

# District of Columbia Voting Representation Proposals in the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress

Updated July 2, 2021

In the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress, several Members of Congress have introduced bills that would grant voting representation in Congress to residents of the District of Columbia (DC), by admitting DC to the Union as a state, or through retrocession of DC land to Maryland. In the past, some Members of Congress have opposed such proposals and recommended maintaining the status quo.

This Insight provides an overview of recent DC voting representation proposals and discusses potential policy considerations. It does not provide [legal or constitutional analysis](#) on DC statehood or voting representation, nor does it analyze [territorial statehood issues](#).

## Proposals in the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress

### Statehood

On January 4, 2021, DC Delegate [Eleanor Holmes Norton reintroduced](#) the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, [H.R. 51](#). The bill was referred to the House Committees on Oversight and Reform; Rules; Armed Services; the Judiciary; and Energy and Commerce. On January 26, Senator Thomas Carper of Delaware introduced [S. 51](#), the companion bill to [H.R. 51](#). The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

On March 22, the House Committee on Oversight and Reform [held a hearing](#) on [H.R. 51](#). The Committee then held a [markup on April 14](#), during which it [rejected several amendments](#), including some that proposed alternative methods for granting voting representation in Congress for DC residents. [H.R. 51 was ordered to be reported](#) favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute by a vote of 25-19.

The House Rules Committee held a hearing on [H.R. 51](#), on April 20. The Rules Committee reported a closed rule providing for floor consideration of the bill. On April 22, [H.R. 51](#) passed the House by a vote of 216-208 and was received in the Senate. On April 20, the Biden Administration published a [Statement of Administration Policy](#) indicating its support of [H.R. 51](#). On June 22, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs [held a hearing](#) on [S. 51](#).

**Congressional Research Service**

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN11599

If enacted, [H.R. 51](#) would admit [Washington, Douglass Commonwealth](#), as the 51<sup>st</sup> state of the United States, “on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever.” The new state would include most of the land in the current District of Columbia. The bill excludes “principal Federal monuments,” the U.S. Capitol Building, the White House, the U.S. Supreme Court Building, and federal office buildings adjacent to the National Mall and the U.S. Capitol. The legislation [names the resulting federal enclave](#) “the Capital,” and establishes it as “the seat of the Government of the United States.”

Under the legislation, Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, [would elect](#) two Senators and at least one Representative to the House. Legislative enactments by the new state would [no longer](#) be subject to [congressional disapproval](#). The bill would also establish procedures to [expedite congressional consideration](#) of a joint resolution to repeal the [Twenty-Third Amendment](#), which provides DC with representation in the Electoral College equivalent to the number of Senators and Representatives in Congress it would be entitled to if it were a state, without exceeding the amount granted to the least populous state. [H.R. 51](#) also sets out the process for transferring federal responsibilities to the new state and would establish a [statehood transition commission](#).

## Retrocession

In the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress, several bills have been introduced that would modify the boundaries of the seat of federal government and retrocede the majority of DC land to the State of Maryland:

- [H.R. 472](#), introduced by Representative Johnson of South Dakota on January 25, was referred to the House Committees on the Judiciary, and Oversight and Reform.
- [H.R. 2614](#), introduced by Representative Griffith of Virginia on April 16, was referred to the House Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, and Armed Services.
- [H.R. 2651](#), introduced by Representative Gohmert of Texas on April 19, was referred to the House Committees on the Judiciary, and Oversight and Reform.
- [S. 1361](#), introduced by Senator Marshall of Kansas on April 22, was referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## Considerations for Congress

Statehood and retrocession are two of several types of [legislative proposals](#) that would grant DC some form of voting representation in Congress. [Other previous proposals](#) have included a constitutional amendment granting congressional voting representation to DC residents, semi-retrocession (i.e., allowing qualified DC residents to vote in Maryland in federal elections for the Maryland congressional delegation to the House and Senate), and a statutory provision for representation in Congress (sometimes referred to as virtual statehood). As noted above, some Members of Congress have opposed these legislative efforts in favor of maintaining the status quo.

Article IV of the Constitution gives Congress the general power to admit new states into the Union. The Article does not prescribe the method, and the process has varied over time. Often, the following [principles have been considered](#):

- a demonstration by the residents of the proposed state of a belief in the principles of republican government;
  - an expression of majority support for statehood among residents; and
  - establishment of sufficient population and resources.
-

Some opponents of DC Statehood contend that the “[District Clause](#)” and the [23<sup>rd</sup> Amendment of the U.S. Constitution](#) pose [unique challenges for granting DC statehood](#) that could require a constitutional amendment.

The idea of retrocession, in general, has not been fully [tested in the courts](#). Past precedent set by the retrocession of land to Virginia in 1846 suggests that the process may require not only the approval of Congress and the President, but also of the State of Maryland and, perhaps, the voters of the retroceded area. Although the Supreme Court heard a case challenging the retrocession to Virginia in [Phillips v. Payne](#) in 1876, it did not rule on the merits of the constitutional arguments raised against retrocession.

Congress might consider maintaining the status quo, with or without additional legislation. Some past legislative proposals sought to ensure maintenance of the status quo, particularly regarding statehood. For instance, a proposal in the 116<sup>th</sup> Congress ([H.J.Res. 97](#)), introduced by Representative Walker of North Carolina, would have proposed a constitutional amendment to prevent expansion of the U.S. Senate’s composition.

## Author Information

Joseph V. Jaroscak  
Analyst in Economic Development Policy

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS’s institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.