will hold this motion in abeyance until 1:45, give everybody time to come back in here.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. And if I might say.

Mr. KHANNA. Yes, sir.

Chairman COMER. I know Brendan Carr well. And—

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chair, I hope you will have him come in.

Chairman COMER. Well, I think we could do that. I think we could—

Mr. KHANNA. I appreciate that, sir.

Chairman COMER. I do not think the motion is necessary, but I am pretty confident he would be willing to come in to testify. So.

Mr. KHANNA. Well, thank you.

Chairman COMER. I will just say that. I do not think the motion is necessary. Do you want to withdraw the motion?

Mr. KHANNA. I still want the motion, sir. Well—

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. KHANNA [continuing]. You know, we will do it, and he can come in. But I would appreciate, you know, I have appreciated your working with our Ranking Member on Epstein, and I have appreciated your collaboration with him. Of course, I appreciate our Ranking Member's leadership on this issue, and he deserves a lot of credit for our subpoena today. But, you know, if you want to work with our Ranking Member on a collaborative process on that, like you have been on Epstein, I would appreciate it.

Mr. GARCIA. Yes, thank you.

Ms. ANSARI. I would also like to second the motion.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Thank you, Congresswoman. And yes, first of all, thank you, Representative Khanna.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a great offer. I think obviously we are very interested in what is happening, and if we could come to an agreement. I know we have another 30 minutes or so before we actually take this vote, but if we can come to an agreement prior to that—I would like to talk to Mr. Khanna and to you—because our goal and clearly yours is to get him in front of this Committee. I think it would be very productive.

Chairman COMER. And I think he would want to come—well, nobody wants to come in front of the Committee, but I think he would be willing to come in front of the Committee. So.

Mr. GARCIA. So, I think we have—

Chairman COMER. We will make sure our staffs are in communication and we will see. But your motion is recognized, and we will see if we can come up with something before 1:45. If we cannot, we will vote on it.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Sessions from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the members of the panel who have taken their time to be with us today.

General, you and I met on the street the other day, and you were most elegant in your discussion with me, and I welcomed you to the Hill. And I am glad that you are here. Mayor, thank you, and I am glad you are here. I have got a note for you that I want to bring to you also.

I think it is important for us to understand where we are coming from as Republicans, perhaps. I do not want to say that Democrats would be a lot different. I think it is just the answer of how you get there. We want this to be a safe town. We want this to be a town that works. We want this to be a town where people can come and visit this town and feel like they can come to our Nation's capital and see things in a way where they are safe, their children are safe, they are not worried about a drive-by shooting. They are not worried about a lot of things that are very present in this town. They are very present in New York City. And we want to be accused of trying to help to make things better.

So, I became engaged, as I told the General, in trying to look at how we satisfy with a better answer, with another answer that I think is better on the Judicial Commission. You may be completely happy with the Judicial Commission. I looked at it, and I am not. There are a huge number of vacancies where people have been nominated for years, Republicans, Democrats, President Biden, President Trump, leaders of the majority of both parties, and it is still hanging out there.

And I simply believe that this city is entitled to our help, and that is what we are trying to do with these bills. I most sincerely believe, as I told the General, I most sincerely believe that it is not good to have—I do not know the exact number—but ten or twelve people that have been nominated that are not serving today, and those judges that are on there on the superior court or on the court of appeals are vacant. And they have been vacant, some of them, since 2013. This is darn near 2025.

And I think that if you go to a model that may work, that is all we are trying to say. I think having the President, whether the President is Republican, whether the President is a Democrat, will have an intrinsic interest. And I remember this, when my parents moved us here in 1969. We knew Washington struggled in lots of ways, but the Presidents all tried to, every one of them, to do something that they saw that would better Washington.

I believe that if we come and try and help with the most sincerity that our young Chairman has, that I think our Members have, it is not about trying to parse words together about whether it is a local judge or not. It is a superior court judge that we are not going to replace any of them. We are trying to move forward to fill those seats of a superior court judge or of an appeals court, superior appeals court judge.

And on the Floor, this thing got pitched as, you are trying to make things that are simple about local judges. There is not much local about this in some respects. It is a national treasure.

So, it is my hope that you would perhaps look through some of the words that are said here and just accept the sincerity by which we come to you, and that I do, and I think our Chairman, and I think the others do. We are trying to help.

So, General, I looked you in the eye. You were most genuine with me. I want to be most genuine with you and say, maybe your feedback about what we do, you might disagree with, but please give us at least credit. We are trying to leave it for any Republican or Democrat to make the decision because they will take the responsibility to get the judges.

Mr. SCHWALB. Representative Sessions, I want to appreciate very much your spirit of working with us on this issue because the vacancies on our court are having a very significant impact on our public safety system and our economy. But the problem with getting judges on our court is not sitting with the Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC). The way to solve getting judges on our court—and I appreciate your willingness to think about solutions—would be to allow our Mayor to nominate judges and have our Council confirm judges the way it is done in your state and states around the country. And we would get that vacancy on our superior court fixed right away.

So, there are multiple ways of getting it solved. I do not think the JNC is the problem. I think the problem has been in the White House and in the Senate, and we could solve this problem together if you would be open, and your colleagues open, to changing the law to allow the Mayor to nominate, the Council to confirm, just like states around the country do. And I appreciate your—

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Spirit of cooperation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir. And my only counter to you is, like a lot of things here, they have been in control of the Council or the Mayor, and we slightly disagree.

Mr. MENDELSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. We slightly disagree about the crime bill. We slightly disagree about a lot of things. I am trying to fix it.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I—thank you. We believe that if a President can have some skin in the game in this town, Republican or Democrat, they will follow through and get those judges confirmed.

I want to thank each of you. Mayor, I am going to walk down and give you something, just a note.

General—

Mr. MENDELSON. Could I answer for just a second? I think the problem is, if—Mr. Chairman, may I just?

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. MENDELSON. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. This is part of good dialog, sir.

Mr. MENDELSON. I agree. In my view, the problem is that the District is not important enough to the Federal Government. It is important today in this hearing, but that vacancy for 13 years, no President has seen us important enough to submit a nomination.

Last December—

Mr. SESSIONS. Oh, he has been nominated.

Mr. MENDELSON. Last December—

Mr. SESSIONS. It is pending.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. The Senate did not think it was important enough to confirm the judges that were pending that had been reported out of Committee because there are always other issues. There are national issues that are more important to you all.

Mr. SESSIONS. But the President nominated them.

Chairman COMER. All right. Okay.

Mr. SESSIONS. The President could have worked—

Chairman COMER. You all could have good conversation after.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and the Ranking Member, thank you for allowing me this time.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate it.

Mr. MENDELSON. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Randall from Washington State.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to our witnesses for being here today as your city goes through these difficult circumstances.

I have heard a lot of discussions over the past few weeks about public safety and crime in Washington, D.C., here on the Hill and from my friends and neighbors who live in the District of Columbia. And these concerns about crime have been used as justification for President Trump's militarization and occupation. Like my Republican colleagues, I believe that Federal Government has a role to play in improving public safety. I would also say, like my Democratic colleagues, we believe that everyone deserves to feel safe.

Where we seem to differ is that I prefer to focus on proven, not performative solutions. Proven solutions are those that invest in community. But my Republican colleagues arbitrarily cut \$1 billion from the D.C. budget in March of this year, which has impacted the city's ability to fund the police, firefighters, and other public safety programs. And then, while holding these funds hostage, the President deployed National Guard in the name of public safety instead of giving D.C. the funds necessary to provide safety. And at the same time, Donald Trump and congressional Republicans have made the largest cut in history to Medicaid, regardless of the fact that Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) led to a significant drop in violent crime nationwide. What we are seeing from this Administration is unlawful, undemocratic, and follows the playbook of an authoritarian government.

Across the country, a total of more than \$4 billion in Federal funding, funding that supports American families, businesses, and local governments, has been frozen or terminated. Withholding these Federal Government funds, funds that have been constitutionally appropriated by Congress, can and will be used to coerce other American states and cities into cooperating with this rogue Administration in fear of having their cities occupied too.

In Pierce County, in my district, they have nearly \$200 billion of Federal funds that could be at risk, which includes a \$706,000 grant from the Department of Homeland Security's Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention Program that was abruptly terminated. These funds were dedicated to implementing, like the name says, targeted violence threat assessments in our schools to mitigate youth violence and radicalization.

The Department of Homeland Security's letter stated that the grant was being terminated in part because the Department, consistent with President Trump's direction, is focused on advancing the essential mission of enforcing immigration laws, securing the border, and combating antisemitism. Consequently, grant projects that support or have the potential to support activities not aligned with Department of Homeland Security (DHS)' current focus do not effectuate the agency's current priorities.

What is so explicitly clear to me is that this Administration's excuses of sending the National Guard to local cities in defiance of the local governments in order to address crime and improve public safety are an absolute sham when they are canceling funding left and right that would actually, actually help our local governments address these very issues.

Mr. Jackson, could you speak to how public safety is affected when you defund programs like targeted violence and terrorism prevention grants?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I mean, a critical resource of our Federal Government has been helping states prepare to identify and intercept targeted violence across the country. In fact, the Department of Homeland Security was required to work with state government on that. But those resources through Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) and other preparatory agencies or departments are under siege.

But what we are also concerned about is just the direct Federal law enforcement resources for agencies like the ATF that are specifically focused on intercepting guns from getting into our communities. And again, with cities like D.C., where 95 percent of the guns are coming from outside of the state, that Federal law enforcement is crucial but are now experiencing over 40 percent cut.

Ms. RANDALL. Would you say, in your experience, that local investments, like funding for local law enforcement, funding for targeted violence and terrorism prevention, funding for ATF programs would have a greater effect on public safety than the militarization of our cities?

Mr. JACKSON. It is a fact. And frankly, that is what we have seen over the last two years with a 31 percent reduction in homicides. This year, we are still tracking for another 20 percent reduction in homicides, and we think that is a direct result of the resources to prevent violence before it happens.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you for your answer, for your work. And Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. McGuire from Virginia, in the corner.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to our witnesses for coming here today.

You know, as a Navy veteran, as a freshman Member of Congress, I love our country, and I love Washington, D.C., the history, the people, the culture. This is America's city. And I represent Virginia's Fifth congressional District. People from the Fifth congressional District come here for vacation or for work every day, and people from around the country. I think we should all agree, though, that whether you live here or visit here, you should be able to walk down any street in America, in Washington, D.C., with your little girl or your little boy and be safe. And I think we would be less honest if we said it has not been a problem.

And I want to say that the actions of this Administration with President Trump have lowered crime and lowered murder rates to record lows. And so, I want to start by saying, thank God President Trump put your security and your safety, law and order, above other divisive ideas.

We would not have a country without our men and women in law enforcement. And I see a lot of them around here right now. I just want to thank you. Each of you, in your written testimony, emphasized the importance of the work of the Metropolitan Police Department is doing to keep the residents of D.C. safe and the need to increase funding for the department.

I have a very simple yes or no question. Do you disagree with defund-the-police movement? And I will start with Mayor Bowser. Yes or no, do you disagree with defund the police?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Mendelson?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. And Mr. Schwalb?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. And Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Frankly, I think you should ask the President that.

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is a yes or no, sir.

All right. Mr. Mendelson, in your written testimony, you stated the following, "Since 2020, police departments across the region and the country have faced challenges in recent years to hiring and have failed to hit their hiring targets."

Can you tell me what major event happened in 2020?

Mr. MENDELSON. The murder of George Floyd.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Mendelson, in 2020, the D.C. Council voted in favor of a budget that defunded the MPD by more than \$15 million. In the years that have followed, crime has skyrocketed in D.C. Do you still stand by this decision? I will remind you that this is a simple yes or no.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, as I said to another Congressman—

Mr. MCGUIRE. I just said a yes or no. I have got a very limited time with all due respect.

Mr. MENDELSON. I realize that, but—

Mr. MCGUIRE. All right, Mr. Mendelson, hundreds of MDP law—

Mr. MENDELSON. These questions are more complicated than a yes or no.

Mr. MCGUIRE [continuing]. Enforcement officers have left the department since 2020 because they do not feel they have support from D.C. Council. In fact, the Council not only voted to defund the department in 2020, you also went so far as to put a target on your officers and their families by releasing body camera footage with the officer's name attached.

For all witnesses, let us talk about D.C.'s fiscal policy. Do you believe D.C. does a good job at managing their budget? This is just—I do not have much time with all due respect—yes or no. So, Mayor Bowser, yes or no?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Mendelson?

Mr. MENDELSON. We do an excellent job.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Schwalb?

Mr. SCHWALB. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MCGUIRE. I find that interesting. I am going to list a few of the programs funded by the city's approved Fiscal Year 2025 budget: \$5 million to support D.C.'s hosting of the World Pride 2025. Regardless of party, race, religion or creed, I love you, but your number one goal should be to keep the citizens safe, not that. One million dollars to support the construction of an LGBTQ-plus community center in Shaw; \$250,000 to support Black LGBTQ-plus history program; \$434,000 in Fiscal Year 2025 and \$1.3 million across the financial plan to establish a reparations task force; \$600,000 to provide workforce development services for transgender and gender nonconforming residents who are experiencing homelessness and

housing instability; \$40 million to ensure migrants in D.C. are treated humanely; \$868,000 for a cost-of-living adjustment for Council staff.

And yes or no, do you stand by these funding initiatives? Yes or no? I do not have much time. Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. I do.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Mendelson? Mr. Schwalb?

Mr. MENDELSON. We have a \$20 billion—

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Budget, and I stand by what we appropriated.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Instead of funding these programs that promote the far left radical woke agenda, this \$48 million could have been used to hire approximately 685 additional MPD officers. If you had put this money toward supporting policies instead of woke agendas, we would have had less murders and safer streets.

So, I will go back to what I said. By the grace of God, President Trump loves the American people regardless of party, race, religion, or creed, and you are safer today. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. MENDELSON. Congressman, we have fully funded the MPD budget request. Every year, we have fully funded the MPD budget request. The challenge is that there are not enough applicants for big city police departments across the country and in the region.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Subramanyam.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the conversation today.

I mean, Mr. Jackson, you just mentioned you should ask the President the question. I want to tackle that a little bit because the question was, you know, about defunding the police, yet this Congress and this President has not fully funded the police and fully funded D.C. with its own taxpayer money, correct? And what we are seeing is that we are hundreds of police officers and law enforcement officials short in D.C. So, could you explain that a little bit more?

Mr. JACKSON. I was referencing a little bit broader than D.C., but this Congress has made the largest defunding of law enforcement, I believe, in American history under Republican leadership and under Trump's advisement to cut ATF, to cut DEA, to cut FBI. And then the remaining officers that are left, as opposed to putting them to their jobs to intercept guns that are being trafficked into our communities, they are now patrolling impoverished communities like Ward 8.

And so, when we talk about defunding the police, we should look right into the eyes of President Trump and ask him, why are you defunding the Federal law enforcement that is supposed to protect our communities from the flow of illegal guns?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mayor Bowser, would you agree with that?

Ms. BOWSER. With defunding the Federal law enforcement efforts?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. What we just said, this Administration and this Congress has not fully funded law enforcement.

Ms. BOWSER. I would agree with that.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Exactly. I would as well because, in the end, we are spending millions of dollars, millions of dollars a day on Na-

tional Guard instead of spending that money on law enforcement that should be a more sustainable, long-term solution. And we are underfunding crime prevention programs in D.C.

And what the National Guard is doing here is they are getting bored, actually. They are at street corners just hanging out, and they are not trained to be in law enforcement. And we are spending millions of dollars a day instead while they pick up trash. These are National Guardsmen from Louisiana where there is a very high crime rate. And there is plenty to do in Louisiana. I went to school there, so I know. And from other states that have their own crime problem, that have their own problems back home, but instead, they are being sent here for photo ops, essentially. And they deserve better. Their families deserve better. And the people of D.C. deserve better instead.

And so, I think a better solution that is better for our taxpayers and better for the American people, and certainly the people of D.C., is why don't we just fund law enforcement and crime prevention programs in D.C. instead of continually underfunding them? Why don't we actually do what Chairman Mendelson just said and try to do more initiatives to find more law enforcement officers? Because that is a problem. Recruiting is a big problem. Instead, we are sending the National Guard in.

And I have got constituents, I am in Northern Virginia, who work in D.C. every single day. And one constituent in Warrenton said, "I work in the District and am now in fear of my safety to come to work and go home. With military roaming the streets, with possible unchecked authorities, there are many opportunities for harassment and abuse." I will tell you, it is not just opportunities. People have been harassed and abused. "And I have never felt unsafe before, but now I am becoming terrified." And I have gotten story after story about that.

Mayor Bowser, have you gotten stories like that as well?

Ms. BOWSER. I have gotten stories about people are concerned about seeing the military patrolling, policing, with guns, out of state. And people are not really sure who they report to.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. And I had one person tell me that their kids play soccer on the weekends, and they had National Guardsmen at their soccer practice, just hanging out. And the kids got scared, right?

And so, I think a better solution would be to send those folks, those National Guardsmen from Louisiana and Mississippi, home. And instead, why don't we fully fund D.C.'s crime prevention programs and its budget instead and actually move forward with these programs that have been working because crime was going down. And then my constituents can come and work in D.C., make that long commute that I make every morning, and we can actually get to work and not be fearing that at every street corner we might get harassed.

One more constituent said that they worked in D.C. for over 30 years and still go frequently. He never felt unsafe until now. And it is a dangerous powerplay this Administration is doing. And these Federal forces are not concentrating on Federal issues of protecting our security. And what I think we should be doing is finding people in our communities who can—or people who want to join the police,

who can actually stay in our communities long term and actually fix the problem long term instead of this short-term photo op that the Administration is putting forward.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I have a UC.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Bell.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Yes, I do.

Mr. BELL. No, no, I do. But if it is still your time?

Chairman COMER. Well, it was like ten seconds, but I will recognize Mr. Bell, for unanimous consent or whatever.

Mr. BELL. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this May 1, 2025, article from *The Washington Post* titled, "Trump Administration cut school mental health grants created after school shootings," which show the complete disregard this Administration shows toward proven solutions to reduce violent crime.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

And Mr. Subramanyam, I would like to remind you that the CR we are going to all have an opportunity to vote on tomorrow restores that \$1 billion in funding, so you will have an opportunity to vote to give the money to the D.C.—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Council that you just mentioned.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Chair, though, how did it get out in the first place? Was that a—

Chairman COMER. I do not know, but I have been—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Was that Democrats?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. A very vocal advocate—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Why was it not funded in the first place?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. To get the money restored, so it is—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Okay.

Chairman COMER. You know, I do not know. No one has ever explained that to me.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. And that does not include funding increase.

Chairman COMER. But you will have an opportunity to—you all will all have an opportunity to vote to restore that funding tomorrow.

All right. The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to move to table the motion to subpoena. Jimmy Kimmel was fired because he lied on ABC about the identity of the man that, Tyler Robinson that murdered,—assassinated, martyred Charlie Kirk. He lied and said he was MAGA. Tyler Robinson was not MAGA, not one bit. He was part of Antifa. He was in a relationship. He was in a relationship with someone who identified as furry and trans. And this is an absurd lie, and so I move to table the motion to subpoena.

Ms. CROCKETT. So, Mr. Chair, since typically, this is nondebatable, I do have a point—

Mr. MCGUIRE. I second it.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Of inquiry because it seems like what we just heard from the gentlelady out of Georgia was her de-

bating why we should table it. So, I feel like we should engage, we should all be given an opportunity to engage——

Chairman COMER. Well——

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. In debate——

Chairman COMER. It is not——

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. About whether or not——

Chairman COMER. You know parliamentary procedure. It is not debatable.

Ms. CROCKETT. But the issue was that the gentlelady from Georgia decided to go on a tirade.

Chairman COMER. Well——

Ms. CROCKETT. So, at a very minimum——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Bell, he did more than announce the title of the UC and the——

Ms. CROCKETT. Well, my question——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Publisher.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Is about this motion to table. The motion that was on the table, so I would, at a very minimum, ask that the Minority be given equal time——

Chairman COMER. We will just try——

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. To respond.

Chairman COMER. How about we just hold off on the motion to table, and let us get back to asking questions. Everybody good with that?

Mr. GARCIA. Was there no motion submitted then?

Mr. LYNCH. Point of order.

Chairman COMER. Withdraw the motion for a little bit or not, it is up to you.

Ms. GREENE. I will withdraw it until——

Chairman COMER. Okay.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. The time needed to bring it back.

Chairman COMER. All right. Okay. All right. Are you satisfied, Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. As long as the Minority gets equal time as Ms. Greene——

Chairman COMER. All right. Okay. All right.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. When she brings it back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bell from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Ranking Member.

Mayor, good to see you again.

Attorney General Schwalb, I want to extend my gratitude to your office. When I was prosecutor, we had a very tough case that actually involved a police officer defendant. And you all helped us work with the victim in that case to a resolution that both parties were happy with, particularly our victims, and I appreciate that.

And so, I have a couple of questions that I want to talk about. One, I think a point needs to be made between the role of the National Guard and what they do and actual policing. And those are two different roles, and I think a lot of folks do not understand that difference. A 20-year-old with a gun in the military is taught how to kill. Police officers have to do a whole slew of things, including de-escalation, and so I think that is important, and we talk about that.

And so, my first question—and I am short on time—Mayor, you were asked a question about the resources and what you would do with those resources, and you were cutoff. Could you quickly finish that answer? That was earlier.

Ms. BOWSER. The resources with regard to our budget?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes. So, in order to close the billion-dollar gap, we looked across our government. So, we had to cut citywide contracts related to everything from mental health services to the contracts to give our employees raises, most notably MPD and fire and EMS.

Mr. BELL. And so, law enforcement would be included in that, obviously—

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. BELL [continuing]. As a priority, but there is also other things that a mayor is responsible for.

Ms. BOWSER. Absolutely, including shifting spending that should have happened in 2025 related to affordable housing.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mayor.

And Attorney General, can you speak to how over-policing and temporary enforcement tactics have addressed or failed to address the root causes of crime in D.C.?

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, as anybody in law enforcement knows, anybody prosecuting cases knows, the level of trust the community has with law enforcement is essential. We need witnesses to feel comfortable coming forward. We need victims to recognize that they can come forward. And that trust between law enforcement, our MPD, and communities all around our city is something that we have worked very hard as a city to build over time. But like so much, it can be broken very quickly. And I worry very much about the distrust that has been caused by the recent events to communities who worked very hard to trust their MPD and vice versa.

Mr. BELL. And I think people also have to understand the cost of sustaining the National Guard in a major city like D.C., or now we are hearing even in my hometown of St. Louis, is astronomical to send our troops who are trained, who are supposed to be protecting the homeland, to be coming in and doing the policing work when we could take a fraction of that cost, pennies on the dollar, invest that in local law enforcement who is actually trained, and give them the resources that they need and keep people safe for fractions of the cost.

And so, it is just interesting to me that my colleague would talk about defunding the police when the big ugly bill actually defunded the police. It cut funding for local law enforcement, and I do not hear my colleagues saying anything about that.

With respect to serious crimes, carjacking, I know that was an issue. What has D.C. been doing to address those issues?

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, my office is prosecuting every case, every carjacking case, every armed carjacking case where we have sufficient evidence to meet our burden of proof. They are difficult cases to make from an evidentiary standpoint, from a witness perspective. And yet more than 84 percent of the cases that MPD brought to us of carjacking last year, we prosecuted. So, we need to hold young people accountable and make sure they face consequences when they are engaged in carjacking.

Mr. BELL. And Mr. Jackson, with the remainder of my time, thank you for the work that you do. Can you speak to strategies you have found to be the most effective in actually curbing recidivism rates in our juveniles?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, we know that one of the most important things you can do is invest in victim services for those who have been traumatized by violence. As I said before, there are 24 states suing the Trump Administration for withholding \$1 billion for victim service funds through the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA). But we know that the best way we can reduce violence and recidivism is by investing in those who are most at risk and those who are most vulnerable, whether that is community violence intervention, victim services, mentorship programs, employment-based programs, all of which are under siege or have been cut by this Administration.

Mr. BELL. Thank you. And with respect to victim services, I could not agree with you more. It is so important. Sometimes what gets lost in the argument is we do focus on arresting serious and violent offenders, which is so important, and also alternatives to incarceration for low-level offenders struggling with addiction and mental health. But we also got to be laser focused on our victims, and that impacts so many of our communities.

So, I thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess for 5 minutes. We plan to reconvene in 5 minutes. [Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come back to order.

The Committee will now take up Mr. Khanna from California's motion to subpoena. I recognize Ms. Greene.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I move to table the motion to subpoena.

Chairman COMER. Okay. The motion is not debatable.

As many as are in favor of tabling, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the table is agreed to. The Committee will now resume—

Mr. GARCIA. Request a recorded vote, please.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the vote.

The Clerk. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The Clerk. Mr. Jordan votes yes.

Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The Clerk. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The Clerk. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Yes.

The Clerk. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.  
The Clerk. Mr. Grothman votes yes.  
Mr. Cloud?  
Mr. CLOUD. Yes.  
The Clerk. Mr. Cloud votes yes.  
Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The Clerk. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
The Clerk. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
The Clerk. Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
[No response.]  
The Clerk. Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
The Clerk. Ms. Green votes aye.  
Ms. Boebert?  
Ms. BOEBERT. Aye.  
The Clerk. Ms. Boebert votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Crane?  
Mr. CRANE. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Crane votes aye.  
Mr. Jack?  
Mr. JACK. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Jack votes aye.

Mr. McGuire?  
Mr. MCGUIRE. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. McGuire votes aye.  
Mr. Gill?  
Mr. GILL. Aye.  
The Clerk. Mr. Gill votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Mfume votes no.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Brown votes no.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. No to table, yes to subpoena.  
The Clerk. Ms. Stansbury votes no.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Frost votes no.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Casar votes no.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
Ms. Randall?  
Ms. RANDALL. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Randall votes no.  
Mr. Subramanyam?  
Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Subramanyam votes no.  
Ms. Ansari?  
Ms. ANSARI. No.  
The Clerk. Ms. Ansari votes no.  
Mr. Bell?  
Mr. BELL. No.  
The Clerk. Mr. Bell votes no.

Ms. Simon?  
 Ms. SIMON. No.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Simon votes no.  
 Mr. Min?  
 Mr. MIN. No.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Min votes no.  
 Mr. Walkinshaw?  
 Mr. WALKINSHAW. No.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Walkinshaw votes no.  
 Ms. Pressley?  
 Ms. PRESSLEY. No to table, yes to subpoena.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Pressley votes no.  
 Ms. Tlaib?  
 Ms. TLAIB. No.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Tlaib votes no.  
 Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. I vote aye.  
 And how has Mr. Timmons been recorded?  
 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman votes aye.  
 Mr. Timmons is not recorded.  
 Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. And how has Mr. Higgins been recorded?  
 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins is not recorded.  
 Mr. HIGGINS. Higgins is aye.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please add the total?  
 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 24, the nays are 21.  
 Chairman COMER. The motion is tabled.  
 Before I recognize Ms. Greene, I am going to recognize the Ranking Member.  
 Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 Obviously, I want to thank Representative Khanna for the motion, but I also just want to just say that the Chairman and I have been talking throughout the last 30 minutes or so, and we are both going to try to work together on an effort to bring in Mr. Carr in front of the Oversight Committee. And it is of interest to both the Majority and the Minority, and so we are going to try to move forward in a bipartisan way to get him in front of the Committee, so I thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 Chairman COMER. Yep.  
 Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I have a U.C.  
 Ms. CROCKETT. I do too.  
 Chairman COMER. I am going to recognize Ms. Norton for unanimous consent.  
 Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record an article on the cut to D.C.'s local budget, Mr. Chairman.  
 Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.  
 Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, while I know you oppose the cut, Republicans keep saying today that their Fiscal Year 2026 continuing resolution fixes the \$1.1 billion cut they made to D.C.'s local budget, which consists entirely of local funds, in the March

CR They are misleading the public. The Senate passed Senator Collins' bill to restore that funding in March. It has been sitting on the Speaker's desk since then. Republicans can never undo the last several months—

Chairman COMER. We will enter into the record that statement. So, without objection, it is entered.

I recognize Ms. Crockett for unanimous consent.

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, Mr. Chair, since I was not allowed equal time to debate, I have a UC. It is from, it looks like, *Yahoo News*. It says, "Charlie Kirk suspect's grandma says family is all MAGA."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair, I have a UC as well.

Chairman COMER. We will recognize you next time.

Ms. GREENE, it is your 5 minutes.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I can assure you that the 22-year-old man, Tyler Robinson, that murdered Charlie Kirk is not MAGA. His family may be Republican, but all of the evidence that is being presented proves that he is a far leftist, very much integrated in online groups that are linked to Antifa. He was in a relationship with a biological male, a so-called furry, whatever that is, that is transitioning to be a fake woman. He was not MAGA, not one bit. That is a complete lie. And it is an insult to every single Republican and person that identifies with those type of politics. We will not tolerate it.

And that is the exact type of language that is getting many of us death threats day after day and led to shootings on the baseball field where Steve Scalise was shot. This is what led to President Trump nearly being assassinated this past summer. This is what has led to Charlie Kirk being assassinated. And so, I just want to give a warning there. We are not going to tolerate that anymore.

You know something else we are not going to tolerate is crime. On August 11, President Trump announced major steps to address the out-of-control crime in the District, thank God, because this is my fifth year in Congress, and living in D.C. and working here has been a nightmare. It is. The crime is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous. And let us talk about some of that.

Since President Trump thankfully brought in the National Guard, carjackings have decreased by 87 percent. Nearly 1,200 people have been arrested, including known members of MS-13 and Trin de Aragua. Those are both foreign terrorist organizations. By the way, many of them came across the border while Democrats controlled this country in the past four years.

Federal law enforcement seized nearly 120 firearms and busted a drug trafficking ring attempting to smuggle fentanyl, PCP, and cocaine into D.C. A joint effort by ICE and MPD arrested an illegal alien previously charged with sex crimes against a child. D.C. went 12 days without a single homicide. Can you imagine that that is something that the National Guard had to be here to do? It is unbelievable to anybody that is right-minded.

U.S. Attorney Pirro reported that 88 percent of arrests made between the start of the Federal deployment on August 11 and August 25 resulted in charges being filed. This is substantially higher than in 2024 where the Biden-appointed U.S. Attorney Matthew

Graves charged suspects only 57 percent of the time. That is because he was busy chasing down MAGA grandmas that went into the Capitol.

So, I have got a simple question for you. Mayor Bowser, do you prioritize criminals or the victims?

Ms. BOWSER. I prioritize law-abiding D.C. residents, visitors, and workers.

Ms. GREENE. So that would be law-abiding citizens and victims. Do you support the police, Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Mendelson, do you prioritize criminals or victims of criminals?

Mr. MENDELSON. I believe in swift and certain justice, and if somebody—

Ms. GREENE. No, I asked you either one. Victims of criminals, of crime, or the criminals themselves, which one do you prioritize?

Mr. MENDELSON. As I understand the question, victims.

Ms. GREENE. Victims. Do you support the police, Mr. Mendelson?

Mr. MENDELSON. Absolutely.

Ms. GREENE. Okay. Mr. Schwalb, I ask you the same questions.

Mr. SCHWALB. Unfortunately, hurt people hurt people, so sometimes victims are victims one day and are perpetrators—

Ms. GREENE. So, you prioritize—

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. The next day.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. The criminals, is that what you are saying?

Mr. SCHWALB. I—

Ms. GREENE. Over victims of crime?

Mr. SCHWALB. I prioritize making my city as safe as it can possibly be.

Ms. GREENE. I will take that as criminals. Do you support police, Mr. Schwalb?

Mr. SCHWALB. Of course. We work very closely with MPD every day.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Jackson, the same questions for you.

Mr. JACKSON. Definitely prioritize victims. And I stand with the 24 states that are suing the Trump Administration for withholding \$1 billion in victim service funds.

Ms. GREENE. Okay. So, you are against cleaning up crime in D.C. Thank you for that.

I have got an article here. The D.C. police union head is the biggest cheerleader of Trump's D.C. police takeover. So, the police here in the District support the efforts and the help from the President. However, I have got a quote here from Mr. Mendelson. You call the union celebrating Trump's takeover "just despicable." You literally attack the police in your statements. You are calling—

Mr. MENDELSON. That is not correct.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. The union supporting the President and the National Guard here, helping them every day on the streets, you are quoted as saying, "That is just despicable."

Mr. MENDELSON. That—you are taking that out of context. I criticized the president of the FOP because he is a liar.

Ms. GREENE. Oh, so you are against the police.

Mr. MENDELSON. No. The—

Ms. GREENE. Thank you for clearing that up.  
 Mr. MENDELSON. No.  
 Ms. GREENE. Also, I have one——  
 Mr. MENDELSON. The president of the FOP——  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.  
 Ms. GREENE. I also have one last thing, Mr. Chairman.  
 Mr. MENDELSON. The president of the FOP, not the police.  
 Ms. GREENE. I reclaim my time.  
 Last here, Mr. Mendelson——  
 Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.  
 Ms. GREENE. You——  
 Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.  
 The Chair recognizes Mr. Bell.  
 Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I have a UC request.  
 Chairman COMER. Okay. State your——  
 Ms. GREENE. I would like to enter for the record——  
 Mr. BELL. No. I am sorry.  
 Chairman COMER. All right.  
 Mr. BELL. Mr. Chair?  
 Chairman COMER. I am sorry, Ms. Greene. I recognized Mr. Bell.  
 That is on me. I apologize. We will get you on the next one.  
 Ms. GREENE. Okay. Thank you.  
 Chairman COMER. Mr. Bell.  
 Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
 I request unanimous consent to enter into the record the September 9, 2025, article from the *LA Times* titled, "Kennedy commissioned child health report ignores gun violence, the leading cause of child death," which calls out the Trump Administration for ignoring——  
 Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.  
 Mr. BELL [continuing]. How gun violence kills more children in this country than any other cause, and the Administration ought to be embarrassed by this.  
 Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.  
 And now——  
 Mr. GARCIA. I think Ms. Crockett is next.  
 Chairman COMER. Ms. Crockett is next?  
 Mr. GARCIA. You have a UC?  
 Chairman COMER. I will recognize Ms. Greene, then Ms. Crockett. Ms. Greene, do you have a unanimous consent request?  
 Ms. GREENE. I do, thank you.  
 For the record, Phil Mendelson's post here says "Repealing our laws is not liberation. Republicans in Congress cannot be trusted. They took one billion from us, are moving more than a dozen bills, rolling back home rule, and are trying to take away our elected independent Attorney General and micromanaging our legislative process." I hope everybody watched Democrats vote against the vote that adds \$1 billion back in for D.C.  
 Thank you.  
 Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.  
 The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett for a UC.  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this September 16, 2025, article from *Time* titled,

“Trump called for a crackdown on the radical left, but right-wing extremists are responsible for more political violence,” which calls out the game the President is playing, in which he creates a fictional problem while downplaying the real history of far-right violence against the American public from the Oklahoma City bombing to January 6. I got another one.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. All right. The next one is an article from September 12, 2025. The article is from *Democracy Docket* titled, “I couldn’t care less, Trump’s downplaying of right-wing violence continues long pattern,” which calls out the game the President is playing, in which he creates a fictional problem while downplaying the real history of far-right violence against the American public.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes our newest Member, Mr. Walkinshaw from Virginia.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to express my gratitude to Leader Jeffries and Ranking Member Garcia for the opportunity to join this Committee. And Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with you and Members on both sides of the aisle as we conduct our important work.

My role here gives my constituents in Virginia’s 11th District, which is home to one of the largest concentrations of Federal employees in the Nation, a voice in conducting oversight of the Federal Government at a time when the Trump Administration’s reckless DOGE cuts have undermined the effectiveness, accountability, and integrity of Federal operations and threatened the livelihoods of the Federal employees, contractors, and small businesses that I represent. I am firmly committed to protecting both the critical services our government provides to everyday Americans and the dedicated workforce behind them.

With that, I want to thank Mayor Bowser, Chairman Mendelson, Attorney General Schwalb, and Mr. Jackson for taking the time to be here today. I also want to welcome—we have a number of other members of the City Council who have joined us. Thank you for joining us, and thank you all for your service.

Ten days ago, I was a local government official as well, serving on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and that is a role that gave me an understanding and respect for the importance of the work that you do as local officials. Local government is the most accountable level of government because the decisions you all make directly and immediately impact your constituents’ quality of life. And I know that your constituents, like mine in Fairfax, are not shy about telling you all what needs to be done or done differently. As President Reagan said, that government is best which remains closest to the people. And you all are closest to the people you represent, not us.

As Mayor Bowser said, in 1973, Congress passed the D.C. Home Rule Act to, among other things, grant to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia powers of local self-government. To achieve this goal, the Home Rule Act expressly gives D.C. residents the power to elect their Mayor, legislative body, and Attorney General. Some of my colleagues, however, while praising the benefits of local

autonomy and authority elsewhere, seek to strip that autonomy from D.C. residents as part of an effort to support a Federal takeover of our Nation's capital by President Donald Trump.

Another stated purpose of the Home Rule Act—and I have not heard this mentioned today—was to “relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local district matters.” Yet at a time when Congress should be focused on very urgent national matters, we are trying to micromanage D.C.'s local affairs in furtherance of President Trump's attempt to consolidate power.

The American people are facing serious challenges. Our economy is faltering. Inflation is rising. Tariffs are driving up prices, and job growth is stagnant. And unless this Congress acts, tax credits that help working families afford healthcare will soon expire. In my district, and the districts of everyone here today, tens of thousands of people will see their healthcare costs skyrocket. And meanwhile, as has been mentioned, President Trump continues to cover up the Epstein files, and a government shutdown is looming.

In the face of all of this, how does the Majority choose to spend its time? By interfering in D.C.'s local government and further disenfranchising 700,000 Americans. They claim it is in the name of public safety. We have heard today from our witnesses many things that could be done to improve public safety in the District of Columbia. This is really part of a broader plan to help President Trump tighten his grip, to help him feel like he is in control, while distracting from failed policies.

Our constituents, Mr. Chairman, with the exception of Delegate Norton, are out there across the country, and they are wondering why this Congress and this Committee seemingly has no time to solve the real problems they face in their communities, but seemingly all the time in the world to cosplay as mayors and councilmembers for the District of Columbia.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Timmons from South Carolina.

Mr. TIMMONS. I appreciate our new colleague's prepared remarks. I have lived in Washington on and off over the last 15, 18 years, for about ten years. And up until two months ago, this city was in disrepair. It was unsafe. There were thousands of homeless people that were plaguing our public spaces. There were rampant mental health issues with these people that were living in squalor. There was incredible drug use. There were muggings. There were carjackings. There were just immense unnecessary violence because our City Council here in Washington, D.C., refused to do their job. They refused to keep us safe. They refused to enforce the rule of law. They have a law that says you cannot sleep in Federal property, that you cannot sleep in the streets. You know what? Zero enforcement, zero.

So, yes, President Trump took extraordinary measures which were necessary to keep this city safe because this is our Nation's capital. And yes, we will delegate responsibility to local government. But when they violate the very premise that we delegate their authority for, which is keeping us safe and running the city in a safe and efficient manner, they have violated their obligation to us.

And I have been working on this for the last six years. I have worked with the Mayor. I have worked with many members of City Council to try to solve this problem because a lot of it is complicated. But you know what is not? What is not complicated is enforcing the rule of law.

And I hate to pick on the Attorney General, but we are going to have a little conversation. You remember criminal law. Back in the day, you went to law school, I went to law school. The two principles of justice are deterrence, which is you have a criminal justice system that says if you do this, this is the consequence. Hopefully, that will deter you from doing it, whether that is carjacking, whether it is going into the CVS and stealing something, whether it is killing somebody. Deterrence is one of the principles of justice.

The second principle of justice is retribution, meaning if a loved one of mine is hurt, killed, I do not take matters into my own hands because I know that the government, that those that we have elected in positions of authority will hold them accountable to whatever degree that our society deems appropriate.

I was a prosecutor for five years. You are the chief prosecutor now in D.C. Do you believe that the D.C. criminal justice system meets the two principles of justice that we learned week one in law school, deterrence and retribution?

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, thank you for the question. Apparently, I also learned incapacitation and rehabilitation are other things that we think about our criminal justice system delivering. When you talk about homelessness, which we all need to continue to work as hard as we can to drive down, we have to separate out conduct from status. And I know this is something you also learned in law school.

Mr. TIMMONS. All right. We are going to do specific examples. So, in 2021, two teenage girls brutally murdered their Uber driver. They literally called the Uber, they lured him in, they ran over him with his own car. And when they turn 21, they will be let out. So, they are going to get three, four, five years for murdering someone intentionally. Do you believe that three, four, five years for murdering someone intentionally—and by the way, I think they will not have a criminal record when they age out. Do you think that that is justice? And do you think that the victim and his family have gotten retribution?

Mr. SCHWALB. Our system has to hold young people accountable when they commit crimes and hurt people. And when they are held accountable, they should face swift and certain consequences—

Mr. TIMMONS. Do you think four years is enough for murder?

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Because that is what we do to try to make our city safe now and in the future.

Mr. TIMMONS. Do you think four years is enough for murder?

Mr. SCHWALB. Under our system, long punishments are not what has been proven to deter crime.

Mr. TIMMONS. All right. That is why—

Mr. SCHWALB. It is—

Mr. TIMMONS [continuing]. You are going to lose—

Mr. SCHWALB. If—

Mr. TIMMONS [continuing]. A lot of power. So again, that is why you are going to lose authority. You are going to lose power. In-

stead of doing that, what you should be doing, you should be negotiating with the U.S. Attorney for D.C. and say, all right, we are going to create systems through which we are going to have deterrence. We are going to say, you do not get to commit a crime and come out of jail hours later. You do not get to kill someone and have no criminal record in three or four years. That is not justice. And if you think that that is appropriate, you will have zero authority.

And I am telling you right now, you have got to change your ways. I mean, the intern that was shot and killed in the midst of, I guess, gang violence, you think that when they age out—I mean, because they are being federally prosecuted, they are going to get tried as an adult. Had that not occurred, what would happen? They would get, what, three, four years for killing a random 21-year-old?

Mr. SCHWALB. Mr. Timmons, nobody cares more about public safety in our city than the 700,000 of us who live here.

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes, and you know what?

Mr. SCHWALB. The 700,000 people—

Mr. TIMMONS. For the last 45 days, for the first time, they have been safe.

Mr. SCHWALB. The 700,000 people who have elected—

Mr. TIMMONS. For the last 45 days.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Local officials and an Attorney General who reflect—

Mr. TIMMONS. For the first time—

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Their views on how to keep—

Mr. TIMMONS. Oh, no, no, no, no, no.

Mr. SCHWALB [continuing]. Our city safe.

Mr. TIMMONS. Again, you are going to lose power. You are going to lose authority because the views that you have are wrong. They are wrong, and we—

[Disturbance in hearing room.]

Mr. TIMMONS. Free D.C. Yes, D.C. has been free for 45 days.

I yield back.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Ms. STANSBURY. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record an article from *ABC News* that said, “Prosecutors already have dropped nearly a dozen cases from Trump’s D.C. crime surge.” And I want to just explain briefly, this is because—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Jeanine Pirro is trying to prosecute—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Pressley.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Cases that a grand jury—

Chairman COMER. You are taking Ms. Pressley’s time.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Will not even indict in because—

Chairman COMER. You are taking Ms. Pressley’s time.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. She is not—

Chairman COMER. Ms. Pressley.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Actually indicting crimes.

Chairman COMER. Start the clock. Ms. Pressley.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

What we are seeing in this moment is chilling. The current occupant of the White House is sending Federal troops into this beautiful majority Black city. And let us be plain about who is being targeted. In this year alone, more than 93 percent of youth arrests in D.C. were of Black youth. More than 40 percent of the arrests tied to this Federal surge have been immigrants. This is not about safety. This is about suppressing Black leadership, stopping Black progress, and criminalizing Black and Brown youth.

Mr. Jackson, you have an expertise in reducing crime, specifically gun violence, and you have researched what works and actually keeps people safe. We have heard a lot of rhetoric today, loud, inflammatory, dangerous, misleading at best. So, let us separate fact from fiction. I will make a statement, and you will answer with fact or fiction. Let us start.

A 14-year-old has a fully developed brain.

Mr. JACKSON. Fiction.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes, that is fiction, easy. Middle schoolers are still learning and growing. Science tells us the brain is not fully developed until our mid to late 20s, which means children do not have the same judgment, impulse control, or decisionmaking capacity as adults. Yet just this week, Republicans passed legislation that would prosecute children as adults and send them to adult prisons, children in adult prisons.

Next question, Mr. Jackson. Fact or fiction, the criminal legal system incarcerates Black youth at disproportionately higher rates than White youth?

Mr. JACKSON. Fact.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Correct. That is fact. Nationally, Black kids are six times as likely as White kids to be incarcerated.

In D.C., the focus of today's hearing, the disparities are even more stark. Despite making up only 51 percent of the youth population, Black children in D.C. are 98 percent of youth confinement. For too long, Black youth have been disproportionately criminalized, policed, and locked up for normal adolescent behavior rather than receiving the resources and support that are proven to help them grow and reach their full potential.

Last one, Mr. Jackson. Fact or fiction, trauma-informed strategies, like community violence intervention, help to disrupt cycles of violence?

Mr. JACKSON. Fact.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Correct. That is a fact. Investing in prevention, mental health, and community-based support keeps people safe. These are real, sustainable solutions. In the Massachusetts 7th, which I represent, cities like Boston, which Trump has threatened to attack next, are partnered with organizations like the Louis D. Brown Peace Institute to make these investments and are seeing historic lows in crime as a result.

If Republicans were actually serious about reducing crime, they would follow that example, but they are so unserious. Instead of going after predators and pedophiles like Jeffrey Epstein, they are going after children, passing policies to ship middle schoolers to adult prisons. That is child abuse, and it is consistent with their pattern of abuse and neglect when it comes to all our children.

They let children go hungry by cutting Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). They make children sicker by cutting Medicaid and taking away vaccines. They strip environmental protections, leaving more kids gasping for air during asthma attacks. They rip families apart with cruel immigration policies as children watch their parents taken away from classroom windows, and they ignore the strange fruit of young Black men like Trey Reed hanging from the trees of Mississippi.

Time and again, Republicans prove they are unserious about the care, the health, and the future of all our children. They are invested only in fear and control, and that is what they are doing here today. Republicans are certainly not keeping us safe. Free D.C.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas. Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MENDELSON, thank you for coming today. You chair the D.C. City Council, and you have since 2012. Is that right?

Mr. MENDELSON. Correct.

Mr. FALLON. And you have been on the City Council itself since 1998?

Mr. MENDELSON. Correct.

Mr. FALLON. Twenty-seven years. I do not know when 1998 became 27 years ago, but it is.

Sir, if somebody asked you if you supported soft-on-crime policies, would you agree with that, or would you vehemently disagree with that?

Mr. MENDELSON. I would vehemently disagree with that.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. So, do you support or oppose President Trump's executive order to Federalize the D.C. police and permit the National Guard to assist in law enforcement?

Mr. MENDELSON. I did not agree with it on multiple counts.

Mr. FALLON. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. It attempted to take over the police department.

Mr. FALLON. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. I think the National Guard—

Mr. FALLON. And I apologize, it is limited time, but you do not agree. Okay. Thank you.

Do you think, sir, that D.C. is safe?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes, I do.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. So that is one of the reasons why you would oppose it because you feel it is safe already. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, no, that is not completely correct. I do think—

Mr. FALLON. But, again, limited time, but you do—

Mr. MENDELSON. Additional law enforcement—

Mr. FALLON. You said that D.C.—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Officers would be helpful.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Is safe. Well, yes, it would make it safer, but you did say it was safe. Do you know who Michael Pulliam is?

Mr. MENDELSON. Do I know what what is?

Mr. FALLON. Michael Pulliam is?

Mr. MENDELSON. Not offhand.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. He was the third district police commander, and he was placed on leave——

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. For questionable changes to——

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Crime data. And then he said that leadership and MPD directed falsifying data. Do you know who Greg Pemberton is? I believe you do because you had an interchange with Mr. Jordan.

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes. And actually, I would like to speak to that because——

Mr. FALLON. Well——

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. He has tweeted.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. You know, I do not have the time, but you do know who he is. And you know that he said that supervisors frequently ordered officers to report lesser of felonies. And you said that he was a liar. Is that correct?

Mr. MENDELSON. Correct.

Mr. FALLON. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON. And I can tell you why, and I would like to tell you why.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. Well, I am not interested in that, honestly, right now, because we have limited time. I wish I had more time, and we could talk about it more.

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes, but he has threatened——

Mr. FALLON. But——

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Me by tweet in the last hour.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. So, he said that they downgraded certain categories, so the categories that are not tracked. So very serious felonies were downgraded. So, we have highly credible reports and evidence that crime data in D.C. has been underreported, and there could be very likely a conspiracy to cook the books.

So, you said that D.C. is safe, so it is interesting and telling that when you compare D.C. to other capital cities around the world, let us say Bogota, Colombia, the murder rate is 15 per 100,000. Lima, Peru, it is 7 1/2. Mexico City is 11. To give it context, tourist cities like Paris, Madrid, and London are one out of 100,000. Do you know what the D.C. number is? I know it varies, but do you know the latest number?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I know that violent crime per 100,000 for D.C. is about 1,005.

Mr. FALLON. I said the murder rate, murder rate per 100,000. Do you know what that is?

Mr. MENDELSON. I would have to do the math.

Mr. FALLON. It is 27 per 100,000, which is much higher than some of the most dangerous capital cities in the world, so.

Mr. MENDELSON. And lower than other cities——

Mr. FALLON. If D.C.——

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. In the United States.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, which are even worse than Honduras. So, if D.C. was its own country, Mr. Mendelson—there are 193 member states in the U.N. Where would D.C. rank if you just use the murder rate?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I know we would celebrate the autonomy.

Mr. FALLON. You would celebrate the autonomy, and you would be the fifth most dangerous country in the world out of 193.

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes, sir, I live in the District of Columbia—

Mr. FALLON. Sir, sir, this is my time.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. And I feel safe.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Fifth most dangerous country in the world. And the only ones that would beat us would be countries like Jamaica, Ecuador, Haiti, and Honduras. That is not safe. I would say that is extraordinarily dangerous.

Mr. Schwalb, did you refer to President Trump's efforts as dangerous and harmful?

Mr. SCHWALB. And unlawful.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. Thank you. And it is interesting you say dangerous and harmful because August 11 through 25, carjackings were down 87 percent, 1,200 arrests were made, 120 guns were seized, 88 percent of arrests had charges brought. And for a 12-day period, gloriously in our Nation's capital, nobody was murdered, not a single homicide. That is an odd definition of dangerous and harmful.

So there have been, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, soft-on-crime policies. No cash bail, 89 percent of defendants last year were not held while awaiting trial, allowing adults as old as 24 to be treated as minors during sentencing.

All these policies, Mr. Mendelson, that you supported, and according to D.C. statistics and the FBI, violent crimes in D.C. when you took over in 1998 compared to last year were up 46 percent. The precise number is right here. So, it is a dire problem. It is an emergency. There is a clear and present danger to the good and law-abiding citizens of Washington, D.C., and not just them, the tourists and all Americans because this is a unique city. It belongs not just to the residents, but to all Americans. And it would be the fifth most dangerous country in the world.

If this was its own country, Mr. Chairman, the United States, would issue a travel advisory. That is how bad it is. So, I would applaud, and I do applaud, President Trump's bold actions for MDCSA, to make D.C. safe again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I think it is really important—I mean, we are talking about, you know, 700,000 people that live here, and I feel like their voice gets completely just dismissed. And so, if I may, Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record, *The Washington Post* poll of D.C. residents found eight in ten opposed Trump's taking over of their local police and sending in Federal troops.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. TLAIB. You know, I think it is also really important to understand, like, the incredible kind of slanderous, like, defamation—I do not know what to call it. They are just burying Washington, D.C. You just heard them speak about our Nation's capital in that way, in a way that I feel very much like that is not what I see. I see people walking around with their families, people enjoying

time to see these beautiful, incredible, beautiful monuments and everything. And there is a pride here too.

And so, I just want to bring the D.C. residents into this Committee because I feel like they are being made invisible and this really ugly picture that is not reflective. And I am from Detroit. I have seen it happen to my city. And it is despicable in a way that I feel like, you know, really goes up against our values.

You know, one of the things that I know in every abuse of power that, you know, we let President Trump and the Administration get away with in D.C., it will be replicated. It will be expanded across the country. And it is going to tear apart our communities.

You know, Mr. Jackson, I talked to you a little bit about this, but I think it is important to understand that we do have a mental health crisis, that we have a housing crisis, affordability crisis. Can you police any of those away?

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Ms. TLAIB. You cannot police away homelessness. And the way they talk about our homeless neighbors is so, I mean, no wonder there is violence increasing toward homeless neighbors. I see it already, the brutality of it. When we see housing costs go up, when we see, again, the lack or dismissiveness of the mental health crisis that we continue to grow in it. And it is not just this Administration, in the previous administrations as well. No one has moved with the urgency that is needed.

Just last week, you know, the Committee approved over a dozen bills regarding Washington, D.C. And, you know, I am just curious. I mean, criminalized children, my colleague from Boston talked about this. It basically interfered with legislation already passed by local government. Was anyone on this panel consulted, any of you? Raise your hand if you were consulted on any of these bills. Yes.

Mr. MENDELSON. We were not.

Ms. TLAIB. You know, one of the things that, you know, AG, I have been listening to you. You know, one of the bills actually eliminates your position completely. What effect would that have, I mean, completely eliminating your position in regards to being able to do the job that you do to protecting all the families in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. SCHWALB. Well, start with the fact that more than 70 percent of the residents of the District of Columbia overwhelmingly voted for having an independent elected Attorney General.

Ms. TLAIB. That is right.

Mr. SCHWALB. And that is a recognition of the fact that when an attorney general is directly accountable to the people, directly responsive to the people, we are much better at doing our job in terms of addressing housing affordability and conditions and slumlords. Seniors and consumers are being scammed, addressing the issues that are most important to D.C. residents because I am accountable to them.

Ms. TLAIB. Yes, I read wage theft is an issue, workplace discrimination, I mean, there is a number of issues that need to be addressed, and they are not going to address that. They want to paint you all as this ugly, dark, all just out in the street. I mean, the way—it is just unbelievable because they all live here. I do not see it. I do not see what they see. I do not understand why we are al-

lowing that to happen because I actually think it is going to hurt our communities. People are going to look at Washington, D.C., folks, in a way that I think is going to be very painful, but also, you know—I do not know, Mr. Jackson. I heard the stories. People did not leave their homes. They were not leaving their homes. Businesses did not see people coming in too. I mean, that is what we want in our Nation's capital? Stay in your house. Do not move. Do not go anywhere. Stay fearful. It is unbelievable that my colleagues continue again to eject this narrative and this rhetoric in regards to it.

But I think it is important, Mr. Chair, just like in D.C. home rule was won out of Black freedom struggle and the fight for civil rights, we cannot be passive right now. So, nobody over there should take anything we say seriously, you know, like so personally as if we are attacking them. No, we are attacking a process. We are not attacking people here.

And I think it is really important. We need to stand up against this fascist takeover. That is not a bad word. It is a fact. And here in D.C. and across the country, it is so incredibly important, Mr. Chair, that this Committee does not allow rhetoric that defames or paints Washington, D.C., in a way that you all have not really truly seen. You are just reading it—no, you are just reading it or something off of some—

Mr. DONALDS. Will the gentlelady yield to a question?

Ms. TLAIB. Yes, I think it is really important.

Chairman COMER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. TLAIB. No, I do not yield. I do not even have time. I can tell you—

Chairman COMER. Well, yes, your time has expired, Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. It has expired, but, Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER. I have been nice.

Ms. TLAIB. But you all live here and you are not telling people the beautiful parts that you do see in our Nation's capital.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. And no, no, no. It is just wrong how we are doing this.

Mr. DONALDS. Chairman, I think it is insane—

Chairman COMER. The time has expired.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. That the gentlelady does not have an argument—

Ms. TLAIB. But you are going to look at the—

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. But she is going to refer to me and some of my colleagues—

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. Kids in Washington, D.C. as a bunch of criminals.

Chairman COMER. Will you yield to Mr. Donalds?

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Like we were from the Third Reich.

Ms. TLAIB. You know this.

Mr. DONALDS. This is insane.

Ms. TLAIB. You are going to look at—

Mr. DONALDS. It is insane.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. 14-, 15-year-olds as a bunch—

Mr. DONALDS. It is insane.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. Of criminals.

Mr. DONALDS. It is insane. Do I look like a member of the Third Reich to you, Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. Please. Oh, please.

Mr. DONALDS. Is that what I look like to you?

Ms. TLAIB. You are the one taking your voting card—

Mr. DONALDS. Is that what you think?

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. And giving it to somebody who is committing a crime.

Mr. DONALDS. Is that what you think?

Ms. TLAIB. No, that is unethical.

Mr. DONALDS. I think it is radical—

Ms. TLAIB. You should—

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. And I think it is insane—

Ms. TLAIB. No, you should be held accountable.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. And I will respect everything that you say—

Ms. TLAIB. Sir, you open your mouth.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. But to say something like that—

Ms. TLAIB. You should be held accountable.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. To myself and a lot of my colleagues—

Ms. TLAIB. Oh.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Is way out of line.

Ms. TLAIB. I am not the one using my—

Chairman COMER. Order.

Mr. DONALDS. It is way out of line.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. Voting card to someone—

Mr. MFUME. Regular order, Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. To go vote—

Mr. DONALDS. Way out of line.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. So you can go to an event.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. MFUME. Regular order.

Mr. DONALDS. That is okay. But it is okay, right?

Ms. TLAIB. No, that is not how it goes.

Mr. DONALDS. It is okay, right?

Ms. TLAIB. You hold yourself accountable before you talk about—

Mr. DONALDS. Hold myself accountable?

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. Washington, D.C.

Chairman COMER. All right. Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. Keep Washington D.C.—

Mr. DONALDS. Hold your own self—

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. Out of your mouth.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Accountable. How about that?

Ms. TLAIB. Keep it out of your mouth.

Mr. DONALDS. Hold your own self accountable—

Chairman COMER. I am trying, Mr. Mfume.

Ms. TLAIB. Free D.C.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. How about that?

Ms. TLAIB. Free D.C. And make sure—

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. TLAIB [continuing]. You vote with your own voting card. Do not be giving it to somebody else.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Tlaib? All right. The Chair recognizes Ms. Boebert from Colorado.

Order. Wait a minute, Ms. Boebert. All right. Order. Ms. Boebert?

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This has certainly been lively today.

Madam Mayor, I appreciate you being here today, and I have a few questions for you. Do you believe in regard to crime, D.C. City Council is moving the District in the right direction or wrong direction?

Ms. BOWSER. The City Council and I are working—

Ms. BOEBERT. Right or wrong direction?

Ms. BOWSER. We are moving in the right direction.

Ms. BOEBERT. Now you—okay. Well, why in 2023 did you veto the Council's updates to the Criminal Code to eliminate most mandatory minimum sentences, reduce mandatory maximum penalties, and allow jury trials for misdemeanors?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, I made clear at the time my objections to the rewrite of the Criminal Code. The Criminal Code does need to be updated.

Ms. BOEBERT. Your objection was this bill does not make us safer. Is that correct?

Ms. BOWSER. That is what I believe.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes, ma'am. Mayor Bowser, as we know, City Council overruled your veto, and the Criminal Code changes went into effect 2023. The same year, crime rates rose dramatically. They overruled your veto, and then we saw crime rates rise dramatically. Do you believe that this bill contributed to the dramatic rise in crime that we saw in 2023 that has been mentioned here today as well by the Council?

Ms. BOWSER. Well, the bill did not go into effect, but I believed that it was necessary for us to look at our entire public safety ecosystem. Not just that year, but previous years.

Ms. BOEBERT. So, you had some foresight that this could help, and you said this bill does not make us safer. The Council overruled your veto. And at multiple events this year, you opposed National Guard deployments in Washington, D.C. However, since President Trump deployed the National Guard in D.C., violent crime has dropped nearly 50 percent.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, Ms. Boebert, may I?

Ms. BOEBERT. One moment.

Ms. BOWSER. Okay.

Ms. BOEBERT. I will give you a chance to respond.

Since President Trump deployed the National Guard in D.C., violent crime has dropped nearly 50 percent. Property crimes like burglary, vehicle theft dropped about 25 percent. And carjacking saw a dramatic 28 percent decline compared to the same period in 2024. Will you admit, Mayor Bowser, that President Trump bringing in the National Guard has helped cleanup this District? And if not, why have you let them stay here indefinitely?

Ms. BOWSER. What I have said is that the increase in Federal law enforcement—National Guard is not law enforcement.

Ms. BOEBERT. You have allowed them——

Ms. BOWSER. And so——

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. To stay here indefinitely, though.

Ms. BOWSER. The President controls the D.C. National Guard, and he purports to control the guards from other states.

Ms. BOEBERT. Have you asked him to remove them?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT. And you would be in favor of that? Do you think that crime would increase once again?

Ms. BOWSER. Ms. Boebert, I put in place a Mayor's order that is a framework for how D.C. government will work with our Federal partners.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. And they include the FBI, the DEA, the ATF——

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. U.S. Capitol Police——

Ms. BOEBERT. Sorry, my time is short. I do not mean to step over you.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. As well as the United States Secret Service.

Ms. BOEBERT. I do want to keep this respectful with you, and I do not mean——

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. To step over you. One more question, Mayor Bowser. Is cracking down on crime racist, as many of your Democrat colleagues have suggested?

Ms. BOWSER. Our police department has been——

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes or no, is it racist, ma'am?

Ms. BOWSER. Not in D.C.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, ma'am.

Chairman Mendelson, you believe that cracking down on crime is racist, correct?

Mr. MENDELSON. No. No.

Ms. BOEBERT. No? Is that not what you said? You said bringing in large numbers of Federal or National Guard troops can escalate tensions, particularly in minority neighborhoods. You also stated that Federal deployments can disrupt daily life, disproportionately affect minority communities, and exasperate racial tensions. So?

Mr. MENDELSON. Are you asking about the National Guard or law enforcement?

Ms. BOEBERT. I said Federal or National Guard troops.

Mr. MENDELSON. I do think that——

Ms. BOEBERT. And we have seen police presence decrease under this Council and funding——

Mr. MENDELSON. I——

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Be redirected, so I really——

Mr. MENDELSON. That is not—that is false.

Ms. BOEBERT. I really do not care to hear how——

Mr. MENDELSON. That is false.

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Pro-police you are because I have seen those numbers decrease over the years and funding be stripped. And so, with the National Guard——

Mr. MENDELSON. We have not stripped funding in four years.

Ms. BOEBERT. It has happened, and crime has increased.

Mr. MENDELSON. We—not in four years. What has happened—

Ms. BOEBERT. And, Chairman Mendelson, if I may.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. In four years is that we have not been reimbursed—

Ms. BOEBERT. So, the Federal deployment—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. \$83 million by the Federal Government for police.

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Is disrupting things, and you said that they can exacerbate racial tensions. So, is it racist to bring in—

Mr. MENDELSON. Militarization is oppressive to neighborhoods.

Ms. BOEBERT. Is it racist? Chairman?

Mr. MENDELSON. No.

Ms. BOEBERT. No. Okay. So, are you redacting your statement?

Mr. MENDELSON. No.

Ms. BOEBERT. Your position? Is—

Mr. MENDELSON. Militarization is a problem. I did not say that was racist, but it is a problem.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, you said that it increases racist tensions. So, I would say that you are characterizing that as racist, bringing them in.

Mr. Chairman, my time has expired.

Chairman COMER. I thank the lady from Colorado.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Min—

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. From California.

Ms. ANSARI. Sorry, I have a unanimous consent request if that is okay.

Chairman COMER. Yes, go ahead.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you.

I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this May 16, 2024, article from *The Washington Post* titled, “A Congressman spared prison as a teen tells D.C. to be tough on youth,” which covers the story of a sitting Congressman who used a pre-trial diversion program to avoid jailtime—

Ms. BOEBERT. I think the title has been read, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. For a possession—

Chairman COMER. Without—

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. With intent to distribute and had a bribery charge.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, the title—

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Has been read.

Ms. ANSARI. And yet, that is—

Chairman COMER. Without—

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, the title has been read.

Ms. ANSARI. That is the level of—

Ms. BOEBERT. We are not reading the entire document.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Ansari, all you have to do is say the title—

Mr. DONALDS. Chairman?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And the publisher. So, without objection.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, and since the gentlelady's referring to me, I wonder if she would like to debate the actual topic. I am more than prepared to debate the topic. I have been doing it my entire life.

Chairman COMER. Do you want to?

Mr. MIN. You voted illegally your entire life?

Chairman COMER. Would the lady yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Ms. ANSARI. No, it is not a debate. It is an article that, obviously, you admit is about you, about how you were spared prison as a teen and now want to not—

Mr. DONALDS. Actually—

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. Allow other young people—

Mr. DONALDS. And actually, for the gentlelady—

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. That same opportunity.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Let us be very clear. The article is wrong. The article is wrong, and I am on the record stating that repeatedly. I have never been proud of what happened when I was 18 years old or 20 years old. I was wrong. And under the laws of the State of Florida, I was held accountable for that as an adult. So, let us be very clear about what was written in that article, which is wrong, that does not coincide with the language that I passed off the House Floor the other day.

If you want to read articles and put them in the record, let us be clear about what they are. And since I am the only subject matter expert—

Mr. MIN. Point of order.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. On that article, I would like to set the record straight right now. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. CROCKETT. I am requesting equal time. I am sorry, Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Was the article about you, Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. It was not about me.

Chairman COMER. Okay.

Ms. CROCKETT. But it was—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Min.

Ms. CROCKETT. But it was a unanimous consent, which—

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I am actually—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Are not debatable.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to take on all comers.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—

Mr. DONALDS. So, I entertain it.

Chairman COMER. If somebody tries to put an article in about you—and I have read a few—

Ms. CROCKETT. Well, I am sure you all want to talk—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. But we have not put them in.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. About my private school, honey.

Chairman COMER. If somebody does, you can defend yourself.

Mr. Min?

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair, appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

I want to be clear, though. This Committee continues to fail to conduct oversight on the most important issues that my constituents care about. Whether it is the allegations of chronic and extreme law breaking by ICE; the politicization of the DOJ, FCC, and other executive branch offices to go after Trump's critics; the repeated attacks on Congress' article 1 authorities, including the illegal taxation of goods imported into the United States, tariffs; or the illegal withholding of funds appropriated by Congress, a.k.a. impoundments, and on and on and on. And incredibly, virtually the entire Republican caucus has refused to sign the discharge petition to release the entire Epstein files.

Earlier this year, GOP leadership recessed early, hoping that the Massie-Khanna discharge petition would fade away, but that is not going to happen. We are going to keep fighting. We are now one vote shy of the 218 needed.

Chairman COMER. Would the gentleman yield to a question from the Chairman?

Mr. MIN. Four Republicans, including three on this Committee, have been brave enough to sign that petition.

Chairman COMER. Would the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. MIN. Meanwhile, the rest of the conference continues to stay silent.

Chairman COMER. Would you yield to a question from me?

Mr. MIN. Absolutely.

Chairman COMER. Are you not keeping up with the Oversight Committee? We have requested more information than the discharge petition. And I think you are trying to create a false narrative that this Committee is not doing anything or Republicans are not doing anything. This Committee has been very aggressive—

Mr. MIN. I applaud the work—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. On Epstein.

Mr. MIN [continuing]. That the Committee is doing, but it is proceeding piecemeal. And the discharge petition, as I understand it, would require the entire release of the Epstein files. They are not inconsistent with each other, and I think that—

Chairman COMER. And then it has to go to the Senate—

Mr. MIN. I would urge you, respectfully, to consider signing on to that.

Chairman COMER. You want us to just wait? Do you want us to just drop everything in the Epstein and wait—

Mr. MIN. I do not understand—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. For the Senate?

Mr. MIN [continuing]. Why the Oversight Committee cannot do oversight while also signing on to the discharge petition. Because we are asking for piecemeal items from the FBI and DOJ. We are not asking, as I understand it, for the entire Epstein files.

Chairman COMER. And we have asked for everything. We have asked for everything. Now I will yield back to your time.

Mr. MIN. Thank you. And if I could have a little more time, I would appreciate it.

I urge my colleagues to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities and to do right by the survivors and sign on to that. And respectfully, Mr. Chair, I would urge you to consider that as well.

But I wanted to turn to today's hearing because I believe this is largely political theater meant to distract us from the fact that Donald Trump is illegally deploying thousands of military troops in the streets of Washington, D.C., following on his illegal deployment of military personnel in Los Angeles. And now he is threatening to deploy the military in cities like Chicago, New York, and Portland over the objections of the local mayors and Governors.

Now, as a reminder, state Governors have broad latitude to call up their National Guard. But the President's authority is very limited, and it is limited under title X authority, which is expressly limited to three circumstances: one, when the United States is invaded or in danger of invasion by a foreign nation; two, there is a rebellion or danger of a rebellion against the authority of the government of the United States; or three, the President is unable, with regular forces, to execute the laws of the United States.

So, I want to ask you all to raise your hands if you agree with the following question. Do you believe the United States is being invaded? I want to note for the record there are no hands raised.

Do you believe there is a rebellion happening?

Mr. MENDELSON. No.

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Mr. MIN. Again, no hands raised.

Do you believe the President is unable to execute the laws of the United States without the National Guard?

Mr. SCHWALB. No.

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Mr. MENDELSON. No.

Mr. MIN. No hands raised. That is right. Donald Trump, ironically, is using a trumped-up crisis over crime to break the law.

Ms. BOEBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIN. No. In January 2024—

Ms. BOEBERT. You did not ask us this last year.

Mr. MIN [continuing]. A group called United to Protect Democracy published a report entitled, "The Authoritarian Playbook for 2025," which warned explicitly that if Trump were elected, he would likely follow the same playbook used by authoritarians like Vladimir Putin in Russia, Recep Erdogan in Turkey, Viktor Orban in Hungary, and others. It outlines a number of actions they expected President Trump to take during his second term.

So, I want you to raise your hand if you think the Trump Administration is doing the following: issuing pardons to license lawbreaking?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MIN. Raise your hands if you agree with that. Directing investigations against critics and rivals?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. MIN. Regulatory retaliation?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MIN. Federal law enforcement overreach?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MIN. Domestic deployment of the military?

Mr. MENDELSON. Yes.

Mr. MIN. It probably will not surprise you to know that this is exactly what these authors predicted Trump would take as far as actions if he were elected to a second term.

But one ironclad rule that is still potentially being forced is the Posse Comitatus Act, which clearly prohibits the use of military personnel, including the National Guard, for law enforcement activities unless specifically authorized by Congress such as with the Insurrection Act.

Now, I have actually asked a lot of the National Guardsmen here that I have run into on the streets whether they are allowed to assist with law enforcement, and they have consistently told me that the answer is no. I asked a Guardsman just earlier today what would happen if he saw crime happening right in front of him. He said he could take pictures, videos, he could call the cops, but he is not allowed to engage.

So, I am really appreciative of those who serve in our National Guard, and I am really, really appreciative that, unlike Donald Trump, they are following the law. But this is also just massively wasteful and disrespectful to our National Guardsmen who have been pulled from their families, their jobs, and their communities, all to essentially serve as human scarecrows, or even worse, to clean up our streets and do our landscaping. This is not what our guardsmen were trained to do. It is not what they are signing up to do.

It is also massively expensive. President Trump's deployment of the National Guard and Marines to Los Angeles cost over \$120 million. The D.C. National Guard's deployment of 958 guardsmen will cost over \$200 million. And while we do not know yet what the deployment of the 1,300 plus other guardsmen sent from other states will cost, it is likely to be much higher because we are paying for their lodging as well. So, basically, we are looking at a deployment cost of over a half a billion dollars for this D.C. deployment, which is doing nothing to stop crime. You could hire thousands of cops with that money.

So, Mayor Bowser, I want to ask you a question. What would be more effective in deterring and preventing crime? Deploying over 2,000 National Guardsmen at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, or sending that money to D.C. for additional law enforcement and crime prevention programs?

Ms. BOWSER. Sending—

Chairman COMER. And the gentleman's time has expired, but the Mayor can answer the question.

Mr. MIN. I think you took up about a minute of my time, though, sir.

Chairman COMER. Oh, we stopped the clock. I watched it.

Mr. MIN. No, you did not, actually.

Chairman COMER. We stopped it.

Mr. MIN. It did not stop.

Chairman COMER. We stopped it.

Ms. BOWSER. I would say sending the money to D.C., restoring our 2025 approved budget as a start would also help. And additionally, we can do more than law enforcement. We can also assist the Federal Government with their parks.

Mr. MIN. I appreciate that answer, and I would just close by saying this. If Trump were serious about stopping crime, he would send greater resources to local law enforcement and try to tackle the root causes. Instead, he is illegally sending troops into our cities, even as he is pardoning criminals, defunding the FBI, and reallocating our scarce Federal resources to going after nonviolent offenders. This makes, like, day laborers, children—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MIN [continuing]. This is making our communities more dangerous, not more safe.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes—

Mr. MIN. I yield back.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Florida's favorite son, Mr. Donalds.

Mr. MIN. And I would like to, with unanimous consent, introduce this article titled "D.C.—

Chairman COMER. I have already recognized Mr. Donalds. You can do it in a minute.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This has been a very interesting hearing for a myriad of reasons. Mayor Bowser, thanks for being here with us. I do appreciate you taking the time today.

It was said earlier that in 1973, Congress did pass the D.C. Home Rule Act. It is known on Capitol Hill, it is known, quite frankly, through our entire constitutional republic, that any Congress cannot bind a future Congress, just like at the state level a legislature cannot bind a future legislature, that something that is enacted can be modified or undone in the future.

I was able to have a conversation with a lot of the people from the Free D.C. organization. Some of them might still be in the room today. And that was the constant point that we came back to, that, yes, under the law passed in 1973, your position was created. The D.C. City Council's position was created. But the ultimate authority for the federal district is still the U.S. Congress and with the signature of the President of the United States. Would you agree with that assessment?

Ms. BOWSER. I would agree. And I would also add it is within the power of this Congress to advance the D.C. statehood bill. By simple majority, this Congress can, like it has done for every state in the union outside of the first 13, admit D.C. as a state.

Mr. DONALDS. I am glad you actually brought that up because one of the reasons why I oppose the D.C. statehood bill is because the Constitution and the framers were actually quite clear that they did not want the federal district, per se, to be leveraged by a state or any state. And I think I had conversations with several residents of D.C. who were walking through the halls of Capitol Hill when then-Speaker Pelosi was bringing that up. And I asked them two very important questions. If you want to have representation, why don't we allow that property to be re-annexed by the State of Maryland, which actually provided the land for the Federal district to be created? Or would the citizens of the District of Co-

lumbia prefer not to be subject to Federal income taxes as a result of them not having “representation”?

Ms. BOWSER. I do—

Mr. DONALDS. What is your thought on that?

Ms. BOWSER. I do think it is time to talk about what the District pays and what we get back. I do think it is time to have that conversation.

Mr. DONALDS. That is a fair conversation to have. I have got a couple of questions for you. Let us get to the business of the matter.

Since President Trump authorized the National Guard to be in D.C., how much has crime decreased in the District of Columbia?

Ms. BOWSER. I think it is important—and I have noticed that this has happened throughout this conversation—that you talk about the National Guard, and you do not talk about Federal law enforcement. And the Federal surge consisted of Federal law enforcement, which MPD works with all the time. I am talking about the FBI, the DEA—

Mr. DONALDS. Mayor Bowser, I am really not trying to disrespect you—

Ms. BOWSER. I, yes, I understand.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. But how much has crime decreased—

Ms. BOWSER. Oh, I—

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Since the President took action?

Ms. BOWSER. I mentioned already the—and let me look—

Mr. DONALDS. Sure.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. At my numbers, that the Federal surge produced a 39 percent decrease in violent crime.

Mr. DONALDS. Thirty-nine percent decrease in—

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Violent crime—

Ms. BOWSER. And that is on top—

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. In the Nation’s capital.

Ms. BOWSER. Let me just add, that is on top of the 26 percent decrease that we were already experiencing.

Mr. DONALDS. So, it seems that the President’s surge was more effective than your own efforts. Wouldn’t you say?

Ms. BOWSER. It accelerated—

Mr. DONALDS. Last time I checked, 39 percent is way higher than 26 percent.

But let me move on. Let me move on.

Mr. MENDELSON. But the full statistic is a little different.

Mr. DONALDS. Hold on. Chairman Mendelson, I did not ask you a question.

Mr. MENDELSON. I know, but the—

Mr. DONALDS. Relax. Hang on.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Full statistic is a little different.

Mr. DONALDS. Actually, Chairman, let me ask you this question.

Mr. MENDELSON. Sure.

Mr. DONALDS. Because you butted in, now let me ask you.

Mr. MENDELSON. Sure.

Mr. DONALDS. What is the current status of the Metropolitan Police Department in terms of staffing? How many officers do you have on the beat?

Mr. MENDELSON. I believe it is less than 3,100—

Mr. DONALDS. Okay. Is the MPD fully—

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Which is much lower than it should be.

Mr. DONALDS. Is the MPD fully staffed?

Mr. MENDELSON. In my view, no.

Mr. DONALDS. Question—hold on. Hold that point. Here is the question. So, is a surge of Federal law enforcement into the Federal enclave, which the Mayor has acknowledged is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government, primary responsibility, isn't it simple logic to say that the President's surge has been helpful to safety and security in the District of Columbia, Chairman?

Mr. MENDELSON. The additional law enforcement resources has been good. We work with those different agencies all the time. There was more of it, more of a good thing. National Guard is separate. ICE is separate.

Mr. DONALDS. Question for you, Chairman. You said something I want to expound. You have been working with the Federal Government during this surge—

Mr. MENDELSON. And before.

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. That was brought by President Trump and before.

Mr. MENDELSON. And before.

Mr. DONALDS. So, you have been working with him through this entire time?

Mr. MENDELSON. With the Federal like DEA, FBI—

Mr. DONALDS. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. NPS, Park Police. It is—

Mr. DONALDS. Mayor Bowser, you would concur that you guys have been working with the President of the United States throughout this entire period, correct?

Ms. BOWSER. Mr. Donalds, you know I work with every President—

Mr. DONALDS. I know, but I am just—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Including President Trump—

Mr. DONALDS. I am trying to establish a baseline.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. In Trump 1 and in Trump 2.

Mr. DONALDS. And I thank you for that, Mayor Bowser.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, that is our job.

Mr. DONALDS. I am just trying to establish—

Ms. BOWSER. As do all of—we all stand ready to work with—we are unique. The District of Columbia is unique in that—

Mr. DONALDS. Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. We are always going to have—

Mr. DONALDS. Mayor Bowser?

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. A relationship with the—

Mr. DONALDS. Mayor Bowser, I am out of time, so I have got to reclaim.

Ms. BOWSER. Sorry, sorry.

Mr. DONALDS. I apologize.

Ms. BOWSER. Yep.

Mr. DONALDS. I agree, Mayor Bowser.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. DONALDS. The district is unique. The district is not like any other city in the United States. It is the Federal enclave. I commend you and your team for working with the President of the United States to keep the District safe. I really do. I think it is important for a lot of people who are saying that they are upset with the President, that your own Mayor and your own Chairman of the City Council has acknowledged that crime has gone down while working with the President. Let us work together. Let us give peace a chance.

I yield back.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Mr. Donalds.

Mr. Min, I will recognize you now for your—

Mr. MIN. I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the record an article from the *USA Today* entitled, "D.C. National Guard deployment to cost \$200 million, as soldiers pick up trash, blow leaves."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I actually have a point of personal privilege.

Chairman COMER. Yes, state your point.

Mr. DONALDS. It was raised earlier in an article about me, so let us just get to it.

Ms. CROCKETT. I thought we did this already.

Mr. DONALDS. No, well, we are doing it again because your name was not raised, so now we get to do it twice. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. He is being recognized for a point of privilege.

Mr. DONALDS. It is a point of personal privilege.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Well, we are going to need one too.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you very much. I do not think it is really personal for you, Madam.

Let us be clear about a couple of things. Yes, when I was 18 and 20, I was arrested twice. I was. I made a lot of mistakes when I was young. I have admitted them. I have had to live with them my entire life. Every day since the age of 21, I have had to purpose myself to be a better man than I was the day before. That is something that was afforded to me by the laws of the State of Florida, and I am grateful for that opportunity. And now I am here in the Nation's capital doing my job.

In Florida, when I got into my trouble, I was not tried as a juvenile. I was tried as an adult because I was an adult. And since that point in time, I have worked, whether it is at the state level or here at the Federal level, to make sure that our criminal justice policies and systems actually make sense and they are built to secure and protect the citizens that we all serve. That is a mission I have been on ever since.

Ms. CROCKETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONALDS. I am not going to yield because it is a personal point of privilege. It is not for you. Thank you.

Ms. CROCKETT. I just wanted to clarify.

Mr. DONALDS. So, for the record, I wanted to make that point be clear. Yes, I am the author of the D.C. Crimes Act. Yes, I believe that adults over the age of 18—

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, this is not—

Mr. DONALDS [continuing]. Should be held accountable as adults.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. A campaign ad for—

Mr. DONALDS. That is all.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. The gentleman's governorship.

Mr. DONALDS. This is not a campaign ad. I am stating it for the record because it was raised by the gentlelady. I am sorry I did not catch your name. I know you are a freshman Member of the House, and I have never had a chance to meet you, but it was raised, so I wanted to provide a response because my name was brought up in an article submitted for the record. I think I am done now.

Ms. CROCKETT. Point of information.

Mr. DONALDS. I yield.

Ms. CROCKETT. Point of information.

Chairman COMER. State your point.

Ms. CROCKETT. The gentleman from Florida just referenced the bill that he authored, and I just want to clarify, is the Chair aware as to whether or not, under current D.C. law, it allows the Attorney General—

Chairman COMER. That is not a point of information.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Well, it is a question, point of inquiry.

Chairman COMER. We can talk about it later.

Ms. CROCKETT. We will do an inquiry. I am trying to clarify—

Chairman COMER. It is not a parliamentary inquiry.

All right. The Chair recognizes Ms. Ansari.

Ms. ANSARI. Okay. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say, but we all know why you have called this hearing. This is one more attempt to cover for the Trump White House, which is itself engaged in a massive, massive coverup to shield the President and his allies from accountability. No one is fooled as to why, suddenly, the President of the United States is declaring emergencies in cities across the country and deploying armed troops against American citizens, despite the fact that crime rates, at least in the District of Columbia, are at a 30-year low.

This is very obviously a blatant and egregious attempt to redirect attention from a very real and ongoing crime, the crime which is the massive and epic coverup for Jeffrey Epstein's abuse and that of other rich and powerful men who engaged with and supported him over the course of decades. Some of those very men are in the White House right now.

Donald Trump wants so badly for the Epstein story to go away. Trump sued *The Wall Street Journal* for \$10 billion for reporting about this letter, not surprising, as we are seeing what is happening now with the alarming authoritarian attacks on the free press. This was one of many examples. But he claimed this letter did not exist. Here it is, this grotesque, disgusting, misogynistic letter which Donald Trump sent to Jeffrey Epstein. He probably laughed. He probably thought this was hilarious, laughing about the abuse of literally thousands of underage girls at the hands of Jeffrey Epstein, Ghislaine Maxwell, and his powerful rich friends, and then lying about it, repeatedly, to this day.

Why? Why lie about it? Donald Trump now claims this is not his handwriting, which is a comical excuse. And House Republicans are covering for him. Why are House Republicans covering for Donald Trump?

They are holding this absurd hearing about crime in D.C. to distract the public from the very real national issues at hand. These are the people that Trump and House Republicans are covering for. Trump's Department of Justice moved Ghislaine Maxwell, Epstein's right-hand accomplice in the sexual abuse of underage girls, to a minimum-security prison, all to buy her silence.

You know, Donald Trump sent his former personal defense attorney, who is now the deputy Attorney General of the United States, to sit down with Ghislaine Maxwell and to transcribe her remarks word for word, releasing this liar's version of the truth to the world. Why would the Trump Department of Justice endorse a convicted liar, Ghislaine Maxwell's version of the truth?

Many of us here in this room actually sat with the victims, the survivors of Epstein, and they were understandably shaken and livid by the fact that a convicted child sex abuser and trafficker was given such a massive platform to continue to spread her lies. Donald Trump did that. Trump's DOJ did that.

When FBI Director Kash Patel was asked about it in the Senate, he said he had no idea why she was moved to a minimum-security prison. Don't House Republicans have any interest in investigating that? No? They do not care? Instead, they want answers to the really important questions, questions like, how many trash bags did the National Guard pick up today? Or how many traffic tickets have been given out in D.C. this week? Or how many drunk college students needed to have the National Guard call them Ubers so they could get home? These are the tough questions that House Republicans want answers to.

So, let us just be very clear. The biggest criminal in Washington, D.C., the criminal who was besties with Jeffrey Epstein and was already found liable of sexually abusing E. Jean Carroll, the criminal who should be investigated not only for those crimes but now this massive coverup is Donald John Trump.

What I want to know is, who instructed the Bureau of Prisons to move Ghislaine Maxwell? What did the Trump Administration promise her to remain silent? Why is FBI Director Patel claiming that no other men victimized underage girls and women through the sex trafficking operation organized by Epstein and Maxwell, which is obviously false, and we heard as much from the women? Did House Republicans collude with the White House to change their tune on the Epstein files? And what is Donald Trump so afraid of? Why won't he just release the unredacted Epstein files, which he could do literally at any moment?

Unfortunately, we will have to continue to wait to get these answers. Also, Republicans can find out how many stray cats need to be dealt with on the streets of Washington, D.C.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Burchett from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think it needs to be said that the Democrats had those files for four years and chose not to do anything with them, and now currently, they are obsessed with it. I think that speaks volumes.

But thank you all for being here. Mayor, thank you, ma'am. I was a county mayor. It was the best job I think I have ever had.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT. And on days like today, I am sure you are thinking, dadgum I wished I had not run for this office, should have sold Amway or something.

But anyway, I have a couple questions for you, ma'am. Has President Trump's response to the spike in violent crime in Washington, D.C., lowered the rate of violent crime?

Ms. BOWSER. I have already testified to the purity of 30 to 34 days we saw a decrease on top of the decreases that we are experiencing already this year.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. Yes, ma'am. But when you are the 435th most powerful Member of Congress, I have to ask those questions again so.

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, yes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Just act like you have never heard that—

Ms. BOWSER. Okay. Okay. You got it.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. And I deserve a Pulitzer Prize for my questioning.

Have the criminal justice policies created by the D.C. City Council led to the spike in violent crime in Washington, D.C.?

Ms. BOWSER. In my experience, Congressman, there is not one single thing that you point to when crime goes up, and it is usually not one single thing you point to when crime goes down. So, my experience as Mayor and as a member of the Council before that is to throw everything at it. We look at the laws. We look at our deployment strategies. We look at our prevention strategies until we see results. And that is what we have seen over the last two years.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Mendelson, why does your Council continue to push these soft-on-crime policies when violent crime apparently has skyrocketed in Washington, D.C., as a result?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, I do not agree that we have done that. In fact, in my statement at the beginning, I noted a number of changes to the law that we, that the Council has—

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, yesterday, though, we stepped in and have changed a couple of those laws that we felt like proved that you all were soft on crime.

Mr. MENDELSON. One of those was the age of 14. That actually was adopted by Congress in 1970.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. What about the one where they are not allowed to chase someone who has stolen a car?

Mr. MENDELSON. We revised that law. I believe it was last year.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yet, we had to—

Mr. MENDELSON. When I say revised, there were complaints we were hearing from the police chief, and we made changes to that law.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. In your statement regarding oversight efforts, you stated that these bills were a completely unnecessary in-

trusion on the District's ability to make and enforce our laws because of the recent work that Council has been doing to combat crime. Are you aware that juvenile crime in Washington, D.C., has increased every year since 2020?

Mr. MENDELSON. I do not believe that is correct. But the data, the Attorney General would have the—

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay.

Mr. MENDELSON [continuing]. Exact data. But I will say that we—juveniles should not be involved in crime. And that should be the goal of any society, of any community, and that is our goal. We do not want juveniles involved in crime. We want them in school. We want them learning. We want them to have every opportunity to achieve as an adult.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. In 2021, Mayor Bowser requested \$11 million for additional funding for police officers. In response, junior colleagues on the D.C. City Council proposed a compromise package that would appropriate \$5 million to police officers in various amounts to gun safety initiatives, because, as is quoted, "because the solution cannot solely be more police." Why have you consistently tried to impede the work and support systems for police officers?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, we have not consistently. So, that is true about 2020 for the Fiscal Year 2021 budget. Every year since then, we have fully funded the request for MPD for hiring officers and for paying officers. Just yesterday, we adopted a 13 percent pay raise for police officers. So, I do not agree that consistently. I would also note MPD has a budget of about \$500 million. I think it is actually more than that now. So, when you talk about \$5 million, I do not think that is even one percent. That is a 10th of a percent. But that was five years ago.

Mr. BURCHETT. But you would gladly turn that money back in then?

Mr. MENDELSON. Well, in my testimony earlier, I noted that we have been asking the Federal Government every year for reimbursement through the appropriation process for the Emergency Planning and Security Fund (EPSF) and that the Congress has shorted us a total of \$83 million over the last four years. So, you can ask me about \$5 million—

Mr. BURCHETT. Over the last how many years?

Mr. MENDELSON. Four.

Mr. BURCHETT. Four years.

Mr. MENDELSON. \$83 million.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. That would be during the Biden Administration.

General Schwalb, did I say that right, Schwalb? You said kids—

Mr. SCHWALB. You did. You did, thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. Should not be treated as adults. At what age does a kid become an adult?

Mr. SCHWALB. Under our law, children are considered juveniles until they are 18.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. Thank you.

And I am out of time. Again, thank you all for being here. Mayor—

Mr. MENDELSON. Thank you.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. It was a pleasure, ma'am.

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, gentlemen.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. I am going to try to go really fast because I got a lot to cover, so I am starting with the AG. I want you to tell me whether or not it is lawful or lawless, ignoring court orders?

Mr. SCHWALB. That is lawless.

Ms. CROCKETT. Impounding congressional funds?

Mr. SCHWALB. Violates the law.

Ms. CROCKETT. Invoking emergency powers when there is no emergency?

Mr. SCHWALB. Unlawful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Sending troops without an invite?

Mr. SCHWALB. Violates the law.

Ms. CROCKETT. Covering for pedophiles? I just threw that one in there. Okay. I will move to the next one.

What about revoking birthright citizenship?

Mr. SCHWALB. Violates the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

Ms. CROCKETT. How about violating due process?

Mr. SCHWALB. Violates the Fifth and 14th Amendment of the Constitution.

Ms. CROCKETT. How about what we see happening with redistricting that would in some way minimize, if not delete, the voices of people of color as they are going through and illegally going through this process? Is there a constitutional amendment that you can think of that is associated with that?

Mr. SCHWALB. Probably many, but it is unlawful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay.

Mr. SCHWALB. And unconstitutional.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you.

Mr. SCHWALB. And un-American.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you. As well as can you tell me if it is lawful or lawless to violate free speech?

Mr. SCHWALB. That is lawless.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Sounds about right because, you know, we had to have a conversation about Jimmy Kimmel, so I am going to say free Jimmy Kimmel for sure. And hopefully, we will deal with the FCC Chairman.

But the reason that I wanted to go through that long list—and that was actually not even the half of it—is because since this Administration has come in on January 20, they have engaged in some form of every single thing that I said on that list, even the part about covering for pedophiles. So, my question is, why are we sitting here today? Number one, they already passed their bootleg laws, and it is clear that even the bill author is not well-informed about what his bill does because, as has already been stated, at the age of 18, you are an adult. So, this idea that somehow 21-year-olds were now somehow juveniles under D.C. law, is that accurate or inaccurate?

Mr. SCHWALB. It was inaccurate.

Ms. CROCKETT. Is it—

Mr. SCHWALB. Misunderstood the way the law works.

Ms. CROCKETT. Correct. Could not understand how to read the law, and decided that they were going to rewrite the law and mess up the law. And to be clear, we were talking about judges being able to have enough discretion to decide whether or not they were going to give someone an opportunity maybe to clean their record, such as the bill author was given that opportunity under Florida law because his second felony was picked up when he was 21, to be clear. So, he was older than 18. And under this law, if you were under, what, 25, so 24 or under, then the judges had discretion, correct?

Mr. SCHWALB. But only in certain kinds of cases.

Ms. CROCKETT. And—

Mr. SCHWALB. Not the most serious cases. And in fact, that discretion was, as we know, exercised very rarely. And it would have been an opportunity, had the Congress wanted to talk with the folks who are involved in applying that law and seeing how it works, to understand that this is not a law that is out of sync with other states, and it is working.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. And the reason that it matters is because now the gentleman from Florida is trying to become a Governor, and chances are maybe D.C., once they get statehood, could have had a future Governor that had a second chance. But since they do not want other people to have chances that they have been given, they want to just pretend like they are bigger and better and badder than.

So, I will move on because I am frustrated that we are having this hearing when we know that this Administration cannot take care of their own business. As we know, they recently illegally bombed yet another Venezuelan boat, and we may be headed for a war.

We know that this particular President has decided that he wants to shake down people as relates to the First Amendment because he has filed not one lawsuit, not two lawsuits, but he has filed numerous lawsuits. He filed a lawsuit against *The New York Times*. He filed one against *The Wall Street Journal*, against *CBS*, against *ABC*, against the *Des Moines Register*. He is doing all of this because he wants to quash any speech that is not appreciative or lauding him, which is pretty much anything that is factual.

So, let us talk a few facts about these January 6 felons that should still be incarcerated because they went through the process, but because they were doing things on his behalf, of course he wanted to let them go. So they released more than 1,000 people who participated in the insurrection on this government, many of whom who have previous criminal records like Mr. Theodore Mendenforth, who was convicted of predatory criminal sexual assault of a child; or Mr. Peter Swartz, who had 38 prior convictions, including one where he beat his wife by repeatedly punching and biting her. Trump also pardoned Mr. David Daniel, who was convicted of production and possession of child pornography. Trump also pardoned Mr. Daniel Ball, who “threw an explosive device that detonated upon at least 25 officers during the Capitol riot.” He also had a record for “domestic violence by strangulation.”

I am not done. Trump also pardoned Mr. Andrew Taake, who sent nudes to an undercover law enforcement officer who was posing as a 15-year-old girl. Mr. Casey Hopkins also received a pardon from Trump, and Mr. Hopkins was convicted of forcible rape. According to court records, he “had forcible intercourse with the victim, choked her to the point of impairing her vision, banged her head into a wall, and urinated into the victim’s mouth as he humiliated her.”

These are the people that he decided to release in the streets of D.C. So, if anybody does need to clean up D.C., I would agree it is this man because he is the one that is causing half the crime that we have. Not only is he participating in the crime, but we know that he instigated the insurrection.

And if I did say that I had one issue with the Biden-Harris Administration, it is the fact that they did not move forward and make sure that this man was put where he should have been put because the last time I checked, as a criminal defense attorney—and, Mr. Attorney General, you may have a different experience—but I never had a defendant that had 34 convictions for felonies and did not spend one day in jail, never in my life.

And the last time I checked, the party of law and order is the only one that decided that they would be out of order and decided to nominate someone who was not only indicted but was actually convicted of multiple felonies. That has never happened in this country, and it is a shame that we are dealing with it now, and now he wants to tell you all how to do your jobs.

Chairman COMER. I thought you were going to say when you had one problem with the Bidens, I thought it was going to be all the pardons, all the pardons that the autopen pardoned.

Ms. CROCKETT. No, it is on the fact that they did not—

Chairman COMER. Okay. All right. Okay.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Gill from Texas.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding this hearing. And I would also like to thank the witnesses for taking the time to be here today. I know you all are busy, so I really appreciate it.

Mayor Bowser, thank you to you especially—

Ms. BOWSER. Thank you.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. For coming here. You have been Mayor for about ten years, right?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. GILL. Okay. And during that time, would you describe D.C. as a safe city?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. GILL. You would?

Ms. BOWSER. Listen, Mr. Gill, just—and it was brought up earlier by the Congresswoman from Detroit.

Mr. GILL. The murder rate in Washington, D.C., is the fourth highest of any city in the country.

Ms. BOWSER. I have, I have heard—

Mr. GILL. Would you describe that as a safe city?

Ms. BOWSER. I have heard every statistic and factoid, and they are all different, about where our city—

Mr. GILL. Are you disputing that—

Ms. BOWSER. No.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Washington, D.C., has the fourth highest murder rate in the country?

Ms. BOWSER. I am not familiar with that statistic.

Mr. GILL. You are not familiar—

Ms. BOWSER. What I know, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. With that statistic? This is your city.

Ms. BOWSER. Mr. Gill?

Mr. GILL. Respectfully—

Ms. BOWSER. Excuse me.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. This is your city.

Ms. BOWSER. What I, respectfully, I know that we have driven our murder rate down over—

Mr. GILL. What was the homicide rate in 2014 before you were—

Ms. BOWSER. I do not—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Elected?

Ms. BOWSER. I do not know.

Mr. GILL. Do you know how much the homicide rate has changed during your tenure as Mayor?

Ms. BOWSER. I do.

Mr. GILL. How much?

Ms. BOWSER. It has gone up—

Mr. GILL. It has gone up—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. And it is going down.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. By about 70 percent. It has gone up by about 70 percent—

Ms. BOWSER. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. From 2014 to 2024.

Ms. BOWSER. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. GILL. Those are from the Metropolitan Police Department. That is correct.

Mr. HIGGINS. I do not think that number is correct.

Mr. GILL. You should know the crime statistics—

Ms. BOWSER. Yes, and I do.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. For your own city, especially—

Ms. BOWSER. I do know my crime statistics.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Whenever it is this dangerous. Do you know how carjackings have trended during your time in office?

Ms. BOWSER. I know that they have gone down.

Mr. GILL. They are up over 500 percent from 2014 to 2024. That is not a safe city. I do not think any person would call that a safe city.

We will move on. You agree that defunding the police makes our communities less safe, don't you?

Ms. BOWSER. This is what I want to say. People—

Mr. GILL. It is a straightforward question.

Ms. BOWSER. People, yes.

Mr. GILL. You are not going to filibuster.

Ms. BOWSER. Well, this is my—

Mr. GILL. Do you think—

Ms. BOWSER. This is my answer.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. That defunding the police makes our communities—

Ms. BOWSER. This is my answer.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Less safe?

Ms. BOWSER. What I know is that people have moved here. People have sent their kids here. People have started businesses here. We have record—

Mr. GILL. Does defunding—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Visitation—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. The police make our communities—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. And so those are—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. More or less safe?

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. The indications—

Mr. GILL. Does defunding the police—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Of a city

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Make our communities more or less safe?

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Where people want to live, work, and visit.

Mr. GILL. You will not even back your own police department right now.

Ms. BOWSER. You, you—

Mr. GILL. I am asking you, does defunding the police make our communities more or less safe, and you will not give me a straight answer.

Ms. BOWSER. I have already answered that today.

Mr. GILL. Then why don't you tell me again? Do you think that defunding the police makes our communities more or less safe?

Ms. BOWSER. I have never defunded the police, nor would I.

Mr. GILL. So, you think it makes our communities less safe. Is that correct?

Ms. BOWSER. I just told you. I have never defunded the police—

Mr. GILL. I understand that.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. And I never would.

Mr. GILL. You may not have defunded the police, and that is a good thing, but you did provide a \$125,000 grant to an organization lobbying to defund the police. Are you aware of that?

Ms. BOWSER. I do not—what is that that you just raised?

Mr. GILL. It is an organization called HIPS that you provided just this year, Fiscal Year 2025, a \$125,000 grant to.

Ms. BOWSER. I think we—

Mr. GILL. This is them lobbying—

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Funded them to do—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. To defund the police.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Public health work.

Mr. GILL. "It's time we shifted to a society free of police and systems of incarceration."

Ms. BOWSER. We fund them for public health work.

Mr. GILL. For public health?

Ms. BOWSER. Yes.

Mr. GILL. Does this make our communities more healthful—

Ms. BOWSER. We fund—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. By defunding our police?

Ms. BOWSER. We fund them for public health.

Mr. GILL. Do you think defunding our police and lobbying to defund our police and undermine local law enforcement—

Ms. BOWSER. I have answered that question.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Makes our communities more safe——

Ms. BOWSER. I have answered that question.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Or healthful? Do you think that providing tax dollars to an organization who wants to defund our police is good for the residents of Washington, D.C.?

Ms. BOWSER. We would not fund them for that purpose. We would fund them——

Mr. GILL. But you funded them.

Ms. BOWSER. We——

Mr. GILL. And you chose to give them money. You gave them hardworking tax dollars to an organization that wants to defund the police.

Ms. BOWSER. We fund them for public health.

Mr. GILL. Do you think that giving free housing to illegal aliens is an appropriate use of tax dollars?

Ms. BOWSER. We think if it keeps people off the streets, then we have to keep people off the streets.

Mr. GILL. You agree with giving your residents' tax dollars and using them to give subsidized housing for illegal aliens?

Ms. BOWSER. But Mr. Gill, we also did not agree with the Governor of Texas or Arizona busing people, tricking them——

Mr. GILL. So, you——

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. To come to our city.

Mr. GILL. And it is not——

Ms. BOWSER. We did not agree with that either.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Surprising to me because you are also funding NGO's that support free housing for illegal aliens.

Ms. BOWSER. And I hope you would agree——

Mr. GILL. And they are lobbying for that.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. That other Governors——

Mr. GILL. You are using tax dollars to provide——

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Should not send people——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. To provide——

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. On buses——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. NGO's that are lobbying——

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. That do not have any housing to our city.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. To get free housing for illegal aliens in your city. That makes your city less safe.

I want to move on. In May 2024, and this was referenced earlier, there were some major pro-Palestinian protests and sit-ins at George Washington University. This was during final exam season. They were terrorizing Jewish students. They were doing it for weeks. It was a major problem. The police were called in, and you stopped them from doing their job.

Ms. BOWSER. I do not——

Mr. GILL. Why is that?

Ms. BOWSER. I did not stop the police from doing anything.

Mr. GILL. It is illegal for them to block a roadway. We have got the law right here. It is unlawful for a person alone or in concert with others to obstruct or incommode any street avenue. That is exactly what they were doing. And you refused to allow police to clear them out. Why is that?

Ms. BOWSER. That is incorrect.

Mr. GILL. Why would you stop—clear the record then.

Ms. BOWSER. I did not, I never stopped the police.

Mr. GILL. You did not stop them?

Ms. BOWSER. No, I did not.

Mr. GILL. You did not stop them. Would you like to explain what happened, why police never cleared out this roadway?

Ms. BOWSER. Police did clear roadways.

Mr. GILL. They were there for weeks.

Ms. BOWSER. Police cleared roadways.

Mr. GILL. They were there for weeks—

Ms. BOWSER. Actually, they were—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Terrorizing Jewish students.

Ms. BOWSER. They were probably on—

Mr. GILL. And this is in your city.

Ms. BOWSER [continuing]. Private property, not on the roadway.

Mr. GILL. No, they were on public roadways.

Ms. BOWSER. No, they were not.

Mr. GILL. Terrorizing Jewish students.

Ms. BOWSER. No, they were not.

Mr. GILL. And you allowed it to happen.

Ms. BOWSER. No, they were not.

Mr. GILL. I yield my time back.

Ms. BOWSER. No, they were not.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

All right. I am going to recognize the Ranking Member for some unanimous consent requests.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record this August 19, 2025, article from the *American Prospect* titled, "The GOP states with guards deployed to D.C. have urban murder rates way higher than D.C.'s."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. I would also ask unanimous consent to enter into the record this February 28, 2024, study from *Third Way* titled, "The 21st century red state murder crisis," which lays out the decades-long problem with high murder rates in red states and undermines the Republican myth that crime is their strong point.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. And my final one is from *Newsweek*, but I do not know the date right now. But this goes to what the gentleman was just talking about when he said that D.C. has the fifth highest homicide rate in the country. According to Freedom for All Americans' 2024 data, D.C. is not on this list at all. It starts with St. Louis and number ten is Chicago.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. So, in closing, I want to thank our witnesses for being here today. I know it was a very long hearing, but this is an issue that America is watching. This is America's city. This is the capital city. We want it to be safe. Many of us spend at least, at least, half our waking hours here in Washington, D.C. So, even though it is not our official residence, we spend a lot of time here. Many of us spend more time here than in certain parts of our district.

So, I want to yield to the Ranking Member, Ms. Crockett, for a brief closing statement.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to my colleagues for their questions and to our witnesses, Mayor Bowser, Chairman Mendelson, Attorney General Schwalb, and Mr. Jackson, for your service and for your testimony here today. I appreciate all of your voices and your leadership to fight for D.C. and its rights. You debunked a lot of misinformation today.

Washington, D.C., is a great American city which deserves to govern itself like any community in our country. If Donald Trump wants to run D.C., he should resign as President—I am here for it—and run for Mayor. Congress should not waste time undermining this city's elected leaders. We will continue to work with you all to support real public safety through smart policies that support communities and hold criminals accountable. We will work with you to tackle gun violence and to protect the rights of every American.

Our Committee will not ignore the real crime at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. We need to stand up for free speech and against corruption and weaponization. Chairman Comer, I appreciate your commitment to work with us to hear from FCC Chair Brendan Carr, which I think is the most alarming news of this last week. I hope both sides of our Committee are opposed to the President of the United States picking and choosing late-night TV hosts. It is ridiculous and dangerous.

I would like to thank our witnesses once again for your testimony today, and thank you for your service. I look forward to working with you throughout my time on this Committee.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

And let me say, D.C. crime reached new levels over the last several years, President Trump finally tackling the crime crisis with the deployment of Federal law enforcement. We are thankful to President Trump for wanting to tackle the crime crisis in this country. That was an issue in the Presidential election, and it was an issue, which every poll shows, was important to voters all across America, especially urban and suburban voters. So, we commend him for sending troops into the cities to support what local law enforcement we have.

Mayor Bowser, I appreciate you and your leadership in the city. I know you are in a very difficult position as Mayor. We believe that a lot of the problems stem from a lack of accountability where our law enforcement's hands are tied in Washington, D.C., as well as our juvenile justice rules and laws and system is not where it should be to hold the most vicious criminals accountable, regardless of their age. And I think you are doing, you know, a good job in a tough position. We disagree with a lot that the Council has done. We would love for the Attorney General to be more aggressive.

Hopefully, the legislative agenda that the President supports that we have passed out of this Committee, hopefully it will become law, and we can see if those new laws help hold people accountable and lower the crime rate in Washington, D.C., which is what the goal of this Committee is. It has nothing to do with race. This has nothing to do with discrimination. This has nothing to do with

picking on Washington, D.C. This is our home too, and we want to make Washington, D.C., safe. We have employees here, and we have a whole lot of constituents that come here every day, and we want to make this city safe.

And I think we can work together, and I look forward to working with the Council, Chairman Mendelson, with the Mayor, with the Attorney General, and with everyone, all the stakeholders in Washington, D.C. In the same collaborative way that we were able to bring the Washington Commanders back to Washington, D.C., in the same way we passed the SHOW UP Act, which I think has been part of the economic development woes in the city.

Remember, under President Biden, he extended the work-from-home agreement or whatever they had with the Federal employees. And, you know, you have government agencies that for years did not have employees going into those offices. That affected restaurants. That affected food vendors. That affected a lot of the local economy. And we have passed a bill in here, the SHOW UP Act, to try to get those Federal employees to come back to Washington, D.C., to work like the rest of us have to do.

So, I think we have demonstrated that we have worked together in the past to do things to help Washington, D.C., and I hope we can do that in the future because, again, our goal is to make this city safe for everyone.

So, with that, and without objection, all Members have five legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:32 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

