

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:  
MARK-UP OF H.J. RES. 42  
DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN  
APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE  
POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM  
AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022**

---

---

COMMITTEE ON  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 29, 2023

**Serial No. CP:118-4**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,  
*oversight.house.gov* or  
*docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

51-835 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <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	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	KATIE PORTER, California
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	CORI BUSH, Missouri
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
PAT FALLON, Texas	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	BECCA BALINT, Vermont
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	GREG CASAR, Texas
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy Director

LAUREN LOMBARDO, Senior Policy Analyst

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

---

Hearing held on March 29, 2023 .....	Page 1
--------------------------------------	-----------

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

---

\* Letter to President Biden, March 27, 2023, from various Civil Rights Organizations; submitted by Rep. Norton.

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



**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:  
MARK-UP OF H.J. RES. 42  
DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN  
APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE  
POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM  
AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022**

**Wednesday, March 29, 2023**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:12 p.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, LaTurner, Fallon, Donalds, Armstrong, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, McClain, Boebert, Fry, Luna, Edwards, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Norton, Lynch, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Porter, Bush, Brown, Gomez, Stansbury, Garcia, Frost, Balint, Lee, Casar, Crockett, and Goldman.

Chairman COMER. The hearing now comes back to order. I am adjourning our hearing titled, "Overdue Oversight of the Capital City: Part 1," and now we are starting our business meeting.

The Committee will please come to order. A quorum is present. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 5(b) and House Rule XI, Clause 2, the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

We begin with House Joint Resolution 42, a Resolution Disapproving of the District of Columbia Council's Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. The Committee meets today, pursuant to notice, to consider House Joint Resolution 42.

The clerk will designate the resolution.

The CLERK. House Joint Resolution 42, a resolution disapproving of the District of Columbia Council's Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022.

Chairman COMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for five minutes of an opening statement on the bill.

Today, we are considering Representative Clyde's House Joint Resolution 42, a Resolution Disapproving of the District of Columbia Council's Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. The men and women of the Metropolitan Police Department serve their community every day to help keep it safe and secure. In doing so, they place themselves in potentially dangerous situations regularly to protect others, and yet progressive policies from the D.C. Council continue to hamstring District officers and needlessly place them in an unsafe situation.

The D.C. Council's Comprehensive Police and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 does just that. It requires untenable barriers officers must overcome to don riot gear for their own protection. It creates a public data base with an officer's personally identifiable information, allowing for activists to harass officers and their families. It also creates additional liability for officers that are not found in other police departments. These are just a few of the many impractical and outrageous proposals of the legislation.

The D.C. police have seen over 1,190 officers leave the force since the beginning of 2020. One thousand one hundred and ninety officers have left the force in three years. That is about one-third of the police department. Nearly 40 percent of those officers resigned, choosing to leave the department instead of dealing with the increasingly impossible burdens placed on them by the Council. Over that same period, crime has soared in the District. The Council has continued to overlook its law enforcement officers in favor of progressive soft-on-crime policies that only benefit criminals.

The citizens of D.C. and visitors to our Nation's capital deserve to feel safe, and our police deserve to have the resources to ensure safety for all. The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act does neither of those things. If the D.C. Council wants to continue down this path, they will have to answer to this Congress, and we are not alone. The D.C. Police Union, representing 3,500 members, the U.S. Capitol Police Labor Committee, the California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations, the Fullerton Police Officers Association, and the Las Vegas Police Protective Association are strongly in favor of H.J. Resolution 42.

We see such broad support for this disapproval resolution from organizations across the Nation because other jurisdictions know just how awful the D.C. Council's anti-policing reforms would be as a precedent for America's cities. Additionally, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser declined to sign this legislation into law. That should be a signal of how extreme it is, but the D.C. Council did not listen, and proceeded to override her signature and pass it anyway.

I call on all of my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. Clyde's Resolution Disapproving of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. Thirty-one House Democrats and 31 Senate Democrats have already joined President Biden and House Republicans this year to block another ill-informed D.C. Council legislative action by disapproving of the Revised Criminal

Code Act of 2022. The dangerous policing reforms addressed by H.J. Resolution 42 are equally bad, if not worse, for the current crime epidemic in D.C.

We must ensure that these pro-crime policies are not allowed in our Nation's Capital. I encourage all of my colleagues on this committee to join me in supporting H.J. Resolution 42 to continue these efforts to restore law and order to D.C.

Who else seeks recognition on this resolution? The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member for five minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. And thank you very kindly, Mr. Chairman. I want to start just by pointing out to my colleagues that most of the debate and discussion we just heard was really about the last bill, about H.J. Res. 26, which already passed out of the House and passed the Senate, and people were rehashing all of the discussion about the definition of "murder," and "carjacking," and all the various substantive offenses. That has nothing to do with what we are doing here today.

H.J. Resolution 42 is about the police department, and as the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia just explained, we are here because the union was very unhappy with the fact that the District Council unanimously decided to remove from collective bargaining questions of discipline of particular members. Now, why did they do that? This is an issue that has come up, certainly came up in Maryland. We debated the exact same thing in the Maryland legislature. It is being debated all over the country. Why did they decide to do that, and certain jurisdictions go one way, certain jurisdictions go the other? Well, here are some of the examples that they talked about and that are part of the legislative record.

There was one officer who beat up a suspect, striking him multiple times in the head. He was criminally convicted in court of assault and sentenced to 30 days in jail with three years of probation and 500 hours of community service, only to be reinstated under the arbitration system that is provided for in their collective bargaining contract. Another police officer sexually assaulted a young woman and was convicted of misdemeanor sexual abuse, but then was reinstated, again, under the arbitration process. Another confessed to abusing a child, was convicted of child abuse, sentenced to five years of probation and yet was reinstated. So, the D.C. Council decided to end, as a matter of collective bargaining, discipline of officers, and the union was very upset about it.

Now, what else is in there? Well, exactly the kinds of things that are taking place with police reforms across the country: expanding the current ban on chokeholds to include other kinds of restraints that pose a severe risk of death; enhancing transparency by improving public access to body-worn camera footage after an officer-involved death or serious use of force takes place; strengthening the Civilian Police Complaint Review Office; prohibiting the police department from hiring officers from other law enforcement agencies who have committed serious misconduct, were terminated or forced to resign for disciplinary reasons, or resigned to avoid adverse action; empowers the chief of police to establish internal policies and procedures for discipline; requires schools to report data on school-based arrests; enhances transparency around the use of overtime, and so on.

All of these classically local, personnel matters go right to the heart of democratic self-government, and the police union is upset because they want to be able to bargain to get people reinstated who have been convicted of crimes, including child sexual abuse or sexual assault. And this is what our colleagues are being carried away with, but they are using rhetoric about the last piece of legislation about carjacking and murder, and so on. And whatever the merits of that debate, that is over, and now what we are talking about is simply the question of whether the District of Columbia gets to have control over its own police department.

The D.C. Council unanimously came forward in legislation that was not vetoed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia to say that they stand by the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Amendment Act of 2022, and either we are going to believe in home rule, or we are not. It was adopted in 1973. Some of our colleagues say, well, there is Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution which says Congress exercises exclusive legislation. But we have delegated local matters to the District Council and the Mayor to have their system of government to govern, and we should not sit as a 535-person city council in order to be deciding all of these things.

We have got much more important things to do, like addressing the gun violence epidemic in America, or even considering the admission of new states, like Washington, DC. or Puerto Rico, that are asking for their democratic rights. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. Who else seeks recognition on the resolution? The Chair recognizes Ms. Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Let me begin by saying to this Committee, keep your hands off D.C., please. It is true that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, but it is false that Congress has an obligation or a responsibility to do so. Instead of legislation on local D.C. matters, remember that is a choice. This disapproval resolution is a choice.

I remind my Republican colleagues who claim to revere the founders what James Madison said in Federalist 43 about the residents of the Federal District: "A municipal legislature for local purposes derived from their own suffrages will, of course, be allowed them." The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate "full legislative power," and I am quoting that, "full legislative power" to D.C. on local D.C. matters.

Today, this Committee is marking up profoundly undemocratic, paternalistic legislation. This one-sentence legislation would nullify legislation enacted by D.C.'s duly elected representatives. D.C.'s local legislature, the D.C. Council, has 13 members elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office. This is called democracy.

After the murder of George Floyd, many states and D.C. passed police accountability and transparency legislation. The Council has repeatedly passed emergency, temporary, and permanent versions of police accountability and transparency legislation. Congress requires the Council to pass the permanent version legislation twice, separated by at least 13 days. The Council passed the legislation that is the subject of this disapproval resolution by votes of 11 to zero and 13 to zero.



The Congress has 535 voting members. The members are elected by the residents of the several states. None are elected by or accountable to D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, even on legislation that applies only to D.C., such as this disapproval resolution, they cannot vote the members out of office. Members who vote in favor of this disapproval resolution are choosing to substitute their policy judgment for the judgment of D.C.'s duly elected representatives. They will choose to govern D.C. without its consent.

I can only conclude that this committee believes that D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are either unworthy or incapable of governing themselves. D.C. residents are not children. They do not need protection from the decisions of their duly elected representatives by Members of Congress, from Kentucky, Georgia, or anywhere else.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation, yet the nearly 700,000 residents cannot vote on any action taken by Congress, whether on national or local D.C. matters, while paying full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any state and more total taxes than 23 states. If this Committee cared about democratic principles or D.C. residents, it would be marking up my D.C. Statehood bill, the Washington, DC. Admission Act, instead. Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the state of Washington, DC. This Committee is choosing not to. It is a choice.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to submit into the record a letter from the leaders of civil rights organizations, led by the Legal Defense Fund, opposing this disapproval resolution.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly. I just want to point out that the local legislation they propose to overthrow today creates a publicly accessible data base for sustained allegations of police misconduct in cases involving an officer's commission of a crime. It was said before that this was for unsustained. No, it is only for sustained allegations. Why wouldn't every citizen want to know if there is an officer coming from another jurisdiction who has been convicted of an assault, a rape, robbery, whatever it might be? Thank you, and I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Congresswoman, would you yield for a question? I am just curious about what you said regarding D.C. Statehood. Would you yield for a question, ma'am?

Ms. NORTON. Of course.

Mr. TIMMONS. OK. Can I yield to you for a question? I have a question for you. I am sorry. In 2009, the Senate passed the D.C. Statehood bill with 63 votes, and the House didn't take it up. The House had 235 Democrats in it. Could you articulate what happened in 2009 and why it didn't get across the finish line then? I was not here.

Ms. NORTON. There was a gun amendment attached to it to wipe out D.C.'s gun laws.

Mr. TIMMONS. Sorry. So, the Speaker controlled the House, and it came out of the Senate, and Democrats——

Ms. NORTON. The gun amendment attached to it was the problem.

Mr. TIMMONS. OK. But the Speaker controls the Rules Committee, and the Speaker controls the Floor, so what you are saying is that in 2009, when the Democrats had the House——

Ms. NORTON. It really wasn't statehood. It was just this vote, that vote.

Mr. TIMMONS. OK. So, my understanding in 2009, there was a statehood bill out of the Senate, so there was not a statehood bill. That was a different issue?

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. TIMMONS. OK. So, this has not been ongoing, but the bill that came out of the Senate, S. 160, what did it do if not address this concern that you have?

Ms. NORTON. There was a House vote only.

Mr. TIMMONS. The CRS report I have says that it got out of the Senate 63 to——

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes, please.

Mr. RASKIN. The legislation itself contemplated granting the District of Columbia a voting representative, but only in the House, not in the Senate. So, it was not a statehood bill, strictly speaking, and it raised constitutional questions, but it was just to provide for one seat for the District of Columbia with a voting representative.

Mr. TIMMONS. So, it was not statehood. It was just to create a new——

Mr. RASKIN. Exactly.

Ms. NORTON. Right.

Mr. TIMMONS [continuing]. Congressional seat where you would have full voting rights on the Floor as opposed to just in Committee.

Ms. NORTON. Exactly.

Mr. TIMMONS. OK. No, I appreciate that. Thank you. It is helpful to understand the legislative history behind this. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition?

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Casar.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you, Chairman. As the Ranking Member mentioned, I believe that we would be, by moving this forward, repealing important protections for people that should, frankly, have bipartisan support. Subtitle A of the D.C. Justice Reform Act that would be overridden by the Congress, prohibits the use of chokeholds and neck restraints in a stronger way. In fact, they had been banned in 1985 by D.C., and this would just make sure that that ban is properly enforced. And I would yield some of my time to hear from anybody in the Majority just for a few seconds to know whether or not the Majority, which supports actually banning chokeholds, or whether or not they would like for chokeholds to be allowed in D.C.

Mr. HIGGINS. Would the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, sir, and I have a few questions, so, you know, 10 or 20 seconds would be great, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. I will ask to be recognized, Mr. Speaker. I am probably the only one here that has actually affected arrest through the use of vascular compression chokeholds. We haven't trained chokeholds in many decades. They don't work. Vascular compression is what we train, and they have saved countless, thousands of lives, but I will ask to be recognized. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you. Furthermore, Subtitle B would allow for body-worn camera footage to quickly be released to the public in cases of critical incidents. I believe, having done oversight and accountability in prior jobs and now here on this committee, that publicly available body camera footage is a good thing, so that we can ensure that folks are held accountable or exonerated based on the facts. And I think body-worn camera has taken things a long way where we have a lot of police departments really supportive of having body-worn camera for those reasons. So, I would, again, ask and want to understand, whether the Majority believes that we should be keeping this body-worn camera footage from——

Mr. HIGGINS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. The original users of body cameras, good sir, were police officers. Far before it was mandated by the department, some of us that were tactical police officers began to practice of wearing body cameras to protect ourselves against false allegations, and I yield.

Mr. CASAR. Yes, sir, and I have seen and heard that ourselves. When we bought body-worn cameras oftentimes in police department, it was to say, well, we know some folks have their own. Let's have them for everyone. What would we ultimately be doing by overriding this D.C. reform, would be getting rid of the transparency reforms here that D.C. move forward with. And so, again, I would urge that we vote "no" on the resolution before us today because why would we take away transparency on body-worn cameras?

One more question, I think, right, to the Ranking Member's point. One of the most critical reforms that folks are talking about overwriting today are reforms to make it so that somebody that was criminally convicted for assault while on the job can't get back onto the force. So, I, again, would yield to better understand why we would overturn that reform. Why would we be supporting a measure that allows it so that people criminally convicted for assault on the job could get back onto the force?

Mr. HIGGINS. At the risk of repeating myself, would the gentleman yield or has the time expired?

Mr. CASAR. No, you have got time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes. So, the hiring practices from department to department has been a matter of, you know, recognized procedure across the country for a long time. Chiefs talk to former chiefs, talk to former supervisors, so this communication is ongoing. I mean, there is never an instance where you hire someone for your department that you don't talk to the previous department, and his supervisors, and guys he worked with, so you know these histories——

Mr. CASAR. One hundred percent. In this case, the police chief wants some of these reforms enacted so that they aren't forced to have people come back to the force that they wanted to get rid of in the first place.

Mr. HIGGINS. Right, but what I am saying is there is nothing stopping those communications right now.

Mr. CASAR. No, that is being stopped.

Mr. HIGGINS. It is common. I yield.

Mr. CASAR. Yes, what we got today in testimony is that because of the Police Association's tactics, people that were convicted of crime had to come back and be allowed to work back on the force. And what we are doing by passing this bill is not supporting public safety by having some of those officers that are dangerous come back on to the police force. What heard in this committee hearing was people calling D.C. and public schools inmate factories, people calling Black Lives Matter a criminal cartel. It is not rational, and I urge that we vote "no" against this bill.

Chairman COMER. Any other Member seek recognition on the resolution?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on favorably reporting H.J. Resolution 42.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Mr. RASKIN. Seeking a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. Because we have subcommittee meetings scheduled right now, we are going to postpone and recess until after the subcommittee hearings adjourn or 4 p.m., whichever is first.

The Committee is now in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The question is on favorably reporting H.J. Resolution 42.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Aye.

Chairman COMER. He said yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes aye.

Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. 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. LaTurner?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds?  
 Mr. DONALDS. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes aye.  
 Mr. Armstrong?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry?  
 [No response.]  
 Mr. Timmons?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Burchett?  
 Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
 Ms. Greene?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
 Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
 Mrs. Boebert?  
 Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
 Mr. Fry?  
 Mr. FRY. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
 Mrs. Luna?  
 Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
 Mr. Edwards?  
 Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Edwards 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. Raskin?  
 Mr. RASKIN. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
 Ms. Norton?  
 Ms. NORTON. No.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.

Mr. Lynch?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
 Mr. Khanna?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?  
 Mr. MFUME. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.  
 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Ms. Bush?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
 Ms. BROWN. Brown votes no.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.  
 Mr. Gomez?  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?  
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
 Ms. Balint?  
 Ms. BALINT. No.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes no.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. No.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. No.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
 [No response.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Nay.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes nay.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. I vote yes. I vote yes, and how is Mr. Fallon recorded.  
 The CLERK. The Chairman votes yes. Mr. Fallon is not yet recorded.  
 Voice. You want to vote aye.  
 Mr. FALLON. Yes.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes yes.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. LaTurner recorded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is not recorded.  
 Mr. LATURNER. Yes.  
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Higgins recorded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Higgins is not recorded.  
 Mr. HIGGINS. Higgins votes yes.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Timmons recorded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons is not recorded.  
 Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. Grothman recorded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Grothman is not recorded.  
 Mr. GROTHMAN. I vote——  
 Chairman COMER. Yes.  
 Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.  
 [Laughter.]  
 The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Connolly recorded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly is not recorded.  
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
 Chairman COMER. And Ms. Porter?  
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter is not recorded.  
 Ms. PORTER. No.  
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Mr. Garcia? Oh, Mr. Gomez. I'm sorry.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez is not recorded.  
 Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, no.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. My bad. Mr. Lynch?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Lynch is not recorded.  
 Mr. LYNCH. No.  
 Chairman COMER. Anybody else? My bad.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. And Mr. Khanna. How is Mr. Khanna re-  
 corded?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna is not recorded.  
 Mr. KHANNA. I vote no.  
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Has anyone else not voted yet?  
 [No response.]  
 Chairman COMER. Do you want to wait another minute? I mean,  
 it is 21 to 17. Is there anyone else you want to wait on?  
 Mr. RASKIN.  
 [Inaudible.]  
 Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report the tally?  
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 21. The  
 nays are 17.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favor-  
 ably reported.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, I ask that Committee Members have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee supplemental additional Minority and dissenting views.

Without objection.

If there is no further business before the Committee, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:55 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

