

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 931

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Amo (to rank immediately after Ms. McClellan).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO CONTINUE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF JOSEPH BIDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 918 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 918

Resolved, That the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary are directed to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Joseph Biden, President of the United States of America, including as set forth in the memorandum issued by the Chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary of the House of Representatives, entitled "Impeachment Inquiry", dated September 27, 2023.

SEC. 2. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability

if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

(6) The Committee on Oversight and Accountability may issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Committee on Oversight and Accountability may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution. The chair may transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. Any report prepared under this paragraph may be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committees on Ways and Means and on the Judiciary.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on Ways and Means may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on Ways and Means if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

(6) The Committee on Ways and Means may issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Committee on Ways and Means may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

The chair may transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. Any report prepared under this paragraph may be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability and on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on the Judiciary may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on the Judiciary if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking mi-

nority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

SEC. 5. IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY PROCEDURES IN THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

(a) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to conduct proceedings relating to the impeachment inquiry described in the first section of this resolution pursuant to the procedures submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on Rules, including such procedures as to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel.

(b) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to promulgate additional procedures as it deems necessary for the fair and efficient conduct of committee hearings held pursuant to this resolution, provided that the additional procedures are not inconsistent with the procedures referenced in subsection (a), the Rules of the Committee, and the Rules of the House.

(c)(1) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(A) by subpoena or otherwise—

(i) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(ii) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(B) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(2) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to paragraph (1), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(3) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(4) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to report to the House of Representatives resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations.

SEC. 6. ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 917.

House Resolution 917 is hereby adopted.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to re-

visé and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 918.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for myself, for the institution, and most of all for the American people. My duty today is one I do not relish. I am sure that every other Member of this institution feels the same way.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a measure under our original jurisdiction. H. Res. 918 formalizes an inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President of the United States.

Three months ago, at the direction of then-Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY, three committees—those of Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary—began this impeachment inquiry.

Over the succeeding months, the committees have done their work and have done it well. The inquiry is now at an inflection point. The three committees are nearing the end of their investigations. The White House has chosen this moment to stonewall and resist the legitimate investigative powers of the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe the House must hold a vote on the floor to initiate an impeachment inquiry, doing so may be said to be best practice.

We are taking up today's resolution that will formalize the impeachment inquiry that has already begun. This will ensure not only that the inquiry has the full authority of the House but also that the House can enforce its subpoenas and ensure that the Biden administration can no longer refuse to cooperate with the investigation.

I will briefly describe the procedures for this inquiry. The resolution tasks three committees—Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary—with continuing their current inquiries. It establishes procedures for conducting hearings and calling and questioning witnesses. It grants the minority equal time to question witnesses and the right to request their own witnesses.

At the conclusion of their proceedings, it provides for the Committees on Oversight and Accountability and Ways and Means to transmit their findings and supporting documents to the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the committee that traditionally considers impeachment matters. It gives the President the right to participate in the proceedings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Finally, the resolution authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to transmit to the House resolutions, Articles of Impeachment, or other recommendations.

The procedures we are adopting today closely parallel those the Democrats created in 2019. In fact, H. Res.

660 from the 116th Congress was our guide. After all, those procedures are now a precedent of the House.

Mr. Speaker, impeachment, especially impeachment of a President, is a starkly serious matter. It is something that no Member of the House should want to do. The House has rights and obligations under the Constitution. We are charged with providing the oversight of the executive branch, and we are the sole institution in the country granted the awesome power of impeachment. It is a power that must be used selectively and wisely, and only after full deliberation.

With today's resolution, we are ensuring that the House will be able to complete its inquiry. We will secure the evidence we need and uncover the facts we need to make that full and fair determination.

Only at the end of the road can we make a decision on how to proceed. I take no joy in today's resolution, but I know the House will do its duty. We owe our committees, the institution, and the Constitution no less.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here for one reason and one reason alone: Donald Trump demanded that Republicans impeach, so they are going to impeach.

These Republicans don't work for you, the American people. They work for Donald Trump. He says, "Jump." They respond, "How high?"

□ 1245

This whole thing is an extreme political stunt. It has no credibility, no legitimacy, and no integrity. It is a sideshow and a distraction from the fact that Republicans have done nothing.

They have the wrong priorities. The American people think they are failing miserably, and Republicans need a diversion. So they are weaponizing and abusing impeachment—one of the most somber and serious things that Congress can do—to attack President Joe Biden.

I get it. They are upset Donald Trump lost. Some of them still don't believe he lost. Many of them are upset that his violent insurrection did not succeed on January 6, and today they want to finish the job. This is a continuation of their crusade to overturn the election.

They have spent a year dredging up every conspiracy you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, against Joe Biden, and still their own investigation, their own Members, their own witnesses, and their own internal documents all say that President Joe Biden is a man of integrity who follows the law. Every single one of their crazy claims has been exhaustively debunked, and, yet, here we are.

The only thing they have uncovered is that Joe Biden is a good dad and that he loves his family. His son Hunter lost his mom and sister in a terrible car accident and lost his brother to cancer. He experienced a lot of traumas, and, sadly, he got caught up with drugs. Republicans are weaponizing this addiction and using it to attack President Biden, a man of decency and integrity.

Frankly, it is one of, if not the most, despicable thing I have seen in my whole career here in Congress.

Republicans talk about an open and transparent process. Give me a break.

Yesterday, Rules Committee Republicans blocked Democrats from adding the words "open and transparent" to this resolution. They voted against requiring a single open hearing. They didn't even put our amendment in the official committee report. I have never seen anything like that. They are so afraid of openness and transparency that they are literally trying to hide our amendments from the public record.

They don't want an open and transparent process. They are allergic to transparency. They want no transparency, so they can go on FOX News, distort the facts, and keep this whole ridiculous charade going. Their whole investigation is built on lies. It is an extreme political stunt designed to distract from how incompetent Republicans are and how obsessed they are with Donald Trump, a twice impeached ex-President who has been indicted more times than he has been elected. How pathetic.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), who is the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 918. Joe Biden has repeatedly lied to the American people about his family's corrupt influence-peddling schemes. He told the American people he never spoke to his son about his family's business dealings. He claimed there was an absolute wall between his official government duties as Vice President and his family. He said that his family never made money from China.

All of these are blatant lies. Our investigation has revealed how Joe Biden knew of, participated in, and benefited from his family cashing in on the Biden name around the world.

Since January we have learned some of the following:

The Bidens created 20 shell companies, most of which were created when Joe Biden was Vice President. The Bidens and their associates then raked in over \$24 million through these shell companies from China, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Romania between 2014 and 2019. At least 10 members of the Biden family have benefited or participated in these schemes.

The Bidens layered these payments through their bank accounts to hide

the sources of the money. The banks even flagged many of these transactions in more than 150 suspicious activity reports to the Treasury Department.

One bank investigator was so concerned about Hunter Biden's financial transactions with a Chinese company that he wanted to reevaluate the bank's relationship with him. He noted that his transactions served no current business purpose. That is what I call a shell company.

According to Devon Archer, a Biden family associate, Joe Biden was the brand of the business. The brand showed up.

Joe Biden spoke to his son's associates by speakerphone more than 20 times, dined with foreign oligarchs and a Burisma executive, and had coffee with Hunter's Chinese associate all when he was Vice President.

Weeks after Joe Biden left the Vice Presidency, money from this Chinese Communist Party-linked entity began to make its way to the bank accounts of several Biden family members.

Based on one Biden associate's interview with the FBI, these payments were sent to the Bidens as a thank you.

Ask any Justice Department public corruption investigator about the importance of payments received after one leaves public office. It is a hallmark of corruption.

We are now at a pivotal moment in our investigation. We will soon depose and interview several members of the Biden family and their associates about these influence-peddling schemes, but we are facing obstruction from the White House. The White House is seeking to block key testimony from current and former White House staff. It is also withholding thousands of records from Joe Biden's time as Vice President.

Joe Biden must be held accountable for his lies, corruption, and obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this necessary and important resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would need a map to get out of the rabbit hole Mr. COMER just took us down.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know what an impeachable offense looks like, here it is: When that man, the wannabe dictator, told that angry, violent mob to attack this Capitol Building where we all are right now to overturn a free and fair election. That is what a smoking gun looks like.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), who is the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason mysteries are called whodunits is because they start with a crime, and then you have to try to figure out who did it.

The Biden impeachment investigation isn't a whodunit, it is a what is it.

It is like an Agatha Christie novel where the mystery is: What is the crime?

That gets very tedious very fast. After 11 months of this, no one can tell us what President Biden's crime was, much less where it happened, when it happened, what the motive was, who the perpetrators were, or who the victims were.

Maybe the funniest thing I have ever seen in Congress was yesterday in the Rules Committee when Congressman NEGUSE kept asking Congressman RESCHENTHALER what the crime was? Congressman RESCHENTHALER—who is not on the Oversight and Reform Committee and is apparently just waking up to the joke—kept saying that he didn't know what it was, but that is why we need an impeachment investigation, to find out.

Congressman NEGUSE kept asking him: But what will the impeachment investigation be looking for?

Finally, Congressman RESCHENTHALER said: A high crime or misdemeanor.

And Congressman NEGUSE said: Yes, but which one?

Now Congressman NEGUSE, of course, was involved in a real impeachment investigation of a real Presidential offense: the incitement of a violent political insurrection against this Congress, against the Vice President of the United States, against the Constitution, and against the election of 2020.

We did not need Sherlock Holmes and a magnifying glass to find the Presidential crime with Donald Trump. It came right into this House and smashed us in the face.

Now, it is true Chairman COMER has collected a mountain of evidence over the last 11 months: tens of thousands of pages of documents and dozens of hours of interviews with dozens of officials, but all of it clearly shows that Joe Biden committed no crime. Even their own witnesses, whom they called to the only public hearing they had, said that there is not remotely enough evidence to justify impeachment.

Chairman COMER has bragged on FOX News about procuring 100 percent compliance with his subpoenas, so forget about obstruction, which I hear them muttering about today.

Mr. Speaker, I played a game with the little kids at our family Thanksgiving. I asked them whether they had seen my henway. When they said, What's a henway? I said, about 4 or 5 pounds. It is a dad joke, and some of the bigger kids got it.

Nevertheless, when I asked the little kids, like 3 or 4 years of age, if they had seen my henway, they said: What's a henway? I said 3 or 4 pounds. They started looking for it. When the other kids came along and asked what they were doing, they said: We are looking for Uncle Jamie's henway. Then for hours they were looking everywhere for my henway, under the sofa and under the chairs, and it could go on for days like that.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for the Republican Party's henway. It just weighs 3 or 4 pounds, but it is costing us tens of millions of dollars. So please forgive me for spoiling the party here, but I want to say this to America: There is no henway. This stupid, blundering investigation is keeping us from getting any real work done for the people of America.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a story as old as the hills.

You have got a politician who does certain things. Those actions then benefit his family financially. Then there is an effort to conceal it and sweep it under the rug.

The best example is to go back to the Ukrainian energy company Burisma.

There are four key facts about Hunter Biden's involvement with this company and Joe Biden's involvement.

First, Hunter Biden gets put on the board of Burisma. Second, he is not qualified to be on the board of Burisma. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, he said it himself.

Third, he is asked by the executives of Burisma: Can you weigh in with Washington, D.C., to help alleviate the pressure we are under?

Three days later the Vice President of the United States, now-President Joe Biden, goes to Ukraine and conditions American tax dollars for Ukraine on the firing of the prosecutor who was applying the pressure to the company Hunter Biden was on the board of.

That is why we are going with an official impeachment inquiry vote today. That is why this needs to be investigated.

There are two resolutions we are considering. They are H. Res. 918 and H. Res. 917, incorporated if we pass H. Res. 918.

There are three names mentioned in those two resolutions. One name, of course, is Joe Biden, the President of the United States. However, the other two names in H. Res. 917 are two Department of Justice tax lawyers, Mark Daly and Jack Morgan. They are the two guys we want to talk to that the Biden Justice Department says we are not going to let you talk to.

With this vote we think we will get to talk to those individuals. Here is why it is important: These two individuals initially said that there should be felony tax charges for 2014 and 2015 in the Hunter Biden investigation.

That is important because those are the years when the bulk of the income from Burisma came to Hunter Biden. They initially said that there should be felony tax charges for those years. Then they changed their position. Eight months later they changed their position, and we want to know why.

Why did you intentionally let the statute of limitations lapse for those years?

My theory is that it is one thing to charge Hunter Biden on a gun charge in Delaware, but it is another thing to charge him on Burisma tax years because that gets you to Joe Biden and that gets you to the White House. That is why we need this vote.

The impeachment power, as the chairman said, is the power that solely resides in the House. When you have a majority of the House of Representatives go on record, that then sends a message. We think we will get timely participation from the witnesses we need to talk to, and the documents Mr. COMER has been seeking.

Finally, I would say this about this changing story from the White House and this changing story from the Justice Department. Today, Hunter Biden did a press conference. He was supposed to be in a deposition, but he did a press conference. At that press conference he said: My father was not financially involved in the business.

That is an important qualifier. We haven't heard that. For 3 years we haven't heard that. All we have heard is that Joe Biden had no involvement. Now his son does a press conference when he is supposed to be deposed, and he says that he wasn't financially involved.

What involvement was it?

We know there were phone calls, dinners, and meetings.

What involvement was it?

That is why we want to ask these questions with important witnesses, and that is why this resolution is important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I need to get a decoder ring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a distinguished member of Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, every conspiracy theory we just heard has been debunked, not true, and distorted from the facts because this impeachment inquiry is political vengeance directed by a twice-impeached, four times indicted President and carried out by extreme MAGA Republicans.

Republicans rejected my amendment to require the committees to hold at least one public hearing.

Why?

It is because 11 months and a mountain of evidence and documents gathered so far prove that President Biden respected the rule of law and fought corruption.

Republicans want to continue a secret investigation so they can distort the facts.

For example, Republicans tried to create a scandal about the \$4,140 Hunter paid to his dad in 2018.

What really happened?

Joe Biden paid his son's truck payments while Hunter struggled with addiction. Hunter paid his dad back. A parent's love is never without pain. A

parent doesn't stop loving a child struggling with addiction.

Americans will see in those truck payments some of their own attempts to help their struggling kids.

Shame on my colleagues for politicizing a parent's pain. Americans know what evidence of an impeachment looks like.

The Capitol Police who were battered and beaten as Trump tried to overturn an election know what an impeachable offense feels like.

This puppet show is more of the same attack on our democracy that we saw here.

□ 1300

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, today, on the very day Hunter Biden ignored a subpoena from this body, we will vote to take the next critical step in formalizing the House's impeachment inquiry into President Biden.

For months, the White House and Hunter Biden have been stonewalling our investigation trying to hide the truth, and this stonewalling is what has caused us to be here today. Like Chairman COLE said yesterday, it is deeply sad and not something any of us want to be doing on this House floor, but it has become necessary.

Following today's floor vote on H. Res. 918, the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary will have greater legal position and subpoena power to fully investigate allegations of influence peddling and wrongdoing by President Biden, his family, and his associates.

The American people deserve transparency and accountability. They deserve the truth, and that is exactly what they are going to get from this Republican House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I remind the gentlewoman that Hunter Biden was here today. He wants to testify in public, but Republicans said no because they want to do it behind closed doors so they can go on FOX News and cherry-pick facts and figures and distort the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans aren't interested in transparency in this investigation, and apparently the Rules Committee isn't either. In our markup yesterday, Democrats offered nine amendments. They were all voted down by Republicans, but in the official Rules Committee report, contrary to years of committee practice and tradition, the majority left out descriptions of those amendments.

Instead of reading, for example, that Republicans defeated an amendment to add "open and transparent" to investigative proceedings, members of the public will only see that Republicans voted down "amendment No. 4."

Instead of defeating an amendment requiring committees to hold an open

hearing as part of the investigation, the RECORD will show that the majority simply voted down "amendment No. 5."

Republicans are literally hiding Democratic amendments about transparency. You cannot make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker, and this is especially shocking to me because it is so out of line with the way this committee has run historically under this chairman. I am deeply disappointed, and I hope that this isn't an indication of how the majority intends to operate in the future.

Further, to make sure that these amendments show up somewhere in this historical RECORD, I am going to put the summaries in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the summaries of our nine amendments, which Republicans intentionally left out of the Rules Committee report.

DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS TO H. RES. 918

1. Offered by Rep. McGovern—Adds a preamble describing President Joe Biden's career of honorable public service and former President Trump's multiple impeachments and 91 pending felony charges.

2. Offered by Rep. Leger Fernandez—Adds a preamble stating that the months-long Republican-led investigation into President Joe Biden has yielded no evidence of wrongdoing by the President.

3. Offered by Rep. Scanlon—Adds a preamble describing the tens of thousands of pages of records provided by the Administration and dozens of hours of testimony heard as part of the investigation.

4. Offered by Rep. Neguse—Adds "Open and Transparent" to investigative proceedings by the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

5. Offered by Rep. Leger Fernandez—Requires the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary to each hold at least one open hearing as part of the investigation.

6. Offered by Rep. Scanlon—Provides that a chair or ranking member cannot issue a subpoena in furtherance of the impeachment inquiry if they did not comply with a House, committee, or select committee subpoena.

7. Offered by Rep. McGovern—Strikes the provision deeming H. Res. 917 as adopted.

8. Offered by Rep. McGovern—Amends H. Res. 917 to exclude access to grand jury material related to a pending criminal prosecution, a prosecution arising from the January 6 attack on the Capitol, or a case in which former President Trump is a defendant.

9. Offered by Rep. Neguse—Adds a preamble stating that by December 11 in the first session of the 117th and 116th Congresses, 71 and 78 bills had been enacted, respectively, versus 22 in the 118th Congress; and stating that the House spent 26 days electing two Speakers in 2023.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just for the RECORD, all these amendments are on the website of the Rules Committee. It is not like they are mysteriously hidden someplace. They are in plain view on the website of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.

NORMAN), my good friend and also a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this impeachment inquiry. I hope all the public tuned into the Rules Committee yesterday. My question: What are you scared of? What facts do you not want to come out? That was so evident. You spent more time quoting Donald Trump, January 6, anything but the facts about what Hunter Biden and his family did.

The checks don't make themselves up that are written to this family. LLC accounts don't make themselves up. These are facts. What more to come out that you are hiding is so evident.

This resolution follows the bar set by Democrats during the impeachment proceedings in 2019. We are playing by the same rules the Democrats set. If Democrats thought this process was fair for President Trump, they should think it is fair for President Biden.

The evidence against the Bidens I think will come out and finally show what the trail is and the fact that there are consequences. You cannot just say you are innocent and not have to prove it. I fully support this inquiry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Members should be advised that Joe Biden, not Hunter Biden, is President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we all know why we are here today.

The majority has no accomplishments to speak of. Their own Members have said so, and the rightwing is getting restless.

So since they can't legislate and run on anything positive, they have decided to tear down President Biden instead. They have no evidence, of course, to support this inquiry, but since this majority never lets facts get in the way of a good set of FOX News talking points, here we are.

Dozens of witnesses have sat for transcribed interviews. Every one of those witnesses tells us the same thing: There was no political interference in the Hunter Biden case. Nobody at the Department of Justice ever blocked the special counsel from bringing charges. Unfortunately, the American public does not have most of this story because Chairman JORDAN refuses to release the transcripts from our interviews.

In fact, of the 85 interviews our committee has conducted so far, he has released exactly one transcript. He knows if he releases any more than that, his preferred narrative will crumble. The evidence simply does not support these baseless charges. Why is the MAGA wing of the Republican Party resorting to this political stunt? Two words: Donald Trump.

The likely nominee of the Republican Party, who faces 91 criminal charges in various courts, was also impeached not once, but twice, and we had evidence. Whenever the former President is accused of wrongdoing, his favorite move is to accuse his opponent of doing the same.

For this to work, of course, he needs President Biden to be impeached, too. Therefore, he asked his enablers in Congress to invent an impeachment, even if there is not a shred of evidence to back it up. Even if everything Chairman COMER said were true, which none of it is, an impeachable offense committed by Vice President Biden would not be under our Constitution grounds for impeaching President Biden.

This is political hackery, not serious work. We should be focused on doing the work of the American people and not be distracted by pernicious nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote “no” on this ridiculous resolution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, this is an impeachment inquiry, defined as an act of asking for information—nothing more, nothing less.

The inquiry is to further investigate at least three things: One, the extent to which Joe Biden as Vice President was involved with the flow of millions of dollars from foreign companies and interests in China, in Ukraine, into the Biden family, into numerous shell companies, including Hunter and his involvement. Devon Archer testified the Vice President was, in fact, at Hunter’s business meetings and there are numerous emails and other evidence indicating that the “Big Guy” or “Dad” was involved.

Two, the extent to which Joe Biden has lied about his involvement, involvement that Hunter all but acknowledged today when avoiding his deposition in a show press conference on the Capitol steps by carefully saying his dad was not involved financially in his businesses.

Three, the extent to which Biden and his administration have obstructed justice by preventing Jack Morgan and Mark Daly with the Department of Justice from testifying to their involvement in DOJ and IRS deciding to slow-walk 2014 and 2015 tax charges so the statute of limitations would lapse.

This is made all the more interesting in light of Hunter Biden being indicted just last week on nine counts of tax offenses for failing to pay \$1.4 million in back taxes after writing off hookers and sex clubs. All of this was only brought to light because the judge called the bluff of Weiss’ sweetheart deal; second, by only providing 14 of 82,000 emails with pseudonyms of which 29,000 were tied to Biden’s family businesses; third, by limiting the scope of witness testimony from Department of

Justice witnesses over and over and over again.

This is an impeachment inquiry. That is all. What are my Democratic colleagues afraid of if there is nothing to see there? Maybe that is all the more reason for the inquiry.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in shock and frustration at our Republican colleagues’ do-nothing Congress. Seinfeld would have called this the impeachment about nothing. They are leading the most unproductive session since the Great Depression, and after manufacturing crisis after crisis, weeks of trying to choose a Speaker, and putting their record-breaking economic recovery, which is nonexistent, under the spotlight, they think that formalizing a fishing expedition will dress it up enough for the American people to believe them.

This is not the work of the Ways and Means Committee. The greatness of this committee has nothing to do with an impeachment proceeding, and how the Ways and Means got involved in this baffles Republican and Democratic members of the committee.

The truth is, it has been nearly a year and not a shred of evidence has shown any wrongdoing or interference by Joe Biden.

Their recycled conspiracy theories continue to be debunked. They continue to mistake Congress, a legislative body, for a law enforcement body. In their only public hearing, their own witnesses conceded that there isn’t evidence to warrant moving forward.

The gentleman from South Carolina said we are trying to hide something. I moved in the Ways and Means Committee to have the whistleblowers’ testimony done in full public for observation. They turned it down.

Meanwhile, we are staring at another Republican government shutdown at the beginning of tax filing season. Enough with this obsession with one person, Joe Biden. The Ways and Means Democrats are concerned about all members of the American family and for the taxpayer that is about to be impeded because of the work that is being done on impeachment instead of on tax reform.

This is where we find ourselves—nothing here, no evidence, no wrongdoing after a year—a waste of time for the American people, a waste of time for a Congress that should be addressing the real problems of the American family.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my very good friend and distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, President Biden has hidden from the American people his knowledge of and role in his family’s overseas business dealings.

Even in the face of overwhelming evidence, showing his knowledge and involvement, President Biden still refuses to come clean. So far, two key DOJ witnesses have failed to show for congressionally subpoenaed depositions after DOJ directed them not to appear. Other witnesses have refused to answer certain questions from investigators and the Biden administration has refused to turn over many of the documents requested by Congress, claiming this inquiry was not properly authorized.

Let there be no mistake: Today’s vote asserts Congress’ authority to conduct an impeachment inquiry and gather all the evidence to proceed with our investigation.

The American people deserve answers.

Here is what we know so far: The existence of multiple email aliases suggest that Joe Biden was deliberately trying to conceal his activities from the public, including one-on-one communications with a key Hunter Biden business partner during his Vice Presidency.

We also learned that investigators were blocked from looking into potential campaign finance crimes by the Biden campaign. Hunter Biden had only known Kevin Morris, a Democrat donor, for 2 months before Morris started settling his tax debts to the tune of about \$2 million and then spent about \$3 million more to cover Hunter’s lifestyle.

In the midst of the 2020 campaign, just weeks before Super Tuesday primary elections that would decide the future of Joe Biden’s candidacy, Morris emailed Hunter Biden’s business associates and there was “considerable risk personally and politically” to not filing his late taxes, but the only person who faced political risk was Joe Biden, whose campaign the whistleblowers had reason to believe Morris was speaking to.

As Members of Congress, we have to abide by campaign finance limits and so must the President. Morris’ millions in payments to cover Hunter Biden’s taxes and other financial obligations appeared to the whistleblowers to be an illegal donation to the Biden campaign.

Unfortunately, they were blocked from investigating further. Time and again, when investigators found a lead that pointed to Joe Biden, DOJ stepped in and prevented them from pursuing it.

□ 1315

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the evidence released by the whistleblowers, the DOJ indicted Hunter Biden on nine tax charges, including three felonies. Everything the whistleblowers told us about the Hunter Biden tax case has been proven

right. I am convinced they are also right about the links to Joe Biden they were prevented from following.

Mr. Speaker, Congress owes it to the American people to follow the facts wherever they lead and pass this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from TIME magazine titled, “‘Absolutely Shocking’: Impeachment Experts Say Biden Inquiry May Be Weakest in U.S. History.”

[From TIME, Sept. 12, 2023]

‘ABSOLUTELY SHOCKING’: IMPEACHMENT EXPERTS SAY BIDEN INQUIRY MAY BE WEAKEST IN U.S. HISTORY

(By Mini Racker)

Speaker Kevin McCarthy took the rare step on Tuesday of announcing the launch of an impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden over his son Hunter’s foreign business dealings.

The House has voted to impeach just three Presidents: Andrew Johnson, Bill Clinton, and Donald Trump, who was impeached twice. But even the launch of an impeachment inquiry against a President has only happened a handful of times. Two impeachment experts tell TIME that there is less evidence implicating Biden of wrongdoing than in any of those previous inquiries.

“This is very disturbing for people who study past impeachments, because impeachment is really a very extreme measure,” says constitutional scholar Philip Bobbitt, a professor at Columbia Law School and expert on the history of impeachment who co-authored an updated edition of Charles Black’s classic legal text, *Impeachment: A Handbook*, in 2018. “I honestly don’t know that there is any evidence tying the president to corrupt activities when he was vice president or now.”

Frank Bowman, professor emeritus at the University of Missouri school of law and author of the book *High Crimes and Misdemeanors: A History of Impeachment for the Age of Trump*, said that McCarthy’s decision did not appear to be based on the evidence House Republicans have gathered thus far.

“Biden’s Republican pursuers have got exactly zero, zip, bupkis, on any matter that might be impeachable,” says Bowman.

The Constitution gives Congress the right to impeach and remove from office a president, vice president, or federal civil officer for committing “treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.” Historically, before the House votes on impeachment itself—the misconduct charge brought by a legislative body—it has usually launched an impeachment inquiry, a formal mechanism that moves the process along. However, an inquiry is not a legal requirement for impeaching a president, and the rules around what constitutes one are poorly defined.

According to Bowman, setting aside whether the five previous presidents who faced impeachment proceedings ought to have been impeached and convicted, there was at least some evidence indicating that they committed misconduct. The impeachment inquiry into President Richard Nixon, who resigned before the House could formally impeach him, was preceded by a special prosecutor investigation examining his ties to the Watergate burglary, as well as a Senate Special Committee inquiry into the break-in that stretched more than a year and reporting by journalists suggesting that responsibility for the incident and attempts to cover it up stretched into the administra-

tion. Two decades later, nearly a month before the House launched an impeachment inquiry into President Bill Clinton, independent counsel Ken Starr released a report outlining 11 possible grounds for impeachment, including lying under oath and obstructing justice.

“In every single case, there was very significant evidence of presidential wrongdoing before the formal inquiry was begun,” Bowman says. “The House, and House leadership, took the responsibility of formally opening such an inquiry extremely seriously. Nancy Pelosi, in the first impeachment, resisted calls for impeachment of Trump for two years.”

McCarthy’s inquiry, Bowman suggests, lacks that discipline.

“What they’re doing here is absolutely shocking,” says Bowman, who added that House Republicans “have no interest at all in preserving the basic integrity of the process, or indeed their own power as legislators in legitimate opposition and tension with the executive branch.”

House Republicans have spent all year investigating Hunter Biden in hopes of proving that Joe Biden profited off his son’s business dealings, particularly while Joe Biden was Vice President. There has been no conclusive evidence indicating Joe Biden did anything wrong.

McCarthy previously indicated that the full House would hold a vote to open an impeachment inquiry into Biden. Such a vote would need the support of nearly every Republican in the narrowly-divided chamber. But nearly 20 House Republicans have expressed resistance to voting for it, and a full House vote could open them up to political liability.

The Speaker’s decision to open the inquiry without a vote has precedent; Pelosi did the same thing ahead of Trump’s first impeachment, holding a full House vote to formally endorse the inquiry only weeks later. Trump’s second impeachment, following the January 6, 2021, attack on the Capitol, was not preceded by any inquiry at all. Congress has also voted to impeach federal judges without first opening inquiries.

Back in 2019, when Democrats controlled the House, McCarthy and his Republican allies slammed them for opening an impeachment inquiry against Trump without a vote, suggesting that doing so made the process illegitimate.

“The fact that, for a period of time between September 24 and October 31 of that year, the impeachment inquiry for Trump was going on without a full House vote, became an excuse for Republicans, first in the House, and then in the Senate, to vote against impeachment for Mr. Trump,” Bowman says.

There are no clear standards for launching an impeachment inquiry, nor are there specific signifiers differentiating it from other kinds of investigations. Ultimately, the decision to initiate one is usually left up to House leadership.

“To the extent they have a plausible end game here, other than just to keep this in the news and to dirty up Biden broadly speaking, presumably it will be to issue subpoenas that are sufficiently intrusive, either to Biden’s personal life or administration workings, that Biden will resist, and then to try to impeach him for obstruction of Congress,” says Bowman.

There’s some historical precedent for that theory; the third article of impeachment ultimately issued against Nixon centered on his refusal to comply with congressional subpoenas brought as part of the impeachment inquiry into him. Plus, McCarthy previously suggested that boosting Congress’ ability to subpoena Biden’s financial documents was a key motivation for the inquiry.

Both Bowman and Bobbitt suggested the current inquiry could weaken the federal system of checks and balances by devaluing the very concept of impeachment.

“This is supposed to be the most extreme sanction in American politics, and if you reach for it every time you think it’ll help you in the polls, I fear it will become degraded,” Bobbitt says. “It just becomes one more very divisive, poisonous event in a Congress that is already deeply divided and alienated.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, This article quotes Philip Bobbitt, a constitutional scholar at Columbia Law saying impeachment “is supposed to be the most extreme sanction in American politics, and if you reach for it every time you think it will help you in the polls, I fear it will become degraded.”

Mr. Speaker, everything the gentleman just said has been debunked, and it is just nuts.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in 2019, Donald Trump attempted to extort the President of Ukraine by withholding military aid unless Zelenskyy agreed to announce a sham investigation of Joe Biden. The evidence of Trump’s impeachable offenses was overwhelming, and Trump was impeached.

In 2020, after losing the election, Trump incited a violent insurrection against our own government. The evidence of that high crime was witnessed by everyone in this Chamber. He was impeached again.

In 2023, Donald Trump is once again seeking illicit help in his campaign, this time by badgering Republicans to impeach Joe Biden. Even with no evidence of wrongdoing by President Biden, Republicans are all too willing to do it.

There is a through line to all of this.

Donald Trump will violate the law and Constitution to gain power and to keep it, and Republicans will enable him every step of the way no matter how destructive the consequences to our institutions or to the country.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my very good friend.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, short of declaring war, impeachment is the most serious act that Congress can take. It must be confined to the narrow grounds established by the Constitution and never used to settle political differences.

However, the Democrats would have us simply turn a blind eye to mounting evidence of a family influence-peddling scheme that implicates the President. This we cannot do.

We owe it to the country to get to the bottom of these allegations, and that requires the House to objectively invoke its full investigatory powers, respect the due process rights of all involved, and lay all of the facts before the American people.

Last session, the Democrats made a mockery of impeachment, and we cannot allow them to become our teachers.

Shrill voices should be kept far from this inquiry lest they undermine its legitimacy and credibility.

Congress has an obligation to approach serious accusations seriously. With this vote, we do so.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman what is a mockery: This is a mockery. We hear the same tired, old conspiracy theories being recycled over and over again that have all been debunked.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) to further debunk them.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in staunch opposition to this resolution.

The Republicans have already spent 12 months on this exact investigation. They have obtained more than 100,000 pages of documents and dozens and dozens of hours of witness testimony, but there is simply not a shred of evidence proving any wrongdoing by President Biden related to his son or otherwise.

Whatever complaints that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have about how the Department of Justice investigated a private citizen, Hunter Biden, you should ask Donald Trump and Bill Barr, who were in power at the time that this investigation was going on.

Since there is no evidence, now we are going to move the goalposts, claiming an impeachment inquiry is necessary to gather more evidence, but Chairman COMER himself said earlier this year that he had received 100 percent compliance from the administration, and they can only cite two low-level career officials at the Department of Justice who have not testified, even though their supervisors have.

Just this morning, Hunter Biden showed up to the Capitol ready to provide evidence. The Republicans refused to take his testimony.

How can you sit there saying you need more evidence when you prevent the central witness in the investigation from giving you evidence?

What are you afraid of?

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS), my good friend.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, Americans have lost faith in the impartiality of the Biden administration. We have ample evidence that the DOJ, FBI, and IRS have refused to do their jobs. Americans deserve to know the truth, and Congress has a duty to investigate.

The question is simple: What did President Biden know about his family's criminal enterprises and when?

That is the question. That is why this inquiry is necessary.

We have already uncovered that the Biden family received \$25 million in payouts from foreign adversaries. Their scheme was simple: Foreign client has a problem; client pays a Biden; Vice

President Biden travels to the foreign country; Vice President Biden leverages U.S. influence to force favorable outcomes for the client; and the Biden family earns their fee.

That is the scheme. The proof of concept was Burisma in 2014, and they replicated it again and again. If President Biden was complicit, then our national security is vulnerable. His administration keeps stonewalling while the President repeatedly lies about his involvement.

As a member of the Oversight Committee, I believe the evidence we have uncovered thus far demands further investigation. This vote is the only logical next step. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this perverse, illegitimate effort to do Donald Trump's political dirty work.

This resolution is nothing more than an extreme political stunt built on absolutely zero evidence of wrongdoing. The one thing it does prove is that Republicans are focused on the wrong priorities. This resolution clearly has nothing to do with protecting the Constitution from high crimes and misdemeanors.

How do we know? Because a year of investigation, piles of documents, and a herd of the Republicans' own witnesses confirm there is zero evidence of wrongdoing. Instead, the Republicans' wasteful witch hunt just confirms that President Biden is a good and honorable man.

What this resolution really does is cover up a full year of do-nothing Republican policies that ignored our families' needs and neglected an array of global threats to democracy.

Worse, this resolution tries to obscure the corrupt and criminal acts of the former President and want-to-be dictator Donald Trump.

This extreme political stunt is built upon the sick, twisted extremism of House Republicans and totally unmask their complete absence of an agenda that helps the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), my good friend.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 918.

This year, House Republicans have conducted a methodical investigation into the alleged actions of the Biden family, including Joe Biden himself, in his family's foreign business dealings and foreign-peddling schemes.

As a member of both the House Judiciary and Oversight Committees, I can say that our investigation has peeled back layer upon layer of Biden family scandals and has exposed the safety nets designed to insulate the Biden family and Joe Biden from impending accountability.

There is an old legal saying, Mr. Speaker, that if you don't have the facts, you argue the law. If you don't have the law, you argue the facts, and if you have neither, you pound the table.

What we are seeing from the other side today is that they want to talk about Donald Trump and January 6. They want to talk about a perceived lack of transparency, about how nothing is happening out in the open.

Well, let me assure you that we have done this for months. We have done more in 10 months than law enforcement agencies have done in 5 years.

Let's talk about the facts: \$25 million has flowed to members of the Biden family; 20 corporate entities and 9 members of the Biden family have received these moneys; a \$40,000 direct payment to Joe Biden himself; a \$200,000 direct payment to Joe Biden himself, allegedly under a loan. We have WhatsApp messages, pseudonyms, fake email addresses, and 22 meetings in which Joe Biden himself met with Hunter Biden and his business associates.

We have been stonewalled. We have even seen this today, as Hunter Biden paraded onto the Senate side and did not come to a lawfully issued subpoena deposition in front of the House Oversight Committee.

Now is the time for an impeachment inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the MAGA majority is putting forward an impeachment inquiry even as their own leaders admit there is no evidence of wrongdoing.

They have already reviewed tens of thousands of documents, interviewed dozens of witnesses, and nothing.

Why?

This has never been about the truth. This is about avenging Donald Trump. This is about undermining our democracy and influencing the 2024 election.

President Ford once said, "Truth is the glue that holds government together."

Mr. Speaker, it is truth that allows this Chamber to function. Abandoning truth in favor of political gamesmanship creates nothing but chaos. That dysfunction isn't a byproduct of the majority's behavior, it is the point.

They don't want the government to function. They have sought nothing in service of the American people, nothing to lower costs, nothing to create good-paying jobs, to grow the middle class, to make everyday people feel more secure.

What has the majority delivered?

The kind of extremism that chooses rich tax cheats over working people, that obstructs the ballot box and hikes the cost of healthcare, that protects guns over kids, that bans abortion and criminalizes doctors, that rewards polluters and corporate greed and tells everyday Americans, you foot the bill.

This sham impeachment is below the dignity of the people's House. It is an affront to the people who sent us here to work for them. What a disgrace.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS), my very good friend.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is telling us that they care about taxpayers, but the son of the President of the United States is a tax cheat. He ignored Federal tax law on purpose. He laundered money through 20 LLCs. He concealed millions of dollars of overseas money, and the only reason he was able to accomplish these feats of getting so much money into his companies is because the President is his father. That is it.

If you are asking why we are looking for an impeachment inquiry, it is because there were 170 suspicious activity reports at the Department of the Treasury, which we went and looked through, and every one of those reports said very clearly that there was evidence of money laundering and potentially tax evasion. There were hours of depositions. There is a web of LLCs with company names that have no business interests whatsoever.

We have finally uncovered one example, Mr. Speaker, \$5 million from a foreign company going to a joint venture partly controlled by Hunter Biden.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, the next day, \$400,000 goes from Hunter Biden to an account controlled by Jim and Sarah Biden. Sarah Biden writes a check to herself, and then \$40,000 is in a check to Joseph Robinette Biden, the President of the United States. That is your evidence. If you want to talk crime: bribery, co-conspirator to firearm violations, and we can go on and on.

Vote for the resolution. Congress must investigate these crimes.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing. A pattern is developing. If you will notice, my Republican friends never talk about Joe Biden. It is all Hunter Biden. They seem to be obsessed with him. I don't know. They need to get some help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, this impeachment is a continuation of the insurrection that came here on January 6.

This gang has never accepted Joe Biden as the President. The architect of the idea that you could overturn the election is the current Speaker of the House.

Donald Trump sent that violent mob here. It didn't work, so now we are here where they are going to try to use this

House to overturn the election through this inquiry.

The problem is they have zero evidence. The only crime is that Joe Biden blew out Donald Trump in the 2020 election. That is a problem because this place is the largest law firm in D.C., with these lawyers working on behalf of just one client, Donald Trump, at the expense of everything else that matters.

I want to give JAMES COMER some credit because after 50,000 pages of depositions, secret hearings, and closed hearings, I think if we give him enough time, he is going to prove that Hunter Biden is Joe Biden's son.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this fake, fraudulent, and fictitious impeachment inquiry effort.

We are here today on the House floor wasting time and taxpayer dollars on an illegitimate impeachment inquiry because Donald Trump, the puppet master, has directed extreme MAGA Republicans to launch a political hit job against President Joe Biden.

There is no evidence that President Biden has engaged in an impeachable offense. There is no evidence that President Joe Biden has engaged in wrongdoing. There is no evidence that President Biden has broken the law.

We know that President Joe Biden is a good, honorable, and decent man who dedicated his life to public service and to making a difference for the American people.

The puppet master in chief, Donald Trump, has directed the sycophants to target Joe Biden as part of an effort to undermine President Biden's reelection.

That is the pattern. That is the process. It reveals that our extreme MAGA Republican colleagues have done nothing—nothing whatsoever—when it comes to making a difference in the lives of everyday Americans.

From the very beginning of this Congress, House Democrats have made it clear that we are ready, willing, and able to find common ground with our Republican colleagues in a bipartisan way on any issue.

This do-nothing Republican Congress has chosen to do nothing to solve problems for hardworking American taxpayers—nothing on the economy, nothing on inflation, nothing on affordability, nothing on gun safety, nothing on trying to improve the quality of life of the American people.

What we have seen from the very beginning of this do-nothing Republican Congress is chaos, dysfunction, and extremism being inflicted on the American people.

When it comes to this fraudulent impeachment inquiry, more than 100,000 pages of documents have been produced

and reviewed. Not a scintilla of evidence exists that President Biden has broken the law.

It is interesting to me. I wonder how my colleagues in New York and California who were sent here to make life better for the American people explain this vote, which is not designed to improve the lives of the folks that we are privileged to serve but is a political hit job, a political stunt, political gamesmanship.

The American people are tired of the partisanship, tired of the brinksmanship, tired of this effort to score political points on a partisan basis as opposed to actually making a difference.

House Democrats will continue to put people over politics. We will continue to fight for lower costs, to grow the middle class, for safer communities, for reproductive freedom, to defend democracy, and to build an economy from the middle out and the bottom up as opposed to the top down.

House Democrats remain committed to joining President Biden in advancing the ball for the American people, for the middle class, for low-income families, for working families, for all of those folks who aspire to be a part of the middle class, for young people, for older Americans, for our veterans.

We plan to continue to build upon the progress that we have made under the leadership of President Biden on behalf of the American people.

It is time for the extreme MAGA Republicans to join us or get out of the way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, this impeachment inquiry is a political stunt with zero evidence.

We are here today not because of any wrongdoing by President Biden but because Donald Trump wants revenge. Welcome to the Donald Trump revenge show.

He is running a campaign promising to destroy democracy and the rule of law and will soon be found guilty of serious crimes. The American people reject this toxic and disgusting agenda.

That is why Trump's allies here in Congress are trying to rescue him. They are throwing everything they can at President Biden, from misleading leaks to outright fabrications and lies. They are even trying to sell debunked Rudy Giuliani conspiracy theories.

Let's be clear: The White House has provided thousands of pages of bank records, statements from personal bank accounts, and testimony from the President's family, but none of this is enough for the extreme MAGA GOP.

This is all to appease the con man and the criminal Donald Trump, but make no mistake: The American people will see through this entire impeachment sham.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Ranking Member for yielding time.

Republicans have had the majority in this House for 11 months, and what do they have to show for it? Nothing—no efforts to grow the middle class, no efforts to lower costs, no efforts to build safer communities; instead, an effort to default on our Nation's debt, two attempts to shut down the government, vacating their own Speaker, and now a baseless impeachment that they are pursuing for one reason and one reason alone—because former President Trump ordered them to do so.

Ask them to articulate what crime they are investigating, and they can't give you an answer. Ask them to identify any evidence of wrongdoing by President Biden—crickets.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, I can assure you, are deeply disappointed in the actions that House Republicans have taken for the better part of the last year, and this action is no different.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this farce of a process. Let's get back to doing the important work that the American people expect us to do.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would ensure every American has full access to essential reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, this entire charade is ridiculous.

Speaker JOHNSON is about to send Members of Congress home for the rest of the year. Instead of lowering costs for families before the holidays or protecting women's freedom to make their own health decisions, House Republicans are taking orders from Donald Trump to force through a partisan, political impeachment with no evidence, no witnesses, and no wrongdoing on behalf of the President.

Meanwhile, as we speak, Kate Cox, a pregnant woman from Texas, is being forced to flee her home as Republican leaders try to force her to carry to term her baby, who was diagnosed with a terrible condition that would result in miscarriage, stillbirth, or death soon after birth.

We could have come to the floor today to pass legislation like the Women's Health Protection Act to protect women like Kate Cox and to prevent that kind of physical harm and trauma from being inflicted on women living under Republican abortion bans, but House Republicans choose impeachment. The American people won't forget.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Oklahoma have any other speakers?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, extreme MAGA Republicans in the House are on a Donald Trump-directed fishing expedition. In fact, they have been on a fishing expedition for months with embarrassing results—nothing—no bites, no evidence for anything that justifies impeachment.

There are no fish to catch in this Republican swamp, and good luck to all these Republicans who have to go home and justify a sham impeachment to their districts while telling them that we haven't passed the budget, haven't reauthorized the farm bill, haven't done a single thing that helps Americans live their lives. Instead, we are wasting time on bogus censure resolutions and bogus impeachment inquiries.

We have 1½ legislative business days left in the year. We should be passing bills to help working families, but that is not what we do under extreme Republicans' control. Vote "no" on this new fishing expedition.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are saying the quiet part out loud.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Rolling Stone article from today titled: "GOP Rep. Explains Impeachment Push: 'Donald J. Trump 2024, Baby!'"

[From RollingStone, Dec. 13, 2023]

GOP REP. EXPLAINS IMPEACHMENT PUSH:

'DONALD J. TRUMP 2024, BABY!'

(By Nikki McCann Ramirez)

House Republicans will vote Wednesday on whether to formalize their impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden. The party has struggled to gin up a legitimate rationale for moving forward with the inquiry, which has yet to produce any credible evidence of wrongdoing, but one Republican is saying the quiet part out loud.

When Rep. Troy Nehls (R-Texas) was asked Tuesday on Capitol Hill what he's hoping to gain from an impeachment inquiry, Nehls responded: "All I can say is: Donald J. Trump 2024, baby!"

Video of the encounter was obtained exclusively by Rolling Stone. When reached for additional comment on Wednesday, Nehls said in a statement to Rolling Stone that Republicans "will follow the rule of law and go where the facts lead us."

Nehls is one of Trump's most ardent supporters in Congress, and even floated the former president as a potential House Speaker after Republicans booted Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.) from the role in October. His comments are essentially an admission of what has long been obvious to many, which is that the GOP's fraught effort to dig up dirt on President Biden and his family is nothing more than a ham-fisted political stunt meant to hurt the president's reelection chances and place Trump back in the White House.

Republicans for months have been trotting out flimsy bits of evidence they say point to Biden's corruption. They've produced nothing substantial, however, nor have they been able to articulate exactly which high crimes and misdemeanors the president may have committed. Hunter Biden, the president's son whom Republicans believe worked with his father on illegal financial dealings, bashed the investigations while defying a GOP subpoena for closed-door testimony on Wednesday.

"I'm here today to make sure the House committee's illegitimate investigations of my family do not proceed on distortions, manipulated evidence, and lies," he told reporters outside the Capitol. "For six years MAGA Republicans including members of the House committees who are in a closed-door session right now, have imputed my character, invaded my privacy, attacked my wife, my children, my family, and my friends. They've ridiculed my struggle with addiction, they've belittled my recovery, and they have tried to dehumanize me, all to embarrass and damage my father."

Meanwhile, Trump is embroiled in a sea of criminal and civil legal trouble. Cases in Washington, D.C., and Georgia relate directly to his effort to undermine the results of the 2020 election and his role in the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol. He's also been indicted in New York over a hush-money scandal ahead of the 2016 election, and by the Justice Department in Florida over his handling of classified material after leaving the White House. A civil trial in New York, where Trump has already been found liable for using fraudulent financial statements for his business, is expected to wrap up this week.

Trump is also the clear frontrunner for the Republican 2024 nomination, and a showdown with Biden in the general election now seems inevitable. Republicans have tied themselves to Trump's erratic trajectory, and an impeachment inquiry in an election year is just the kind of circus they need to compete with the vortex of trials, depositions, and court appearances swirling around their all-but-official nominee.

The circus will continue with the vote on Wednesday to formalize their impeachment inquiry, the push to hold Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress over his defiance of their subpoena, and a new round of Fox News appearances to try to legitimize the party's never-ending fishing expedition. Oversight Committee Chair James Comer (R-La.) won't be going on one of the network's most popular anytime soon. He said on Tuesday that he's boycotting Fox & Friends because one of its hosts keeps asking him questions he can't answer about what actual evidence the GOP has on Biden.

House Speaker Mike Johnson (R-La.) also avoided giving specifics in an op-ed announcing the vote to formalize the inquiry on Tuesday, writing—sincerely, absurdly—that

"impeachment is among the most solemn constitutional authorities the U.S. Congress holds, particularly when it comes to a president."

If that's the public line Johnson wants House Republicans to use, he'd better get them some additional media training. At the very least, he should make sure they don't offer up the real reason for the inquiry as easily as Nehls did on Tuesday.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend and the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, here is what we know.

We know that President Biden's transition team ran interference for Hunter Biden and obstructed law enforcement's attempts to interview the President's son.

We know that somebody in the FBI decided not to investigate bribery allegations against Hunter Biden and Joe Biden provided by a confidential informant. That source is so important and the FBI has deemed him so credible that they oppose the release of the report and only agreed to a review in a classified setting.

We know that IRS investigators were not allowed to follow leads that had the potential to implicate President Biden in Hunter Biden's alleged financial crimes.

We know that recommendations for prosecution of Hunter Biden were denied or delayed until the statute of limitations had run.

We know that a plea deal was offered to Hunter Biden by the DOJ that offered him global immunity for crimes outside the scope of the charged conduct and that that plea deal only fell apart after whistleblowers came forward to Congress.

Set aside for a minute the \$24 million, the 20-plus shell companies, the payments to President Biden, and the changing narrative from this White House every time a new bad fact comes to light. Set that aside.

□ 1345

These instances alone should concern all Americans because it appears that people in the highest echelons of our government were running interference for the President's son.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have an innocent explanation for every single incident. The problem is, it is very difficult to see an innocent explanation for all of the incidents.

The FBI, the DOJ, the IRS, and the President's political operation have all frustrated attempts to investigate the Bidens.

Obstruction is a crime, and it is no less of a crime if it is being used within the highest powers of government to perpetrate that coercion.

Take all of the politics out of this, there is no investigator in any jurisdiction in the world that would not continue this investigation with these facts.

The purpose of the impeachment inquiry is for the House to authorize impeachment and strengthen its ability to compel testimony and document production in response to Congressional subpoenas. This will allow the House to continue its investigation into whether President Biden changed U.S. policy due to payments received by the Biden family members from hostile foreign powers; or whether he knowingly allowed foreign powers to believe that the payments were being made and to employ the Biden family members would result in access and the ability to alter U.S. policy; or whether the President and the President's administration were using government agencies to obstruct investigations into Hunter and Joe Biden.

This inquiry is warranted. It would put the House of Representatives in the best legal position possible to uncover the facts, and the American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, this inquiry has nothing to do with Joe Biden. It is about the Republican Party and how radicalized and extreme they have become. They are allergic to truth and transparency.

Republicans say this is not about a preordained outcome. It is. They are going to try to impeach President Biden despite the fact that there is no evidence against him at all.

Trump sent a violent MAGA mob here to the Capitol to reverse the election results and certify that he won, even though he lost.

What they couldn't do on January 6 they want to do with this extreme political stunt. They have contempt for our democracy. They want to finish the job.

Republicans say this is all about process, about how the House will proceed. It is not. The truth is this process has already proceeded for 10 months. They have been investigating all year, obtaining tens of thousands of documents and hours and hours of witness testimony. All of it says there is no wrongdoing by President Biden.

Republicans say the White House is stonewalling their inquiry. Again, that is not true. The White House has provided over 35,000 pages of financial records, dozens of hours of testimony and interviews. Hunter Biden is here to testify today, and Republicans won't let him because they want to do it in secret so they can cherry-pick and distort his testimony.

This whole inquiry has nothing to do with the integrity of President Biden and everything to do with the lack of integrity in the Republican Party.

No amount of evidence could convince Republicans that Joe Biden did nothing wrong because they aren't looking for the truth. They are looking for revenge.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say directly to the American people, that the Republican Party works for Donald Trump; not for you, for Trump.

That is why they are pursuing this extreme political stunt. That is why they are doing everything in secret. They want to hide the truth from you because they know their whole impeachment inquiry is a sham, and it will evaporate into thin air when people realize what a pathetic joke it is.

This shameful process has no credibility. It has no legitimacy and no integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close, and I urge all my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot today, heard a lot about Donald Trump. We have had ad infinitum insults to the majority. We have had pejorative language. We have had pounding on the table.

Why? Simply because we want to empower three committees in Congress to do what the White House asked us to do; that is, to have a formal vote on the floor before they fully cooperate. That is all we are doing.

If my friends are so confident—again, as one of my colleagues mentioned from the Rules Committee—what are you worried about? It is an investigation. It is open.

We hardly talked about what the resolution is about, which is how we are going to proceed.

How are we going to proceed? Almost exactly as my friends proceeded in 2019. Their playbook, their play, their approach. There is nothing unfair that we are asking to be done.

Since September, the House has been engaged in an impeachment inquiry, examining whether sufficient grounds exist for the House to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President of the United States.

Today's resolution simply formalizes that inquiry and grants the House full authority to enforce its subpoenas—subpoenas that have been denied as recently as today.

My friends have some pretty experienced lawyers on their side. Most of them will tell you it is better to have a deposition before you have a hearing, let alone a trial.

All we are trying to do is get the needed people who have been blocked or refused to cooperate to come in and testify under oath before Congress.

The resolution follows closely, again, as I said, the procedures established in 2019. It empowers the three committees to continue their existing inquiries. At the end of the inquiry, it provides for the Committee on the Judiciary, the traditional impeachment committee, to report to the House resolutions, Articles of Impeachment, or other recommendations.

It is deeply unfortunate that we are here, Mr. Speaker, but today's resolution will ensure that the House can fulfill its obligations under the Constitution. So it is with respect for the Constitution, for this institution, and for this great Nation that we proceed. That is all we are trying to do today. We had very little discussion of that, but we ought to entertain that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind everybody of a few facts.

We have millions of dollars from foreign entities that have flowed towards shell companies that we didn't even know existed until the investigations uncovered them. We have whistleblowers, public servants of long standing that have come in and told us their efforts to investigate either Hunter Biden or the wider schemes that have been obstructed.

We have lots of things to be concerned about. Our committees need to be empowered with the tools that are required to pursue the truth and then come back and tell us what they found and have a recommendation as to how we should proceed. That is all today is about.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to yet another shameful effort to erode the founding principles of our democracy.

This resolution is a pitiful attempt to continue the politicization of our government's ability to function once those who are duly elected to serve seek to govern.

Impeachment is not a punishment, sought to be inflicted when one branch of government merely disagrees with or dislikes what a co-ordinate branch has done.

It is a serious remedy designed to prevent abuses of power and is designed to ensure that ours remains a government of, by, and for the people.

This is about the duty of the President of the United States—you do not impeach people because you disagree with their approach to their service to the country or to the provisions on their policy. We do not impeach people on that basis.

No, this resolution does not provide any meaningful or sincere effort to protect the American people.

Rather, this resolution sets forth nothing more than a partisan fishing expedition and should be rebuked as such.

Impeachment is serious, yet here we are engaged in a baseless political stunt to impeach our current President.

The U.S. Constitution governs the order of our nation, and it dictates the work of the Congress.

Article I details the powers of the House and the exercising of these powers as they relate to the coordinate, coequal branches of government, codified in Articles II and Articles III: three equal branches of government coexisting and cohesively working to provide oversight to the respective actions of the Congress, the Executive and Judiciary.

Specifically, Article I, Section 2, Clause 5 indicates that the "House of Representatives . . . shall have the sole power of impeachment." Article II states that the "The President . . . shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason,

Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Article II also requires that the "President take care that the laws are faithfully executed."

That language is stark and clear—and throughout our history it has been used in varying periods where the assessment was that the law has been breached.

Sometimes Congresses are concerned that the weight and view of the American people should be considered. Sometimes they are moved by the urgency of the matter.

This has worked, with challenges of course, since 1789, yet the outright abuse of our constitution to use impeachment as a political tool is an abomination of our congressional duties.

As constitutional scholars have long laid out the historical guardrails and mandates upon which must heed, I would like to point to a few salient remarks from the September 28, 2023, Committee on Oversight and Accountability hearing entitled "The Basis for the Impeachment Inquiry of President Joseph R. Biden" as reminders for us all here today.

In the testimony of Michael J. Gerhardt, Burton Craige Distinguished Professor of Jurisprudence, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, he highlighted the clear warning from Alexander Hamilton in the Federalist Papers, and what he foresaw in the dangers of trivializing impeachment through petty partisanship.

As quoted in Alexander Hamilton, No. 65, the Federalist Papers (1961), he states that impeachment may "agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with pre-existing factions, and will enlist all their animosities, partialities, influence, and interest on one side or on the other; and in such cases there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the relative strength of the parties, than by the demonstrations of innocence or guilt."

As Professor Gerhardt noted, "in other words, an impeachment proceeding, including the initiation of an impeachment inquiry, must rise above petty partisanship in order to ensure its legitimacy."

And as aptly stated in the testimony of Johnathon Turley, Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law at George Washington University School of Law, in highlighting the carefully crafted powers vested in the House of Representatives pursuant to Art. I, §2, cl. 5. is that:

"The Framers debated and crafted this standard and process to avoid an 'anything goes' mentality. That was the reason our Framers opposed the 'maladministration' standards as too malleable and indeterminate. While we continue to have passionate and good-faith debates over the meaning of the high crimes and misdemeanors standard, it is not intended to give the House carte blanche for any impulsive impeachment theory."

Nearly fifty years ago, my predecessor Barbara Jordan of Texas's 18th Congressional District, declared, in the first presidential impeachment inquiry in more than a century, that:

"My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution." She noted "those are impeachable 'who behave amiss or betray their public trust'"

(quoting from the North Carolina ratification convention).

In this vein, we should not be here today in efforts to betray and diminish our Constitution and rule of law.

The unsubstantiated accusations, that the President of the United States has abused his powers and that his conduct is in dereliction of his duties as President, flatly outrageous.

When the Framers of our Constitution designed our government, they bifurcated power between the federal and state governments, and divided among the branches.

They vested in Congress the capacity to make the laws, and in the Executive the power to faithfully execute those laws.

Because the House enjoyed a natural superiority, as most representative of the passions of the populace, the Framers vested in the House of Representatives the sole power of impeachment and made the Senate the judges.

Yet, entirely unlike the incredulous and now confirmed illegality of President Trump's behavior while in office, President Biden has certainly not earned the same stain of impeachment from the House of Representatives and his conduct absolutely does not merit conviction and removal from office by the Senate.

When the Founders inserted the Impeachment Clause in Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, they did so to preserve our democracy, protect the American people, and to prevent the abuses and excesses of the Chief Executive.

The Constitution has served our nation well for over two hundred years.

Yes, in order to keep faith with the Framers and with our future, we must preserve, protect and defend that Constitution and all its provisions.

This impeachment resolution, however, is not one that is within the national interest but a disgrace to our government and its entrusted duties.

My Republican colleagues are sadly focused on the wrong priorities.

The American people want us to focus on helping their families, not attacking the President and his family.

This so-called "impeachment inquiry" is just an extreme political stunt.

President Biden is a good and honorable man who has spent his life serving the American people.

Extreme House Republicans are pushing these lies to try to smear him for political purposes.

They have been investigating President Biden all year—obtaining tens of thousands of pages of documents and dozens of hours of witness testimony—but have found no evidence of wrongdoing by the President.

In fact, over and over again, Republicans' own witnesses and documents have embarrassed them by debunking their ridiculous allegations.

They now want to waste time on the House floor voting on this extreme stunt, instead of focusing on advancing important priorities like Ukraine aid or doing their job to avoid a government shutdown in a few weeks.

No vote will make this baseless fishing expedition legitimate.

They have proven all year just how illegitimate this impeachment stunt is.

All a vote would do is put every Republican who supports it on record pushing an extreme agenda.

This is not what Congress should be focused on.

Democrats and President Biden will stay focused on putting people over politics.

As such, I ask my colleagues to vote no on this shameful resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 918 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

WHOLE MILK FOR HEALTHY KIDS ACT OF 2023

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1147.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONALDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 922 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1147.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1355

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1147) to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to allow schools that participate in the school lunch program under such Act to serve whole milk, with Mr. DESJARLAIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1147. It is Christmastime across America. For many, the season brings with it the annual return of cherished Christmas traditions, such as leaving milk and cookies out for Santa Claus and his reindeer to enjoy.

As for my family, our traditional choice of dairy has always been whole milk. We want only the most nutritious option for Santa.

The nutrients in whole milk, like protein, calcium, and vitamin D, provide the fuel Santa needs to travel the whole globe in one night. Whole milk is the unsung hero of his Christmas journey.

Protein helps build and repair Santa's muscles. Hoisting heavy sacks of gifts up and down the chimney is no easy task.

Calcium is vital for strong bones. It is calcium that keeps Santa strong and sturdy as he dashes from rooftop to rooftop.

Vitamin D is essential to a strong immune system. Santa absolutely needs one as he braves the cold, wintry night. You see, it is not just the magic of the season that helps Santa deliver presents worldwide, it is also the fortifying nutrients in whole milk.

Reflecting on Christmas traditions this year begs the question: If whole milk is a good option to fuel Santa's extraordinary Christmas Eve journey, then why isn't it an option for American schoolchildren in their lunchrooms?

That is why I support Representative G.T. THOMPSON's Whole Milk For Healthy Kids Act, a bill allowing unflavored and flavored whole milk to be offered in school cafeterias.

Since 2012, the National School Lunch and Breakfast Program has allowed only low-fat and fat-free milk options for American schoolchildren. This means 2 percent and whole milk have been excluded from the daily diets of an entire generation of kids.

The USDA intends to finalize another rule which will further limit milk op-

tions. Anti-milk advocates advance one main argument against whole milk: that whole milk is bad for kids.

□ 1400

Rather, milk has 13 essential nutrients that are needed for children to live healthy lives and succeed in school. It is an essential ingredient to growth and development. Research shows that whole milk is associated with a neutral or lower risk of heart disease and obesity.

Moreover, the USDA contradicts itself by limiting milk options for young children. On one hand, it recognizes that children are at risk of under-consuming dairy, yet on the other, it creates policies that will only exacerbate the problem.

If Americans have learned anything from these past 3 years, it is that scientific authorities tend to contradict themselves. The truth is that whole milk is a significant source of vital nutrients for children's growth and development. The Federal bureaucracy should never stand between your children and a nutritious lunch.

The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act isn't about advocating for one type of milk over another. It is about providing parents, schools, and food service providers with the option to choose what is best for our children's nutrition.

This act does not aim to diminish the importance of other milk varieties. Rather, it seeks to restore the availability of a wholesome, natural option that has been a staple for generations. This bill is about choice. It is a chance to empower parents and schools to make informed choices about what goes into our children's diets.

Whether it is a nutritional foundation for Santa's journey or your child's math homework, let's not discount the benefits of whole milk.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1147, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act.

School meals are critical to reducing child hunger and providing children with the healthy food they need. Milk, offered as part of these meals, can help deliver essential nutrients that are vital to a child's development. That is why it is so important that we provide students with the most nutritious milk options.

Child nutrition standards for school meals, including milk options, are guided by the science-based Dietary Guidelines for Americans, or the DGAs, which are periodically updated based on recommendations from child nutrition experts and input from the public.

The latest DGAs, along with the American Heart Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, and over a dozen other public