



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024

No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign God, You have marked out our appointed times in history and provided the time and space for our lives so that we would seek You, reach to You, and find You, for You are never far from us. For in You we live and move and have our being.

So into Your hands we place the U.S. House of Representatives and all who labor therein. From this body there is revealed an intricate tapestry of hopes and fears, possibility and challenge. Into this unique quilt You have woven our talents and treasures, our time and our effort.

We pray then that You would use this sometimes unlikely and unruly montage of Members. Reveal Your mercy in our doubt, and even in the wavering of our faith, reveal Your glory.

In our busyness may we find Your quietness. In our quietness may we receive Your purpose. Let the favor of the Lord be upon us. Establish for us the work of our day, this day and every day.

In the power to be found only in Your name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TLAIB led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SUPPORT OF HOSTAGES HELD BY HAMAS

(Ms. De La CRUZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the hostages being held by Hamas following the October 7 attacks in Israel, the worst massacre of the Jews since the Holocaust.

These individuals, unjustly seized and separated from their families, must not be forgotten. Each day in captivity underscores the cruel reality of anti-Semitism and terrorism.

We must continue demanding their immediate release. Their stories, etched in our hearts, demand our unwavering commitment to the fight against hate. In their names, we must reinforce our stance against anti-Semitism in all its forms.

Let us unite in our efforts to ensure their safe return, keeping their families and loved ones in our prayers. We will not rest until they are home.

EVERY MONTH IS BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I want everyone to know and to be very clear that every month in the 12th Congressional District is Black History Month.

I was born and raised in the most beautiful, Blackest city in the country: the city of Detroit. Countless Black leaders, our neighbors, have inspired us all to seek change in the face of segregation, Jim Crow, economic injustices, and dehumanizing racism.

We bore witness in our city to Dr. King's first Walk to Freedom and the transformative work of so many of our Black trailblazers, like Mother Rosa Parks, James Boggs, Reverend Franklin, and so many others.

It was on our very streets that the fight for Black liberation and civil rights bent the arc of the moral universe in our Nation. From the iconic Motown sound to powerful activism, our community's Black history has a remarkable legacy.

The 12th District acknowledges that Black history and Black lives matter every single day of the year.

Please know that you will also have a fighter in me in the United States Congress.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION WAGING WAR ON AMERICAN ENERGY

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, since President Biden took office, his administration has waged an unprecedented war on American energy and continuously pushed this country into adopting the Green New Deal agenda.

These policies pushed by the global elites have caused energy prices to skyrocket, as well as allow for our energy security to be exposed before our greatest adversaries, such as China and Iran.

Two weeks ago, Joe Biden's Department of Energy announced that they

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H435

would freeze permits for liquefied gas exports, forcing hardworking Americans to spend more on residential uses for natural gas, including cooking and heating homes. Furthermore, this decision will hurt our farmers as it would force them to spend more on fertilizer.

The last thing Virginians want is more burdensome regulations pushed by the Biden administration, including by their two climate czars, John Kerry and John Podesta. These are two individuals who are among the Democratic elite and are simply out of touch with everyday Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 987 so the American people aren't further burdened with climate change policies that we have seen fail throughout the world.

House Republicans will continue to fight for American energy independence on behalf of the American people.

BIDENOMICS FAILS FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the failed policies of Biden and Democrats are costing American families over \$11,400 more a year to buy the basics. The dollar stores I shop at are now \$1.25.

When Biden took office, inflation was just 1.4 percent. Since then, inflation has risen by 17.2 percent. Over the last year, families are paying 20 percent more for car insurance, 19 percent more for frozen juice, 11 percent more for beef steak, 10 percent more for transportation, and 7 percent more for baby food and formula.

House Republicans, led by Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will continue to fight to pass legislation to reduce inflation and create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden open borders for terrorists.

It is sadly clear that there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent in our country as warned by the FBI. Families need a rally point now for safety when communications are cut.

SECRETARY MAYORKAS GUILTY OF MALADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas is guilty of maladministration of our immigration laws on a cosmic scale, but we know that is not grounds for impeachment because the American Founders specifically rejected it.

They didn't want political disputes to become impeachments because that

would shatter their separation of powers that vests the enforcement of the laws with the President—no matter how bad a job he does.

Cabinet Secretaries can't serve two masters. They can be impeached for committing a crime relating to their office, but not for carrying out Presidential policy.

This border crisis can't be fixed by replacing one leftwing official with another. It can only be fixed by the American people at the ballot box by replacing this administration with one committed to securing our borders, defending our country, and upholding the rule of law. Americans are already coming to that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that stunts like this don't help.

BEING HONEST

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his statement. I don't normally agree with very much of what Mr. MCCLINTOCK says, but I want to publicly thank him for being honest.

If we are being honest with one another, we would not be bringing this impeachment resolution of Secretary Mayorkas forward. This is a sham. This is a joke. It has no basis within the Constitution. This is a political ploy.

For the purpose of this 1-minute speech, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for his honesty. We need more honesty around here.

STAND WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act and our ally Israel as it continues its fight against Hamas.

In November, less than 1 month after Hamas terrorists brutally attacked Israel, I proudly voted "yes" on the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, which would send \$14.3 billion in emergency aid to our most loyal ally in the Middle East, Israel.

This bill is fully paid for without increasing the debt or raising taxes by offsetting the new spending with cuts to previous funding found in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, which would hire unnecessary additional IRS agents.

Unfortunately, the Senate refused to pass this bill to provide immediate, direct, and much-needed relief for Israel. Instead, they have prioritized the funding of an army of IRS agents.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I wholeheartedly stand with Israel and its fight against Hamas and for providing much-needed military assistance.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING TROOPER ZACHARY FINK

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning of February 2, 2024, Florida Highway Patrolman Zachary Fink, ID No. 1550, gave his life in the line of duty. He served in St. Lucie County, where he was raised and where he dedicated everything he had to protecting.

He will be remembered by all who knew him, and remembered as a man you could count on. He was a natural comedian who could deescalate. He was an outdoorsman. He was a man deeply proud of his law enforcement brothers and sisters, who he himself considered it an honor to be among their ranks.

Mr. Speaker, it is we who have all been honored by Trooper Fink's selfless and total commitment to others. I thank God, and I thank his parents for giving him to us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for silence in recognition of the sacrifice of Trooper Zachary Fink.

□ 1215

HONORING RUDY IRIARTE

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor a civil servant of Guam, the late vice mayor of Sinajana, Rudy Iriarte.

Rudy was a proud son of Guam whose service to the island and his village of Sinajana never went unnoticed. He had served in public life for over 30 years in several capacities through the local government and his village.

Today, we recognize the great visions, accomplishments, and selfless service Rudy Iriarte made to our community.

On behalf of a grateful island and Nation, I extend my deepest and utmost condolences to the family of the late vice mayor and thank him for his service to making Guam a better place.

LAND OF THE FREE AND THE HOME OF THE BRAVE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness and with great disappointment.

America is the land of the free and the home of the brave, and continually tells the world that we will protect them to be lands of the free and the home of the brave.

Yet this week, we are about to consider a bill that tells people, particularly those in distress, we don't care. I believe all of us want to defend Israel and give her the resources she needs,

but the people in Ukraine want to be the land of the free and the home of the brave, and yet we continue to stand silent.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to say that it is beneath the principles, image, and reality of America that we are not passing a comprehensive bill to make sure that whether you are in Asia, the Middle East, or any place else, we will help you be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Let's do that, Mr. Speaker. Let's do it now.

BRING KEITH SIEGEL AND ALL HOSTAGES HOME

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Keith Samuel Siegel.

Keith was born in the United States and has worked and lived alongside both Jews and Arabs and treasures them all equally. He lives and loves co-existence. His family says he is a man of an innate faith in the goodness of humankind.

Like all of us, he has a family that loves him dearly and friends whose lives are richer because of him.

On October 7, Keith was one of more than 240 who were kidnapped by Hamas. He is one of more than 100 hostages still being held captive in Gaza, enduring unthinkable torture and trauma.

I stand here today to demand that Hamas release Keith immediately, along with all of the remaining hostages. Israel has proven its willingness to pause the fighting for hostages to be returned home. Nonetheless, Hamas continues to hold more than 100 hostages taken during its despicable acts on October 7; 8 of them believed to be Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring Keith home. It is time to bring all of them home.

FIGHTING TO PROTECT FREELANCERS AND INDEPENDENT WORK

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

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor has announced a new independent contractor rule, which, in fact, targets independent contractors across America.

It is based upon AB5, a truly destructive California law that has devastated independent professionals in over 600 professions.

In hopes of trying to get this House to act to stop this rule from taking effect next month, I am sharing the stories of California freelancers and independent contractors who have been harmed by AB5, which President Biden

has called his model for national labor relations.

One story comes from Jodie. Jodie said: I worked years to gain my skills as an American Sign Language interpreter. It was my goal since I was 9 years old. After AB5, I lost all three of my agencies. The dream I worked for is lost. I can't provide for my family and thousands of California deaf won't be served.

In order to spare millions of Americans the same fate as Jodie, I am asking for bipartisan support for my legislation under the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Biden administration's new independent contractor rule.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 863, IMPEACHING ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 485, PROTECTING HEALTH CARE FOR ALL PATIENTS ACT OF 2023

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 996 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 996

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H.Res. 863) impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of House Resolution 863—

(a) House Resolution 995 is hereby adopted; and

(b) no other resolution incidental to impeachment relating to House Resolution 863 shall be privileged during the remainder of the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 485) to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to prohibit the use of quality-adjusted life years and similar measures in coverage and payment determinations under Federal health care programs. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute

rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 996, providing for the consideration of two measures: H.R. 485 and H. Res. 863.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 485 under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate and H. Res. 863 under a closed rule with 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction, or their designees. The rule provides for one motion to recommit for H.R. 485.

The rule also deems passed H. Res. 995, which appoints the impeachment managers. I will also mention that all amendments offered to H.R. 485 were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills H. Res. 863, Impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland

Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors; and H.R. 485, the Protecting Health Care for All Patients Act of 2023.

Today, this body begins consideration of one of its most solemn constitutional duties: the consideration of Articles of Impeachment against a Federal official.

H. Res. 863, Impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors includes two Articles of Impeachment: willful and systematic refusal to comply with the law and breach of public trust.

On February 2, 2021, Alejandro Mayorkas was sworn in as the seventh United States Secretary of Homeland Security by Vice President KAMALA HARRIS. On this day, Secretary Mayorkas solemnly swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

He swore that he took this sacred obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and swore to faithfully discharge the duties of the office.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this oath of office sworn on February 2, 2021, has, indeed, been broken.

Since President Biden took office, United States Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 7 million illegal migrants along the southwest border; 3.3 million have been released into the United States interior, including 312 individuals on the Terrorist Screening Data Set.

In 2003, Customs and Border Protection encountered over 2.5 million illegal migrants attempting to cross the United States southern border. That is an all-time high for a fiscal year.

In December alone, Customs and Border Protection encountered 302,000 illegal migrants attempting to cross the United States southern border, the highest number of unlawful migrant crossings in a single month in recorded history.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas has shown willful and systematic refusal to comply with the law time and time again. He has willfully refused to comply with numerous detention requirements spelled out in the Immigration and Nationality Act but has instead implemented a mass catch and release program, whereby apprehended illegal migrants are released into the interior of our country without any effective way to ensure their return before an immigration court.

Secretary Mayorkas has also willfully misused parole authority laid out in the Immigration and Nationality Act that permits parole to be granted only on a case-by-case basis, temporarily, and for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas has not only failed in his solemn statutory duty to control and guard the border of the United States, to protect and defend this country and the Constitu-

tion, but he has also breached the public trust.

□ 1230

Secretary Mayorkas has willfully failed to put in place or enforce initiatives that he abandoned that would enable the Department of Homeland Security to maintain operational control of our southwest border. He has also breached the trust of Congress and the American people by knowingly making false statements about the results of his refusal to comply with the law.

The American people, and certainly those that I represent in Texas, have had enough of the Secretary's lies. Despite undeniable evidence that his gross negligence toward securing our southern border is endangering American families and communities across the country, Secretary Mayorkas thinks what he is doing is just fine, but he could not be more wrong.

Contrary to what the Secretary says, the border is not secure. America is, in fact, less safe because of his negligence and because of his numerous failures. Since Secretary Mayorkas will not resign, Congress must take this action.

Every day that Secretary Mayorkas remains as the head of the Department of Homeland Security is another day of pathetic disservice to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have been to the border. I have been many times, and I have seen how understaffed, unsupported, and underresourced the Customs and Border Patrol is. My friends on the other side of the aisle might have you believe it is not because of a lack of funding. While more funding may be helpful for better technology or building and repairing the border wall, it will not make up for the time spent by Customs and Border Patrol agents at the funerals of their coworkers or time spent wondering if they are next.

It is shameful that these brave men and women aren't getting the support that they need. The Biden administration's policy of open borders and amnesty is killing Americans, and Alejandro Mayorkas, whose primary job it is to secure the homeland, refuses to do his job.

The worsening conditions of the men and women who have sworn to protect our border and actually honored that oath is unacceptable. We must hold those accountable who have willfully refused to honor their oath.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also allows for consideration of H.R. 485, the Protecting Health Care for All Patients Act, that I introduced along with Chairwoman MCMORRIS RODGERS of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Chairman SMITH, and my friend from Ohio, Dr. WENSTRUP. This bill aims to preserve access to lifesaving cures and to prevent discrimination for Americans with disabilities.

I practiced medicine for nearly 30 years. I treated each patient as a human being, not just a diagnosis. Quality-adjusted life years measure-

ments are cruel and hinder the physician's ability to care for and treat all patients with dignity. The government should never be able to decide or determine the value of a life to approve or deny care.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago, the Affordable Care Act banned Medicare from using quality-adjusted life years, a metric often used in cost-effective analyses widely known to discriminate against people with disabilities. The purpose of the quality-adjusted life year metric assigns a person living with a disability a lower value of a year of life than a person who is considered to be in good health.

The quality-adjusted life year often fails to consider outcomes meaningful to patients, such as the impact on the ability to work or the impact on caregiving needs. In a quality-adjusted life year base assessment, a person living with conditions like heart disease, ALS, or sickle cell disease will be considered to be of less worth than someone else.

Often, quality-adjusted life years are used by countries that have government-controlled healthcare systems to devalue treatment for those with chronic conditions and disabilities. This concept has been pushed by socialist healthcare advocates for years. Thankfully, the United States of America has not fallen totally prey to these harmful ideologies, at least not yet.

I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that the first quality-adjusted life year ban within the Affordable Care Act passed with strong Democrat support. Therefore, this bill should be passed with strong Democrat support, as well.

It is not the government's place to determine whether a person living with a chronic condition or a disability is of less worth. This is why we need to prohibit the use of quality-adjusted life years in all Federal programs and ensure that all human life has inherent value. Republicans will continue to work to reduce the government's hand in healthcare, and I urge colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 485.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rule and the underlying bills. I urge my fellow Members to support the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This impeachment resolution was supposed to be our second rule of the day. We had an emergency meeting last week in the Rules Committee about fixing SALT. Everybody hurry up, it is an emergency. Better do it right away so we can vote quickly. Then—get this—last night a change was made to pull their emergency bill from the schedule. It was such an emergency that Republicans decided it is not an emergency at all.

Not only did their bill not even fix the problem that they, themselves, created, it is not even going to come to the floor now because of their inability to govern. This majority is so incompetent, they couldn't even manufacture a fake vote to pretend New York Republicans are good at legislating.

We wasted hours last Thursday at the Rules Committee debating a rule that has now been pulled from consideration—and for what? Will the gentleman from Texas tell us next that he is glad he had to sit through a hearing on a rule his leadership can't even bring up because they are so bad at governing? This Republican-led House is an unmitigated disaster. I would say it is a clown show, but that would be a disservice to actual working clowns.

That brings us to the second emergency rule. Mr. Speaker, impeachment is one of the most solemn, serious, somber things that we can do in this body. It is not something that ought to get thrown around lightly or invoked when you disagree with someone or you don't like their policies or you think they are doing a bad job.

It is something that should happen after a grave constitutional offense has been committed, a crime against the Republic. The Founders in Article I reserve it only for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Consequently, today, I am very confused because our Republican colleagues have presented zero evidence for impeachment. This could be the first time in American history an impeachment will go to the floor of the United States House of Representatives with no evidence, no proof, no elements of a crime, nothing at all.

You don't have to take my word for it. Listen to the lead Republican for immigration policy, our colleague, TOM MCCLINTOCK. He says: "The problem is they [the Articles] fail to identify an impeachable crime that Mayorkas has committed. In effect, they stretch and distort the Constitution in order to hold the administration accountable. . . ."

Another Republican, KEN BUCK, says: Secretary Mayorkas did not commit an impeachable offense and is not guilty of high crimes or misdemeanors.

These are not my words. These are your fellow colleagues, Mr. Speaker, openly admitting that these vague, unprecedented Articles of Impeachment trivialize this process and make a total mockery of this institution. What does this impeachment have to do with fixing our challenges at the border? Nothing at all.

They say this is about securing the border, and their plan to secure the border is to impeach the guy responsible for securing the border and replace him with—now wait for this, wait for it—they aren't sure. The chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security couldn't tell us during our Rules Committee meeting who will replace Secretary Mayorkas if he were removed. I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

For months and months and months, Republicans have said that they would shut down the government, they would default on our debt, refuse to do anything unless we passed a border bill. Well, good news. Senate Republicans worked out a border bill, and the person who negotiated it for Republicans, Senator LANKFORD, was someone Donald Trump endorsed. Donald Trump said that Senator LANKFORD is "strong on the border." Therefore, I am shocked by the Republican rejection of Senator LANKFORD's bill.

Before we even saw what was in it, before the ink was even dry on the discussion draft, Donald Trump came out, and he ordered them to kill it. He ordered them to do nothing to fix our broken immigration system. They would rather let chaos prevail than work with Democrats to have a conversation about a path forward.

Here is the truth, Mr. Speaker. Republicans simply do not want to participate in government. They want to create chaos. They want to create confusion, and they want to create a campaign issue for Donald Trump going into the next election. They are not interested in solving problems. They only want to gain power.

That is the real dereliction of duty here: House Republicans' refusal to address our challenges at the border because Donald Trump told them he wants a crisis so he can help his campaign, so he can hide from his crimes.

Well, they own this now. Republicans own this now. They own the border. They own the fentanyl crisis. They own it all because they refuse to behave like adults. They are acting like spoiled, rotten children who got what they want and still can't take "yes" for an answer, but they own all of this now.

If anyone needs more proof than that, look no further than the sponsor of this resolution—MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, a MAGA extremist who amplifies Holocaust deniers, who said 9/11 was a hoax, who says wildfires are started by Jewish space lasers. That is the legislative and intellectual force behind this impeachment resolution. In fact, if it passes, she is going to be an impeachment manager on the floor of the United States Senate. God help us.

It is just more proof that this is fraudulent, unconstitutional garbage, but Donald Trump wants another fraudulent impeachment, another distraction from his own legal troubles, another excuse to kill a bipartisan border deal instead of working across the aisle to get something done.

Here we are, because Trump calls the shots around here. He directed Speaker JOHNSON and extreme MAGA Republicans not to work with Democrats to address challenges at the border. One thing we know, Republicans work for Trump, not for the voters. They worship and they work for Donald Trump, who doesn't care about anybody but himself. They are frightened to death of the former President.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas is a good man, a decent man, someone who is trying to do his job despite the fact that Republicans refuse to give him the tools needed to do what they are asking him to do. He is an honorable public servant who respects law enforcement and takes seriously his oath of office and his obligation to uphold and enforce the law.

In smearing his good name, Republicans are only impeaching themselves and showing that all their rhetoric about the border has been nothing more than a bunch of BS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I get no great joy being on the floor of the House of Representatives and talking about something as important and solemn as the removal of a Secretary of one of our Departments, particularly one as important as the Department that is in charge of homeland security. This is an individual who was appointed and then confirmed by the United States Senate. Impeachment is one of the highest charges we have as Members of the United States House of Representatives.

The charge by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the ranking member on the Rules Committee, that this is a political exercise or that there are individuals taking "orders" from former President Trump, I think indicates the extent to which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle desperately want to make this political.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle desperately want to take the abject and total failure of Democrat leadership on the southern border, resulting in death and destruction of the American people, the undermining of economic activity, the death of our children, fentanyl pouring into schools, ranchers who are getting absolutely decimated, the empowerment of cartels, and the empowerment of China.

This has all happened at record levels, record numbers, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this. Therefore, they are desperately trying to deflect, deflect to legislation that was political and never had a chance to move from the Senate to the House, never had a chance to move, but they want to be able to deflect. They want to deflect an entire conversation about the failures of President Biden and the failures of Secretary Mayorkas to secure the border by not having a serious conversation about why we would be bringing Articles of Impeachment against a sitting Secretary.

□ 1245

The reason is simple: The Secretary of Homeland Security has blatantly ignored the laws of the United States he is charged to faithfully execute.

He has done so with reckless abandon. He has done so in a way that has

led directly to the death of American citizens and to the death of the very migrants that the Secretary suggests they want to try to help.

A thousand migrants along the southwest border are dead, and 53 migrants died in a tractor-trailer in San Antonio last year in the district I represent. Mr. Speaker, 75,000 Americans died from fentanyl poisoning last year.

These numbers are off the charts, at levels we have never seen before, and they are the direct result of the policies enacted by the Biden administration but very specifically by the Secretary of Homeland Security. It is his leadership of that Department that has led to an abject failure of the Department to secure the border.

It is not the line men and women of the Border Patrol or ICE who are out there trying to do their jobs. They are being denied the ability to do their jobs because the Secretary won't let them. The Secretary has turned them into processing machines. He has done so intentionally to flood the zone, and they basically acknowledge that.

He has turned the law upside down. The basic law requiring that they have operational control of the border, that we stop the flow, that you have to have papers to come to the United States has been turned upside down.

In its place, the administration, and specifically Secretary Mayorkas, has used exceptions to swallow the rule: exceptions for asylum, exceptions under parole that are supposed to be on a case-by-case basis, based on our benevolence as human beings to try to help people, a bipartisan desire to do so. We have been made to swallow the rule of actual border security. As a result, the numbers have been astounding.

The key considerations, of course, are the types of individuals that are coming into the United States. We are not talking about some workers who want to go from Nuevo Laredo to Laredo or Juarez to El Paso. We are talking about dangerous individuals from all over the globe, including 331 that have been encountered that are associated with terrorist organizations under this administration, under Mayorkas' watch, which compares to 11 under President Trump.

They say: Well, aren't they doing their job? They encountered them. No. Those numbers indicate who we are finding, not the 50,000 a month or so got-aways that are pouring into the United States.

Now we see cops being beaten in the streets of New York by people who are here illegally walking out of the court with no bail and flicking off the American people.

We have a woman being dragged out of a parking garage in New York by migrant gangs, dragged through the streets of New York.

We have all sorts of danger to the American people, people like a cheerleader getting killed in Texas by somebody here illegally and an illegal who posed as an unaccompanied child who

lived with a family in Florida and then killed the family.

That is what we have happening in the United States of America, and it is directly a consequence of a Secretary of Homeland Security who is failing to secure the homeland as he is charged to do when he takes an oath to fulfill his duty to carry out the laws of the United States.

If the Attorney General just went out and ordered all the United States attorneys and prosecutors and assistant U.S. attorneys to stop enforcing the law, allow reckless abandon, he should be impeached. That is, in fact, a high crime and misdemeanor.

This is where I disagree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and a few, I think, on my side of the aisle, this notion of high crimes and misdemeanors and what it includes or does not include. It most certainly includes officials in the administration, in the executive branch, who are completely refusing to carry out their duty. Literally, his job is to secure the homeland, and he is refusing to do it.

The fact of the matter is, some of my colleagues have concerns about issues of maladministration and so forth. If you believe this is maladministration—and I do not. I think it goes beyond maladministration. It is the purposeful, willing ignoring of the law to endanger the American people. It goes beyond maladministration.

Even if you accept the notion that it is maladministration, I keep hearing people say: Well, the Founders rejected maladministration.

The fact of the matter is Colonel Mason put it forward. Mr. Gerry put it forward, seconded it. Mr. Madison raised a concern. He said the term would be equivalent to a tenure during pleasure of the Senate.

There was some debate. Gouverneur Morris, Colonel Mason withdrew maladministration. There was no vote. There was no affirmative rejection of it. There was a debate. They withdrew. Instead, in its place, he substituted—the language was not there at the time—other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Now, you go back and say: Well, what does that mean? Well, I wasn't there. You can go back and look. There are debates about what it meant.

One thing is, British common law had developed a definition of high crimes and misdemeanors that included but was not limited to maladministration.

Now, this is a debate worthy of academic debate, but the fact is, it is up to us. There are no elements of the crime in the Constitution. There is no specific requirement that there be a violation of statute. There is no mens rea in the Constitution. It is for us and us alone to determine.

When the Secretary violates his duty to the Constitution, violates his oath to defend the people of the United States and secure the homeland, then it is incumbent upon this body to call

out and reject that Secretary—in this case, that Secretary being Secretary Mayorkas.

There are other tools at our disposal, but there are not many. We have the power of the purse. We should use it. That is a speech for another time.

One last point on this notion that somehow by rejecting the bill that the Senate was debating and that, by the way, has not been sent to us—the Senate is merely debating it. They are not even debating it yet. They haven't even proceeded to it yet. They haven't even gotten past cloture on proceeding to it yet.

Why? Because it is fundamentally flawed. The bill does not do what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are suggesting it does.

I am sorry. You are getting punched in the head 10 times. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to say: Well, sorry. We will just start punching you in the head five times. Why won't you take that half a loaf?

I am sorry. That is not how this works. That is not what we are here to do. We are actually here to stop the flow.

That bill was flawed. It would have set essentially in permanent stone, effectively, mass migration. It has 250,000 visas and 250,000 work permits.

It enconces alternatives to detention as part of how the releases would work for asylum claims. It would spend \$4 billion to hire up new asylum officers by this administration, by this Secretary, who has the power right now to stop this flow but refuses to use it.

The President of the United States could use 212(f) right now and stop the flow. The Secretary could apply the laws the way they are supposed to be applied with respect to asylum and parole. He could stop it right now but refuses to do so.

We are here to defend the people of the United States who don't have a voice. We are here to stand up for the forgotten men and women of this country who are tired of getting rolled over.

That is why we are here, and the Secretary of Homeland Security deserves to be held accountable. I rise in support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas just took almost 10 minutes—10 minutes of my life which I will never get back—and still didn't get it right, which is basically that this move to impeach Secretary Mayorkas is a sham. There is no basis for this.

Just because you don't like the guy or disagree with the policies of this administration is not a reason—it is not a high crime and misdemeanor. It is not a reason to move forward on impeachment.

I am listening to the gentleman and also my colleague from Texas. Republicans are really good about complaining about things, talking about what the problems are. We agree with

some of the things that have been highlighted, that they are problems. What my Republican friends are not really good at is actually solving a problem or getting to yes on anything.

The gentleman from Texas said: Oh, we are asked to consider a Senate bill that the Senate hasn't acted on. Wait a minute. The Speaker of this House of Representatives has already said he will not have a vote in this House, no matter what happens in the United States Senate.

Donald Trump, the guy you are all afraid of, has been making calls saying: You better not do this. You better not do this.

The author of this Senate bill—again, I haven't read it all—there is lots of stuff in it that gives me heartburn, from what I can tell, but the guy who wrote it was a Senator from Oklahoma who Donald Trump says is strong on the border.

I will repeat what I said before: What we are doing today does nothing to help anything at the border—not a thing, not one thing.

Any opportunity to do something requires working in a bipartisan way to move a bill forward, which apparently my Republican friends here in the House do not want to do.

That is a shame, but here is the deal: You now own this. This is a problem that you are maintaining, that you have deliberately decided that you will own, because you will do nothing.

You are blocking any attempt for any kind of legislation to come to this floor that has a chance of passing in a bipartisan way and getting signed into law. You are doing it. Even the Border Patrol union has endorsed what the Senate is doing.

I haven't read the whole thing yet. I bet you none of you have either. Even before the ink was dry on the draft copy, Trump gave you the orders to kill it, and that is where we are.

Complaining about a problem, I get it. Maybe it used to be good politics, but here is what I am predicting. The American people are watching. They are now seeing how this works. If we want a bill, if we want to work in a bipartisan way, there is a bipartisan coalition that developed in the Senate, led by a very conservative Republican Senator, and they come up with a bill. As soon as they do: No, we don't want to solve the problem. We want to continue the problem for political purposes.

So now you own all of this. You own all of this.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reasonable Republicans and even The Wall Street Journal editorial board have written that this impeachment does not qualify as high crimes and misdemeanors.

The board wrote: "Grandstanding is easier than governing, and Republicans have to decide whether to accomplish anything other than impeaching Democrats. . . . [I]mpeaching him accomplishes nothing beyond political symbolism." That is right. It is political symbolism. It is political theater.

Our immigration system is broken. We have been saying it, and we have been offering up a bipartisan solution that Republicans have refused to take up.

They just blew up a bipartisan deal in the Senate. They refuse to provide Secretary Mayorkas the resources and legal changes he needs to reform the immigration system so our border is secure, our policies are humane, and our country is richer, thanks to the immeasurable contributions of our immigrant workforce.

Instead, we have a clown show directed by MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE. If we vote for this sham impeachment in the House, she will have the power to march over to the Senate and stop all their work. She will stop work on a budget that we need to keep our government open. She will stop work on the farm bill, which my rural communities need. She will stop work on policies to lower costs and expand the middle class.

Extreme Republicans have answered The Wall Street Journal's question: Do they want to govern? They don't want to govern. They want chaos, chaos at the border, chaos in Congress. They put chaos over people.

They always put politics over people. We cannot trust them to reform our immigration system in a bipartisan manner.

They continue to use immigration as a political bulldozer to destroy and divide. Their abuse of this solemn impeachment process shows us we cannot trust them with our Constitution. We cannot trust them.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, what is needed is border security. What is needed is border protection. Immigration reform can come later after border security is established.

So a discussion about what is happening over in the Senate, to me, until you get the border secured, you have no opportunity to discuss any type of immigration reform.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas to ask this question:

Does he agree or disagree that to change enforcement we must change the law? Does he agree that we need to change the law if we are going to change enforcement?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the gentleman to enforce existing law as a starting point.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I

am using Dr. BURGESS' words from 6/18/2018 when he said: We know that to change enforcement we must change the law.

Then he went on to talk about immigration bills that we might consider in Congress, and he talked about the importance of legislation, and this is how democracy works.

So the bottom line is, Republicans are really good about complaining but they are not so good at legislating. They are not so good at getting things done. When things begin to move in the direction where we may get something done, then they back away and they say no. They can't get to yes on anything.

That is not leadership. That is not governing. That is, frankly, incompetence. When Trump was President my friends were saying one thing, and now that Biden is President, they are saying another thing.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is if we are going to get something done, we need to come together in a bipartisan way. That is what has begun to happen over in the Senate.

For the life of me, I do not understand why the Speaker of the House of Representatives, why my colleagues on the Republican side, one after another after another do not want to do anything.

Well, you know what, if you do not want to do anything, that means you are satisfied with the status quo and you own this problem. This is a problem of your creation because we are trying to fix it and we are trying to work in a bipartisan way.

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 a central reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

Far too many States have enacted laws to either ban some or all abortions, which many Republicans have declared numerous times is their goal.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK) to discuss that proposal.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 12, the Women's Health Protection Act of 2023.

As a woman, a mother of two teenagers, and a Member of Congress, I was proud to cosponsor this legislation, and look forward to the day when we as a Congress enshrine a Federal law to reestablish a nationwide right to abortion.

Abortion is healthcare, and access to healthcare saves many lives.

In Texas, Kate Cox was forced to flee her home State to receive lifesaving care after the Texas Supreme Court decided she wasn't close enough to dying to receive an abortion, despite four emergency room visits, elevated vitals, and a risk of uterine rupture.

In my home State of Florida, Deborah Dorbert was forced to give birth to her son, who died in her arms shortly after he was born, just as doctors predicted. For an agonizing 13 weeks, Deborah was forced to carry a baby she knew would die, which left her with severe anxiety and depression.

In Ohio, Brittany Watts, a Black woman, was criminally charged after having a miscarriage at home, after doctors found that her water broke prematurely and the fetus she was carrying would not survive.

In the wake of the Supreme Court overturning half a century of precedent, we have women nationwide who are at risk of losing their lives every single day.

Women in States with abortion bans are nearly three times more likely to die from childbirth, and Black women have the highest maternal mortality rates in the U.S., three times higher than White women.

Being forced to give birth means Black women will die, and if they don't die, they will be jailed for miscarrying an unviable fetus.

This could be your wife, your daughter, your sister, or even me, whose life is at risk unless we receive an abortion. How can any doctor tell a woman that her life cannot be saved when we know it can.

This is reprehensible. Congress must pass H.R. 12, the Women's Healthcare Protection Act of 2023.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CHU for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I further inquire as to engaging in personalities or destruction of personalities? Is that something we are now doing on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to respond to hypotheticals or provide advisory opinions.

Mr. BURGESS. It wasn't a hypothetical; it was what was said on the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded that remarks should be addressed to the Chair and not to engage in personalities.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk about existing authority that the President has today that he could use to solve the problem at our southern border. He could end catch and release, reinstate

the remain in Mexico policy, enter into asylum cooperative agreements with other countries, end parole abuses, detain inadmissible aliens, use expedited removal, rein in taxpayer-funded benefits for people who are in the country illegally, and issue a proclamation to suspend or restrict entry.

All those are available to the President right now, today, to solve this problem.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman from Texas confuses me because not too long ago—and I will use one of his quotes—he said: “President Trump has presented a clear path forward; however, he cannot solve this crisis alone.”

Those are the gentleman's words.

Congress must stand ready to put partisan politics aside and pass meaningful solutions, but now all of a sudden Joe Biden can do it alone?

I mean, when Trump was President, he needed Congress, according to the gentleman, to give him the ability to be able to do what he wants on the border. Now, all of a sudden, it is a different story because it is a different President.

Mr. Speaker, let me also address something that the other gentleman from Texas mentioned in his 10 minutes of remarks when he said something about this isn't about politics.

I would point out that in April of 2023, Chairman GREEN, who is the chair of the Homeland Security Committee, promised Republican donors that he would produce an impeachment case against Secretary Mayorkas—before donors.

According to a recording of Chairman GREEN's remarks to campaign contributors, he said: “On April 19, next week, get the popcorn—Alejandro Mayorkas comes before our committee, and it's going to be fun.”

Chairman GREEN also said: “That'll really be just the beginning for him.”

The chairman said those things 2 months prior to the committee formally announcing its so-called investigation—2 months prior, Mr. Speaker.

He already promised his Republican donors that he would deliver impeachment charges.

To be clear, this entire impeachment process has had a predetermined outcome. This has nothing to do with a legitimate case for impeachment, but it has everything to do with Republicans' mission to distract, deflect, and exact revenge for President Biden winning the 2022 election.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the New York Times article titled: “Key Republican Tells Donors He Will Pursue Impeachment of Mayorkas.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 2023]

KEY REPUBLICAN TELLS DONORS HE WILL

PURSUE IMPEACHMENT OF MAYORKAS

(By Karoun Demirjian)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee promised donors this month that he would produce an impeachment case against the Biden administration's homeland security chief, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, saying that the secretary's appearance before the panel this week would be the beginning of his demise.

Representative Mark E. Green told an enthusiastic crowd in his home state of Tennessee last week that his committee would expose Mr. Mayorkas's “dereliction of duty and his intentional destruction of our country through the open southern border.” He said the panel would deliver charges to the House Judiciary Committee, which handles impeachment proceedings, according to an audio recording of a House Freedom Caucus fund-raiser obtained by The New York Times.

He said he had a “five-phase plan” for doing so and that the Homeland Security Committee would “put together a packet, and we will hand it to Jim Jordan and let Jim do what Jim does best.”

Mr. Green apparently was referring to Representative Jim Jordan, the Ohio Republican who leads the Judiciary panel. His comments made clear that G.O.P. leaders are serious about their threats to impeach Mr. Mayorkas. He said the plan would start with an appearance by the secretary before his committee on Wednesday.

“On April 19, next week, get the popcorn—Alejandro Mayorkas comes before our committee, and it's going to be fun,” Mr. Green told the room, adding: “That'll really be just the beginning for him.”

A spokeswoman for Mr. Green did not respond to requests for comment.

Mr. Green and other Republican leaders have made no secret of their desire to pursue impeachment charges against Mr. Mayorkas. Speaker Kevin McCarthy began threatening to impeach him months before Mr. McCarthy won his gavel. But their ambitions have been limited thus far by the political realities of the House; not every Republican wants to demonize Mr. Mayorkas as solely responsible for the country's immigration problems, and with a slim majority, party leaders do not yet have the votes to impeach him.

As a result, Mr. Green and other House Republicans in positions of authority have been careful to avoid promising publicly that they would find evidence against Mr. Mayorkas worthy of prosecution. Behind closed doors with core supporters, however, Mr. Green was less cautious, using the issue to whip up the crowd.

During a public session on Capitol Hill on Tuesday before the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, Republicans hammered Mr. Mayorkas both for the border situation and for recent revelations, documented in an investigation by The New York Times, that unaccompanied migrant children have been exploited as laborers. Both Senators Ron Johnson of Wisconsin and Josh Hawley of Missouri demanded that the secretary resign.

Mr. Mayorkas pushed back, saying his department was not responsible for the child labor crisis.

“You are incorrectly attributing it to our policies,” he told Mr. Hawley. He also disputed the idea that he could be held personally responsible for the problems at the border, telling senators: “Our asylum system is broken, our entire immigration system is broken, and in desperate need of reform—and it's been so for years and years.”

The Department of Homeland Security has dismissed calls for Mr. Mayorkas to step down as “baseless” and “reckless,” and Mr. Mayorkas has suggested in past interviews that the efforts to impeach him were simply a way of turbocharging policy disputes with the administration.

Mr. Green made his comments at an event billed as a “V.I.P. Reception and Conversation with Conservative Heroes,” where he appeared behind closed doors alongside Mr. Jordan and other hard-right Republicans. He pointed to recent testimony before his panel by Raul L. Ortiz, the Border Patrol chief, who detailed “an increase in flow” in five of the nine sectors along the U.S.-Mexico border and said it had “caused a considerable strain on our resources.”

He also recalled Mr. Ortiz’s testimony that the United States does not have “operational control” of the southern border, which Republicans seized on to accuse Mr. Mayorkas, who had testified that the border is secure, of dishonesty. Mr. Mayorkas addressed the apparent discrepancy during a separate hearing last month, telling senators that he was using a different definition of “operational security,” and that the two statements were not in conflict.

Mr. Green nonetheless trumpeted Mr. Ortiz’s words as a kill shot against Mr. Mayorkas, telling the donors that “he’ll see that video a couple of times” during the upcoming hearing before the Homeland Security panel.

The secretary’s appearances on Capitol Hill this week come as the Republican House is barreling ahead with what Mr. Green told donors would be “the most conservative border security bill that this Congress has ever seen, or any Congress has ever seen.” The panel is expected to debate that bill next week.

On Wednesday, while Mr. Mayorkas is testifying before the Homeland Security panel, the Judiciary Committee is scheduled to debate a second border security bill aimed at restricting migrant inflows, including by restricting access to asylum and requiring all employers to adopt an electronic system that screens prospective employees’ eligibility to work.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am very distressed about is that many of my Republican colleagues who are upset that Donald Trump lost the last election and they were not able to overturn the free and fair results of that election, they are upset that they didn’t get their way, and they weren’t able to overturn the results.

So now this is kind of a continuation of that effort to deny the legitimate results of the election. This in many respects is a continuation of what happened here on January 6, and it really is sad.

There is another election coming up in November. I predict that my friends will understand better than that their policy of obstruction, impeachment, distraction, and not wanting to solve problems, I think they will realize that when people go to the ballot box, that is not what they want.

The American people want us to work together to get something done. We have a serious situation at the border. We are trying to provide President Biden with the tools to be able to act. Just as my friend said that Donald Trump needed the legislative tools to be able to get what he wanted to get

done—and unfortunately, notwithstanding some very impressive bipartisan cooperation in the Senate—my friends here have decided to reject everything; anything that might solve the problem; anything that might ease the situation at the border; anything that might help our Border Patrol agents, anything that will do anything to be able to solve this problem they are against.

It is pathetic that that is the state that we are in right now.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that we have is that President Biden will not use any of the tools he has in his toolbox, and now he is asking for additional tools.

The other problem is codifying 5,000 illegal immigrants a day, 2 million a year, is not, in anyone’s estimation, a solution to a problem.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this is not about Secretary Mayorkas or a high crime and misdemeanor. It is about a policy disagreement with President Biden.

Again, it is interesting to point out that when Trump was President, he couldn’t do things because Congress didn’t give him the tools. Biden is asking for more tools, and my Republican friends don’t want to do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I have a memo here, released today on the arguments regarding impeaching Secretary Mayorkas, offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement, Mr. McCLINTOCK.

In listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle, surely you would assume that the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, the lead Republican on immigration issues, would conclude in his memo that this impeachment is necessary and warranted. But, no, you would be wrong.

In fact, he concludes the exact opposite, and Mr. McCLINTOCK has said he will vote “no” on impeaching the Secretary.

Now, I would ask unanimous consent to put the entire memo into the RECORD, but it is so exhaustive in its analysis of how this impeachment is a bunch of garbage, that the memo exceeds the page limit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me just read a quick excerpt instead.

He writes: “The problem is that they fail to identify an impeachable crime that Mayorkas has committed. In effect, they stretch and distort the Constitution in order to hold the administration accountable. . . .”

“Stretch and distort”: Those are the words of the Republican chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague from California, who came to the well and basically called it as he sees it. He told the truth.

We need some more truth around here. This is a sham. This is a dangerous precedent to go down.

To impeach somebody because of a policy disagreement, I tell you, this is not what we should be doing. I am hoping that there are Republicans on the other side of the aisle who still believe in the Constitution and in this institution and who will reject this.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a memo prepared by the Secretary of Homeland Security, released on September 30, 2021, discussing the Secretary being there to enforce the laws.

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

There was no objection.

SEPTEMBER 30, 2021.

Memorandum To: Tae D. Johnson, Acting Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

CC: Troy Miller, Acting Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Ur Jaddou, Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; Robert Silvers, Under Secretary, Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans; Katherine Culliton-González, Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties; Lynn Parker Dupree, Chief Privacy Officer, Privacy Office.

From: Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary.
Subject: Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Law.

This memorandum provides guidance for the apprehension and removal of noncitizens.

I am grateful to you, the other leaders of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and our frontline personnel for the candor and openness of the engagements we have had to help shape this guidance. Thank you especially for dedicating yourselves—all your talent and energy—to the noble law enforcement profession. In executing our solemn responsibility to enforce immigration law with honor and integrity, we can help achieve justice and realize our ideals as a Nation. Our colleagues on the front lines and throughout the organization make this possible at great personal sacrifice.

I. FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE: THE EXERCISE OF PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION

It is well established in the law that federal government officials have broad discretion to decide who should be subject to arrest, detainers, removal proceedings, and the execution of removal orders. The exercise of prosecutorial discretion in the immigration arena is a deep-rooted tradition. The United States Supreme Court stated this clearly in 2012:

“A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all.”

In an opinion by Justice Scalia about twelve years earlier, the Supreme Court emphasized that enforcement discretion extends throughout the entire removal process, and at each stage of it the executive has the discretion to not pursue it.

It is estimated that there are more than 11 million undocumented or otherwise removable noncitizens in the United States. We do not have the resources to apprehend and seek the removal of every one of these noncitizens. Therefore, we need to exercise our discretion and determine whom to prioritize for immigration enforcement action.

In exercising our discretion, we are guided by the fact that the majority of undocumented noncitizens who could be subject to removal have been contributing members of our communities for years. They include individuals who work on the frontlines in the battle against COVID, lead our congregations of faith, teach our children, do back-breaking farm work to help deliver food to our table, and contribute in many other meaningful ways. Numerous times over the years, and presently, bipartisan groups of leaders have recognized these noncitizens' contributions to state and local communities and have tried to pass legislation that would provide a path to citizenship or other lawful status for the approximately 11 million undocumented noncitizens.

The fact an individual is a removable noncitizen therefore should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them. We will use our discretion and focus our enforcement resources in a more targeted way. Justice and our country's well-being require it.

By exercising our discretionary authority in a targeted way, we can focus our efforts on those who pose a threat to national security, public safety, and border security and thus threaten America's well-being. We do not lessen our commitment to enforce immigration law to the best of our ability. This is how we use the resources we have in a way that accomplishes our enforcement mission most effectively and justly.

II. CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES

We establish civil immigration enforcement priorities to most effectively achieve our goals with the resources we have. We will prioritize for apprehension and removal noncitizens who are a threat to out national security, public safety, and border security.

A. Threat to National Security

A noncitizen who engaged in or is suspected of terrorism or espionage, or terrorism-related or espionage-related activities, or who otherwise poses a danger to national security, is a priority for apprehension and removal.

B. Threat to Public Safety

A noncitizen who poses a current threat to public safety, typically because of serious criminal conduct, is a priority for apprehension and removal.

Whether a noncitizen poses a current threat to public safety is not to be determined according to bright lines or categories. It instead requires an assessment of the individual and the totality of the facts and circumstances.

There can be aggravating factors that militate in favor of enforcement action. Such factors can include, for example:

- the gravity of the offense of conviction and the sentence imposed;
- the nature and degree of harm caused by the criminal offense;
- the sophistication of the criminal offense; use or threatened use of a firearm or dangerous weapon;
- a serious prior criminal record.

Conversely, there can be mitigating factors that militate in favor of declining enforcement action. Such factors can include, for example:

- advanced or tender age;
- lengthy presence in the United States;

a mental condition that may have contributed to the criminal conduct, or a physical or mental condition requiring care or treatment;

status as a victim of crime or victim, witness, or party in legal proceedings;

the impact of removal on family in the United States, such as loss of provider or caregiver;

whether the noncitizen may be eligible for humanitarian protection or other immigration relief;

military or other public service of the noncitizen or their immediate family;

time since an offense and evidence of rehabilitation;

conviction was vacated or expunged.

The above examples of aggravating and mitigating factors are not exhaustive. The circumstances under which an offense was committed could, for example, be an aggravating or mitigating factor depending on the facts. The broader public interest is also material in determining whether to take enforcement action. For example, a categorical determination that a domestic violence offense compels apprehension and removal could make victims of domestic violence more reluctant to report the offense conduct. The specific facts of a case should be determinative.

Again, our personnel must evaluate the individual and the totality of the facts and circumstances and exercise their judgment accordingly. The overriding question is whether the noncitizen poses a current threat to public safety. Some of the factors relevant to making the determination are identified above.

The decision how to exercise prosecutorial discretion can be complicated and requires investigative work. Our personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction or the result of a database search alone. Rather, our personnel should, to the fullest extent possible, obtain and review the entire criminal and administrative record and other investigative information to learn of the totality of the facts and circumstances of the conduct at issue. The gravity of an apprehension and removal on a noncitizen's life, and potentially the life of family members and the community, warrants the dedication of investigative and evaluative effort.

C. Threat to Border Security

A noncitizen who poses a threat to border security is a priority for apprehension and removal.

A noncitizen is a threat to border security if:

(a) they are apprehended at the border or port of entry while attempting to unlawfully enter the United States; or

(b) they are apprehended in the United States after unlawfully entering after November 1, 2020.

There could be other border security cases that present compelling facts that warrant enforcement action. In each case, there could be mitigating or extenuating facts and circumstances that militate in favor of declining enforcement action. Our personnel should evaluate the totality of the facts and circumstances and exercise their judgment accordingly.

III. PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

We must exercise our discretionary authority in a way that protects civil rights and civil liberties. The integrity of our work and our Department depend on it. A noncitizen's race, religion, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity, national origin, or political associations shall never be factors in deciding to take enforcement action. A noncitizen's exercise of their First Amendment rights also should never be a factor in decid-

ing to take enforcement action. We must ensure that enforcement actions are not discriminatory and do not lead to inequitable outcomes.

This guidance does not prohibit consideration of one or more of the above-mentioned factors if they are directly relevant to status under immigration law or eligibility for an immigration benefit. For example, religion or political beliefs are often directly relevant in asylum cases and need to be assessed in determining a case's merit.

State and local law enforcement agencies with which we work must respect individuals' civil rights and civil liberties as well.

IV. GUARDING AGAINST THE USE OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT AS A TOOL OF RETALIATION FOR THE ASSERTION OF LEGAL RIGHTS

Our society benefits when individuals—citizens and noncitizens alike—assert their rights by participating in court proceedings or investigations by agencies enforcing our labor, housing, and other laws.

It is an unfortunate reality that unscrupulous employers exploit their employees' immigration status and vulnerability to removal by, for example, suppressing wages, maintaining unsafe working conditions, and quashing workplace rights and activities. Similarly, unscrupulous landlords exploit their tenants' immigration status and vulnerability to removal by, for example, charging inflated rental costs and failing to comply with housing ordinances and other relevant housing standards.

We must ensure our immigration enforcement authority is not used as an instrument of these and other unscrupulous practices. A noncitizen's exercise of workplace or tenant rights, or service as a witness in a labor or housing dispute, should be considered a mitigating factor in the exercise of prosecutorial discretion.

V. THE QUALITY AND INTEGRITY OF OUR CIVIL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

The civil immigration enforcement guidance does not compel an action to be taken or not taken. Instead, the guidance leaves the exercise of prosecutorial discretion to the judgment of our personnel.

To ensure the quality and integrity of our civil immigration enforcement actions, and to achieve consistency in the application of our judgments, the following measures are to be taken before the effective date of this guidance:

A. Training

Extensive training materials and a continuous training program should be put in place to ensure the successful application of this guidance.

B. Process for Reviewing Effective Implementation

A review process should be put in place to ensure the rigorous review of our personnel's enforcement decisions throughout the first ninety (90) days of implementation of this guidance. The review process should seek to achieve quality and consistency in decision-making across the entire agency and the Department. It should therefore involve the relevant chains of command.

Longer-term review processes should be put in place following the initial 90-day period, drawing on the lessons learned. Assessment of implementation of this guidance should be continuous.

C. Data Collection

We will need to collect detailed, precise, and comprehensive data as to every aspect of the enforcement actions we take pursuant to this guidance, both to ensure the quality and integrity of our work and to achieve accountability for it.

Please work with the offices of the Chief Information Officer; Strategy, Policy, and Plans; Science and Technology; Civil Rights

and Civil Liberties; and Privacy to determine the data that should be collected, the mechanisms to collect it, and how and to what extent it can be made public.

D. Case Review Process

We will work to establish a fair and equitable case review process to afford noncitizens and their representatives the opportunity to obtain expeditious review of the enforcement actions taken. Discretion to determine the disposition of the case will remain exclusively with the Department.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDANCE

This guidance will become effective in sixty (60) days, on November 29, 2021. Upon the effective date, this guidance will serve to rescind (1) the January 20, 2021 Interim Revision to Civil Immigration Enforcement and Removal Policies and Priorities issued by then-Acting Secretary David Pekoske, and (2) the Interim Guidance: Civil Immigration Enforcement and Removal Priorities issued by Acting ICE Director Tae D. Johnson.

We will meet regularly to review the data, discuss the results to date, and assess whether we are achieving our goals effectively. Our assessment will be informed by feedback we receive from our law enforcement, community, and other partners.

This guidance is Department-wide. Agency leaders as to whom this guidance is relevant to their operations will implement this guidance accordingly.

VII. STATEMENT OF NO PRIVATE RIGHT CONFERRED

This guidance is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter.

Mr. BURGESS. In this memo, he basically says he is going to make the laws that he then purports to enforce.

He bemoans the fact that there is no path for citizenship that has been established, but then goes on to say: "The fact an individual is a removable noncitizen therefore should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them."

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Michael Chertoff, the former Republican-appointed Homeland Security Secretary, the first-ever Homeland Security Secretary, has also come out in support of Secretary Mayorkas.

He said: "I can say with confidence that, for all the investigating that the House Committee on Homeland Security has done, they have failed to put forth evidence that meets the bar."

He went on to say: "I don't agree with every policy decision the Biden administration has made. There are aspects of immigration strategy that are worthy of debate. But House Republicans are ducking difficult policy work and hard-fought compromise. Impeachment is a diversion from fixing our broken immigration laws and giving DHS the resources needed to secure the border."

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an opinion piece written by Michael Chertoff and published by the Wall Street Journal titled: "Don't Impeach Alejandro Mayorkas."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 28, 2024]

DON'T IMPEACH ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS

House Republicans are misusing the process to target an official who has done nothing wrong.

(By Michael Chertoff)

Political and policy disagreements aren't impeachable offenses. The Constitution gives Congress the power to impeach federal officials for treason, bribery and "other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." That's a high bar. In the history of our republic, only one cabinet secretary has been impeached (for receiving corrupt kickback payments).

The House Homeland Security Committee is moving toward a Jan. 30 vote on articles of impeachment against Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, with a possible vote by the full House on Feb. 5. As homeland security secretary under President George W. Bush—and as a former federal judge, U.S. attorney and assistant attorney general—I can say with confidence that, for all the investigating that the House Committee on Homeland Security has done, they have failed to put forth evidence that meets the bar.

This is why Republicans aren't seeking to hold Mr. Mayorkas to the Constitution's "high crimes and misdemeanors" standard for impeachment. They make the unsupported argument that he is derelict in his duty.

Since Mr. Mayorkas took office, the majority of migrants encountered at the Southwest border have been removed, returned or expelled. In fact, since the pandemic-era Title 42 policy was ended last May, DHS removed, returned or expelled more noncitizens than in any five-month period in the past 10 years. The truth is that our national immigration system is outdated, and DHS leaders under both parties have done their best to manage our immigration system without adequate congressional support.

I don't agree with every policy decision the Biden administration has made. There are aspects of immigration strategy that are worthy of debate. But House Republicans are ducking difficult policy work and hard-fought compromise. Impeachment is a diversion from fixing our broken immigration laws and giving DHS the resources needed to secure the border.

Our nation is at its best when our leaders work together to confront the seemingly intractable.

The situation at our border and our national security, demand such bipartisan collaboration. Despite our different parties, I know Mr. Mayorkas to be fair and honest—dedicated to the safety and security of the U.S. He has represented DHS to the country and to both parties in Congress with integrity. Republicans in the House should drop this impeachment charade and work with Mr. Mayorkas to deliver for the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article detailing the number of children that the Department of Homeland Security has lost.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Times, Friday, Sept. 9, 2022]

REP. MICHAEL BURGESS DEMANDS ANSWERS AFTER ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT CHILDREN GO 'MISSING'

(By Stephen Dinan)

Rep. Michael Burgess warned the Biden administration that it is endangering children and may be breaking the law after many illegal immigrant juveniles have gone 'missing' in Houston.

Mr. Burgess, Texas Republican, said he was alarmed by a Reuters report earlier this month that said roughly 48 illegal immigrant children went missing from the Houston homes where the federal Health and Human Services Department had placed them with sponsors. Another nine children ran away from HHS-operated shelters.

HHS began a frantic effort to track the children. As of late August, 46 of them had been 'confirmed safe,' Reuters reported.

Mr. Burgess, in a letter to HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra this week, demanded quick answers on what is going on, saying there were signs the department was putting kids in unsafe situations.

"These patterns have been brought to light by the Houston police chief after noticing an increase in missing UACs from the homes of their U.S. sponsors," the congressman wrote. "Of even greater concern, dozens of these children have been released to similar addresses."

The Washington Times has reached out to HHS for comment.

UACs, or Unaccompanied Alien Children, are juveniles who jump the border without a parent.

Under the law, UACs are to be quickly transferred from Homeland Security's custody to HHS, which places the children in shelters until sponsors can be found.

Sponsors are often relatives—usually in the country illegally themselves—but can be just about anyone willing to take a child. Some parents will send their children to the border as UACs, with names, addresses and phone numbers for potential sponsors tucked in the children's clothing.

But there have been horrific abuses.

The Times reported last month on a case out of Illinois where a 10-year-old girl was placed with a purported aunt who turned out not to be related. The fraudulent aunt now stands accused of terrifying abuses, including stabbing the girl and allowing male members of her household to repeatedly rape the young girl.

UACs began to surge into the U.S. in 2014, and there have been subsequent waves, but the Biden administration has shattered all previous records with more than a quarter of a million UACs nabbed at the border in just 18 months.

Overwhelmed by the numbers, the Biden administration tossed some of the safety checks the Trump administration had put in place to try to better vet sponsors.

In his letter, Mr. Burgess said the fact that the same addresses kept popping up as placement locations in Houston should have been a warning sign about possible exploitation.

He also questioned whether those placements were even legal.

"I am not certain that releasing UACs to non-parent sponsors complies with current law," he wrote.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, that number has increased year over year. It was 100,000 kids last year. What are we doing if we are losing track of 100,000 children that have come into this country illegally?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial piece from the Wall Street Journal titled: "Impeaching Mayorkas Achieves Nothing."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 30, 2024]

IMPEACHING MAYORKAS ACHIEVES NOTHING
A POLICY DISPUTE DOESN'T QUALIFY AS A HIGH
CRIME AND MISDEMEANOR

(By Wall Street Journal Editorial Board)

House Republicans are marking up articles of impeachment against Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, and the question is why? As much as we share the frustration with the Biden border mess, impeaching Mr. Mayorkas won't change enforcement policy and is a bad precedent that will open the gates to more cabinet impeachments by both parties.

The Homeland Security Committee on Tuesday began marking up two articles of impeachment against Mr. Mayorkas—one for breach of trust and the other for "willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law." The articles say these are "high crimes and misdemeanors" that justify removal from office.

The 20-page political indictment certainly is a sorry list of policy failings on Mr. Mayorkas's watch and their damaging consequences for American cities and states. These include the entry of migrants on the terrorism watch list, and an increase in average encounters at the border from 590,000 in fiscal years 2017–2020—to 1.4 million in 2021, 2.3 million in 2022 and 2.4 million in 2023.

These are failures of policy and execution, but are they impeachable offenses? That seems doubtful. The first article cites Mr. Mayorkas for refusing to implement a law that requires detention of aliens. It says his policy of "catch and release" is impeachable.

Yet the Supreme Court has not ruled that the Biden policies are illegal. The High Court in 2022 let the Biden Administration end Donald Trump's Remain in Mexico policy, and last year it ruled 8–1 that states don't necessarily have standing to challenge the federal government's enforcement priorities.

As for catch and release, one problem is the statutory "credible fear" standard for claiming asylum in the U.S. The standard is too low, but it isn't clear under the law that the Administration can legally deport people claiming asylum before they get a hearing. The U.S. lacks the facilities to hold asylum claimants, so they are released to await their hearing—and that can take years. But the problem is asylum law, as Republicans have long argued.

Article I also claims Mr. Mayorkas has violated the law by expanding humanitarian parole beyond Congress's intent. That's probably true, but the law puts no cap on parole numbers. Texas and other states challenged the President's authority to use parole for large classes of migrants, but the Supreme Court ruled against them.

House Republicans dislike how the Administration is interpreting immigration law. But Congress has failed to reform asylum

standards or humanitarian parole, or to otherwise tighten immigration rules. That's why Senators are now negotiating over language to reform both the asylum standard and parole.

If Congress holds Mr. Mayorkas impeachable for policy failure, what's the limiting principle? Are his deputies also guilty of "high crimes" for implementing the Biden immigration agenda? Career officials? How many GOP cabinet secretaries will the next Democratic House line up to impeach? Policy disputes are for the voting booth, not impeachment.

All the more so because the main architect of the border-security fiasco isn't Mr. Mayorkas. It's his boss, President Biden. "If you want to flee and you are fleeing oppression, you should come," said Candidate Joe Biden in a 2019 debate. Mr. Mayorkas is following White House orders.

Impeaching Mr. Mayorkas won't have any effect on policy, or even on the politics of border security. Most voters don't know who Mr. Mayorkas is. Even if the House passes the articles, on a largely partisan vote, there is no chance the Democratic Senate will convict him. Impeaching Mr. Mayorkas would be the political equivalent of a no-confidence vote. This would continue Congress's recent trend of defining impeachment down.

Grandstanding is easier than governing, and Republicans have to decide whether to accomplish anything other than impeaching Democrats. Mr. Mayorkas is an easy political target, but impeaching him accomplishes nothing beyond political symbolism.

A better idea is to strike a deal with Mr. Biden on serious border-security reforms that would restrict his discretion on parole, rewrite the asylum standard, and give the executive other tools to control the border. If Messrs. Mayorkas and Biden refuse to use them, the GOP will have an election issue. And the tools will be there for the next President to use.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, everything we have heard from the other side has confirmed that this impeachment is a predetermined political stunt. Again, this is the first time in American history an impeachment could go to the floor of the United States House of Representatives with no evidence, no proof, no elements of a crime, nothing at all. Not my words, Mr. Speaker. It is your own colleagues who say that.

Here are a few more quotes. Jonathan Turley, a top Republican legal adviser, says: "There is also no current evidence that he [meaning Secretary Mayorkas] is corrupt or committed an impeachable offense."

Donald Trump's own impeachment defense lawyer, Alan Dershowitz: "I urge principled Republicans who care about the Constitution to oppose those in their party who are seeking to impeach and remove Mayorkas based on nonconstitutional accusations."

Republican leaders told their donors behind closed doors that they were going to impeach Mayorkas before they even began their sham investigation. They raise money off of this. They promised MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE last year that they were going to impeach, no matter what, in order to help Donald Trump, to distract from his legal troubles and their own incompetence.

I get why they need to change the subject. Trump was the worst Presi-

dent in my lifetime, probably in history. He tried to overturn the election results when he lost. He said he wants to be a dictator "on day one" and he invokes Adolph Hitler, saying: Immigrants poison the blood of our country.

He had the worst jobs record since the Great Depression. He told everyone to drink bleach and take horse medicine during COVID. He has been indicted more times than elected and is currently in trial for 91 felony charges. That is after being ordered to pay \$83 million after a jury of his peers decided he was a rapist.

That is the leader of the Republican Party. That is who this impeachment is about, Donald Trump; not Secretary Mayorkas, a good, honorable, decent man. Donald Trump is a corrupt, dishonorable, disgraceful man.

This is all about helping Republicans rile up MAGA voters and distracting from their inability to govern and address the critical issues facing our country.

Instead of legislating, they are being led by MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE and the extreme MAGA chock-full-of-nuts caucus to pursue this baseless, extreme, and harmful impeachment charade that distracts from actually securing the border.

Do we have a problem at the border? Absolutely. Democrats and President Biden want real, comprehensive solutions to fix it, but the MAGA extremists have shown no interest in working with House Democrats to address the challenges facing the American people.

What we need is Republicans to stop playing political games. That is the exact opposite of what is happening here, the exact opposite of this cynical, reckless, impeachment stunt.

We are going to continue, as Democrats, to put people over politics, to fight for issues that matter, to try to lower costs, grow our economy, and, yes, to secure our border.

If Republicans decide they want to join us as partners in government to solve these challenges, we welcome that. If they don't, there is an election coming up in November.

I would say history is going to judge this Republican majority, but I don't think we need to wait for that. The voters are going to judge us all in November, and I think people are going to look at this fraudulent impeachment and they are going to look at Republicans' lack of accomplishments and they are going to vote them out because of their incompetence, their extremism, and their refusal to work with Democrats to address the challenges our country faces, including the border.

As I said before, this entire impeachment stunt is an absurd, cynical exercise in extremism. I strongly urge a "no" vote on this rule and a "no" vote on the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have seen one of the worst cases of Trump derangement syndrome ever recorded.

I would just remind people that I am not running for reelection, so I am not beholden to anyone. As I told the gentleman last week, I am bulletproof. I am only beholden to the constituents I represent. And the constituents I represent do not understand why Texas has had to endure basically an invasion during the tenure of this Secretary of Homeland Security, why he has not enforced the laws that he swore an oath to uphold and enforce. He won't do it.

What are we left to do when we have someone who is charged with protecting our country, charged with enforcing our laws, and he says it is too much trouble, I can't do it?

We know it is possible, because I was on a codel with Speaker JOHNSON down to the border down at Eagle Pass not but a couple weeks ago. The week before, we had seen on Bill Melugin's report on FOX News thousands of people on the riverbanks on the United States side who were there awaiting processing to be released into our country to parts unknown, for lengths of time unknown. When the Speaker of the House goes down there, there is not a soul on that riverbank.

This problem can be stopped literally overnight, if the Secretary and the President would make it a priority and would do it, but they won't. What are we left to do?

I agree with the gentleman that there is an election coming up. I hope people do remember that. I hope they do remember they have a President who, under 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, has it in his power right now to suspend activities on the southern border, but he won't do it.

We are being invaded, Mr. Speaker. My Governor, Governor Abbott, has officially declared an invasion. I don't think there is any debate about that. The administration and this Secretary have done nothing to help Texas. Instead, they have turned around and sued the State at every turn. Mr. Speaker, \$12 billion dollars is what Texas has had to spend over the last year to do the job that Secretary Mayorkas should have been doing.

Just by the numbers, over 2 million illegal aliens apprehended last fiscal year, 15,000 pounds of fentanyl seized from drug smugglers crossing our border. How many families need to lose a child? How many American lives have to be cut short before Secretary Mayorkas, President Biden, and his border czar, Vice President KAMALA HARRIS, change course and actually enforce existing law?

The consequences of this administration and Secretary Mayorkas' actions have been staggering: A southern bor-

der open to drug cartels, criminals, human traffickers, and potential terrorists; a record number of migrant deaths; rising human trafficking; exploitation of minors; a growing public health disaster; and an annual net burden to the American taxpayer exceeding \$150 billion.

Mr. Speaker, each of these consequences would have been avoidable if Secretary Mayorkas had just enforced existing law. This willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and the continued breach of public trust by Secretary Mayorkas will not be tolerated. For this, he must be impeached.

I also thank Chairwoman MCMORRIS RODGERS for her leadership in bringing H.R. 485 to the floor and Chairman MARK GREEN of the Homeland Security Committee for his work on a proper and thorough investigation leading to consideration of H. Res. 863.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 996 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VAN DUYNÉ). 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. Madam 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. VAN DUYNÉ) at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 996; and

Adoption of House Resolution 996, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 863, IMPEACHING ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 485, PROTECTING HEALTH CARE FOR ALL PATIENTS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 996) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 863) impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 485) to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to prohibit the use of quality-adjusted life years and similar measures in coverage and payment determinations under Federal health care programs, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 207, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Chavez-DeRemer
Alford	Bishop (NC)	Cline
Allen	Boebert	Cloud
Amodei	Bost	Clyde
Armstrong	Brecheen	Cole
Arrington	Buchanan	Collins
Babin	Buck	Comer
Bacon	Bucshon	Crane
Baird	Burchett	Crawford
Balderson	Burgess	Crenshaw
Banks	Burlison	Curtis
Barr	Calvert	D'Esposito
Bean (FL)	Cammack	Davidson
Bentz	Carey	De La Cruz
Bergman	Carl	DesJarlais
Bice	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Donalds

Duarte Jordan
 Duncan Joyce (OH)
 Dunn (FL) Joyce (PA)
 Edwards Kean (NJ)
 Ellzey Kelly (MS)
 Emmer Kelly (PA)
 Estes Kiggans (VA)
 Ezell Kiley
 Fallon Kim (CA)
 Feenstra Kustoff
 Ferguson LaHood
 Finstad LaLota
 Fischbach LaMalfa
 Fitzgerald Lamborn
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann LaTurner
 Flood Lawler
 Foxx Lee (FL)
 Franklin, Scott Lesko
 Fry Letlow
 Fulcher Loudermilk
 Gaetz Lucas
 Gallagher Luetkemeyer
 Garbarino Luna
 Garcia, Mike Luttrell
 Gimenez Mace
 Gonzales, Tony Malliotakis
 Good (VA) Maloy
 Gooden (TX) Mann
 Gosar Massie
 Granger Mast
 Graves (LA) McCaul
 Graves (MO) McClain
 Green (TN) McClintock
 Greene (GA) McCormick
 Griffith McHenry
 Grothman Miller (IL)
 Guest Miller (OH)
 Guthrie Miller (WV)
 Hageman Miller-Meeks
 Harris Mills
 Harshbarger Molinaro
 Hern Moolenaar
 Higgins (LA) Mooney
 Hill Moore (AL)
 Hinson Moore (UT)
 Houchin Moran
 Hudson Murphy
 Huizenga Nehls
 Hunt Newhouse
 Issa Norman
 Jackson (TX) Nunn (IA)
 James Obernolte
 Johnson (LA) Ogles
 Johnson (SD) Owens

NAYS—207

Adams Craig
 Aguilar Crockett
 Allred Crow
 Amo Cuellar
 Auchincloss Davids (KS)
 Balint Davis (IL)
 Barragán Davis (NC)
 Beatty Dean (PA)
 Bera DeGette
 Beyer DeLauro
 Bishop (GA) DelBene
 Blumenauer Deluzio
 Blunt Rochester DeSaulnier
 Bonamici Dingell
 Bowman Doggett
 Boyle (PA) Escobar
 Brown Eshoo
 Brownley Espallat
 Budzinski Evans
 Bush Fletcher
 Caraveo Foster
 Carbajal Foushee
 Cárdenas Frankel, Lois
 Carson Frost
 Carter (LA) Gallego
 Cartwright Garamendi
 Casar Garcia (IL)
 Case Garcia (TX)
 Casten Garcia, Robert
 Castor (FL) Golden (ME)
 Castro (TX) Goldman (NY)
 Cherfilus-McCormick Gomez
 Chu Gonzalez,
 Clark (MA) Vicente
 Clarke (NY) Gottheimer
 Cleaver Harder (CA)
 Clyburn Hoyer
 Cohen Himes
 Connolly Horsford
 Correa Houlihan
 Courtney Hoyer

Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Pfluger
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Self
 Sessions
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spartz
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley

Ciscomani
 Costa
 Green, Al (TX)

Mfume
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nickel
 Norcross
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Pingree
 Spartz
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley

NOT VOTING—9

Langworthy
 Meuser
 Payne

□ 1357

Mrs. SYKES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mses. MATSUI and WILLIAMS of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ARRINGTON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CISCOMANI. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 34.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 209, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—216

Aderholt
 Alford
 Allen
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Lee (PA)
 Leger Fernandez
 Levin
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lynch
 Magaziner
 Manning
 Matsui
 McBath
 McClellan
 McCollum
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 Meeks
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Bean (FL)
 Bentz
 Bergman
 Bice
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Boehbert
 Bost
 Brecheen
 Buchanan
 Buck

Stevens
 Strickland
 Swalwell
 Sykes
 Takano
 Thanedar
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tokuda
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Vasquez
 Veasey
 Velazquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Weston
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)

Phillips
 Scalise
 Waters
 Jackson (TX)
 James
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson (LA)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kean (NJ)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kiggans (VA)
 Kiley
 Kim (CA)
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaLota
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn

NOES—209

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Amo
 Auchincloss
 Balint
 Barragán
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bowman
 Boyle (PA)
 Brown
 Brownley
 Budzinski
 Bush
 Caraveo
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson
 Carter (LA)
 Cartwright
 Casar
 Case
 Casten
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Cherfilus-McCormick
 Chu
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Craig
 Crockett
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (NC)
 Dean (PA)
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deluzio
 DeSaulnier
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Evans
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Foushee
 Frankel, Lois
 Frost
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Garcia, Robert
 Golden (ME)
 Goldman (NY)
 Gomez
 Gonzalez,
 Vicente
 Gottheimer
 Grijalva
 Harder (CA)
 Hayes
 Himes
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Hoyle (OR)
 Huffman
 Ivey
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson (NC)
 Jackson Lee
 Jacobs
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Kamlager-Dove
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim (NJ)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Landsman
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Lee (PA)
 Leger Fernandez
 Levin
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lynch
 Magaziner
 Manning
 Matsui
 McBath
 McClellan
 McCollum
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 Meeks
 Menendez
 Meng
 Mfume
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nickel
 Norcross
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Pelosi

Peltola	Scholten	Titus
Perez	Schrier	Tlaib
Peters	Scott (VA)	Tokuda
Pettersen	Scott, David	Tonko
Pingree	Sewell	Torres (CA)
Pocan	Sherman	Torres (NY)
Porter	Sherrill	Trahan
Pressley	Slotkin	Trone
Quigley	Smith (WA)	Underwood
Ramirez	Sorensen	Vargas
Raskin	Soto	Vasquez
Ross	Spanberger	Veasey
Ruiz	Stansbury	Velázquez
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Wasserman
Ryan	Stevens	Schultz
Salinas	Strickland	Waters
Sánchez	Swalwell	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Sykes	Wexton
Scanlon	Takano	Wild
Schakowsky	Thanedar	Williams (GA)
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—6

Graves (LA)	Langworthy	Phillips
Green, Al (TX)	Payne	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1406

Ms. PORTER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 35, H. Res. 996.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for rollcall votes 34 and 35. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 34 and “no” on rollcall vote No. 35.

□ 1415

IMPEACHING ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 996, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 863) impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 863

Resolved, That Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I: WILLFUL AND SYSTEMIC REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE LAW

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment” and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, to bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has willfully and systemically refused to comply with Federal immigration laws, in that:

Throughout his tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has repeatedly violated laws enacted by Congress regarding immigration and border security. In large part because of his unlawful conduct, millions of aliens have illegally entered the United States on an annual basis with many unlawfully remaining in the United States. His refusal to obey the law is not only an offense against the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States, it also threatens our national security and has had a dire impact on communities across the country. Despite clear evidence that his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has significantly contributed to unprecedented levels of illegal entrants, the increased control of the Southwest border by drug cartels, and the imposition of enormous costs on States and localities affected by the influx of aliens, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has continued in his refusal to comply with the law, and thereby acted to the grave detriment of the interests of the United States.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, requiring that all applicants for admission who are “not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted...shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding...”. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.*

(2) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined to have a credible fear of persecution “shall be detained for further consideration of the application for asylum”. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.*

(3) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention set forth in section 235(b)(1)(B)(iii)(IV) of such Act, requiring that an alien who is placed into expedited removal proceedings and determined not to have a credible fear of persecution “shall be detained...until removed”. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has implemented a catch and release scheme, whereby such aliens are unlawfully released, even without effective mechanisms to ensure appearances before the immigration courts for removal proceedings or to ensure removal in the case of aliens ordered removed.*

(4) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 236(c) of such Act, requiring that a criminal alien who is inadmissible or deportable on certain criminal and terrorism-related grounds “shall [be] take[n] into custody” when the alien is released from law enforcement custody. Instead of complying with this requirement, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued “Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws”, which instructs Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as “DHS”) officials that the “fact an individual is a removable noncitizen...should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them” and that DHS “personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction...alone”, even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory arrest and detention pursuant to section 236(c) of such Act, to take them into custody. In *Texas v. United States*, 40 F.4th 205 (2022), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded that these guidelines had “every indication of being ‘a general policy that is so extreme as to amount to an abdication of...statutory responsibilities’” and that its “replacement of Congress’s statutory mandates with concerns of equity and race is extralegal...[and] plainly outside the bounds of the power conferred by the INA”.*

(5) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully refused to comply with the detention mandate set forth in section 241(a)(2) of such Act, requiring that an alien ordered removed “shall [be] detain[ed]” during “the removal period”. Instead of complying with this mandate, Alejandro N. Mayorkas issued “Guidelines for the Enforcement of Civil Immigration Laws”, which instructs DHS officials that the “fact an individual is a removable noncitizen...should not alone be the basis of an enforcement action against them” and that DHS “personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction...alone”, even with respect to aliens subject to mandatory detention and removal pursuant to section 241(a) of such Act.*

(6) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his parole authority set forth in section 212(d)(5)(A) of such Act that permits parole to be granted “only on a case-by-case basis”, temporarily, and “for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit”, in that:*

(A) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas paroled aliens en masse in order to release them from mandatory detention, despite the fact that, as the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit concluded in *Texas v. Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), “parol[ing] every alien [DHS] cannot detain is the opposite of the ‘case-by-case basis’ determinations required by law” and “DHS’s pretended power to parole aliens while ignoring the limitations Congress imposed on the parole power [is] not nonenforcement; it’s misenforcement, suspension of the INA, or both”.*

(B) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas created, reopened, or expanded a series of categorical parole programs never authorized by Congress for foreign nationals outside of the United States, including for certain Central American minors, Ukrainians, Venezuelans, Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, Colombians, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans, which enabled hundreds of thousands of inadmissible aliens to enter the United States in violation of the laws enacted by Congress.*

(7) *Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully exceeded his release authority set forth in section 236(a) of such Act that permits, in certain circumstances, the release of aliens arrested on an administrative warrant, in that Alejandro N. Mayorkas released aliens arrested without a warrant despite their being subject to a separate applicable mandatory detention requirement set forth in section 235(b)(2) of such Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas released such aliens by retroactively issuing administrative warrants in an attempt to circumvent section 235(b)(2) of such Act. In *Florida v. United States*, No. 3:21-cv-*

1066-TKW-ZCB (N.D. Fla. Mar. 8, 2023), the United States District Court of the Northern District of Florida noted that “[t]his sleight of hand – using an ‘arrest’ warrant as a de facto ‘release’ warrant – is administrative sophistry at its worst”. In addition, the court concluded that “what makes DHS’s application of [236(a)] in this manner unlawful...is that [235(b)(2)], not [236(a)], governs the detention of applicants for admission whom DHS places in...removal proceedings after inspection”.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law has had calamitous consequences for the Nation and the people of the United States, including:

(1) During fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of about 590,000 aliens each fiscal year were encountered as inadmissible aliens at ports of entry on the Southwest border or apprehended between ports of entry. Thereafter, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure in office, that number skyrocketed to over 1,400,000 in fiscal year 2021, over 2,300,000 in fiscal year 2022, and over 2,400,000 in fiscal year 2023. Similarly, during fiscal years 2017 through 2020, an average of 130,000 persons who were not turned back or apprehended after making an illegal entry were observed along the border each fiscal year. During Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure in office, that number more than trebled to 400,000 in fiscal year 2021, 600,000 in fiscal year 2022, and 750,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(2) American communities both along the Southwest border and across the United States have been devastated by the dramatic growth in illegal entries, the number of aliens unlawfully present, and substantial rise in the number of aliens unlawfully granted parole, creating a fiscal and humanitarian crisis and dramatically degrading the quality of life of the residents of those communities. For instance, since 2022, more than 150,000 migrants have gone through New York City’s shelter intake system. Indeed, the Mayor of New York City has said that “we are past our breaking point” and that “[t]his issue will destroy New York City”. In fiscal year 2023, New York City spent \$1,450,000,000 addressing Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s migrant crisis, and city officials fear it will spend another \$12,000,000,000 over the following three fiscal years, causing painful budget cuts to important city services.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s unlawful mass release of apprehended aliens and unlawful mass grant of categorical parole to aliens have enticed an increasing number of aliens to make the dangerous journey to our Southwest border. Consequently, according to the United Nations’s International Organization for Migration, the number of migrants intending to illegally cross our border who have perished along the way, either en route to the United States or at the border, almost doubled during the tenure of Alejandro N. Mayorkas as Secretary of Homeland Security, from an average of about 700 a year during the fiscal years 2017 through 2020, to an average of about 1,300 a year during the fiscal years 2021 through 2023.

(4) Alien smuggling organizations have gained tremendous wealth during Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, with their estimated revenues rising from about \$500,000,000 in 2018 to approximately \$13,000,000,000 in 2022.

(5) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the immigration court backlog has more than doubled from about 1,300,000 cases to over 3,000,000 cases. The exploding backlog is destroying the courts’ ability to administer justice and provide appropriate relief in a timeframe that does not run into years or even decades. As Alejandro N. Mayorkas acknowledged, “those who have a valid claim to asylum...often wait years for a...decision; likewise, noncitizens who will ultimately be found ineligible for asylum or other protection—which occurs in the majority of cases—often have spent many years in the

United States prior to being ordered removed”. He noted that of aliens placed in expedited removal proceedings and found to have a credible fear of persecution, and thus referred to immigration judges for removal proceedings, “significantly fewer than 20 percent...were ultimately granted asylum” and only “28 percent of cases decided on their merits are grants of relief”. Alejandro N. Mayorkas also admitted that “the fact that migrants can wait in the United States for years before being issued a final order denying relief, and that many such individuals are never actually removed, likely incentivizes migrants to make the journey north”.

(6) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, approximately 450,000 unaccompanied alien children have been encountered at the Southwest border, and the vast majority have been released into the United States. As a result, there has been a dramatic upsurge in migrant children being employed in dangerous and exploitative jobs in the United States.

(7) Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s failure to enforce the law, drawing millions of illegal aliens to the Southwest border, has led to the reassignment of U.S. Border Patrol agents from protecting the border from illicit drug trafficking to processing illegal aliens for release. As a result, during Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the flow of fentanyl across the border and other dangerous drugs, both at and between ports of entry, has increased dramatically. U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized approximately 4,800 pounds of fentanyl in fiscal year 2020, approximately 11,200 pounds in fiscal year 2021, approximately 14,700 pounds in fiscal year 2022, and approximately 27,000 pounds in fiscal year 2023. Over 70,000 Americans died from fentanyl poisoning in 2022, and fentanyl is now the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45.

(8) Alejandro N. Mayorkas has degraded public safety by leaving wide swaths of the border effectively unpatrolled as U.S. Border Patrol agents are diverted from guarding the border to processing for unlawful release the heightening waves of apprehended aliens (many who now seek out agents for the purpose of surrendering with the now reasonable expectation of being released and granted work authorization), and Federal Air Marshals are diverted from protecting the flying public to assist in such processing.

(9) During Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s tenure as Secretary of Homeland Security, the U.S. Border Patrol has encountered an increasing number of aliens on the terrorist watch list. In fiscal years 2017 through 2020 combined, 11 noncitizens on the terrorist watchlist were caught attempting to cross the Southwest border between ports of entry. That number increased to 15 in fiscal year 2021, 98 in fiscal year 2022, 169 in fiscal year 2023, and 49 so far in fiscal year 2024.

Additionally, in *United States v. Texas*, 599 U.S. 670 (2023), the United States Supreme Court heard a case involving Alejandro N. Mayorkas’s refusal to comply with certain Federal immigration laws that are at issue in this impeachment. The Supreme Court held that States have no standing to seek judicial relief to compel Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with certain legal requirements contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, the Supreme Court held that “even though the federal courts lack Article III jurisdiction over this suit, other forums remain open for examining the Executive Branch’s enforcement policies. For example, Congress possesses an array of tools to analyze and influence those policies [and] those are political checks for the political process”. One such critical tool for Congress to influence the Executive Branch to comply with the immigration laws of the United States is impeachment. The dissenting Justice noted, “The Court holds Texas lacks standing to challenge a federal policy that inflicts substantial harm on the State and its residents by releasing illegal aliens with

criminal convictions for serious crimes. In order to reach this conclusion, the Court...holds that the only limit on the power of a President to disobey a law like the important provision at issue is Congress’s power to employ the weapons of inter-branch warfare...”. As the dissenting Justice explained, “Congress may wield what the Solicitor General described as ‘political...tools’—which presumably means such things as...impeachment and removal”. Indeed, during oral argument, the Justice who authored the majority opinion stated to the Solicitor General, “I think your position is, instead of judicial review, Congress has to resort to shutting down the government or impeachment or dramatic steps...”. Here, in light of the inability of injured parties to seek judicial relief to remedy the refusal of Alejandro N. Mayorkas to comply with Federal immigration laws, impeachment is Congress’s only viable option.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas willfully and systemically refused to comply with the immigration laws, failed to control the border to the detriment of national security, compromised public safety, and violated the rule of law and separation of powers in the Constitution, to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the United States people, and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: BREACH OF PUBLIC TRUST

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment” and that civil Officers of the United States, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. In his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, in violation of his oath to well and faithfully discharge the duties of his office, has breached the public trust, in that:

Alejandro N. Mayorkas has knowingly made false statements, and knowingly obstructed lawful oversight of the Department of Homeland Security (hereinafter referred to as “DHS”), principally to obfuscate the results of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress that the border is “secure”, that the border is “no less secure than it was previously”, that the border is “closed”, and that DHS has “operational control” of the border (as that term is defined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006).

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements to Congress regarding the scope and adequacy of the vetting of the thousands of Afghans who were airlifted to the United States and then granted parole following the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan after President Biden’s precipitous withdrawal of United States forces.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements that apprehended aliens with no legal basis to remain in the United States were being quickly removed.

(4) Alejandro N. Mayorkas knowingly made false statements supporting the false narrative that U.S. Border Patrol agents maliciously whipped illegal aliens.

(5) Alejandro N. Mayorkas failed to comply with multiple subpoenas issued by congressional committees.

(6) Alejandro N. Mayorkas delayed or denied access of DHS Office of Inspector General (hereinafter referred to as “OIG”) to DHS records

and information, hampering OIG's ability to effectively perform its vital investigations, audits, inspections, and other reviews of agency programs and operations to satisfy the OIG's obligations under section 402(b) of title 5, United States Code, in part, to Congress.

Additionally, in his conduct while Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro N. Mayorkas has breached the public trust by his willful refusal to fulfill his statutory "duty to control and guard the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens" as set forth in section 103(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Alejandro N. Mayorkas inherited what his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol called, "arguably the most effective border security in our nation's history". Alejandro N. Mayorkas, however, proceeded to abandon effective border security initiatives without engaging in adequate alternative efforts that would enable DHS to maintain control of the border and guard against illegal entry, and despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border. According to his first Chief of the U.S. Border Patrol, Alejandro N. Mayorkas "summarily rejected" the "multiple options to reduce the illegal entries...through proven programs and consequences" provided by civil service staff at DHS. Despite clear evidence of the devastating consequences of his actions, he failed to take action to fulfill his statutory duty to control the border, in that, among other things:

(1) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols (hereinafter referred to as "MPP"). In *Texas v. Biden*, 20 F.4th 928 (2021), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit explained that "[t]he district court...pointed to evidence that 'the termination of MPP has contributed to the current border surge'...(citing DHS's own previous determinations that MPP had curbed the rate of illegal entries)". The district court had also "pointed out that the number of 'enforcement encounters'—that is, instances where immigration officials encounter immigrants attempting to cross the southern border without documentation—had 'skyrocketed' since MPP's termination".

(2) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated contracts for border wall construction.

(3) Alejandro N. Mayorkas terminated asylum cooperative agreements that would have equitably shared the burden of complying with international asylum accords.

In all of this, Alejandro N. Mayorkas breached the public trust by knowingly making false statements to Congress and the American people and avoiding lawful oversight in order to obscure the devastating consequences of his willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and carry out his statutory duties. He has also breached the public trust by willfully refusing to carry out his statutory duty to control the border and guard against illegal entry, notwithstanding the calamitous consequences of his abdication of that duty.

Wherefore Alejandro N. Mayorkas, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national and border security, the safety of the American people, and to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with his duties and the rule of law. Alejandro N. Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security is adopted.

The resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 863.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to present two Articles of Impeachment against Department of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

Article I charges him with willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law, and Article II charges him with breach of public trust.

Since Secretary Mayorkas took office, we have all watched the unprecedented crisis at our borders unfold. We have seen the chaos.

Under Secretary Mayorkas' watch, CBP has reported more than 8.5 million encounters at our borders, including more than 7 million apprehensions at the southwest border. Even more terrifying is the approximate 1.8 million known got-aways that Border Patrol agents detect but are unable to apprehend.

Millions of those inadmissible aliens who are encountered are eventually released into our communities. This has never happened before in the history of the country, and it doesn't happen by accident.

For nearly a year, the House Committee on Homeland Security conducted a thorough, fair, and comprehensive investigation into the causes, costs, and consequences of the border crisis. Our Members saw firsthand numerous parts of the southwest border, spent time with law enforcement officers on the front lines, and spoke with real Americans about how the crisis is affecting them.

We also conducted a field hearing and roundtable on the border that our Democrat colleagues refused to attend, burying their heads in the sand as if there wasn't a crisis. We published seven total reports, totaling nearly 400 pages, to which Democrats never had a single substantive response.

Instead, their only response was to simply shout MAGA louder and louder,

as if that is a meaningful response to the millions of Americans suffering from this crisis.

We held many hearings at the subcommittee and full committee level, and we heard from a variety of witnesses, including former senior DHS enforcement officials, State attorneys general, and victims who have been impacted by Secretary Mayorkas' border crisis. Democrats consistently claimed these hearings were a waste of time. Tell that to the families of the 150,000 Americans who died from fentanyl poisoning in 2021 and 2022 alone.

Throughout this investigation and subsequent impeachment proceedings, we found that Secretary Mayorkas' willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law and his breach of public trust are responsible for this historic crisis. However, for almost a year, Democrats have turned a blind eye to the victims of the border crisis while berating us for spending what they believed was too much time investigating Secretary Mayorkas' lawless handling of our sovereign borders.

Keep that in mind when you hear them claim now this impeachment is somehow rushed. The truth is this process has been painstakingly thorough. Unlike House Democrats, we take the use of impeachment extremely seriously.

While I do not wish to be standing here presenting these Articles of Impeachment today, we have exhausted all other options. Our oath to the Constitution now requires us to exercise this solemn duty.

Secretary Mayorkas has explicitly refused to comply with the law. His refusal to obey the law has led to the death of our fellow citizens, and he no longer deserves to keep his job.

What is unique here in the history of impeachments is that the Supreme Court, just this summer, denied the affected States judicial review on many of these issues, but with the understanding that the result of doing so could mean the impeachment of a Secretary.

In oral argument, Justice Kavanaugh explained how he understood the position of the Biden administration if judicial review was denied, saying: "I think your position is, instead of judicial review, Congress has to resort to shutting down the government or impeachment or dramatic steps if . . . some administration comes in and says we're not going to enforce laws or at least not going to enforce the laws to the degree that Congress by law has said the laws should be enforced . . ."

In response, the Biden administration's solicitor general agreed, saying: "Well, I think that if those dramatic steps would be warranted, it would be in the face of a dramatic abdication of statutory responsibility by the executive."

Today's Articles of Impeachment outline exactly that; a dramatic abdication of statutory responsibility by Secretary Mayorkas has occurred.

Of the Articles of Impeachment's 20 pages, 6 are solely dedicated to the laws Secretary Mayorkas has violated, while 4 more document his lies to Congress and the American people and the violation of his statutory duty to control and guard our borders.

We identify numerous unambiguous provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act he has refused to enforce, laws requiring him to detain inadmissible aliens and limit his ability to grant parole. We also highlight how programs he has created, such as various mass parole programs, are void of congressional authority.

Secretary Mayorkas is the very type of public official the Framers feared: someone who would cast aside the laws passed by a coequal branch of government and replace those with his own preferences, hurting his fellow Americans in the process.

He has directed the release of millions of inadmissible aliens into the country in violation of the INA, which requires them to be detained.

He has abused the statute limiting parole to be issued only on a case-by-case and temporary basis for very specific and limited reasons—instead over-seeing more than 1.5 million paroles.

He has created new categorical parole programs in defiance of the statute to further his mass release agenda, and he has directed Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel not to detain all manner of illegal aliens, including criminal aliens. In his September 2021 enforcement guidance, the Secretary even directed that unlawful presence in the country was no longer sufficient grounds for removal and that criminal convictions alone were not enough to warrant ICE attention.

This is not about policy differences. We certainly object to Secretary Mayorkas' policies, but this goes far deeper. According to the Democrat-led committees that investigated Iran-Contra: "Government officials must observe the law, even when they disagree with it," or when they think that, "Congress is to blame for passing laws that run counter to administration policy."

Again, we are here because our oath and our duty compel us to be here. The actions and decisions of Secretary Mayorkas have left us with no other option than to proceed with Articles of Impeachment. That is why we must remove him from office. The time for accountability is now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 863 and the Republicans' sham impeachment of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

Madam Speaker, what is happening here today is a travesty. It is an affront to the United States Constitution, it will do nothing to solve chal-

lenges at our border, and it is a baseless attack on a dedicated public servant.

Republican Members of Congress, sworn to support and defend the Constitution, are rejecting the Framers' intent and over two centuries of precedent in favor of a politically motivated sham impeachment. Republicans have failed to make a constitutionally viable case for impeachment.

Neither of the impeachment charges in H. Res. 863 are a high crime and misdemeanor under Article II of the Constitution. Impeachment over mere policy disputes was deliberately rejected by the Framers, and those disputes are best settled in our court system.

In fact, the policy disputes identified in the Articles of Impeachment have already been addressed by the courts. The courts have either decided in the Biden administration's favor, or the disputes are still working their way through the system.

Republicans are trying to relitigate court decisions through a sham impeachment, but the Constitution doesn't allow that.

Constitutional experts testified before the Committee on Homeland Security that, for a breach of public trust to rise to a high crime and misdemeanor, it would require conduct intended to serve an official's own benefit or the benefit of a foreign power.

Secretary Mayorkas has done nothing of the sort.

Republicans have misrepresented the law and Secretary Mayorkas' record to justify this sham impeachment.

Secretary Mayorkas has served our country honorably over 30 years as a prosecutor and in leadership roles at the Department of Homeland Security. He has been a tireless advocate for the more than 260,000 DHS employees working to secure the homeland every day. He has leveraged all the authorities at his disposal while using every resource provided by Congress to secure the border.

Under Secretary Mayorkas' leadership, DHS removed record levels of migrants from the U.S., detained even more people than Congress had provided funding for, and prevented record levels of fentanyl from entering our communities.

If House Republicans were serious about improving conditions along the border, they would provide the Department the funding necessary to do so. They have not. At every opportunity, Republicans have refused to provide resources to the Department of Homeland Security.

If House Republicans were serious about improving conditions at the border, they would support the bipartisan Senate border bill. They have not.

Republicans take their orders from Donald Trump, and he told them to reject the Senate bill. Republicans have been trying to kill the bill before they even knew what was in it.

The Republican majority is running a do-nothing Congress.

This sham impeachment effort isn't really about border security. It will do nothing to solve the border challenges we face. The truth is the extreme MAGA Republicans running the House of Representatives don't want solutions; they want a political issue.

House Republicans want to distort the Constitution and the Secretary's record to cover up their inability and unwillingness to work with Democrats to strengthen border security. It is about Republican politics and subversion of the Constitution.

Bipartisan constitutional law and impeachment experts agree the Secretary has not committed an impeachable offense. Former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff agrees, and even some of my Republican colleagues here in the House agree.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) said in a memorandum to House Republican colleagues:

The problem is that [the impeachment articles] fail to identify an impeachable crime.

The gentleman from California is right. I suspect some of his Republican colleagues agree, even if they won't admit it.

Secretary Mayorkas has faithfully implemented the administration's border policies consistent with the funding Congress has provided, just like every other Secretary of Homeland Security before him, Democrat or Republican.

During consideration in the Homeland Security Committee last week, Republicans improperly shut down the markup and blocked Democrats from offering amendments to the resolution.

Republicans couldn't bear to consider amendments to their poorly drafted Articles of Impeachment. They silenced Democrats who attempted to inject a dose of reality into the chaotic proceedings.

Yesterday, before the Rules Committee, Republicans again failed to make their case, relying on partisan rhetoric and obvious misinformation, because neither the law, nor the facts are on their side.

The truth is Republicans' actions show they don't have faith in their own case against the Secretary. That is why they lack the courage of their convictions to see their markup to the end.

This nonsense has to stop, and it should stop here. Republicans need to start doing the work Americans sent them here to do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to honor their oath to the Constitution, listen to the constitutional experts, listen to your own Republican colleagues who know H. Res. 863 is baseless. Drop this sham impeachment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 863, impeaching Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

Alejandro Mayorkas is guilty of aiding and abetting the complete invasion of our country by criminals, gang members, terrorists, murderers, rapists, and over 10 million people from over 160 countries into American communities all across the United States.

His willful refusal to secure the border has bankrupted communities, closed down U.S. schools that our children attend, drowned hospitals, and incapacitated law enforcement, while empowering criminal cartels and illegal aliens.

My Democrat colleagues argue that one cannot be impeached over policy differences. Well, I argue that breaking our laws is more than just policy differences. Mr. Speaker, 300 dead Americans every day from fentanyl poisoning is more than just a policy difference; it is murder.

Today, in my own office, narcotics law enforcement officers from Georgia told me that 7 out of 10 doses of Oxycotin or Percocet sold on the street are laced with fentanyl, and that comes directly across the border from Mexico.

Secretary Mayorkas has violated numerous provisions in the Immigration and Nationality Act, including unlawfully directing DHS to mass-parole illegal aliens into the U.S. when Federal law specifically prohibits this, and unlawfully implementing catch and release policies when Federal law specifically mandates the detention and removal of inadmissible aliens.

In fact, detention facilities under Mayorkas have been mostly vacant because of such unlawful policies. The largest detention facility in California, which can house almost 2,000 illegals, is currently housing only 6 illegal aliens. He has violated his oath of office and breached the public trust by willfully refusing to ensure the laws passed by Congress and signed into law by the President are faithfully executed as required by Article II of the Constitution.

He has allowed over 10 million illegal border crossers to invade our country, approximately 2 million of whom are known got-aways. These are people who have completely evaded U.S. authorities and are roaming the interior of American communities, assaulting, raping, and murdering Americans. God help us if we have a terrorist attack on our land.

□ 1500

His subversion of the law has resulted in the highest number of illegal alien encounters in a single day, the highest number of illegal alien encounters in a single month, and the highest number of illegal alien encounters in a single year, surpassing every national record on each account.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, his willful refusal to enforce the law has resulted in the most egregious national security crisis in the history of our country.

Democrats are in a quandary. Either they must own the policies of murder and crime of American citizens, or they can admit Secretary Mayorkas has broken Federal laws and vote to impeach Secretary Mayorkas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, though she sits on the Homeland Security Committee, Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE has raised doubts about 9/11 to the false assertion that 9/11 was done by our own government. She said that is all true. She also thinks Jewish space lasers cause wildfires. She fundraises off defunding the FBI. She is a person whose advice Republicans are taking today on this impeachment.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I welcome my colleagues to another week of impeachment unlimited.

Having no legislative accomplishments to show for their 14 months in power, Republicans are voting on yet another pointless resolution.

Unable to provide any evidence against President Biden, they have now decided to impeach someone else instead. We have serious challenges at the border—no one denies that—but these are not serious people.

By this standard put forward by this hapless majority, every single DHS Secretary would have been impeached. This is a policy and political dispute, not a high crime or misdemeanor.

When an administration official tries to extort a foreign leader into helping them cheat in an election or leads an insurrection against our government, then impeach them. Until then, stop wasting everyone's time.

I have known Ale Mayorkas since we were prosecutors together. He is a person of great integrity and devotion to this country.

This impeachment is baseless, it is unconstitutional, and it should be defeated.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas took an oath to protect our Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic. He has violated that oath and the public trust.

Today, I intend to personally uphold the oath of office that I swore to my country.

In my 25 years of dealing with the border as a Federal prosecutor and the former chairman of this committee, I have never seen it this broken. That is because of one man's actions: his refusal to enforce the law, his rescission of successful policies like remain in Mexico, and his breach of public trust. His dereliction of duty has led to 8 million encounters, 300 on the terror

watch list, and 2.3 million aliens released into the interior, enough to fill 13 States. Another 200,000 young Americans have died due to fentanyl poisoning.

These numbers are clear. Secretary Mayorkas is the architect of destruction, and the legal justification for his impeachment is strong.

In the Supreme Court decision *The United States v. The State of Texas*, the Court examined a statute that mandated the government shall take into custody any alien that has committed an aggravated felony. It is not discretionary. It is mandatory. By failing to uphold this law, he has released dangerous and violent criminals into our communities and has put every American life at risk.

Supreme Court Justice Story in 1833 said: "Where a lord admiral has neglected to safeguard the seas, that shall be deemed an impeachable offense." That is exactly the case we have here. Secretary Mayorkas, charged with the defense of air, land, and sea, has failed to defend our borders.

The Founders clearly believed impeachable offenses included neglect of duty, violation of public trust, and injury to society.

When asked before the Supreme Court if impeachment is a proper remedy, President Biden's own solicitor general said: In the face of a dramatic abdication of statutory responsibility by the executive branch, such steps would be warranted.

Secretary Mayorkas is guilty of those impeachable offenses. He is destroying the fabric of this Nation. Americans agree.

Today, I will proudly stand up for our Nation by voting to remove him from office.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas has invested significantly in stopping dangerous drugs, like fentanyl, from entering the country and launched several efforts targeting smugglers, gangs, and cartels.

Under Secretary Mayorkas' leadership, we have more personnel, technology, infrastructure, and resources on our borders than ever.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, considering this impeachment resolution is the fastest I have seen the House GOP move all session. That is because there has been no collection of evidence, only the manipulation of it. There has been no meaningful bipartisan engagement, only partisan political stunts. There has been no due process. Instead, it is a deliberate disregard for the basis of our legal system.

It has no constitutional precedent or basis, no real backing by Senate GOP counterparts who are going to hold the trial, no meaningful engagement with policy, and no support from respected legal scholars, political pundits, nor former DHS directors.

History will remember this for what it is, an appeasement of the most extreme members of the MAGA base, and put very simply, the brownnosing of a man with 91 indictments, several convictions, and two impeachments.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN).

Mr. BRECHEEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this impeachment resolution.

As Chairman GREEN of the Homeland Security Committee has reminded our committee often in recent weeks, James Madison, the father of our Constitution, said: "If an unworthy man be continued in office by an unworthy President, the House of Representatives can at any time impeach him, and the Senate can remove him, whether the President chooses or not."

This impeachment is not about policy difference, though we have them. It is absolutely because Secretary Mayorkas refuses to enforce the laws that are a part of our Nation's fabric. The rule of law matters. Nobody is above it, including Secretary Mayorkas.

Contrary to what he and the President publicly claim, no new laws are needed to stop this crisis. They have created it. Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act already grants them the authority to holler halt.

We know Secretary Mayorkas is aware of this provision. On day 5 of the Biden administration, the President suspended entry by those coming from the U.K., Ireland, Brazil, and South Africa. Secretary Mayorkas has left us with no other option other than impeachment because he refuses to enforce the law.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, Republicans say this impeachment is not about policy disagreements, but every argument they make is about policies.

Secretary Mayorkas has taken action to secure the border, but he has used different, more humane policies that are not impeachable.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), our Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, we all agree that something needs to be done to fix our broken immigration system, but when it comes to doing the work, finding the solutions, House Democrats have come to the table, President Biden has come to the table, and the Senate has come to the table. Then there is the House GOP.

The MAGA extremists hold up our national security priorities, our commitment to our allies, and to our own readiness, supposedly to strike a deal on immigration. The President says let's get it done and then he did.

Instead of pursuing a bipartisan compromise, instead of strengthening the security of our border, advancing hu-

mane solutions, and doing their jobs, they are now impeaching the Secretary of Homeland Security without a single allegation of any impeachable crime, not one. Impeaching a cabinet member without any evidence of high crimes or misdemeanors, that is the breach of public trust here.

The plan is to impeach the Secretary. Then what? Will the majority invest in Border Patrol? No. Their dream budget fires 2,000 Border Patrol agents. Just yesterday, Speaker JOHNSON ridiculed the men and women of Border Patrol for supporting the Senate bill saying it is probably because it would give them a fair wage. This majority's contempt for working people, even those whose mission is to carry out border security, has no bounds.

This extreme MAGA majority has repeatedly rejected funding for technology that is needed to stop the flow of fentanyl.

Here we are. The extreme MAGA majority, what are they going to do about the border? Only this sham impeachment.

They have told us what the future holds. As one Member across the aisle put it, they oppose action on immigration, because it would boost Biden against Trump. That is all they care about. That is what this sham is about, choosing extremism over country, stunts over solutions, and politics over people. That is a breach of trust we all must reject.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to impeach Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

We are here today to address one of the most serious responsibilities that we can undertake as Congress, the impeachment of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

The Committee on Homeland Security has worked diligently to investigate and consider the causes and the consequences of the catastrophe at our southern border, and it has concluded that it is necessary and appropriate to pursue this impeachment.

Since President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas took office, there have been over 8.3 million illegal crossings nationwide. We have seen the devastating effects of human trafficking, of fentanyl trafficking, and what happens when we cede operational control of our southern border to the Mexican drug cartels.

Secretary Mayorkas has refused to enforce the duly enacted laws passed by this Congress. By doing so, he has endangered our homeland, a direct violation of his oath of office. Even in the face of irrefutable evidence to the contrary, he has given false testimony to Congress, claiming that the border is secure. He has defied court orders ordering the Secretary to abandon the illegal programs and policies that he has implemented, which incentivize illegal immigration.

House Republicans know that border security is national security, and the crisis at our border is a critical threat to our national security and the safety of the American people.

Secretary Mayorkas has willfully and deliberately refused to uphold the laws of the United States, he has violated his oath of office, and he has breached the public trust.

Congress has a constitutional duty to secure our border and to ensure our communities are safe. We cannot allow an executive branch agency head to defy the lawful authority of Congress and the courts in pursuit of policies that are contrary to law and endangering Americans. That is why Secretary Mayorkas must be impeached.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the border is not open. In fact, under Secretary Mayorkas' leadership, this administration has removed, returned, or expelled more migrants in 3 years than the Trump administration did in 4 years.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), who is the ranking member on our Border Security and Enforcement Subcommittee.

□ 1515

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, we have something in common with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This country, Main Street, and every one of our districts have a challenge with fentanyl. We have all witnessed the deaths in our communities of good, young men and women from this scourge of fentanyl. Nonetheless, Secretary Mayorkas is doing his job.

Madam Speaker, I want you to look at this graph. The seizures at the border of fentanyl: 2019, 2,800 pounds; 2023, 27,000 pounds of fentanyl were seized.

Madam Speaker, I just got back again from visiting the border. I went to San Ysidro, and, again, I asked the men and women in uniform: What do you need from us to double these numbers?

It was a simple answer: We want more resources. We want more personnel, more drug-sniffing dogs, and we want more equipment.

Some of those agents were struggling. They were working double shifts. Women, moms, men, and fathers were saying: We don't have time for families. We are going to have to find another job.

Right now we have a solution. We have legislation that the Senate has worked on with Senate Republicans, Senate Democrats, and the President supporting a solution that will bring resources to the border, and the majority party here refuses to bring that legislation forward for a vote.

Who is delict in their duty?

We must step up and make sure that we protect Main Street and we help Secretary Mayorkas do his job and double these numbers.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG).

Mr. STRONG. Madam Speaker, today's legislation is about delivering accountability on behalf of the local and State leaders unable to bear the weight of thousands of illegal immigrants flooding their communities, hospitals, and schools; on behalf of the thousands of families who have lost loved ones at the hands of illegal immigrants; and on behalf of hundreds of Border Patrol agents stripped of their tools to do their job.

The situation at the border cannot continue. I have seen it firsthand during my trips to the southern border. Mayorkas' refusal to enforce the laws of our Nation has encouraged millions of illegal aliens from 160 different countries to cross the border. Over 85 percent of them are being released into the United States.

This is in clear violation of Federal immigration law. Failure to act is not an option. The yearlong investigation held by the committee confirmed what every American already knew to be true.

The actions that we will take today against Secretary Mayorkas are warranted and utterly urgent. Our country is under attack, and the Secretary of Homeland Security is working against America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to act at this critical time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, if my Republican colleagues were serious about the border, then they would drop this baseless impeachment and bring up the Senate's bipartisan border agreement for debate.

Be that as it may, they aren't serious about reform. Speaker JOHNSON made it clear that the bill was dead on arrival before he saw the text of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, on the first Homeland Security Committee hearing, Professor Bowman, an expert in impeachments, made it clear that policy differences are not a legitimate basis for impeachment. There is no legitimate basis for impeachment, yet here we are.

Why?

It is because Republicans believe persecution is a substitute for policymaking.

I guess when you can't legislate, you punish, right?

Persecution has become the go-to strategy to score political points. We have seen that on Congresspersons OMAR, SCHIFF, TLAIB, and even their own Speaker McCarthy, government employees, immigrants, and now Secretary Mayorkas.

While great for political theater, persecution and punishment do not solve problems. Policy does. Nonetheless, Republicans are not interested in policy. They shut us down for presenting policy. They even killed a supplemental they had negotiated for months.

They are just desperately deflecting attention from their failure to govern to secure their own empty reelections.

If they were serious, then we would be debating policies to address the humanitarian crisis and the root causes of migration and fentanyl. Clearly they are not.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Clearly, they are not serious about solutions, just chaos.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, many have said what the issue is. Many have mischaracterized it, in my judgment.

The issue presented by the Articles of Impeachment and why they should be adopted by the House is not a matter of policy, it is not a matter of maladministration, it is not a matter of incompetence, it is not a matter of neglect, and it is not even a matter of refusal to enforce the law.

It was stated succinctly and aptly in the District Court opinion that ultimately led to the United States Supreme Court last summer in the United States v. Texas.

The core of the dispute is whether the executive branch may require its officials to act in a manner that conflicts with a statutory mandate imposed by Congress.

It may not.

You see, Madam Speaker, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas, issued guidelines—administrative law—instructing the Department of Homeland Security not to detain criminal aliens nor those ordered finally removed. That is what he did, and that was flatly contradictory to statutes passed by the Congress in the mid-1990s.

We are a nation of laws. The Supreme Court has said it cannot referee this dispute, it is up to Congress, and the Congress has but one means in this situation to vindicate the law. It cannot help the situation by shutting down the government or by cutting off funding. There is no new Cabinet Secretary to refuse to confirm in the Senate.

There is but one means: the impeachment of the Secretary who purported to issue law defying the Congress. That must result in his impeachment if the law is to have any force and if the Congress is to remain of any significance in the jurisprudence in the law of the United States.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the Republicans highlight the Secretary's enforcement guidelines as an example of breaking the law. They fail to mention that the conservative Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals said: "The guidance does not necessarily violate a single word of the statute."

The Sixth Circuit also found that the provision of immigration law that Re-

publicans frequently cite does not "... creates a judicially enforceable mandate that the Department arrest or remove certain noncitizens."

Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

Mr. IVEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

The power to impeach is one of the greatest constitutional powers granted to the House of Representatives. This awesome responsibility should be reserved for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Nonetheless, House Republicans have decided to abuse that responsibility for a cheap political stunt.

House Republicans have not alleged an impeachable offense. Policy disagreements are not impeachable. Even if you strongly believe border security should be improved, Madam Speaker, that does not provide grounds to remove a Cabinet official.

That is why former Republican Secretary Michael Chertoff said that Mayorkas hasn't committed an impeachable offense. Even law professor Jonathan Turley has said that Secretary Mayorkas' alleged actions are not impeachable and fail to amount to high crimes and misdemeanors warranting his impeachment.

Republicans offered no constitutional scholars as witnesses during their two impeachment hearings, but rather relied on Republican States attorneys general's testimony, one of which didn't even mention the word "impeachment" in his prepared statements.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. This unconstitutional impeachment process has been predetermined and unjust since it began. It will lower the constitutional bar for future impeachments, and it will not make our border more secure. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, often known as the invasion clause, says that this government will protect every State from invasion.

That is something that clearly this Secretary is in complete dereliction of duty of, and I know that he swore an oath to protect and defend the Constitution.

Now, I am not sure how many Americans have to die of fentanyl or have their kids raped and murdered by MS-13 gang members. We had one in Homeland Security just a couple weeks ago begging us to do something about this absolutely atrocious leadership from the Secretary.

Nonetheless, it is high time that this individual be held accountable for his

complete dereliction of duty at our southern border.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The last thing I want to say is that I think it tells you everything you need to know when my colleagues say that it doesn't matter if you impeach Secretary Mayorkas, we are just going to have somebody come in and do the same exact job.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you for saying the quiet part out loud.

Yes, your policies are so bad that no matter whom you put in there it will cause the same amount of damage to the American people. The people of this country are watching. Let's get this done.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, 90 percent of fentanyl seized is interdicted at ports of entry, mostly in passenger vehicles driven by U.S. citizens and lawful residents, not migrants. If we invest in our ports of entry instead of pursuing this sham impeachment, we can scan more of these vehicles.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, smoke and mirrors have never been the foundation of the Constitution. That is all we have today to misrepresent to the American people that we are doing serious work.

It comes to mind as to whether or not Secretary Mayorkas is being charged with Articles of Impeachment because he is a Cuban immigrant who came to the United States with his family as political refugees, that they spent time fleeing the Nazis, and that he came here to do his very best for the American people. Yet we attempt to charge him with willful violation of the law.

Operational control of the border means zero persons coming across. This has not been the case as relates to any Secretary no matter what administration. Yet we have failed in this process of false smoke and mirrors to allow us to be able to articulate any charge that might constitute high crimes and misdemeanors. We failed to provide evidence to support the charges such as they are.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. We have failed to name the proper target for impeachment in a policy dispute. We have failed to process anything against Secretary Mayorkas, and we could not, in

any way, bring anything to suggest that he violated the law or that he benefited from any aspect of his work.

This Secretary has been denied due process. This is smoke and mirrors. The Constitution, which is the foundation of this land, is true. There have been no high crimes and misdemeanors or bribery. This is an impeachment that should be immediately dismissed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the Articles of Impeachment.

Madam Speaker, it is a sad day that the House has been convened to consider an impeachment bill against the current Secretary of Homeland Security—a measure that is without merit or consideration of the consequences to the agency or how this action may undermine the current challenges the nation is facing.

While this impeachment resolution bears no meaningful or serious merits, I offered an amendment for consideration by the Rules Committee that would strike Article 1 of H. Res 863—Impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, because he is not accused of committing any high crimes or misdemeanors.

Article 1 of the bill accuses him of "Willful and Systematic Refusal to Comply with the Law.

Secretary Mayorkas has not committed "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors"—the United States Constitution's standard, for an impeachment.

Secretary Mayorkas is carrying out his duties faithfully.

House Republicans may not approve of the Biden administration's policies, but policy differences are not grounds for impeachment under the Constitution.

House Republicans are trying to distract from their inability to govern and score political points with their extreme political base by impeaching the Secretary.

Rather than abusing their power as the majority in the House of Representatives with an unjustified impeachment process, they should focus on keeping the government open and join with Democrats to provide border personnel the funding they need to do their job. I regret that of the two hearings held that they did not include any majority witnesses that were Constitutional Scholars nor a minority hearing to allow opposing views to be aired, nor the target of the impeachment Secretary Mayorkas being allowed to come before the committee in his defense.

This is the standard set by prior impeachment proceedings but ignored by the majority-controlled Homeland Security Committee.

In 1776 the Framers declared the self-evident and later the universal truth that all persons are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As important, the Framers declared that "to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed."

This genius of self-government is the Framers' gift to us and America's gift to the world, and for nearly 250 years the world has looked upon the United States with wonder, awe, and envy not just for its awesome powers and achievements, but for being the exemplar to which most freedom-loving nations aspire.

But as President Lincoln reminded us at Gettysburg, the proposition that a people can

govern themselves is not to be taken for granted; it is a proposition that will be tested time and again and it is for us, the living, to highly resolve to commit ourselves to the great task always before us, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people not perish from the earth.

As Thomas Paine said in his time, the past fourteen years were times that tried one's soul. The nation was tested, severely so, by what can only be described as the modern-day Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: a deadly pandemic, economic devastation unseen since the Great Depression, social justice unrest, and the very real threat of authoritarianism.

While the threat posed by these challenges are still with us to varying extent, we can all rejoice that the nation withstood the challenge, e pluribus unum, by standing together as "We The People."

President Lincoln reminded us that in times of testing and challenge that "the fiery trial through which we pass will mark us down in honor or dishonor until the latest generation" but that so long as the people "retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government' in the short space of four years."

And Lincoln was right, for on Election Day 2020, Americans by a substantial majority, voted to withhold consent to govern from an incumbent administration and confer it upon another.

That act of self-government and sovereign expression was solemnized on January 20, 2021, at noon when Joseph R. Biden and Kamala D. Harris took the oath of office as the 46th President and 59th Vice-President of the United States.

The Philadelphia Miracle of 1789 endures but only because we Americans resolve that it does and work to make it so.

The President takes the oath of office pledging to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

As does every one of my congressional colleagues, I have sacredly pledged true faith and allegiance in defending the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to execute the duties of the office well and faithfully I hold. I do this ever mindful that the purpose of our form of government is "to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to ensure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty for posterity."

But we all have a responsibility to preserve and strengthen this constitutional republic and pass it on to the next generation by engaging in robust, lawful, and peaceful civic activity to hold our government to account and to peaceably assemble when necessary to petition for a redress of grievances as shown by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. at the March on Washington, following the example of Mahatma Gandhi; by John Lewis and the Civil Rights foot soldiers at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama; by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott at Seneca Falls; by Cesar Chavez leading the fight for human dignity of farmworkers, and by Black Lives Matter demonstrators protesting inequalities in the criminal justice system.

For the work of democracy is never complete, our union is always in the process of being made more perfect.

The ingredients for good policy are competence, capability, and willingness to put aside partisanship and place national interest first.

At this moment in our nation's history Republicans are attempting to impeach Secretary Mayorkas not for any malfeasance or wrongdoing—but because they disagree with his actions carrying out the Biden administration's border and immigration policies.

Using policy differences as grounds for impeachment is an abusive political action that the Founders rejected as antithetical to the U.S. Constitution.

Republicans have not alleged that the Secretary has committed an impeachable offense, so their "reports" attempting to legitimize their unfounded case for impeachment effort contain blatant misinformation and politically motivated rhetoric, such as criticizing the termination of harmful but barely utilized Trump-era immigration and border policies, which were not laws—a fact they either do not understand or willfully ignore.

Such a political theater has no basis in the history of American constitutional law, as Article II of the U.S. Constitution sets the standard for impeachment of "civil officers" as "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

The Biden administration's departure from the failed, cruel, and sometimes unlawful border and immigration policies of the previous administration is certainly not an impeachable offense.

Impeachment under these circumstances is not a constitutional remedy for political and policy differences.

Impeachment is an extraordinary remedy reserved for the most egregious political offenses, not policy differences. Indeed, Madison objected to the term "maladministration" being added to the list of impeachable offenses during the Constitutional Convention because it would upset the separation of powers.

The first and only impeachment of a Cabinet official occurred in 1876 following extensive evidence of corruption.

Republican Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement, described Rep. GREENE's attempt to impeach Secretary Mayorkas over policy disagreements as a "perilous path" for future governance.

Chairman MCCLINTOCK went on to argue that the redefinition of impeachment found in H. Res. 863 "would utterly destroy the separation of powers at the heart of our Constitution.

While these are the basis for this Committee not moving forward in the process, there are compelling reasons why the Committee should be actively engaged in Immigration Reform.

Impeachment is not a punishment, sought to be inflicted when one branch of government merely disagrees with or dislikes what a coordinate 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 detail the powers of the House and the exercising of these powers as they relate to the coordinate, coequal branches of government, codified in Article II, and Article 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 Craig 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 preexisting 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' 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 is 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 representatives 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 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.

The reason given for the Impeachment is the border crisis, one that this body has not taken any steps to address, but the Senate has sent over a border bill to address the border policy issues raised during the two Impeachment hearings.

The response from the House is to stay the Senate Border bill is dead on arrival-sight unseen and no counteroffer made.

As a result of lack of Congressional action, the Biden Administration is using the tools it has available to secure the border and build a safe, orderly, and humane immigration system.

Secretary Mayorkas as head of DHS began a whole-of-government approach in Fall 2021 to prepare for the end of Title 42.

In May 2022, Secretary Mayorkas issued the six-pillar plan that outlined preparations to prepare for surges in migration and the lifting of Title 42.

The plan showed measurable success.

The power of immigration reform to reduce unlawful entry is proven through the Biden Administration method of promoting the largest expansion of legal pathways for safe, orderly, and humane migration in decades, and put in new rules to encourage people to use those lawful pathways instead of making the dangerous journey to try to enter unlawfully.

The success of the lifting of Title 42 was not sustainable without resources and changes being made to immigration laws.

Instead, Republican governors have become the poster children for increased irregular migration because of their work to send people from the Southern Border to New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, which sent a message that unlawful border crossings were welcomed.

The final ingredient is legislative action by Congress to address increasing the capacity of immigration courts to prioritize the orderly and fair processing of asylum claims of certain recent arrivals, while ensuring those not seeking protection or who don't qualify are promptly returned to their country of origin.

The Administration is continuing to aggressively increase legal pathways, enforce our immigration laws, target smugglers who prey and profit on vulnerable migrants and seek to traffic drugs into our country, and work collaboratively with cities and states that are impacted.

Republicans who have used immigration as a wedge issue attempted to derail the President's efforts.

It is time to focus on the places and communities receiving new residents and families to make sure the transition a win—win for new immigrants and communities.

Providing Resources to Larger Urban Areas and Rural Areas.

Democrats have proposed legislation, such as the Dream Act and the American Dream and Promise Act, that would provide a pathway to citizenship for young undocumented immigrants brought to the U.S. as children, also known as Dreamers.

Democrats are focused on providing resources to communities receiving migrants, implementing policies to ensure an orderly, humane border, and keeping the government funded.

Democrats also recognize that while there are near-term costs to receiving migrants, immigrants contribute significantly to the U.S. economy, fuel our growth, and provide a net benefit to our country's finances by paying billions in taxes annually.

Democrats also support comprehensive immigration reform that would create a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants and improve border security measures while respecting the rights and dignity of all individuals.

In July 2021, the House passed a bill that would create a pathway to citizenship for un-

documented farmworkers and their families, called the Farm Workforce Modernization Act.

This would protect workers from exploitation and abuse and would provide stability for the agricultural industry.

Democrats have advocated for a comprehensive immigration reform package that would address the root causes of migration, improve border security, and create legal pathways for people to enter the U.S. lawfully.

The Biden-Harris Administration, under the direction of Secretary Mayorkas, are showing Congress, the nation and the world what is indeed possible when immigration is not treated like an offense to the nation instead of the fuel that drives our economy and injects vitality into our communities.

Because of joint Congressional and White House support since early 2021, DHS and CBP increased their border holding capacity by over a third through the construction of new facilities.

CBP has increased the efficiency of migrant processing and reduced the time noncitizens spend in temporary holding by 30 percent.

Over the years, I worked with my fellow Democrats and Republican Members of this Committee to make sure that these unaccompanied children stay safe and have a legal documentation in the United States, while the Republican Party sadly has steadfastly opposed all the legislations that benefits these children.

I ask the Rules Committee to reject this impeachment and begin plans to consider the bill sent from the Senate for a resolution to the Border crisis.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, this is a sad day. It is a sad day that we have to be here, but the Framers of our Constitution forecasted that this could occur.

While we are going to hear that this is a policy difference, that this is maladministration. This is the systemic refusal to follow the law and to enforce the law. It is an egregious breach of public trust.

Moreover, there are no other avenues here. There must be a consequence, and there must be accountability. That is why we are moving to impeach Alejandro Mayorkas for endangering our country.

Anyone with common sense can see that what is being allowed to happen at our border is not only a catastrophe, but it is a national security crisis.

□ 1530

Madam Speaker, 9 million illegal aliens have entered our country since President Biden has been in office, including 300 people that have matched the terror watch list.

It took less than 20 people to orchestrate the attacks on 9/11, which sent me into 20 years of service to this country to protect us overseas. Yet, we are letting the Trojan horse into our country that threatens us. We have a Secretary who refuses to enforce the laws on the books.

It is Congress' duty to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security

is led by individuals committed to upholding the rule of law and protecting our borders, and the failure to secure the border has been so severe that we have to provide accountability.

Not only is this a systemic refusal to follow the law, but it is also the systemic deconstruction of the rule of law that eventually will eat away at this country.

I am so concerned, and our country should be concerned.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone in this House to do something that actually gets accountability, to impeach Alejandro Mayorkas, and to get our country secure again.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 37¼ minutes. The gentleman from Mississippi has 39¼ minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, daily removals are nearly double what they were compared to pre-pandemic averages. The vast majority of individuals encountered at the southwest border throughout this administration have been removed, returned, or expelled.

Secretary Mayorkas is enforcing the law.

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to call out the hypocrisy and extreme political stunts Republicans are displaying with this baseless and unconstitutional impeachment against the Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas.

Instead of seeking bipartisan solutions, they voted to cut border security funding. Let me repeat that: cut border security funding. They are now bringing an impeachment that lacks basis in law just to pull another one of their political stunts.

Secretary Mayorkas has dedicated his career to public service and our country. During his time in the Department, he led the development and implementation of DACA and led the Department's successful response to Ebola and Zika outbreaks.

He has worked tirelessly on combating human trafficking and developed an emergency relief program for orphaned youth following the tragic January 10 earthquake in Haiti.

Secretary Mayorkas has done the work he was tasked to do by the President and more.

Stop wasting time on yet another extreme political farce. Start working with Democrats for a bipartisan, real solution.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H. Res. 863, the Articles of Impeachment against Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

It is clear that Secretary Mayorkas has willfully and systematically refused to comply with U.S. immigration law. An average of 5,000 illegal immigrants are being released into the United States each day, which is a flagrant abuse of immigration laws passed by Congress governing the parole, detention, and removal of illegal immigrants.

For 3 years, Secretary Mayorkas has refused to enforce the laws passed by Congress. He has abused his authority as a Cabinet Secretary. He has misled Congress and the American people about the crisis and the role his actions and decisions have played in sparking and facilitating it.

As a result, we see record amounts of daily fentanyl flowing into our communities, rising crime across our country, and a massive strain on our localities, schools, and community services.

Since Secretary Mayorkas' tenure, over 300 individuals on the terrorist watch list trying to illegally enter the United States at the southern border between ports of entry have been apprehended by Border Patrol agents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, cartels in Mexico are empowered to expand lucrative trafficking and smuggling operations across our porous southwest border.

The actions of Secretary Mayorkas have led to a complete humanitarian and national security catastrophe.

Congress must hold the executive branch accountable when they fail to uphold the oath of office.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H. Res. 863.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, Republicans ignore the fact that no administration has ever had the resources to detain all border crossers. President Trump released over 500,000 people without ever detaining any of them.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the sham impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

This resolution is filled with false and misleading statements that amount to nothing more than policy disagreements. Even if it were based in truth, however, policy disagreements are not a legitimate basis for impeachment.

Impeaching a Cabinet Secretary is serious. Unfortunately, House Republicans are not. This sham impeachment ran roughshod over due process and completely bypassed the Judiciary Committee, the committee of jurisdiction for impeachment.

This is not a serious effort, nor is it a serious resolution.

Republicans allege that Secretary Mayorkas should be impeached simply because he failed to meet the impossible standards set out in our laws, standards that no administration, not even President Trump's, has ever come close to meeting.

For example, they allege that Secretary Mayorkas failed to detain everyone that the law requires to be held in mandatory detention. To do so would require Congress to appropriate over \$35 billion a year, a number 10 times higher than President Trump ever requested for detention. That is why the Trump administration released over 500,000 people at the U.S.-Mexico border and released 1.1 million people from immigration detention into the United States.

Did we hear calls from the Republicans to impeach Secretaries Kelly, Duke, or Nielsen? Of course not.

The resolution also takes aim at the Secretary's use of his parole authority, but Republicans never complained when President Trump used his parole authority for tens of thousands of Cubans and military families.

So, what is different now? Could it be that it is an election year and Republicans have no record of accomplishments to run on?

With no ideas, no agenda, and no ability to govern, they are cheapening the serious and awesome power of impeachment to score a few cheap political points. That is shameful.

Our immigration system has been broken for decades. Impeaching a Cabinet Secretary because you do not like their policies will not repair it. Only bipartisan reform can do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYN).

Ms. VAN DUYN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas. His actions support lawbreaking and lawlessness and have inflicted a horrific toll on our country. The kind of damage he has done to our cities and families is something you would expect from a hostile foreign adversary looking to destabilize and destroy America.

Our cities are overrun, forcing vital services to be cut off or reduced, shutting down our schools to house illegal migrants, and turning community centers into refugee camps, all while ignoring the needs of our own citizens.

There are more than 110,000 dead Americans from fentanyl that is being smuggled by Mexican cartels. We see criminal illegal immigrants committing murder, rape, and beating our police in broad daylight.

This is far more than a policy difference. This is the death and destruction of our country and our people. I will not stand by and just politely ask the Biden administration to please stop the chaos and devastation.

In a functioning government, people need to be held accountable when they

have deliberately inflicted harm on our Nation, and that is exactly what we are doing today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, if my Republican colleagues were worried about the impacts of migration on our local communities, they should support DHS' Shelter and Services Program. This is the only Federal program that can provide direct assistance to cities and organizations responding to arriving migrants. Instead, they are trying to gut this program and impeach Secretary Mayorkas, which would accomplish nothing.

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

Mr. SWALWELL. Madam Speaker, this is not about Secretary Mayorkas. This is straight-up sabotage.

MAGA Republicans have never accepted President Biden as the President, from the day they led an insurrection into this Chamber to this day, where they are trying to sabotage solutions at the border.

Any shortcomings with Mayorkas are the Republicans' fault. The Republicans won't give him the authority that he needs to carry out more security at the border.

All we have heard for years is noun, verb, border. You get your border deal, led by the second most conservative in the Senate, and you are walking away from it. You are walking away from it because Trump says you can't have it.

This place with you all in charge is looking less and less like the House Chamber and more and more like Trump's echo chamber.

What we need right now are solutions, not chaos. With you all in charge, you are a party of followers. With President Biden's leadership, Democrats continue to show that we are a party of leaders.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, how many Democrats or open border caucus members—I apologize for my redundancy there—are willing to house migrants in their own homes, Madam Speaker? None. Zero. Nada. They seem to all be for providing sanctuary, provided they don't have to provide it.

Alejandro Mayorkas, under oath, testified before Congress and claimed the border is no less secure than it was previously. Does anyone in this Chamber

actually believe that? Does anyone in this country believe that?

Let's compare the first 3 years of President Trump's and Biden's tenures: President Trump in his first 3 years, 1.6 million illegal crossings; Joe Biden, 8.3 million, a 519 percent increase. Terror watch list suspects apprehended under Trump were 8 in 3 years; under Joe Biden, 361. That is a 4,512 percent increase. Chinese nationals, men mostly of military age entering illegally, last year under President Trump it was 450, and under Joe Biden it is over 24,000. That is a 5,333 percent increase.

No less secure. Is that the new math? Opioid deaths have doubled. The Mexican drug cartels are enjoying record profits.

Alejandro Mayorkas fostered this mayhem, and he facilitated cataclysmic chaos. He is inept. He is weak. He is impotent. He has violated Federal law. He has perjured himself in front of Congress. He has lied to the American people. He has undermined his own Border Patrol agents.

Mayorkas has shown the world who he is. He is a sheep in sheep's clothing. The cartel wolves and our enemies across the world are circling.

This impeachment is richly deserved, and we must fire this bum, this second coming of Benedict Arnold, forthwith.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, let's look at the facts. Since May 12, 2023, when title 42 ended, DHS has removed more than 500,000 individuals. That is more people than Donald Trump removed in any given year. The border is not open.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, we are here because the madcap wild goose chase to impeach Joe Biden has produced no wild geese. Even FOX News is lampooning the fact that their own expert witnesses repeatedly say that President Biden did nothing wrong and that there are no grounds for impeachment. More than a dozen GOP Members in Biden majority districts don't want to go anywhere near that fantasy production.

So, the Trump-Putin-MAGA faction, headed up by the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE), has been given this worthless trinket of a consolation prize—the opportunity to bring this slapstick impeachment drive against a Cabinet member of unimpeachable integrity who has obviously committed no treason, no bribery, no high crimes, no misdemeanors, nothing indictable or even “in-dict-able,” if you prefer.

What makes this farce a tragedy is that Secretary Mayorkas and the U.S. Senate have been working for months to achieve precisely the immigration and border compromise the GOP has been demanding. Miraculously, they got to a bipartisan immigration agreement for billions of dollars for more

Border Patrol officers, immigration judges, and fentanyl detection machines—a far tougher border.

It was good enough for Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and dozens of GOP Senators, and it was good enough for *The Wall Street Journal*, but the House MAGAs would not take “yes” for an answer. Why? Because Donald Trump doesn't want a border solution. He wants a border problem. Nothing else to run on.

□ 1545

Vladimir Putin certainly doesn't want \$60 billion going to the heroic people of Ukraine defying his filthy imperialist invasion. All over the world, democracy and freedom are under siege today and all our colleagues can think to do is to sell out our democratic allies and sell out the cause of human rights, and then impeach a Cabinet Secretary working diligently to solve the immigration problem that they claim to care about.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas swore an oath to defend the U.S. Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic. Unfortunately, it seems as though he hasn't defended it from a single one.

Since President Biden took office, there have been more than 7 million illegal encounters at our southern border and more than 1.7 million known got-aways. Not once has Secretary Mayorkas issued a statement, signed a policy, or taken action to discourage this from happening.

In fact, he has doubled down and encouraged the invasion by endorsing catch and release policies, ending title 42, and stopping remain in Mexico. This subversion of our Constitution, willful disregard of our country's laws, and unfettered dedication to exacerbating the self-inflicted crisis have left the House with no other option than to impeach Secretary Mayorkas.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to join me in voting to impeach Secretary Mayorkas and I urge the Senate to remove him from his position.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that they voted to terminate the COVID-19 national emergency and thus voted to end title 42. In addition, DHS has no role in ending this policy.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

Mr. MAGAZINER. Madam Speaker, the American people want us to be working together to solve our challenges at the border. We could be working together to vote on President Biden's proposal for \$14 billion of funding that would add over 1,000 Border Patrol officers. We could be working with the Senate on real immigration reform that Republicans claimed they wanted until Donald Trump told them that they didn't, but instead we are

wasting time and energy on an impeachment with no legal basis just because it is what Donald Trump wants.

The facts are this: Congress has allocated funding for 34,000 beds at detention centers. The average daily census last year was 37,000. The centers are full, and so the Secretary, under the law, uses his legal discretion to decide who to detain and who to release—the same legal discretion that all of his predecessors have used.

In the last 2 years of the Trump administration, 52 percent of migrants were released, nearly a million people, and I did not hear my House Republican colleagues calling to impeach that Homeland Security Secretary.

No. This is about one thing—politics. There are no high crimes, no misdemeanors, no treason, no bribery. I would remind my colleagues, our oath is to the Constitution, not to Donald Trump.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, it has been said that Secretary Mayorkas is dishonest, duplicitous, and derelict in his duties, and I agree.

However, he has also willfully refused to comply with and enforce our Nation's immigration laws and explicitly instructed his employees to not enforce these laws.

Additionally, the Secretary has willfully obstructed inquiries of the Judiciary Committee regarding entry of illegal aliens into our country. The constitutional standard for impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas has been satisfied.

I commend Chair MARK GREEN for his excellent work in managing this important constitutional matter, and in following regular order while doing so.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, despite what Republicans want us to believe, the courts at the highest level have not found that Secretary Mayorkas is violating the law. Courts are where we go to determine whether a Cabinet Secretary is following the law Congress wrote, not a partisan impeachment.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP's political stunt of the day: impeaching Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas.

The real problem here is congressional inaction on immigration reform. My community of El Paso, Texas, on the U.S.-Mexico border has been on the front lines of this issue and living with the consequences of Congress' failure to act.

Our Federal personnel, local governments, and shelters are all overwhelmed, and Republicans continue to withhold vital funding that would help address this issue.

As a border legislator, I have never met a more committed, accessible Cabinet member than Secretary Mayorkas.

He is a great public servant doing everything he can with the limited resources Congress has given to him.

Madam Speaker, I invite my Republican colleagues who really want to solve this to join the bipartisan coalition supporting the Dignity Act. Stop playing games and do your job.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for impeaching Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas for reasons outlined in both Articles of Impeachment, but specifically for Article II, breach of public trust.

Secretary Mayorkas has repeatedly testified falsely, misleading Congress and the American people. He has done so by saying that the southwest border is secure and that his department has operational control of the border.

Secretary Mayorkas in his previous appearances before the Committee on Homeland Security has told me personally multiple times, testifying while under oath, that the border is secure.

Time and time again, Secretary Mayorkas has appeared before Congress, both the United States House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate and has repeated that the southwest border is secure.

These declarations, Madam Speaker, are patently untrue, and they contradict statements made by both his former Border Patrol Chief, Raul Ortiz, and by the President himself.

President Biden just recently said and admitted that the border was not secure, and he went on to say that the border has not been secure for almost a decade.

Madam Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas' dealings with Congress indicate a lack of transparency and an attempt to mislead the public on the true conditions that exist at the border, and we, as Congress, must now hold Secretary Mayorkas accountable.

This is a grave day in our history, a grave day for this Nation, and not one that we take lightly. However, in light of all the facts, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to impeach Secretary Mayorkas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues won't admit that this impeachment is a sham, but their favorite conservative legal experts will.

President Trump's impeachment attorney, Alan Dershowitz, accused Republicans of "distorting the Constitution;" and Republicans' favorite legal witness, Jonathan Turley, said that: "There is also no current evidence that [Mayorkas] is corrupt or committed an impeachable offense. . . ."

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the partisan sham impeachment proceedings against a dedicated and honorable public servant, Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

Secretary Mayorkas has done his job while operating within a broken immigration system that this Congress has refused to fix. Instead of working with House Democrats and the Biden administration on serious solutions, House Republicans are focused on one thing: appeasing former President Donald Trump.

This impeachment is an unconstitutional abuse of power. It is clear that policy differences are not grounds for impeachment. Even worse, in the partisan nature of these proceedings are the alleged facts that they are based on. To build their case, House Republicans work with and cite reports from groups such as the Center for Immigration Studies, a Southern Poverty Law Center designated hate group.

When I attempted to introduce an amendment to point this out, it was rejected by House Republicans twice in committee—once in Homeland and once in Rules.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, Republicans don't want Americans to know the baseless and completely unprecedented nature of this impeachment, and that is that antimigrant hate groups form the foundation of the case that we are listening to today.

I stand with my Democratic colleagues against this partisan impeachment, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no."

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, James Iredell, one of the Founders from North Carolina, talking about this impeachment clause said: "The power of impeachment is given by this Constitution, to bring great offenders to punishment. It is calculated to bring them to punishment for crime which it is not easy to describe, but which everyone must be convinced is a high crime and misdemeanor against the government."

For instance, corruption. "Its exercise"—the impeachment—"will arise from acts of great injury to the community, and the objects of it may be such as cannot be easily reached by an ordinary tribunal."

That is why you have impeachment. It is necessary here because what you have is a Secretary who came into Judiciary, he was given the language from the Secure Fence Act of 2006. I said: Is the border under operational control? He says: Well, no. We have redefined it ourselves. We are comfortable with the new definition that we have made. That is a violation of the separation of powers.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, this is the same Secretary who tells his ICE agents you cannot remove 1 million, 1.2 million people who have actually had due process through the courts and have active removal orders.

He is the same Secretary who said that we don't have to adhere to title 8.

That has resulted in great injury to our communities, and that is why he must be impeached—because he falls on the definitions that one of the Founders, James Iredell, said. He is right on the money, and I urge everyone to support this movement to impeach.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the definition of "operational control" in the Secure Fence Act of 2006 has never been achieved under any administration, including the Trump administration. This is not grounds for impeachment.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, today, Republicans are engaging in yet another impeachment scam.

We are here today because the majority wants to attack President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas all to elect Donald Trump. The insane leader of their party claims that immigrants, like me, pollute the blood of this country.

Donald Trump's rhetoric is just like Hitler's, and he wants chaos. He thinks the border crisis helps him, so he wants it to continue.

In fact, Border Patrol apprehensions more than tripled in the last 8 months of the Trump Presidency, but let's remember the Donald Trump and MAGA vision for border security.

These are actually some of their ideas: Donald Trump wants to build alligator moats. He has proposed bombing Mexico. He has actually said we should shoot migrants in the legs and maybe even electrify the fence.

These are cruel and ridiculous ideas, but they are proposals of Donald Trump and the MAGA right. This extreme political stunt should fail.

□ 1600

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleagues across the aisle who have voiced their opposition. It is important that we clarify the legacy that some of us would condemn by impeaching the Secretary responsible for this legacy; and, by contrast, the legacy that my colleagues who oppose the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas will support:

300,000 Americans dead from cartel drugs;

100,000 teenage girls and boys missing, lost by the Mayorkas system into the unspeakable horror of sex slavery networks across the filthiest corners of criminal organizations in our cities;

American sovereignty disintegrated, American soil lost to cartel human and drug trafficking bases;

Millions of single military-aged men from over 100 countries unvetted, released into our country, creeping into every corner of American society, every city, every town;

Our schools overrun by illegals granted free access to American education infrastructure in hundreds of reports with no room left for our children;

Hundreds of thousands of violent criminals released into our Nation, despite Federal law stating that DHS shall detain known criminals who enter America illegally;

A thousand or more known or suspected terrorists allowed to pass freely into the heart of our Nation, into my State, into yours.

This is the legacy of Alejandro Mayorkas. By our oath, we must impeach this man who has presented an arrogant, defiant tone of denial and lies to Congress for 3 years, seemingly content or even proud to destroy America day by day. So it is that on this day, it shall be written in the historic record of the people's House that Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas, has been impeached. So shall it be written, so shall it be done.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are starving DHS of necessary border security resources while accusing Secretary Mayorkas of not doing his job.

House Republicans refuse to consider the White House's \$13.6 billion border supplemental funding request that would pay for more border agents and officers and detention beds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution to impeach Secretary Mayorkas.

This resolution is as ridiculous as it is dangerous. It has no evidence of high crimes and misdemeanors. Are we really debating impeaching a Cabinet Secretary because House Republicans don't like the policies that he advances under a democratically elected President?

Far from alleging true high crimes and misdemeanors, this resolution relies on the same tired and untrue Republican talking points that Democrats have demonstrated for months are not true. With this MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE sham impeachment resolution, the majority is bending to the will of the most extreme members of their Conference simply because they don't like the policies that Secretary Mayorkas is pursuing.

Secretary Mayorkas is an excellent and dedicated public servant, working tirelessly to protect our national security and to address a broken immigration system.

This Republican Congress, the least productive Congress in the history of

the United States, having passed only 27 bills that have been signed into law, despite over 700 votes in this body, is simply trying to distract the American people from the fact that they are not doing a single thing to address the lives of ordinary Americans across this country.

I keep thinking that the House cannot debase itself further, Mr. Speaker, but it appears that we have not reached rock bottom yet. Vote "no" on this sham of an impeachment.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI).

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, let me start with this: The House is pursuing impeachment because there is no option left. Secretary Mayorkas has abandoned his job, and he has abandoned the American people.

As the charges describe, the Secretary has willfully and systemically refused to comply with the law, and he has put our communities and our country at risk by doing so.

This is not an action we take lightly. The last time a Cabinet Secretary was impeached was in 1876. This is a historic impeachment for someone with historic failures.

The time has run out for Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas to be able to do his job. In order to secure our communities, protect our homeland, and keep Americans safe, Secretary Mayorkas has got to go.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD op-eds from frequent conservative legal commentators Jonathan Turley and Alan Dershowitz opposing the Mayorkas impeachment, despite their policy disagreements with the Biden administration; and a January 30, 2024, editorial by the conservative Wall Street Journal titled: "Impeaching Mayorkas Achieves Nothing."

[From the Daily Beast, Jan. 29, 2024]

HOMELAND SECURITY CHIEF ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS' FAILURES ARE NOT IMPEACHABLE
(By Jonathan Turley)

Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas has been denounced as dishonest, duplicitous, and derelict by his critics. In my view, all of those things are manifestly true. It is also true, in my opinion, that none of those things amount to high crimes and misdemeanors warranting his impeachment.

The Republican push to impeach Mayorkas has been gaining steam as record numbers of undocumented migrants pour over our Southern border. Even many Democrats are now alarmed by the numbers and the threat that they pose to our national security and to our economy. Sanctuary cities from Chicago to New York are actively trying to prevent new migrants from seeking sanctuary within their own borders.

At the center of all of this is Mayorkas, who has long been viewed as an enabling figure for illegal migrations. He is also accused of implementing Biden policy changes that removed barriers to migrants, including rescinding the "Stay in Mexico" rule.

Some of us have also questioned his integrity, particularly in controversies like the false claims that border agents whipped migrants in Texas.

Mayorkas knew the allegations against his own personnel were debunked, but showed little concern or compassion for agents, particularly after President Joe Biden promised they would be punished before any investigation had even begun.

However, being a bad person is not impeachable—or many cabinets would be largely empty.

Moreover, being bad at your job is not an impeachable offense. Even really bad. Even Mayorkas' level of bad. If that were the case, he would be only the latest in a long line of cabinet officers frog-marched into Congress for constitutional termination.

In history, there has only been one cabinet member impeached. That was Secretary of War William Belknap in 1876. That alone should concentrate the mind of members. Despite decades of controversial cabinet members accused of flaunting the law or abusing their positions, Congress has only crossed this Rubicon once. There has existed a certain detente between the parties; an understanding that policy-based impeachments could open up endless tit-for-tat impeachment politics.

The charges against Belknap were serious, in that he had allegedly "disregarded his duty as Secretary of War, and basely prostituted his high office to his lust for private gain." The alleged bribes in contracts in the Indian territories would have constituted impeachable offenses, but Belknap had already left office. His case raised the question of retroactive impeachments for former federal officers.

The jurisdictional concerns made the difference for Belknap. The final vote on the closest article was 37 to 25 in favor of impeachment—four votes short of the number needed for conviction.

There is no jurisdictional question for Mayorkas, but there is also no current evidence that he is corrupt or committed an impeachable offense. He can be legitimately accused of effectuating an open border policy, but that is a disagreement on policy that is traced to the President.

In fairness to the GOP, they allege that Mayorkas is violating federal law in releasing what he now reportedly admits is over 85 percent of illegal migrants into the country as well as alleged false statements to Congress. Such releases, however, occurred in prior administrations and the merits of these claims are still being argued in court.

The courts have long recognized that presidents are allowed to establish priorities in the enforcement of federal laws, even when those priorities tend to lower enforcement for certain groups or areas. It is a matter of discretion.

Indeed, even under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) which holds the government liable for civil damages, there is a discretionary function exception codified under 28 U.S.C. § 2680 (a) for policy-based judgments.

Immigration has long been an area of intense policy disagreements. Trump policies were denounced by critics as draconian or even racist. Biden's policies have been denounced as fueling illegal crossings and frustrating efforts to curtail the flow, particularly by border states.

In my view, Biden has been dead wrong on immigration, but voters will soon have an opportunity to render a judgment on those policies in the election. Mayorkas has carried out those policies. What has not been shown is conduct by the secretary that could be viewed as criminal or impeachable.

If Mayorkas is violating federal law, he can be brought to court to enjoin his actions. A prior case seeking to prevent the termination of the "Stay in Mexico" policy resulted in a win for the Biden administration in *Biden v. Texas*, when the Supreme Court

ruled the president had the authority to revoke the Migrant Protection Protocols.

During the Constitutional Convention, there was a debate over the grounds for impeachment with George Mason arguing for a broad scope of offenses that could “subvert the Constitution.” His view was rejected. Most notably, there was a rejection of “maladministration” as a basis for impeachment.

An English trial of Warren Hastings weighed heavily on the forging of the impeachment standard. The former governor of India was charged with various offenses including “mismanagement and misgovernment...and mistreatment of various provinces.” While figures like Mason saw the need for the adoption of a similarly broad definition, his suggestion of maladministration was rejected as too broad.

What Mayorkas is guilty of is maladministration. He has failed to secure the Southern border and has long denied the gravity of this crisis, including refusing to call it a crisis even as daily and monthly crossings reached unprecedented levels.

None of this means that a cabinet member cannot be impeached. However, not like this. Not for maladministration.

I hold no brief for Alejandro Mayorkas. However, I hold the Constitution more dearly than I despise his tenure. Absent some new evidence, I cannot see the limiting principle that would allow the House to impeach Mayorkas without potentially making any policy disagreement with a cabinet member a high crime and misdemeanor. That is a slippery slope that we would be wise to avoid. Indeed, it is precisely the temptation that the Framers thought they had avoided by rejecting standards like maladministration.

That is why the case has not been made to impeach Alejandro Mayorkas.

[From The Hill, Jan. 30, 2024]

REPUBLICANS WHO VOTED AGAINST IMPEACHING TRUMP SHOULD NOT VOTE TO IMPEACH MAYORKAS

(By Alan Dershowitz)

When I represented then-President Donald Trump in his first impeachment case, many Republicans praised me for demonstrating that the Constitution permits impeachment only for “treason, bribery, and other high crimes or misdemeanors.” Trump had not been charged with any of those offenses, but rather with vague allegations of abuse of power and obstruction of Congress. The Senate voted to acquit Trump of the unconstitutional charges brought by Democrats. Republicans applauded that result.

Now many of the same Republicans are seeking to impeach Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas on equally vague and unconstitutional grounds. Whatever else Mayorkas may or may not have done, he has not committed bribery, treason, or high crimes and misdemeanors. Testifying to his opinion that the borders are secure is a far cry from perjury. Nor is failure to enforce laws a crime. Indeed, most Republicans do not even claim that his actions or inactions meet these daunting constitutional standards, but they are prepared to apply a double standard based on partisan considerations.

Double standards are anathema to justice under our Constitution. There must be one Constitution for all, regardless of party affiliation. If Republicans want to amend the Constitution, let them try, but neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have the right to redefine constitutional standards on an ad hoc basis in order to serve their partisan interests.

So, let’s hear from some principled Republicans who may dislike what Mayorkas is doing but who understand that they have

previously voted for a standard that has not come close to being met.

The philosopher La Rochefoucauld said that “Hypocrisy is the tribute that vice pays to virtue.” It is also the currency of politics in present-day Washington. But it is wrong regardless of which side promotes it.

Congress has the power to issue a statement condemning Mayorkas, just as it had the power to issue a statement condemning Trump. But the extraordinary power of impeachment should be reserved for constitutionally impeachable offenses and not invoked simply because one party has the votes to do so.

In the Federalist Papers, Alexander Hamilton warned that the “greatest danger” regarding the power to impeach would be if it were “regulated more by the comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.”

We experienced that danger when President Clinton was impeached by Republicans and when Trump was impeached by Democrats. Now we are seeing it play out once again with Republicans in control of the House of Representatives.

Hopefully there will be enough principled Republicans to prevent this abuse of the Constitution. But even if not, our system of checks and balances—which requires a two-thirds vote for conviction by the Senate—will prevent Mayorkas’s unconstitutional removal. Even if Mayorkas remains in office, a House vote to impeach him would add to the dangerous precedents established by previous partisan abuses of the impeachment provision.

The time has come, indeed it is overdue, for members of Congress who claim to be originalists when it comes to constitutional interpretation to recognize that the Framers explicitly refused to allow impeachment and removal for “maladministration” or other such vague abuses of duty. It is the voters who are allocated the power to vote against those who fail at governance.

Just because the Democrats were hypocritical when they impeached Trump on non-constitutional grounds does not give Republicans the right to do the same. Two wrongs make a fight, not a right. And the real losers are the American people, who count on Congress to uphold the Constitution, especially in areas of impeachment, where the courts have taken a hands-off view.

We live in an age in which partisanship too often trumps principle, and in which noble ends are thought to justify ignoble means. There is a reasonable dispute about how to achieve border security. I may agree with some Republicans who are critical of the current administration’s border policies and who place the blame on Mayorkas. But these criticisms—whether one agrees or disagrees with them—do not justify distorting the Constitution.

It is particularly essential in an age of partisan division that the nonpartisan principles of our Constitution be scrupulously obeyed. So I urge principled Republicans who care about the Constitution to oppose those in their party who are seeking to impeach and remove Mayorkas based on nonconstitutional accusations.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 30, 2024]

IMPEACHING MAYORKAS ACHIEVES NOTHING
(By The Editorial Board)

House Republicans are marking up articles of impeachment against Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, and the question is why? As much as we share the frustration with the Biden border mess, impeaching Mr. Mayorkas won’t change enforcement policy and is a bad precedent that will open the gates to more cabinet impeachments by both parties.

The Homeland Security Committee on Tuesday began marking up two articles of impeachment against Mr. Mayorkas—one for breach of trust and the other for “willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law.” The articles say these are “high crimes and misdemeanors” that justify removal from office.

The 20-page political indictment certainly is a sorry list of policy failings on Mr. Mayorkas’s watch and their damaging consequences for American cities and states. These include the entry of migrants on the terrorism watch list, and an increase in average encounters at the border from 590,000 in fiscal years 2017–2020—to 1.4 million in 2021, 2.3 million in 2022 and 2.4 million in 2023.

These are failures of policy and execution, but are they impeachable offenses? That seems doubtful. The first article cites Mr. Mayorkas for refusing to implement a law that requires detention of aliens. It says his policy of “catch and release” is impeachable.

Yet the Supreme Court has not ruled that the Biden policies are illegal. The High Court in 2022 let the Biden Administration end Donald Trump’s Remain in Mexico policy, and last year it ruled 8–1 that states don’t necessarily have standing to challenge the federal government’s enforcement priorities.

As for catch and release, one problem is the statutory “credible fear” standard for claiming asylum in the U.S. The standard is too low, but it isn’t clear under the law that the Administration can legally deport people claiming asylum before they get a hearing. The U.S. lacks the facilities to hold asylum claimants, so they are released to await their hearing—and that can take years. But the problem is asylum law, as Republicans have long argued.

Article I also claims Mr. Mayorkas has violated the law by expanding humanitarian parole beyond Congress’s intent. That’s probably true, but the law puts no cap on parole numbers. Texas and other states challenged the President’s authority to use parole for large classes of migrants, but the Supreme Court ruled against them.

House Republicans dislike how the Administration is interpreting immigration law. But Congress has failed to reform asylum standards or humanitarian parole, or to otherwise tighten immigration rules. That’s why Senators are now negotiating over language to reform both the asylum standard and parole.

If Congress holds Mr. Mayorkas impeachable for policy failure, what’s the limiting principle? Are his deputies also guilty of “high crimes” for implementing the Biden immigration agenda? Career officials? How many GOP cabinet secretaries will the next Democratic House line up to impeach? Policy disputes are for the voting booth, not impeachment.

All the more so because the main architect of the border-security fiasco isn’t Mr. Mayorkas. It’s his boss, President Biden. “If you want to flee and you are fleeing oppression, you should come,” said Candidate Joe Biden in a 2019 debate. Mr. Mayorkas is following White House orders.

Impeaching Mr. Mayorkas won’t have any effect on policy, or even on the politics of border security. Most voters don’t know who Mr. Mayorkas is. Even if the House passes the articles, on a largely partisan vote, there is no chance the Democratic Senate will convict him. Impeaching Mr. Mayorkas would be the political equivalent of a no-confidence vote. This would continue Congress’s recent trend of defining impeachment down.

Grandstanding is easier than governing, and Republicans have to decide whether to accomplish anything other than impeaching Democrats. Mr. Mayorkas is an easy political target, but impeaching him accomplishes nothing beyond political symbolism.

A better idea is to strike a deal with Mr. Biden on serious border-security reforms that would restrict his discretion on parole, rewrite the asylum standard, and give the executive other tools to control the border. If Messrs. Mayorkas and Biden refuse to use them, the GOP will have an election issue. And the tools will be there for the next President to use.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this is so frustrating because today we are, in fact, impeaching upon. We are impeaching upon for the President. The Secretary is being impeached for what he did wrong. He is, in fact, guilty as alleged, but, in fact, he is just part of the high crimes and misdemeanors of the President of the United States.

It was the President's decision to, in fact, undo policies that were working, to reverse, to make a systemic change that in my district, with over 55 miles of Mexican border, my border agents are reduced to being Uber drivers for everyone coming over the border.

I am perfectly willing to listen to people say that this is a policy difference, but it is not. To faithfully execute the mission, you can have differences in how to do it. To thwart the very execution of that mission, which Secretary Mayorkas has done, is, in fact, an impeachable offense.

I have some sympathy for him because I believe he is just obeying the orders of his boss, but that has been said before. That excuse has been used. The fact is, he took an oath. He must faithfully execute that oath. If he cannot, because the President will not let him do it, then he needs to resign.

As we impeach the first Cabinet officer in well over 100 years, the fact is, he should have resigned rather than to do things which were adverse to the Constitution, adverse to his oath, but upon the orders and duty of the President.

The President can be wrong. The President can order high crimes and misdemeanors. The President can be guilty of them. This President is, in fact, guilty of that which we are impeaching the Secretary for today, but so is the Secretary, and for that reason, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). The gentleman from Tennessee has 22½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Mississippi has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this baseless sham impeachment fails to articulate a single charge that rises to the level of high crimes and misdemeanors, the constitutional standard for impeachment. Mere policy differences do not amount to impeachable offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter by eminent constitutional

scholars opposed to this political stunt, as well as The Washington Post op-ed by Joshua Matz and Norman Eisen titled, "Why impeaching Mayorkas would violate the Constitution."

JANUARY 10, 2024.

Speaker MIKE JOHNSON,
The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

Chairman MARK GREEN,
Washington, DC.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW EXPERTS ON THE IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS

Senior Republicans in the House of Representatives—including Speaker of the House Mike Johnson and Chairman Mark Green of the Committee on Homeland Security—have stated that they intend to pursue an impeachment of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. This proceeding will apparently occur in the Committee on Homeland Security on an accelerated timeframe. As scholars of the Constitution, considering the facts currently known and the charges publicly described, we hereby express our view that an impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas would be utterly unjustified as a matter of constitutional law.

Although House Republicans have offered various justifications for an impeachment, the underlying basis appears to be their view that Secretary Mayorkas's policy decisions have degraded border security and involved objectionable uses of enforcement discretion. House Republicans have also publicly asserted that Secretary Mayorkas testified falsely in stating that he is enforcing existing federal law and that the southern border is closed and secure.

When the Framers designed the Constitution's impeachment provisions, they made a conscious choice not to allow impeachment for mere "maladministration"—in other words, for incompetence, poor judgment, or bad policy. Instead, they provided that impeachment could be justified only by truly extraordinary misconduct: "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." U.S. Const., art. II, §4. Thus, as Charles L. Black, Jr. noted in his influential handbook, impeachment is not permitted for "mere inefficient administration, or administration that [does] not accord with Congress's view of good policy." Simply put, the Constitution forbids impeachment based on policy disagreements between the House and the Executive Branch, no matter how intense or high stakes those differences of opinion.

Yet that is exactly what House Republicans appear poised to undertake. The charges they have publicly described come nowhere close to meeting the constitutional threshold for impeachment. Their proposed grounds for impeaching Secretary Mayorkas are the stuff of ordinary (albeit impassioned) policy disagreement in the field of immigration enforcement. If allegations like this were sufficient to justify impeachment, the separation of powers would be permanently destabilized. It is telling that there is absolutely no historical precedent for the impeachment charges that House Republicans have articulated. To the contrary, on the rare occasions that Members of the House have proposed impeaching executive officials for their handling of immigration matters, the House has properly retreated from that grave step.

We hold a wide range of views on the wisdom and success of Secretary Mayorkas's approach to immigration policy. But we are in agreement that impeaching him based on the charges set forth by House Republicans

would be a stark departure from the Constitution.

Of course, our institutional affiliations are listed for identification purposes only, and our signatures reflect our personal capacity, not any position on behalf of our employers. Sincerely,

Laurence H. Tribe, *Carl M. Loeb University Professor, Emeritus, Harvard University*; Joshua Matz, *Partner I Kaplan Hecker & Fink LLP, Adjunct Professor of Law | Georgetown Law School*; Donald Ayer, *Adjunct Professor of Law, Georgetown Law School*; Philip C. Bobbitt, *Herbert Wechsler Professor of Federal Jurisprudence, Columbia Law School*; Corey Brettschneider, *Professor of Political Science, Brown University*; Erwin Chemerinsky, *Dean and Jesse H. Choper Distinguished Professor of Law, Berkeley Law*; Gabriel J. Chin, *Edward L. Barrett Jr. Chair of Law, Martin Luther King Jr. Professor of Law, Director of Clinical Legal Education, UC Davis School of Law*; Rosalind Dixon, *Professor of Law, University of New South Wales*; Michael Dorf, *Robert S. Stevens Professor of Law, Cornell Law School*.

Amanda Frost, *John A. Ewald Jr. Research Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law*; Michael Gerhardt, *Burton Craige Distinguished Professor of Jurisprudence, UNC School of Law*; Stuart Gerson, *Trustee, Society for the Rule of Law*; Aziz Huq, *Frank and Bernice J. Greenberg Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School*; Kevin R. Johnson, *Dean and Mabie-Appallas Professor of Public Interest Law and Chicana/o Studies, UC Davis School of Law*; Pamela S. Karlan, *Kenneth and Harle Montgomery Professor of Public Interest Law, Stanford Law School*; Jon D. Michaels, *Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law*; Timothy Naftali, *Senior Research Scholar, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs*.

Victoria Nourse, *Ralph V. Whitworth Professor in Law, Georgetown Law School*; Deborah Pearlstein, *Director, Princeton Program on Law and Public Policy, Charles and Marie Robertson Visiting Professor of Law and Public Affairs, Princeton University*; Robert Post, *Sterling Professor of Law, Yale Law School*; Cristina Rodriguez, *Leighton Homer Surbeck Professor of Law, Yale Law School*; Jack Rakove, *William Robertson Coe Professor of History and American Studies, Professor of Political Science, Emeritus, Stanford University*; Kermit Roosevelt, *David Berger Professor for the Administration of Justice, Penn Carey Law School*; Peter Shane, *Professor and Jacob E. Davis and Jacob E. Davis II Chair in Law Emeritus, The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law*; David A. Strauss, *Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law, Faculty Director, Supreme Court and Appellate Clinic, University of Chicago Law School*.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 2024]

WHY IMPEACHING MAYORKAS WOULD VIOLATE THE CONSTITUTION

(By Joshua Matz and Norman Eisen)

House Republicans appear poised to rush through a partisan impeachment of Alejandro Mayorkas, the secretary of homeland security. They do not allege corrupt, abusive or criminal conduct; they accuse him merely of poor judgment, believing he could better use his legal authority and enforcement discretion to safeguard the southern border.

Whatever the wisdom of Mayorkas's policy decisions, the claim that he should be impeached is indefensible as a matter of constitutional law.

In designing the U.S. Constitution, the framers adapted the impeachment power from England but made several key changes. Parliament had historically impeached royal ministers for "maladministration"—for bad policy or poor performance in office. The

framers rejected that vision. For impeachments of “the President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States,” they instead required proof of egregious malfeasance: “Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”

This decision was fundamental to the separation of powers. Congress has many tools it can use to shape public policy and express disagreement with the executive. Impeachment, however, is not one of them. To ensure that the president could govern—and that he could select a Cabinet to execute his vision—the framers forbade impeachment over policy disagreements, no matter how fierce or consequential.

That understanding has endured throughout American history. Despite centuries of heated policy disagreements between Congress and the executive, there has been only a single impeachment of a Cabinet official. In 1876, War Secretary William Belknap was impeached for a corrupt kickback scheme; although he resigned minutes before the House vote, that did not deter House members from impeaching him anyway.

Of course, not all executive branch officials are angels. But in practice, miscreant Cabinet officials are not corralled through congressional impeachment. They are fired by the president, or they simply resign.

No official who maintained the president's support has ever been impeached for carrying out policy in ways the House found objectionable. Impeaching Mayorkas on that basis would offend the Constitution and unbalance the separation of powers. Future Cabinet officials would be unduly chilled in doing their job, and presidents would fear that heated policy disputes might engulf their most senior officials in an impeachment quagmire.

This concern applies with full force in the homeland security setting. The rule that we do not impeach over policy disagreements has had its strongest expression in disputes over immigration enforcement. There are two illuminating precedents.

The first occurred in 1920, when the House considered impeaching Assistant Secretary of Labor Louis Post. Over the previous year, Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer had carried out his infamous “Palmer Raids,” indiscriminately rounding up suspected radicals, anarchists and communists for deportation. When those deportation orders reached Post's desk (the Labor Department then oversaw immigration matters), he canceled more than 1,000 of them, citing the absence of evidence justifying removal.

The response was explosive. A New York Times editorial claimed that Post “let loose on the country these public enemies, some of them fugitives from justice.” Rep. Homer Hoch, a Republican from Kansas, put forward an impeachment resolution, which was referred to the House Rules Committee.

Post was outraged. He viewed an initial report accusing him of misconduct as “mental dullness at high tension.” As Post later wrote, “I had offended by deporting such aliens as were proved guilty and releasing the others, instead of pitching all of them out of the country indiscriminately.”

Post's ensuing testimony before the Rules Committee was electric. As one observer remarked, the committee “had very much the aspect of a group of gentlemen who had picked up a very hot poker and were looking for some place to cool it.” The drive to impeach collapsed.

A similar tale unfolded less than two decades later. In 1938, Martin Dies Jr., the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, accused Labor Secretary Frances Perkins of wrongly failing to deport an accused communist. As Dies escalated his attacks against Perkins's immigration poli-

cies, she bitingly responded: “It is not usual for the legislative branch which has so many duties to attempt to usurp the functions and duties of the administrative branch.”

Undeterred, another member of Dies's committee introduced an impeachment resolution. Among other things, and reminiscent of the latest attacks against Mayorkas, it accused Perkins of “having failed, neglected, and refused to enforce the . . . immigration laws of the United States.”

Perkins was shaken. But she maintained support from President Franklin D. Roosevelt and vigorously defended her handling of immigration matters, including in closed-door testimony before the House Judiciary Committee.

Ultimately, the committee concluded that “sufficient facts have not been presented or adduced to warrant the interposition of the constitutional powers of impeachment by the House.” The decision was unanimous. With respect to Perkins's handling of a particularly controversial deportation decision, it found that her decision “involved a question of judgment, and there is no evidence that it was not exercised in good faith.”

As these cases confirm, disagreement over a Cabinet official's good-faith exercise of enforcement discretion is not a valid basis for impeachment. In launching an impeachment attack against Mayorkas, House Republicans not only violate the Constitution but also defy long-standing precedents. They should step back from the brink.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate, the gentleman from Mississippi noted that there has been more fentanyl seized at our southern border than ever before, but what he did not recognize is that there are now more fentanyl deaths in this country than ever before, and that is a direct result of what is happening across our southern border.

I rise today in support of the impeachment of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas. This is one of the most solemn and consequential actions the United States House of Representatives can take, and I do not take it lightly.

However, under the watch of Secretary Mayorkas, we have witnessed the degradation of our border security and the willful and consistent refusal to comply with and enforce Federal immigration laws.

Today, fentanyl is the leading cause of death for those aged 18 to 45, terrorists on the FBI watch list are being released into the interior of the country, and the cartels are a multibillion-dollar business.

The crisis we face today is a threat to every single American, causing our communities to be less safe, and it is a direct result of Secretary Mayorkas' actions. A clear message must be sent to the executive branch that they no longer get to break the law without consequences. Secretary Mayorkas must be held accountable.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today three bipartisan former Secretaries of Homeland Security wrote to Speaker JOHNSON voicing

their opposition to impeaching Secretary Mayorkas. They agree that impeachment for policy is not constitutionally permissible. They further warn that allowing impeachment of Cabinet officials over policy differences would jeopardize our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from Secretaries Chertoff, Napolitano, and Johnson.

FEBRUARY 6, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: As former Secretaries of Homeland Security who served in Republican and Democratic Administrations, we write to oppose the House of Representatives' effort to impeach Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

We have differing views among us on the policies pursued by President Biden and implemented by Secretary Mayorkas. But we collectively agree that policy differences are not Constitutionally permissible impeachment offenses. Rather, they are issues to be resolved via legislation or elections.

During our respective terms, when members of Congress of both parties disagreed with the policy choices made by the Presidents we served, they would make their views known, often vociferously, bring us to the Capitol for hearings, and consider new laws. That is the way our political system is supposed to work.

To instead allow impeachments of cabinet officials over political disagreements would jeopardize our national security; make Cabinet-level positions more difficult to fill under future administrations; and undermine the ability of future officials to fulfill their vital missions.

And one cannot ignore that the Department of Homeland Security is responsible for much more than managing our immigration system. Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas could undermine the mission for which the Department was created—preventing terrorism—as well as our cybersecurity, aviation security, maritime security, our response to natural disasters, and the protection of our national leaders, among many other things.

If you want a solution to strengthen our border security—and a solution is badly needed—you would be well advised to work with the Senate on the bipartisan bill they have put forward. Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas solves nothing and leaves our outdated immigration system exactly where it is now—broken.

We urge you to set aside this groundless impeachment effort and get back to solving America's real problems.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CHERTOFF,
Secretary of Homeland Security, 2005–2009.

JANET NAPOLITANO,
Secretary of Homeland Security, 2009–2013.

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
Secretary of Homeland Security, 2013–2017.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this rushed, baseless sham impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas that will go down in history as one of Congress' darkest moments.

The Republican argument for impeachment boils down to their view

that Secretary Mayorkas has intentionally caused the influx of immigrants over our southern border. Never mind that, even if true, this is not a high crime or misdemeanor that has ever been used before in the history of our country. Never mind that, no court has found the Secretary or the Department of Homeland Security to have violated the law. In fact, the United States v. Texas case, which my friends on the other side of the aisle like to cite so frequently, actually reversed a district court ruling and held that there must be discretion given to the Secretary as there has been given to every single Department Secretary for 27 years.

Never mind that every one of those Department of Homeland Security Secretaries has interpreted the law the exact same way that Secretary Mayorkas has. Never mind that Republicans have sued him to stop him from implementing the policy changes that the administration has tried to put in effect to address the situation at the border. Never mind that House Republicans are impeaching him for failing to address the problems at the border while he has spent months negotiating a bipartisan bill in the Senate to do just that.

□ 1615

The reason for this partisan stunt is simple. Donald Trump and House Republicans want to use the border as an election year issue rather than actually solve the problems through necessary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues who care about the Constitution, the rule of law, and this institution to vote “no.” They will otherwise come to regret this.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, the last Secretary of Homeland Security appointed by a Democratic President once described a border crisis as more than 1,000 Border Patrol encounters per day. In December last year, we averaged nearly 10 times that number.

Perhaps most worryingly, 2023 saw a record-setting 860,000, just a little bit shy of a million got-aways, border crossers who were detected but who were never apprehended. That is nearly a million potential felons, cartel members, terrorists, and drug traffickers freely allowed into our country and currently residing in our communities and our neighborhoods.

This crisis has been aided and abetted through the unprecedented dereliction of duty of Secretary Mayorkas. As the House Homeland Security Committee has uncovered, Mayorkas has repeatedly violated, subverted, and simply ignored multiple laws set forth by Congress that he swore an oath to uphold, all while ignoring court orders and lying to Congress and the American people.

The evidence of his wrongdoings is damning. His abuse of power goes well

beyond simple bureaucratic incompetence. His actions, which have put our Nation at extreme risk, cannot go unanswered.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are exploiting impeachment power to distract from their inability to pass legislation.

Here is what Republican Representative CHIP ROY said in November: “I want my Republican colleagues to give me one thing—one—that I can go campaign on and say we did. One. . . . [E]xplain to me one material, meaningful, significant thing the Republican majority has done.”

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Mississippi for yielding, for his leadership, for his dignity, for his decency, for his continued defense of our democracy in the face of the extreme attacks coming from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this political stunt, this reckless Republican effort to impeach Secretary Mayorkas.

Let’s be clear: Secretary Mayorkas is a good man, a patriotic man, and a hardworking man doing the best he can under very difficult circumstances. That is not an impeachable offense.

Extreme MAGA Republicans have produced no evidence that Secretary Mayorkas has engaged in a high crime or misdemeanor, no evidence that Secretary Mayorkas has engaged in an impeachable offense, and no evidence that Secretary Mayorkas has broken the law or violated the Constitution—not a shred of evidence, not a scintilla of evidence, nothing but extreme MAGA Republican chaos and confusion and the effort to avoid doing the hard work necessary to find common ground to actually address the challenges at the border.

What do these impeachment articles have to do with the issue of addressing our broken immigration system? Nothing.

What do these impeachment articles have to do with building a healthy economy for everyday Americans? Nothing.

What do these impeachment articles have to do with addressing the inflationary challenges and affordability issues that the American people are experiencing day after day as we work to continue to emerge from a once-in-a-century pandemic that shut down the economy? Absolutely nothing.

Extreme MAGA Republicans have spent this entire Congress not advancing any ideas, acting on any agenda, deciding to work together with us to solve problems for the American people.

You have brought Articles of Impeachment that are not anchored in reality. You have brought Articles of Im-

peachment for one simple reason: Because you really want to impeach Joe Biden.

That is what you were directed to do by the puppet master, the former President of the United States, Donald Trump.

You really want to impeach Joe Biden, but you realize that that is politically unpopular, so you have brilliantly come up with, in your minds, plan B. Let’s go after Secretary Mayorkas. No evidence that he engaged in wrongdoing, committed a crime, or violated the Constitution, but let’s go after Secretary Mayorkas.

Maybe that will satisfy the quest for revenge of the puppet master because when the puppet master, Donald Trump, says jump, extreme MAGA Republicans respond: How high? We just got evidence of that over the last few weeks because extreme MAGA Republicans have been lecturing America that we have to deal with the challenges at the border.

We agree. A bipartisan process has been underway in the Senate for months to try to fix our broken immigration system, but as soon as Donald Trump says no, we actually don’t want to do anything about the challenges at the border because, politically, that might not be good for us, you walked away from working together in a commonsense fashion to fix our broken immigration system. Instead, what you have to offer the American people is this sham impeachment, this political stunt, this waste of time.

You will not fool the American people. You will actually be held accountable for your inaction and your affirmative leaning into doing things that don’t advance progress in any way, shape, or form for the American people.

No reasonable American can conclude that you are making life better for them with this sham impeachment, but you will live with this like a scarlet letter.

It may succeed. It may not. Secretary Mayorkas should wear this like a badge of honor because it is worthless. It means nothing.

It is fake. It is fraudulent. It is foolish.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote “no,” so we can get back to doing the real business of the American people.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding and for his great work on this impeachment resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas’ political career is on the chopping block, where it rightfully belongs. He has failed to apply the laws that would stop this invasion at the southern border.

To those who claim that this impeachment is for purely political purposes, you are dead wrong. This is about upholding the rule of law that governs our Republic, the same rule of law that Secretary Mayorkas has ignored and forsaken every day.

Secretary Mayorkas has had innumerable opportunities to enforce the laws that are already on the books but has chosen not to. He has earned his own impeachment.

Let's be clear: Our entire constitutional system is predicated on the idea that Congress creates laws, and the executive branch enforces those laws.

Allowing this abuse of our constitutional system to go unchecked could spell the beginning of the end for our Republic.

I am proud to serve as a cosponsor of these impeachment articles. The rule of law must be restored at the border immediately.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Republicans use the language of invasion and great replacement theory, but invasion in the Constitution means invasion during an act of war by a foreign nation or insurrection from within.

I direct my Republican colleagues to Federalist Papers Nos. 4 and 43 if they want to learn why the entry of migrants escaping crisis for a better life is not invasion.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our fearless leader and the good gentleman from Tennessee for yielding time.

Just a comment about this not being an invasion: No honest or objective American, from sea to shining sea, could characterize what is happening at our southern border in any way other than an invasion, and it is destroying our country.

It is because of willful neglect. It is because of dereliction of duty. It is because of the faithlessness to this Constitution and its first job: to provide a common defense.

I thank Chairman GREEN for restoring the dignity and integrity of the impeachment process. I think it is important that we are careful and that we make the fullness of due process an important feature, restoring what has happened over the last two impeachments.

This is a yearlong process, and I appreciate his fidelity to the Constitution and the integrity of this institution.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker: I believe that the Impeachment Clause in the Constitution, according to our Founders, was to give remedy for this very circumstance, to remove someone who had violated their public trust in a way that resulted in serious and systemic injury to society.

I thank Chairman GREEN, again, for his leadership. I stand with him. This

is the right and responsible thing to do in faithfulness to the Constitution, in the protection of the American people, and in defense of the sovereignty of the greatest Nation in human history.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the extreme MAGA Republican stunt to impeach Secretary Mayorkas is baseless.

The Democratic staff of the Committee on Homeland Security thoroughly documented the many failures of fact and law in the Articles of Impeachment contained in H. Res. 863.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the key findings and introduction of the Democratic staff report, which can be found online at: <https://democrats-homeland.house.gov/download/homelanddemimpeachmentreportfinal>.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1630

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

In the time that we have had to debate one of the most sacred and deliberative responsibilities of the United States Congress—that is, impeachment proceedings—there has not been one iota of truth and/or facts that would suggest that Secretary Mayorkas is, in fact, guilty of the Articles of Impeachment against him: One, the willful violation of the law, and the benefit to himself from anything that he might have done or that he did not do.

What it has done is given to this Nation, a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, the sense that you cannot flee Nazism, you cannot flee Cuba, and come to this country to serve your beloved adopted country for more than two decades, that you cannot be the Justice Department U.S. attorney, you cannot be a Deputy Secretary and now the Secretary of Homeland Security without those who find it strange to have you, with your diversity, to be able to lead in this way.

This is a question of stunts over solutions, and the Constitution was created to create a more perfect order, and that is that, under that Constitution, precious rights fall under the Fifth Amendment and the 14th Amendment, due process.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this Secretary of Homeland Security was not allowed to bring his own witnesses. The majority did not allow the minority to have its day of witnesses. There were no constitutional scholars who pointed to the fact in large numbers, as they would have, that this is, in fact, a fraud, and it is fraught with misrepresentations.

Operational control is zero people crossing the border. That means they are not crossing for entertainment, they are not crossing for business, they are just there.

This is wrong. This is wrongheaded. This is a stunt, and this does not bequeath or equal to the Constitution,

which is to create a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against these Articles of Impeachment.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 863, the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

Mr. Speaker, Montana is about the same size as from here to Chicago plus 2 miles. It is a long, long border. The few border people we have generally are deployed down south.

My friend and the gentleman from New York said: What evidence do we offer? What evidence of negligence? What evidence of wrongdoing? I would say it is pretty easy to find. It is found in every street, every city, every county, every State across this Nation.

The evidence is found in every fentanyl pill and death. The evidence is found in every woman that is raped along our border. The evidence is found in every child-trafficking case that is in every city, to include Billings, Missoula, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. It is found in every evidence of children being sex trafficked, and I could go on.

The evidence of negligence is the willful blindness to the horror that we have on our southern border.

Our northern border, while not discussed a lot, is wide open, because this country doesn't have a border. In Montana, this administration can't even prevent a balloon. So the evidence is clear, compelling, and not in dispute. The lack of action, willful blindness, and willingness to do nothing is deserving of no less than impeachment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas is doing his job with the resources allotted by this Congress. Not only has no administration detained all border crossers, but Congress has never appropriated sufficient resources to detain all individuals who should be detained under the Republicans' reading of the law.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this impeachment against Secretary Mayorkas is a sham. The process was a sham. The charges are a sham.

You might wonder, if that is the case, then why go through all of this trouble?

Well, last November, a colleague of mine from the State of Texas stood up in this Chamber and asked for one meaningful accomplishment that the Republican Congress has accomplished this session.

The answer was nothing. That colleague was not a Democrat on this side of the aisle, but a Republican—a Republican, who asked the question whether somebody could name one meaningful accomplishment.

Therefore, the answer to my question: Why does this happen? When you have no record of accomplishment to run on—nothing on education, nothing on healthcare, nothing about creating jobs, nothing on the environment, nothing about keeping people safe—this is what you do. You put on a circus, and that is why we are here today.

If we need an example, let's look to the last few days. For years, Republicans have used immigrants as political scarecrows. They are using them like scarecrows to put up in the face of Americans and scare Americans that every single one of these people, including the 6-year-old children, are coming to harm you and hurt you.

Since my Republican colleagues have no positive policy solutions, they sell that really hard. You hear it on every radio interview, every television interview. You hear it from the people in here. You hear it on television on FOX News. Every single place, these people are used to scare Americans. That is how Republicans want to win.

That is why we are here, because there is nothing else—nothing else left.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have claimed that we need to secure the border. Even when President Biden made the comment that he would be willing to shut down the border because it is overwhelmed, the Republican Speaker says that proposal—which would allow for what Republicans have been asking for, supposedly for years—is dead on arrival. The Republicans are not going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a show trial. It is a sham.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL).

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, before coming to Congress, I spent 8 years as a sheriff in my home county and 42 years as a law enforcement officer. If I hadn't done my job as a sheriff, I would have been fired and removed from office.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Mayorkas has not done his job. He has willfully ignored immigration laws passed by Congress and allowed our southern border to turn into utter chaos.

His breach of public trust cannot go unanswered. I voted to hold him accountable in committee last week, and I will do so today on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this impeachment and hold Secretary Mayorkas accountable for his actions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose this baseless, politically driven impeachment of Secretary

Mayorkas by extreme MAGA Republicans.

House Republicans have failed to meet the constitutional standard for impeachment and have failed to provide evidence for high crimes and misdemeanors because no evidence exists.

Republicans rant about the challenges at the southern border, and their only solution is to remove the person who has been in the room trying to work on a bipartisan basis to get tough on border policies that I don't even agree with. Republicans are not serious about border security. This is all about politics for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

House Republicans have consistently opposed legislation to increase funding for more Border Patrol agents at the southern border, more Customs and Border Protection, more money to combat fentanyl from coming across the southern border, something Republicans love to talk about, but they want to give no resources to make sure that it is not coming over.

Of course, they have even said no to a billion dollars in ICE detention beds. This is a Republican talking point, and they have said no to this, too.

So why are we wasting floor time on political games with a fact-free impeachment resolution instead of legislation to improve the lives of Americans?

It is because House Republicans can't govern. They want to distract from their weekly embarrassments. Their own Members admit they have not accomplished anything.

Mr. Speaker, this sham impeachment is not an accomplishment. It is just another embarrassment because they are a do-nothing Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Mississippi has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will address some of the, at a minimum, misinformation that has been provided by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This notion that Republicans have somehow cut Border Patrol is absolutely false.

In fact, it has been the administration that has brought decreasing budget requests, for example, for ICE detention beds every single year, and we wound up giving them more than they asked for.

Our bill, H.R. 2, actually would provide 3,000 new Border Patrol agents, and the supplemental request by the President asks for approximately 1,400. You can't say we are resourcing less when we are actually providing numbers for more. That is just disinformation. It is false.

This notion that seizures are up, if you pour more water through a small pipe, there is more volume coming at

the fence. They are going to seize more. I get that. However, tell me why the price for a hit of fentanyl on the street in Tennessee went from \$95 a hit when this President took office to \$28 a hit.

It is because of the supply and demand of fentanyl. It is the supply and demand curve. That is because it is pouring across our southern border. It is pouring across our southern border because the cartels are jamming folks through the crossing sites. The Border Patrol agents are having to move off the border to cover that, and we have a wide-open southern border.

We have shown this in our five-phases investigation, videos of camouflage-wearing, carpet-shoe-wearing people with backpacks full of drugs coming through the remote parts of the country or the border. To suggest that just because seizures are up somebody is doing their job, that is meaningless.

I want to make a point here, because several people have said, if we were concerned about border protection, we would bring up the Senate negotiated bill. Well, I thought the Senate had to pass it before we could bring it up. I haven't heard that the bill has even passed the Senate. Therefore, this accusation that we somehow aren't for Border Patrol because we haven't taken up this bill is false because it hasn't even passed the Senate yet.

I heard someone say Mr. Mayorkas has done his job. The last poll I saw indicated approximately 85 percent of Americans think the Secretary is failing, but, yes, keep singing that song.

Rushed? We have been at this for almost a year.

One gentleman said: No court has actually ruled that Mr. Mayorkas is breaking the law.

The Fifth Circuit court absolutely ruled it. Then the gentleman who mentioned that actually said that the Supreme Court overturned that.

No, they didn't. They decided they weren't going to decide. They said: We don't have standing here, or you don't have standing here, so their case technically wasn't even heard. They said: You don't have standing. Have a nice day.

To suggest that that was overturned, the Fifth Circuit court's ruling on the lawlessness of this Secretary, is just wrong. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I want to push back.

What is happening here is not political theater, as my friends on the other side of the aisle wish to make this.

The Democrats have sought to blame Republicans, saying that our inaction has helped cause this border crisis, but I will tell you that nothing is farther from the truth. Almost a year ago, this body passed H.R. 2, a border security bill, a border security bill that would find a record number of Customs and

Border Patrol agents, a bill which would give raises to those men and women who were there on the front lines trying to secure our border, a bill which would invest in technology to stop the flow of illegal drugs coming across our border, a bill which would have restarted wall construction.

That bill, for almost a year, has sat in the other Chamber, has sat in the Senate, and Mr. SCHUMER has refused to bring that bill to the floor.

□ 1645

This body also passed the Homeland Security appropriations bill, giving the Department of Homeland Security more money than that Department has ever received. We funded those additional agents. We funded those pay raises. We funded additional detention beds. What has happened to that appropriations bill? It also sits in the Senate waiting for the Senate to take action.

Today, my friends across the aisle seek to hide behind this Senate bill that was crafted behind closed doors, in the cover of darkness, a bill that did not include any input from the House of Representatives, did not include Homeland Security Chair MARK GREEN or Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON from Mississippi. Three Senators out of 100 got behind closed doors for weeks, and they sat down and crafted a bill.

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, with no input on behalf of the House of Representatives, we are now supposed to adopt that bill before it even passes the Senate.

I want to give you a number, Mr. Speaker. That number is 370,000. That is the number of immigrants who came into our country last month alone. That is not a year; that is not 6 months; that is a single month, 370,000 people, yet our Homeland Security Secretary continues to maintain that the border is secure.

My friends across the aisle seek to blame Republicans for this crisis. I will tell you that their blame is misplaced. If they want to blame someone for what is happening on the southwest border, they need to look in the mirror. They need to look at what their Secretary has done, and they need to look at what their President has done. They can no longer blame Republicans for their failures.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. If we are unable to hold Secretary Mayorkas accountable for his failures, for his failure to enforce the law, we can hold no one accountable. Secretary Mayorkas must be impeached.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the administration is enforcing the law. ICE is currently detaining over 38,000 people. This is 4,000 more than Congress has provided funding for. If Republicans want DHS to detain more people, they should provide the

funds the administration has asked for in the supplemental request.

Under former President Trump, Republicans cheered the doubling of drug seizures. Now, they view it as a problem. This is hypocrisy at its finest.

Under Secretary Mayorkas' leadership, DHS has seized more fentanyl and arrested more criminals for fentanyl-related crimes in the last 2 years than in the previous 5 years. This impeachment has been a preplanned political stunt from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a New York Times article detailing how Homeland Security Committee Chairman MARK GREEN promised donors that the House would impeach Secretary Mayorkas prior to launching any type of inquiry. He said: "Get the popcorn."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 2023]

KEY REPUBLICAN TELLS DONORS HE WILL PURSUE IMPEACHMENT OF MAYORKAS

(By Karoun Demirjian)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee promised donors this month that he would produce an impeachment case against the Biden administration's homeland security chief, Alejandro N. Mayorkas, saying that the secretary's appearance before the panel this week would be the beginning of his demise.

Representative Mark E. Green told an enthusiastic crowd in his home state of Tennessee last week that his committee would expose Mr. Mayorkas's "dereliction of duty and his intentional destruction of our country through the open southern border." He said the panel would deliver charges to the House Judiciary Committee, which handles impeachment proceedings, according to an audio recording of a House Freedom Caucus fund-raiser obtained by The New York Times.

He said he had a "five-phase plan" for doing so and that the Homeland Security Committee would "put together a packet, and we will hand it to Jim Jordan and let Jim do what Jim does best."

Mr. Green apparently was referring to Representative Jim Jordan, the Ohio Republican who leads the Judiciary panel. His comments made clear that G.O.P. leaders are serious about their threats to impeach Mr. Mayorkas. He said the plan would start with an appearance by the secretary before his committee on Wednesday.

On April 19, next week, get the popcorn—Alejandro Mayorkas comes before our committee, and it's going to be fun," Mr. Green told the room, adding: "That'll really be just the beginning for him."

A spokeswoman for Mr. Green did not respond to requests for comment.

Mr. Green and other Republican leaders have made no secret of their desire to pursue impeachment charges against Mr. Mayorkas. Speaker Kevin McCarthy began threatening to impeach him months before Mr. McCarthy won his gavel. But their ambitions have been limited thus far by the political realities of the House; not every Republican wants to demonize Mr. Mayorkas as solely responsible for the country's immigration problems, and with a slim majority, party leaders do not yet have the votes to impeach him.

As a result, Mr. Green and other House Republicans in positions of authority have been careful to avoid promising publicly that they would find evidence against Mr. Mayorkas worthy of prosecution. Behind closed doors with core supporters, however, Mr. Green

was less cautious, using the issue to whip up the crowd.

During a public session on Capitol Hill on Tuesday before the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, Republicans hammered Mr. Mayorkas both for the border situation and for recent revelations, documented in an investigation by The New York Times, that unaccompanied migrant children have been exploited as laborers. Both Senators Ron Johnson of Wisconsin and Josh Hawley of Missouri demanded that the secretary resign.

Mr. Mayorkas pushed back, saying his department was not responsible for the child labor crisis.

"You are incorrectly attributing it to our policies," he told Mr. Hawley. He also disputed the idea that he could be held personally responsible for the problems at the border, telling senators: "Our asylum system is broken, our entire immigration system is broken, and in desperate need of reform—and it's been so for years and years."

The Department of Homeland Security has dismissed calls for Mr. Mayorkas to step down as "baseless" and "reckless," and Mr. Mayorkas has suggested in past interviews that the efforts to impeach him were simply a way of turbocharging policy disputes with the administration.

Mr. Green made his comments at an event billed as a "V.I.P. Reception and Conversation with Conservative Heroes," where he appeared behind closed doors alongside Mr. Jordan and other hard-right Republicans. He pointed to recent testimony before his panel by Raul L. Ortiz, the Border Patrol chief, who detailed "an increase in flow" in five of the nine sectors along the U.S.-Mexico border and said it had "caused a considerable strain on our resources."

He also recalled Mr. Ortiz's testimony that the United States does not have "operational control" of the southern border, which Republicans seized on to accuse Mr. Mayorkas, who had testified that the border is secure, of dishonesty. Mr. Mayorkas addressed the apparent discrepancy during a separate hearing last month, telling senators that he was using a different definition of "operational security," and that the two statements were not in conflict.

Mr. Green nonetheless trumpeted Mr. Ortiz's words as a kill shot against Mr. Mayorkas, telling the donors that "he'll see that video a couple of times" during the upcoming hearing before the Homeland Security panel.

The secretary's appearances on Capitol Hill this week come as the Republican House is barreling ahead with what Mr. Green told donors would be "the most conservative border security bill that this Congress has ever seen, or any Congress has ever seen." The panel is expected to debate that bill next week.

On Wednesday, while Mr. Mayorkas is testifying before the Homeland Security panel, the Judiciary Committee is scheduled to debate a second border security bill aimed at restricting migrant inflows, including by restricting access to asylum and requiring all employers to adopt an electronic system that screens prospective employees' eligibility to work.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that most of my colleagues here and a lot of people back home certainly know that I had the unbelievable privilege to interview Saddam Hussein on the night of his capture.

As I was sitting there talking to Saddam Hussein, I asked him why he invaded Kuwait. He gave me all these

justifications about who owned which oil field. Then he held up the palm of his hand and he pointed to the palm of his hand and said: All human civilization is from the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Every person on the planet is an Iraqi, and I am the President of Iraq.

What Saddam Hussein was saying was he was the king of the world. The thought struck me: How does a person get there? Well, the old adage came to mind that absolute power corrupts absolutely. When you concentrate power into the hands of fewer and fewer people, you get tyranny every time. In this case, one man.

Our Founders were brilliant. They were following the philosophies of Montesquieu, and they decided they would divide power out; they would separate three branch of government. Then with the 10th Amendment, they would separate power between the Federal Government, the States, and the local governments. They did develop three equal and separate branches of government, with the legislative branch writing the laws and the executive branch executing the laws.

Interestingly enough, in the Iran-Contra hearing, the Democrats said in their report: You can't pick and choose which law you want to enforce. It is also fascinating that here we are and they say it is about policy. This is about a systemic, planned mechanism to undo the immigration laws passed before, just because the current Secretary doesn't think that is what they ought to be.

This Secretary is supposed to execute those laws, but he has chosen not to. It says, shall detain criminal felons, and he has directed his DHS employees not to do that, violating the laws passed by this body, telling this separate but equal branch of government: I don't care what you say or have passed as law. I don't care that you represent the voice of the American people. I am the guy who knows the best way to do it, and I am going to do it my way. That is the road to tyranny, that is power in one man's hands, and that is not what our Constitution says it is supposed to be.

He took an oath to that Constitution to defend that Constitution that says this branch writes, that branch executes. He has violated his oath of office. He has subverted the laws that this body has passed and, thus, basically said: I don't care about the Congress. That is unacceptable. Whether he were a Republican or a Democrat standing that way, I would be here today doing everything I could to remove him from office.

When I was 17, I took an oath to that Constitution for the first time and served for 24 years, willing to take a bullet for that Constitution and the people of this country. I will not stand idly by while he throws it in the garbage.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Even some House Republicans have acknowledged that there is no constitutional basis for impeachment. Representative MCCLINTOCK called this effort an unconstitutional abuse of power and reckless, partisan, and unserious. Representative BUCK said: It is not an impeachable offense. This is a policy difference.

Mr. Speaker, besides failing to articulate a single cognizable charge that would meet the constitutional impeachment standard of high crimes and misdemeanors, this sham impeachment has been marred by procedural failures.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD documentation of those procedural failures.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2024.

Hon. MARK E. GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your ill-advised decision to rush to a markup of an impeachment resolution of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas without any form of due process or Democrats' properly requested minority-day hearing is disappointing yet expected.

Nothing about this sham impeachment has abided by House precedent, but all of it has been done to reach the predetermined outcome you promised your donors last year.

1. This impeachment inquiry was not authorized by the full House. Until this Congress, Republicans have railed against pursuing impeachment without formal authorization by the full House. The last time a Cabinet official was impeached—the 1876 case of Secretary of War William W. Belknap—the full House authorized several committees to investigate well-publicized cases of fraud in the Federal Government. In this case, however, the full House was not permitted to debate the merits (or lack thereof) of impeaching Secretary Mayorkas or consider the proper procedures for any such investigation.

2. Secretary Mayorkas was not afforded any rights in the absence of an authorized impeachment inquiry. Authorizing resolutions not only imbue investigative committees with additional authority and legitimacy, but they also afford subjects of such investigations the ability to respond to the investigation. When the House authorized its impeachment inquiry into former President Donald Trump during the 116th Congress, for example, House Resolution 660 authorized the Committee on the Judiciary to adopt rules allowing for the participation of the President and his counsel. In the Belknap impeachment, the committee of primary jurisdiction “gave [Belknap] opportunity to explain, present witnesses, and cross-examine witnesses.” No such rights were afforded to Secretary Mayorkas.

3. Secretary Mayorkas was not afforded the opportunity to testify before the Committee despite his willingness to do so. Secretary Mayorkas has testified at congressional hearings 27 times during his tenure—more than any other Cabinet secretary. The Secretary said he would “make himself available” to testify before the House Homeland Security Committee, but you refused to accommodate his request and find a mutually agreeable date. Instead, on January 18, 2024, you offered the Secretary the opportunity to include written testimony for the record of that day's hearing. The window to

submit such testimony will still be open by the time the Committee proceeds to markup a resolution impeaching him on Tuesday, January 30, 2024.

4. Democrats' properly entered minority-day hearing request will not be acted upon prior to the markup of an impeachment resolution. At the January 18, 2024 Committee hearing, I furnished you with a timely demand for a minority-day hearing, signed by all Democratic Members of the Committee, pursuant to clause 2(j)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. The rule is clear: “[T]he minority members of the committee shall be entitled . . . to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.” When presented with that demand, however, you erroneously said, “So as I understand the rules, the request is only in order when you don't have a witness present and today, you have a witness present, so this not [in] order.”

Nothing in the text of the rule supports that assertion. Indeed, as I pointed out during our exchange, the rule states the precise opposite: “Although a majority of the minority members of a committee are entitled to call witnesses selected by the minority for at least one day of hearings, no rule of the House requires the calling of witnesses on opposing sides of an issue.” The Chair is required to schedule a minority-day hearing. Having a witness selected by the Minority at a hearing does not preclude the request for a minority-day hearing under rule XI.

Democrats intended to call additional Constitutional and legal experts to continue to inform the Committee of the lack of any grounds to proceed with the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas. Indeed, even frequent Republican impeachment expert Jonathan Turley thinks that Secretary Mayorkas has not committed an impeachable offense. The impeachment resolution will proceed to markup without this hearing required under House rules and the benefit of such testimony.

5. The Committee was used as a platform for Members to campaign for other office. In blatant disregard for the House Code of Official Conduct (House rule XXIII) and chapter 4 of the House Ethics Manual, a Republican Member referenced his campaign for State attorney general during his questioning of hearing witnesses on January 10, 2024. As I pointed out to you at the time, “I just ask that if [the Member is] going to run just go run, just don't run when the committee is in session.” This violation of ethical standards underscores the political nature of this entire impeachment farce: it bears no relationship to the Constitution or whether Secretary Mayorkas has committed an impeachable offense.

Despite these obvious defects and departures from precedent, the Committee will regrettably proceed to a markup of an impeachment resolution next week.

This unserious impeachment is a testament to partisan politics over rules and reason. Just two legal experts testified before the Committee, and both participated at the invitation of Democrats. Both of these distinguished scholars plainly stated that the Constitution did not support the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas. Given the grave importance of impeachment—which you once described as “probably the most extreme remedy that our constitution affords for taking someone out of office”—this Committee should do better. At the very least, it should follow the rules and practices established over more than two centuries of congressional history.

In 1788, Alexander Hamilton wrote: “In many cases [impeachment] will connect

itself with the 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 comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt."

In the inept and inappropriate ways you have handled the Committee during this partisan sham, you have proven Hamilton correct.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2024.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to clause 2(j)(1) of rule XI, the Democratic Members of the Committee on Homeland Security request a hearing to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the impeachment of Secretary Alejandro N. Mayorkas, currently before the Committee.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
ERIC SWALWELL,
DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.,
J. LUIS CORREA,
TROY A. CARTER, Sr.,
SETH MAGAZINER,
DAN GOLDMAN,
DELIA C. RAMIREZ,
DINA TITUS,
SHRI THANEDAR,
GLENN IVEY,
ROBERT GARCIA,
YVETTE D. CLARKE,
ROBERT J. MENENDEZ,
Members of Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the statements from the other side this afternoon have misrepresented the facts and the laws of this baseless, sham impeachment.

This extreme MAGA Republican majority is more about stunts rather than solutions. This political stunt is about placating extreme elements within the Republican Conference rather than doing what is right for America, because it is clear that Republicans have failed to make the case for impeachment. They have failed to articulate a single high crime and misdemeanor. The other side of the aisle wreaks of desperation.

Sadly, many Republicans appear willing to undermine the Constitution they claim to hold dear to score cheap political points. I am holding out hope that some of my colleagues across the aisle will do the right thing, that they will join us in upholding the oath we all swore to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject H. Res. 863. Vote "no" on this sham impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security has issued a detailed rebuttal of this sham impeachment in a letter to the House Rules Committee. I include in the RECORD an extract of the legal analysis of the Department. The full letter can be found at https://democrats-homeland.house.gov/imo/media/doc/dhs_letter_to_rules.pdf.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2024.

Chairman TOM COLE,
Ranking Member JIM MCGOVERN,
House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COLE AND RANKING MEMBER MCGOVERN: We write in connection with House Resolution 863 (the "Resolution"), which was introduced by Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene and approved along partisan lines by the Committee on Homeland Security (the "Committee"). The Resolution contains two articles impeaching Secretary Mayorkas.

Passage of this Resolution by the House of Representatives would be unconstitutional. The effort to impeach Secretary Mayorkas represents a dramatic departure from over two centuries of established understanding and precedent about the meaning of the Impeachment Clause of the Constitution and the proper exercise of that extraordinary tool. In addition to lacking any basis in the Constitution, the impeachment articles reflect a basic misrepresentation of key statutes governing immigration law. Contrary to the Resolution's charges, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS" or the "Department") under Secretary Mayorkas's leadership has always followed the law in good faith, and any suggestion otherwise is false.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This letter explains why the proposed impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas is illegitimate, invalid, and dangerous. It proceeds in three parts. Part I describes the broad and overwhelming consensus that the constitutional standard for impeachment—"Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors"—does not encompass mere disagreements with policy decisions made in good faith or the lawful exercise of enforcement discretion. Both the Constitution's text and the Framers' explicit intent make clear that impeachment is not a lawful remedy for partisan disputes, nor is it a permissible means for Congress to voice its disapproval of how a Cabinet Secretary is furthering the Administration's policies. Indeed, Congress has twice rejected proposals to impeach Executive Branch officials based on partisan disagreement with their immigration enforcement decisions.

Part II explains why the effort to impeach the Secretary lacks any basis in law and consists only of a thinly-veiled dispute about border security and immigration policy. While the Resolution has charged the Secretary in Article I with "willful and systemic refusal to comply with the law," there is no legal or factual basis for that allegation. At its core, the Article is nothing more than a simple list of criticisms of the policies of the current Administration. These assertions do not meet the Constitutional standard for impeachment. The Secretary has followed the law in good faith in each and every action that the Resolution cites as a purported ground for impeachment, whether related to asylum, detention, removals, parole processes, or any others. All of those decisions find ample support in existing provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"). To the extent Congress wants to change the Administration's policies, the Constitution prescribes a different path: passing legislation. In fact, the Secretary has worked for months with Members of Congress from both parties to seek bipartisan legislation—the draft of which was released yesterday—to help solve the challenges faced at the border. There has been no "refusal to comply with the law," much less the kind of deliberate malfeasance or personal corrup-

tion that the Constitution requires for the extraordinary remedy of impeachment.

Finally, Part III addresses the hodgepodge of claims under Resolution Article II, entitled "Breach of Public Trust." That Article claims that the Secretary made false statements about "operational control" or border security, that he inappropriately reversed Trump-era immigration policies, and that he failed to comply with unidentified Congressional subpoenas. These conclusory assertions are false, and the Resolution provides no support for them. As detailed below, the Secretary has not made false statements about conditions at the border but rather transparently provided his opinions about border security. His reversal of certain earlier immigration policies is the result of a change of Administrations, not a breach of the public's trust. And he has not failed to comply with subpoenas or other oversight; under his leadership, DHS has been extraordinarily cooperative with Congress. It is the Committee, not the Secretary, that has departed from regular order by abandoning established standards and procedures that have characterized every relevant impeachment effort in this Nation's history.

Impeachment in these circumstances, and on this record, would represent a radical and dangerous step in violation of the Constitution. Taken to its logical conclusion, it would alter the balance between the Legislative and Executive Branches and would disrupt the relationship between a President and his or her Cabinet. The House of Representatives should reject the proposed Articles of Impeachment.

IMPEACHMENT BASED ON PARTISAN POLICY DIS-
PUTES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNPRECE-
DENTED

Under the Constitution, impeachment is an extraordinary measure limited to "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Although the Resolution alleges a "Willful and Systemic Refusal to Comply with the Law" and "Breach of Public Trust," there is no basis to support either Article. To the contrary, the entire Resolution reduces to an expression of disagreement with and disapproval of the Secretary's good-faith policy decisions, judgments, and opinions about how best to pursue the Administration's policy choices on border security and immigration enforcement within legal bounds. Disagreement with an Administration's policy positions and opinions is not a valid basis to impeach a Cabinet Secretary, whose job is to execute those policies. Constitutional text, historical precedent, and the overwhelming body of scholarship—including every Constitutional scholar who testified before the Committee and dozens of others who have commented publicly on these proceedings—confirm that impeachment of the Secretary in these circumstances would be unconstitutional, unprecedented, and destabilizing.

THE FRAMERS ESTABLISHED A HIGH BAR FOR IM-
PEACHMENT THAT DOES NOT ENCOMPASS POL-
ICY DISAGREEMENTS

The Framers carefully erected a high bar for impeachment, deliberately rejecting the more liberal use of that tool that had characterized British Parliamentary practice. The Framers specifically limited impeachment to a narrow set of intentional and grave crimes against the public that could undermine the constitutional order. In adopting the phrase "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" as grounds for impeachment, the Framers first considered, and squarely rejected, a lower standard that would have encompassed less severe offenses such as "malpractice," "neglect of duty," and "maladministration." The Framers thereby sought to prevent impeachment from becoming a mere partisan weapon that could be

used to supplant the President's policies for those favored by the legislature. As the Constitution's text, the Founding debates, and overwhelming weight of expert opinion make clear, impeachment is not an appropriate means for Congress to express disagreement with an official's exercise of his duties or the policies he pursues. Rather, the Framers determined that impeachable conduct would consist only of the most serious intentional wrongdoing that regular elections could not adequately remedy.

THE CONSTITUTION'S TEXT MAKES CLEAR THAT POLICY AND ENFORCEMENT DECISIONS ARE NOT "HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS"

Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution limits Congress's power to impeach the President, Vice President and, as relevant here, officer of the United States to: "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Because Secretary Mayorkas has not been accused of either treason or bribery, any article of impeachment against him must establish that he committed "high Crimes and Misdemeanors." The Framers of the Constitution intended that this term of art encompass a narrow set of "great" and "dangerous" crimes against the public characterized by serious and intentional "abuses of official power." That was the kind of "breach of the public trust," in which the office-holder pursued some illegitimate interest over his duty to country, that the Framers deemed worthy of impeachment.

The Framers recognized treason and bribery as the most serious offenses one could commit against the constitutional system of government. The use of the word "other" before "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" signaled that this category comprises only those offenses that are similar to "treason" and "bribery" both in kind and degree. Any impeachable "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" must involve an act of deliberate malfeasance as serious and damaging to the constitutional order as betraying the Nation in exchange for personal gain, "not merely a mistake in judgment or policy or partisan differences."

THE FRAMERS REJECTED "MALADMINISTRATION" AND GOOD-FAITH POLICY DISPUTES AS A BASIS FOR IMPEACHMENT

While American impeachment practice has roots in the British Parliamentary system, the Framers intentionally rejected the lower impeachment standard that system applied. Consistent with the separation of powers established in the Constitution, the Framers rejected "maladministration" as grounds for impeachment, instead requiring deliberate and egregious misconduct. The Framers thereby sought to prevent Congress from employing impeachment as a mere political tool that could subordinate the Executive to the will of Congress.

The Framers adapted the concept of impeachment from the British Parliament, which first employed impeachment procedures in the fourteenth century as a legislative check against disfavored royal ministers. Because the hereditary monarchy wielded absolute power that insulated it from direct criticism, Parliaments dissatisfied with a monarch's policies devised a method for removing ministers charged with carrying out royal policies by alleging that the ministers were incompetent or malicious in the execution of their duties. In practice, this broad standard meant royal ministers served at the pleasure of Parliament. Parliament's impeachment power was limited to instances typically involving an abuse of power exercised either through corruption or maladministration. Because there was no formal codification of the term, however, British officials were impeached for a wide variety of misdeeds, ranging from personal

corruption and the commission of crimes to neglect of duty and even providing bad advice.

Against this historical backdrop, the Framers debated whether to adopt the British use of "high crimes and misdemeanors" but decided to narrow it to willful and egregious abuses of power. Under the resulting American formulation, good-faith policy decisions or the exercise of discretion do not constitute impeachable conduct.

Initially, some delegates to the Constitutional Convention proposed that the Constitution provide for impeachment in cases of "mal-practice or neglect of duty." That language was rejected in favor of the phrase "treason, bribery, or corruption," a revision that "seemed to exclude mere mismanagement or incompetence." George Mason then proposed adding "maladministration" as a basis for impeachment. The delegates also rejected that formulation, believing "[a]n election of every four years will prevent maladministration." James Madison added that if the Constitution made "maladministration" impeachable, "[s]o vague a term will be equivalent to a tenure during pleasure of the Senate" rather than allowing officials to serve out their terms and execute the policies that they were elected to pursue. In other words, "maladministration" would create an impeachment standard more analogous to the British Parliamentary system. It would thereby subject the Executive Branch to the will of Congress and allow for the removal of the President or other Executive Branch officials for a wide range of common transgressions, including "inefficient administration, or administration that did not accord with Congress's view of good policy." Having created a government executive power that, unlike the monarch in Britain, was answerable to the voters, they concluded the impeachment power should and need not be available for mere policy differences or failure to perform the job adequately. The Framers thus established that "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" would not encompass mere "maladministration."

Additional historical records indicate that impeachment is reserved for conduct characterized by intentional or purposeful wrongdoing. For example, during the Virginia Ratifying Convention, Edmund Randolph remarked that even in England, "[n]o man ever thought of impeaching a man for an opinion."

Scholars across the ideological spectrum agree that the "Framers' rejection of 'maladministration' as a basis for impeachment was, in effect, a rejection of a standard" that lacked prerequisites such as bad faith or corrupt intent. As Professor Charles Black explained in his seminal treatment of impeachment, "certainly the phrase 'high Crimes and Misdemeanors,' whatever its vagueness at the edges, seems absolutely to forbid the removal of a president on the grounds that Congress does not on the whole think his administration of public affairs is good." Thus, "whatever may be the grounds for impeachment and removal, dislike of a president's policy is definitely not one of them, and ought to play no part in the decision on impeachment." Likewise, impeachment scholar Professor Michael Gerhardt observed, following a comprehensive review of historical impeachment precedent, that the Senate has "concluded that impeachable offenses do not include errors of judgment or policy differences." Professor Keith Whittington similarly concluded that the adoption of the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" "seemed to capture the range of potential dangers that concerned Madison and others, without leaving the president vulnerable to impeachment over routine political and policy disagreements."

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Homeland Security Committee Chairman MARK GREEN denied Secretary Mayorkas the ability to testify during the committee's sham impeachment "investigation." Secretary Mayorkas, however, wrote the Chairman to set the record straight. I include in the RECORD the Secretary's January 30, 2024, letter to Chairman GREEN.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, January 30, 2024.

Hon. MARK E. GREEN,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREEN: On January 5, 2024, you sent a letter to me requesting that I again appear before the House Homeland Security Committee to provide testimony. I have testified before this Committee seven times. I agreed to testify again and asked to work with your staff to identify a mutually agreeable date. You did not respond to my request, changed course, and instead invited me to submit written testimony. Two days later, you issued a statement representing that every member of the Committee's majority already had rendered their decision. I respectfully submit this letter in response.

The problems with our broken and outdated immigration system are not new. I assumed office in February 2021. Immigration cases concluded that year reportedly had been languishing in court for an average of 1,319 days. In 2010, that average was 347 days. The Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review reports that at the end of Fiscal Year 2020, there were 1,261,144 cases in the immigration court backlog. In 2017 that number was 656,383. The DHS Office of Immigration Statistics reported that there were approximately 11.4 million undocumented individuals present in the United States in 2018. Our immigration laws last received an overhaul in 1996. Our immigration laws were simply not built for 21st century migration patterns.

In 2019, prior to the onset of COVID and as country conditions in Latin America were on the decline, the number of migrants encountered at our Southwest Border increased almost 100 percent over the prior year. In this post-COVID period, the challenges at our border have again intensified as the world experiences the greatest displacement of people since World War II and our entire hemisphere is gripped with mass migration brought on by violence, food insecurity, severe poverty, corruption, authoritarian regimes, and the destruction of homes and communities by extreme weather events. These movements are facilitated by human smuggling organizations that exploit migrants as part of a billion-dollar criminal enterprise. The depth of suffering that migrants are willing to endure speaks to the desperation they feel about their prospects at home.

We need a legislative solution and only Congress can provide it. I have been privileged to join a bipartisan group of United States Senators these past several months to provide technical and operational expertise in support of their efforts to strengthen our country's border security. These efforts would yield significant new enforcement tools and make a substantial difference at our border.

Our law enforcement personnel need additional resources to execute our border security and enforcement strategy, which is why the Administration requested supplemental funding in August and then again in October 2023. That request included the hiring of an additional 1,300 Border Patrol Agents, 1,000 law enforcement officers and the purchase and deployment of over 100 cutting-edge

Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) systems to prevent cartels from moving fentanyl into the country, and 1,600 additional asylum officers to rapidly adjudicate claims for asylum and facilitate timely decisions so that those who are ineligible can be quickly removed and those with valid claims can receive prompt resolution.

Instead, you claim that we have failed to enforce our immigration laws. That is false. We have provided Congress and your Committee hours of testimony, thousands of documents, hundreds of briefings, and much more information that demonstrates quite clearly how we are enforcing the law. The extensive material we have provided informed you that, for example:

This Administration has removed, returned, or expelled more migrants in three years than the prior Administration did in four years.

Since May 12, 2023, DHS has removed or returned more than 500,000 individuals, the vast majority of whom crossed the Southwest Border.

Total removals and returns since mid-May 2023 exceed removals and returns in every full fiscal year since 2015.

Daily removals and returns are nearly double what they were compared to the pre-pandemic average from 2014 to 2019. The majority of individuals encountered at the Southwest Border throughout this Administration have been removed, returned, or expelled.

We have significantly increased the number of removal flights within the Western Hemisphere since the end of Title 42, sending over 20 flights per week of individuals who have been rapidly processed and determined to be removable. We continue to repatriate individuals to more than 150 countries.

Before 2013, the majority of individuals attempting to cross the border entered without being caught. Under this Administration, the estimated annual apprehension rate has averaged 78 percent, the same average rate of apprehension as in the prior Administration.

We developed and implemented a regulation that created a presumption of ineligibility for asylum if an individual who crossed the Southwest Border without authorization traveled through another country and failed to meet defined criteria, including the use of lawful pathways made available to them.

We have been executing an unprecedented and high-impact campaign to disrupt and dismantle the smuggling organizations. More than 14,000 smugglers throughout the region have been arrested and thousands have been prosecuted under federal law.

We have worked with Mexico to conduct mirrored patrols along the Southwest Border, and we have worked with Mexico and other countries to increase interdictions along the migratory routes, increase repatriation flights, and execute the removal of third-country nationals.

Last year we secured funding to hire 300 more Border Patrol Agents, the first increase in more than a decade. Last year I was honored to promote Jason Owens, a career Border Patrol Agent, as the new Chief of the United States Border Patrol.

Undoubtedly, we have policy disagreements on the historically divisive issue of immigration. That has been the case between Administrations and Members of Congress for much longer than the past 38 years since the last overhaul of our immigration system. I think it is unconscionable to separate children from their parents as a tool of deterrence. I believe that law enforcement at the border can be tough and humane. It is our responsibility to the American people to work through our differences and try to reach solutions together. The bipartisan group of United States Senators is currently doing just that.

The trafficking and use of illegal drugs are also not new problems for our country. We have been fighting the war against drugs for decades. When I was working to convict drug dealers and traffickers as a federal prosecutor throughout the 1990s—including the prosecution of the largest cocaine money laundering operation in the country at the time—I saw up close the loss and damage wreaked by black tar heroin, methamphetamine, crack cocaine, and other illegal drugs. I was dedicated then, as I am now, to defeating this scourge upon our country.

What I saw for twelve years as a federal prosecutor does not compare to what our country has experienced and what we have been fighting for more than the past seven years. The addictiveness and fatality of synthetic opioids have cost hundreds of thousands of lives and have ravaged communities. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that overdose deaths involving synthetic opioids—primarily fentanyl—began to climb in 2014 and have accelerated since. Provisional data from the CDC reflects 28,659 overdose deaths involving synthetic opioids in 2017, escalating to 56,894 in 2020; 71,143 in 2021; and 74,789 in 2022. Every death from drug overdoses and poisoning is a tragedy.

The battle against fentanyl presents unique challenges because fentanyl is cheap to make, easily concealed, and made with precursor chemicals and materials that have legal uses. We have intensified our efforts against the cartels and developed new strategies in response. In Fiscal Year 2023 our targeted operations seized more than 43,000 pounds of fentanyl, 3,600 pill presses, and \$16 million in currency. We work closely with partners in other countries. Homeland Security Investigations has established 16 Transnational Criminal Investigative Units (TCIUs) that are successfully supporting investigations and prosecutions abroad. In Fiscal Year 2023, efforts by the Mexico TCIU resulted in more than 59 criminal arrests and the seizure of 64,138 pounds of precursor chemicals.

To better detect smuggling, we are dramatically expanding the use of NII technology at ports of entry, through which more than 90 percent of fentanyl is smuggled into the United States. We are adding new state-of-the-art NII systems to complement those currently in use across Southwest Border ports of entry, with 72 construction projects underway at 15 ports.

Our strategy has evolved to target not just fentanyl, but also the tools and materials the transnational criminal organizations use to make it. We are interdicting and seizing precursor chemicals, pill press machines, die molds, and pill press parts used in the manufacturing process. We are targeting Chinese pill press and precursor supply chains, Mexican pill press brokers, the Mexican transnational criminal organizations and the domestic traffickers who are producing and moving fentanyl, and the money launderers who help facilitate this illicit trade. Our efforts over the past year have resulted in the seizure of nearly 1 million pounds of fentanyl and methamphetamine precursor chemicals.

Our Department is helping partners in the Western Hemisphere and Asia build their own capacity to combat the smuggling of illicit fentanyl. We recently established a working group for ongoing communication and law enforcement coordination with the People's Republic of China to increase cooperation and information sharing.

We are innovating with the responsible use of artificial intelligence at our ports of entry. This year alone, machine learning models that help CBP Officers determine which suspicious vehicles and passengers to refer to secondary screening have led to 240

seizures, which included thousands of pounds of cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, and fentanyl. More details about our efforts to combat fentanyl can be found in this recent DHS fact sheet.

There is much more to do in the fight against fentanyl and other synthetic opioids. We must reduce both supply and demand. To accomplish this, we must work together to tackle what we all agree is a horrific problem that poses grave danger to our citizens, our communities, and our nation.

The Chairman and Members of the Committee's majority have harshly criticized the Department's responsiveness to oversight. The allegations are baseless and inaccurate.

I take very seriously my responsibility to cooperate in good faith with Congress's oversight function. I have devoted significant Departmental resources and personal time to this effort. I have testified publicly in 27 Congressional hearings since I became DHS Secretary. Twelve of those hearings were in the House of Representatives, including seven before the House Homeland Security Committee. I have testified more than any other member of the Cabinet.

In every House hearing, I was asked and I answered many questions about immigration and the border. In all but one of those hearings, I was asked and I answered questions about our counter-fentanyl work. The Department has produced thousands of pages of documents, provided countless briefings, and sent dozens of witnesses to appear in hearings and transcribed interviews. We have produced more than 13,000 pages of documents and data in response to this Committee's requests alone. Further information evidencing the Department's response to Congressional oversight is attached.

Whatever proceedings you initiate, however baseless, my responsiveness to oversight requests will not waiver. The Department has been committed to responding and will continue to respond in good faith to Congressional oversight requests.

I will defer a discussion of the Constitutionality of your current effort to the many respected scholars and experts across the political spectrum who already have opined that it is contrary to law. What I will not defer to others is a response to the politically motivated accusations and personal attacks you have made against me.

I have been privileged to serve our country for most of my professional life. I have adhered scrupulously and fervently to the Oath of Office I have taken six times in my public service career.

My reverence for law enforcement was instilled in me by my parents, who brought me to this country to escape the Communist takeover of Cuba and allow me the freedoms and opportunity that our democracy provides. My parents experienced such loss at the fisted hands of authoritarianism that the American law enforcement officer stood as a tangible symbol of safety and the rule of law in our new home. When I was a boy, my mother would have me jump out of the back seat of our family's station wagon, approach a police officer in uniform, extend my hand, and say thank you.

It was because of everything America meant and gave to my family that I was motivated to enter public service. It was because of my admiration and respect for the men and women who wore a badge that I wanted to work with them to enforce our country's laws. In 1989, I was privileged to take the Oath of Office and be sworn-in as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Central District of California.

For the next nearly nine years, I worked with federal, state, and local law enforcement agents and officers in the investigation and prosecution of federal crimes. We seized

and forfeited property purchased with proceeds of drug deals, and successfully prosecuted bank robbers; counterfeiters; members of the MS-13, 18th Street, Crips, Bloods, and other street gangs; cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, and marijuana traffickers; migrant smugglers; illegal border crossers (most often criminals with multiple felonies, deportations, and reentries); fraudulent document manufacturers; illegal telemarketers; and many others. In 1996 I became the Chief of our General Crimes Section, where I trained all new Assistant United States Attorneys in the investigation and prosecution of federal criminal cases and how to try them before a jury. I have represented the United States in a federal courtroom in hundreds of hard-fought criminal cases.

In 1998 I was confirmed to serve as the United States Attorney for the Central District of California. I was the first federal prosecutor in our office's history to be promoted from within to the top leadership position. To have my father at my side as I took the Oath to assume that role was one of the proudest moments of my life.

Over the next three years, I prosecuted cases of national and international significance, enforcing a wide breadth of criminal statutes. I pursued the death penalty against members of the Mexican mafia, brought RICO charges against a Los Angeles street gang, and successfully prosecuted federal cases of money laundering, public corruption, human trafficking, foreign corrupt practices, drug trafficking, securities fraud, violent crime, immigration fraud, organized crime, and much more. A partial list of the recognition I received for my work as an Assistant United States Attorney and as the United States Attorney is attached.

I returned to public service in August 2009, upon my confirmation as the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. I vividly remember taking the Oath and getting to work on a top-to-bottom review of the agency and leading a subsequent realignment to best serve its mission. As a result of that review, I created a new Directorate within the agency—the Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate—to prioritize and more effectively fulfill the fundamental responsibilities of safeguarding our homeland and protecting the integrity of our legal immigration system.

I served as the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for four years, until I was nominated and confirmed by the United States Senate to serve as the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. My responsibilities as the Deputy Secretary covered the entire expanse of the Department's work, from going after the drug cartels, building the Department's cybersecurity capabilities, combating illegal immigration, and strengthening the Department's partnerships with state and local law enforcement, to negotiating security agreements with foreign countries, implementing new trade and travel protocols, and advancing our interests in the Arctic.

For my service as the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, I was awarded the Distinguished Service Award, the Department's highest civilian honor; the Distinguished Public Service Award, the United States Coast Guard's highest civilian honor; and recognition and awards from law enforcement agencies across the Department and the federal government.

On February 2, 2021, I took the Oath for the sixth time in my public service career and was sworn-in as the Secretary of Homeland Security. I am now in my 22nd year of service to our country. I no longer introduce and argue evidence in a federal courtroom to persuade the jury to convict a dangerous crimi-

nal, but the mission to which I remain devoted is the same: to safeguard the American people.

I assure you that your false accusations do not rattle me and do not divert me from the law enforcement and broader public service mission to which I have devoted most of my career and to which I remain devoted. The privilege of working alongside the 260,000 men and women who serve in the Department of Homeland Security—the privilege of working with incredibly talented and dedicated people on behalf of the United States of America—is the greatest thing one can do.

Secretary,

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS,
Secretary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, former Department of Homeland Security officials recognize that this impeachment is baseless and has the potential to distract from the “actual business of legislating.” A divisive impeachment is far from a constructive solution. I include in the RECORD a letter by former senior homeland security officials who are opposed to this political stunt.

JANUARY 17, 2024.

Representative MARK E. GREEN, MD,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Representative BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.*

OPPOSITION TO THE IMPEACHMENT OF
SECRETARY MAYORKAS SIGN-ON LETTER

As former senior homeland security officials who served in administrations of both parties, we are compelled to express our deep concern regarding the potential impeachment of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas over longstanding political differences on immigration and border policies would be a grave mistake with far-reaching consequences for our national security and economic prosperity. The U.S. southern border is undeniably facing challenges, but assigning blame solely based on political and partisan grounds will do little to address the complex issues at hand.

It is imperative to consider the historical context; Congress has not impeached a Cabinet Secretary in over a century. Impeachment is a tool to remove officers of the government for treason, bribery, and high crimes and misdemeanors. The Founders never intended it to be used as a tool for mitigating policy disagreements.

Initiating such proceedings not only threatens to undermine national security but sets a perilous precedent that could have dire implications for the stability of our government. Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas would only serve to distract from the pressing need to implement effective policy solutions to rectify our immigration system and fortify America's national security.

The bipartisan struggle to assert control over the southern border has persisted for more than two decades, transcending administrations of both Democratic and Republican orientations. Resorting to a partisan impeachment would be counterproductive, exacerbating the existing polarization around this critical issue without addressing its root causes.

Furthermore, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has grappled with challenges in attracting and confirming senior officials, a situation detrimental to its overall functionality. Impeaching a Senate-confirmed Secretary would only contribute to the chaotic leadership structure, hindering the crucial mission of DHS in ensuring the security and economic success of our nation.

The significance of DHS's mission cannot be overstated, ranging from processing legal travelers at air and seaports to confronting drug-related threats at the border to securing aviation and other critical infrastructure to cybersecurity and many other missions. The performance of DHS directly impacts the lives of everyday Americans, and it is incumbent upon us to navigate the current challenges with a focus on constructive solutions rather than divisive measures.

We urge both Republicans and Democrats to set aside political differences and collaborate to develop genuine and meaningful changes to address the situation at the border. Ongoing negotiations around border security and funding present a potential opportunity for constructive development. We advocate for legislative solutions, including adequate funding, to replace the outdated policies that currently characterize our immigration system. It is crucial that Congress prioritizes solutions that strengthen our borders, treat migrants with dignity, and reduce backlogs that delay decisions on asylum claims, legal immigration petitions, and other cases and applications.

To be clear, the signatories to this letter do not all agree with the wisdom or effectiveness of all the immigration and border policies Secretary Mayorkas oversees, just as we often disagreed with policies his predecessors implemented. However, escalating these policy disagreements into an impeachment proceeding is a dangerous distraction from the actual business of legislating, where Congress' focus should lie.

We urge the House of Representatives not to initiate or conclude impeachment proceedings against Secretary Mayorkas. If the House completes such an impeachment, we urge the Senate to reject the proposal.

Thank you,

Jayson Ahern, Former Commissioner (A), U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Ross Ashley, Former Assistant Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Thomas Atkin, Former Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Border and Transportation Security Policy; Douglas Baker, Former Special Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Senior Director for Border and Transportation Security Policy; Alan Bersin, Former Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; William Booher, Former Public Affairs Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Ed Cash, Former Director, Intergovernmental Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Gus Coldebella, Former Deputy and Acting General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Gil Kerlikowske, Former Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Prakash Khatri, Former Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Admiral James M. Loy, Former Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; David A. Martin, Former Deputy and Acting General Counsel, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Lynden Melmed, Former Chief Counsel, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; Robert Mocny, Former Senior Executive, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Michael Neifach, Former Principal Legal Advisor, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; Elizabeth Neumann, Former Assistant Secretary for Threat Prevention and Security Policy, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Leon Rodriguez, Former Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

W. Price Roe, Former Counselor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Paul Rosenzweig, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Seth Stodder,

Former Assistant Secretary for Borders, Immigration & Trade Policy, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; C. Stewart Verdery, Jr. Former Assistant Secretary for Borders and Transportation Security Policy and Planning, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Dave West, Former Advisor, International Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Jim Williams, Former Director, US-VISIT, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Julie Myers Wood, Former Assistant Secretary, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; James Ziglar, Former Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff, who was appointed by Republican President George W. Bush, wrote an op-ed for the conservative Wall Street Journal opposed to the baseless impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas. Former Secretary Chertoff wrote that House Republicans have, quote “failed to put forth evidence that meets the bar” for an impeachable offense. I include in the RECORD the Chertoff op-ed.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 28, 2024]

DON'T IMPEACH ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS
(By Michael Chertoff)

Political and policy disagreements aren't impeachable offenses. The Constitution gives Congress the power to impeach federal officials for treason, bribery and “other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” That's a high bar. In the history of our republic, only one cabinet secretary has been impeached (for receiving corrupt kickback payments).

The House Homeland Security Committee is moving toward a Jan. 30 vote on articles of impeachment against Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, with a possible vote by the full House on Feb. 5. As homeland security secretary under President George W. Bush—and as a former federal judge, U.S. attorney and assistant attorney general—I can say with confidence that, for all the investigating that the House Committee on Homeland Security has done, they have failed to put forth evidence that meets the bar.

This is why Republicans aren't seeking to hold Mr. Mayorkas to the Constitution's “high crimes and misdemeanors” standard for impeachment. They make the unsupported argument that he is derelict in his duty.

Since Mr. Mayorkas took office, the majority of migrants encountered at the Southwest border have been removed, returned or expelled. In fact, since the pandemic-era Title 42 policy was ended last May, DHS removed, returned or expelled more noncitizens than in any five-month period in the past 10 years. The truth is that our national immigration system is outdated, and DHS leaders under both parties have done their best to manage our immigration system without adequate congressional support.

I don't agree with every policy decision the Biden administration has made. There are aspects of immigration strategy that are worthy of debate. But House Republicans are ducking difficult policy work and hard-fought compromise. Impeachment is a diversion from fixing our broken immigration laws and giving DHS the resources needed to secure the border.

Our nation is at its best when our leaders work together to confront the seemingly intractable. The situation at our border and our national security, demand such bipartisan collaboration.

Despite our different parties, I know Mr. Mayorkas to be fair and honest—dedicated to

the safety and security of the U.S. He has represented DHS to the country and to both parties in Congress with integrity. Republicans in the House should drop this impeachment charade and work with Mr. Mayorkas to deliver for the American people.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise that the Biden administration is opposed to this sham impeachment. The Biden administration has done everything in its power to uphold the law and have an orderly, humane approach to border security. I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy opposing the baseless impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H. RES. 863—RESOLUTION IMPEACHING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS—REP. GREENE, R-GA

The Administration strongly opposes H. Res. 863, a House resolution introduced by Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene to impeach Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro N. Mayorkas.

Secretary Mayorkas, a Cuban immigrant who came to the United States with his family as political refugees, has spent more than two decades serving his country with honor and integrity in a decorated career in law enforcement and public service. From his time in the Justice Department as a U.S. Attorney to his service as Deputy Secretary and now Secretary of Homeland Security, he has upheld the rule of law faithfully and has demonstrated a deep commitment to the values that make our Nation great. Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas would be an unprecedented and unconstitutional act of political retribution that would do nothing to solve the challenges our Nation faces in securing the border.

This impeachment effort clearly fails to meet the Constitution's threshold for impeachable offenses. The Constitution permits impeachment only for “Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” The impeachment power was never intended as a device for members of an opposing political party to harass Executive Branch officials over policy disputes. Legal scholars across the ideological spectrum, including every scholar who testified to Congress about the Resolution and conservatives who have previously sided with Congressional Republicans on matters of impeachment, agree that impeaching Secretary Mayorkas would be an “abuse of the Constitution” and that there is no “cognizable basis” for it.”

The Resolution's purported grounds for impeachment have no basis in law or fact. The Resolution does not demonstrate a failure to follow the law in any respect, let alone a “willful” one. Nor does it demonstrate that Secretary Mayorkas has “breached the public trust.” To the contrary, the Secretary has scrupulously followed the law, faithfully implemented policies to address the significant and longstanding challenges at the border, and engaged with Congress and the public in a manner that is truthful and transparent.

Impeaching Secretary Mayorkas would trivialize this solemn constitutional power and invite more partisan abuse of this authority in the future. It would do nothing to solve the challenges we face in securing our Nation's borders, nor would it provide the funding the President has repeatedly requested for more Border Patrol agents, immigration judges, and cutting-edge tools to detect and stop fentanyl at the border.

If the House of Representatives wishes to address these challenges, the Constitution provides an obvious means: passing legislation. The Administration will continue to

engage with Congress to enact bipartisan solutions for securing our border and strengthening our immigration system and strongly urges the House of Representatives to join us, instead of supporting this baseless impeachment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As you have heard, the evidence against Secretary Mayorkas is compelling, but so too is the constitutional justification for impeachment. The constitutional history and the Framers' intent are clear. We, the people's Representatives, have no option but to exercise this duty when executive branch officials blatantly refuse to comply with the laws we have passed, threaten the separation of powers, imperil the constitutional order, and expose Americans to untold suffering and death.

This historical record is unambiguous. From Madison to Hamilton, the Framers uniformly believed that executive branch officials who fail to defend the Constitution and enforce the law should no longer hold office.

We know that Secretary Mayorkas has refused to comply with the law. We know that he lied to Congress and breached the public trust. We all witnessed the horrific consequences.

In closing, my question to my colleagues is this: If Secretary Mayorkas' brazen, blatant disregard for the laws we have passed is not enough to warrant action, why are we even here? What is the point of passing laws if we allow the executive branch to violate those laws with impunity?

Do we care so little for our constitutional role and responsibilities that we would allow an official of either party to openly defy laws passed by this House, the people's House? I truly hope not. That would be a dangerous precedent and a serious abdication of our duty.

Willfully violating the law to open America's borders to millions of unvetted migrants and breaching the public trust are grave offenses against our country, our Constitution, and our constituents. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us, on this solemn day, to fulfill our oaths to the Constitution and exercise the power to impeach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 863, Republicans' sham effort to impeach Department of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

House Republicans are choosing to pursue an impeachment that has no basis in wrongdoing by Secretary Mayorkas. Their cynical ploy has everything to do with weaponizing a constitutional process in an attempt to divert attention from their inability to provide viable solutions to the border crisis. Secretary Mayorkas has not violated the law, let alone committed “high crimes and misdemeanors,”

which is the constitutional standard for impeachment.

Rather than working toward bipartisan solutions, House Republicans are doing the bidding of former President Donald Trump in a pointless attempt to reinstate the Trump administration's failed and inhumane border policies. They know these policies will not become law. They are actively blocking real solutions for the complex issues that impact border communities and migrants.

House Republicans should stop wasting time and taxpayer resources by pushing lies and to score cheap political points with their MAGA base and instead work together with Democrats to solve problems for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H. Res. 863 is postponed.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

ISRAEL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7217) making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the attacks in Israel for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7217

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$15,221,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$31,934,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such

amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$203,683,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$507,994,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$11,094,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$81,030,000, to remain available until December 31, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$5,035,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading in this Act, \$4,400,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, may be transferred to accounts under the headings "Operation and Maintenance" and "Procurement" for replacement of defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, and for reimbursement for defense services of the Department of Defense and military education and training, provided to Israel or identified and notified to Congress for provision to Israel: *Provided further*, That funds transferred pursuant to the previous proviso shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which the funds are transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of the details of such transfers not less than 15 days before any such transfer: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided under this heading, such amounts may be transferred back and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That any transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Army", \$191,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Army", \$901,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Army", \$283,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Weapons Procurement, Navy", \$10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Navy", \$163,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$31,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", \$39,524,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", \$655,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Air Force", \$4,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, \$5,341,516,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading in this Act, \$5,200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome, David’s Sling, and Iron Beam defense systems to counter short-range rocket threats: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be transferred pursuant to an exchange of letters and are in addition to funds provided pursuant to the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall be construed to apply to amounts made available in prior appropriations Acts for the procurement of the Iron Dome, David’s Sling, and Iron Beam defense systems: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, \$31,263,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, \$105,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, \$61,660,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, \$304,756,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to respond to the attacks in Israel, including for battle management software and cooperation on defensive programs through emerging technologies: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for “Defense Working Capital Funds”, \$549,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant

to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, \$1,150,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024, which shall be for operation and maintenance to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Section 12001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287), as amended by Public Law 115-141, is further amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (2) of subsection (a), by striking “armor” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting “defense articles that are in the inventory of the Department of Defense as of the date of transfer, are intended for use as reserve stocks for Israel, and are located in a stockpile for Israel as of the date of transfer.”.

(2) In subsection (b), by striking “at least equal to the fair market value of the items transferred” and inserting “in an amount to be determined by the Secretary of Defense”.

(3) In subsection (c), by striking “30 days” and inserting “15 days”, and by inserting “Appropriations,” after “Committees on” in each place it appears.

SEC. 102. During fiscal year 2024, section 514(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)) shall not apply to defense articles to be set aside, earmarked, reserved, or intended for use as reserve stocks in stockpiles in the State of Israel.

SEC. 103. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter through fiscal year 2025, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide a written report to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate describing United States security assistance provided to Israel since the October 7, 2023, terrorist attack on Israel, including a comprehensive list of the defense articles and services provided to Israel and the associated authority and funding used to provide such articles and services: *Provided*, That such report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may be accompanied by a classified annex.

SEC. 104. Concurrent with any notification of assistance made pursuant to section 506(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a written notification to the congressional defense committees that contains a description of the defense articles and defense services to be furnished, including the quantity, approximate value, and an estimate of the cost to replace such article or an equivalent capability, and a timeline for the delivery of such defense articles and defense services.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Diplomatic Programs”, \$150,000,000, to remain available

until September 30, 2025, for responding to the attacks in Israel and areas impacted by the attacks in Israel, including for crisis response and relocation support for Mission Israel, of which \$100,000,000 shall be available until expended for Worldwide Security Protection to sustain requirements for Mission Israel and other United States missions affected by the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for “Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service”, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, for emergency evacuation of United States Government personnel and citizens in Israel and in countries in the region impacted by the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Foreign Military Financing Program”, \$3,500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to respond to the attacks in Israel: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading in this Act and prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for fiscal year 2024, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used by the Department of State for necessary expenses for the general costs of administering military assistance and sales, including management and oversight of such programs and activities: *Provided further*, That, to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel under this heading shall, as agreed by the United States and Israel, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which up to \$3,500,000,000 may be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services: *Provided further*, That any congressional notification requirement applicable to funds made available under this heading for Israel may be waived if a determination is made that extraordinary circumstances exist that impact the national security of the United States: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 201. (a) During fiscal year 2024, and subject to subsection (b), section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1)) shall be applied by substituting “\$2,500,000,000” for “\$100,000,000”.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the exercise of the authority of such subsection is necessary to respond to the situation in Israel.

SEC. 202. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report on the proposed uses of funds appropriated by this title to respond to the situation in Israel: *Provided*, That such report shall be updated and submitted to such Committees every 60 days thereafter until September 30, 2025, and every 180 days

thereafter until all funds have been expended, and shall include information detailing how estimates and assumptions contained in previous reports have changed, including obligations and expenditures.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 304. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

SEC. 305. Any amount appropriated by this Act, designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently so designated by the President, and transferred pursuant to transfer authorities provided by this Act shall retain such designation.

This Act may be cited as the “Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer H. Res. 7217, the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2024. This bill provides \$17.6 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations, which will provide needed military assistance to America’s great ally, Israel, and support U.S. military forces operating in the region.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas carried out a brutal, unprovoked terrorist attack on the people of Israel. The horrific acts committed on this day resulted in 1,200 deaths, thousands injured, and 240 hostages, 136 of whom remain in captivity, and over 30 are believed to be dead.

The Israeli people are still reeling from the horrors of October 7, but they have bravely pushed their sorrow aside

to root out and fight Hamas and ensure that their people are never threatened again.

Last November, the House passed a \$14.3 billion supplemental to shore up our ally. The bill included:

\$5.2 billion in missile defense systems such as Iron Dome, David’s Sling, and Iron Beam;

\$4.4 billion to backfill U.S. stocks;

\$1 billion for U.S. munitions production, such as 155 rounds and small diameter bombs;

\$3.5 billion for foreign military financing of U.S. systems and munitions; and

\$200 million for the protection of U.S. personnel and emergency evacuations of American citizens in the region as a result of this conflict.

These requirements remain unchanged and are aligned with the Biden administration’s supplemental request. They are included, again, in the bill we are considering today.

Unfortunately, the situation in the Middle East has continued to deteriorate since November. The Houthis have launched dozens of missile, drone, and boat attacks on military and civil ships in the Red Sea.

On January 28, three U.S. soldiers were killed and 40 were injured by a drone attack at a military base in Jordan caused by an Iranian-backed militia. Just this morning, the Houthis fired missiles at two civilian ships in Yemen, one British and one American. We are putting our military in an untenable situation, and attacks continue to escalate.

Now, we must act to shore up our ally, Israel, and provide our military with the resources they need to protect our troops in the region.

The new funding in this bill addresses that changing reality by providing \$3.3 billion for U.S. military operations in the region funded through December 2024. This includes \$1 billion for low-cost defensive capabilities to thwart future attacks on U.S. forces in the region.

In many instances, we have been intercepting low-cost Iranian-backed drones with multimillion-dollar missiles. This funding will protect our forces and put us on the right side of the cost curve.

This funding bill resupplies Israel’s defensive capabilities, restores America’s defense industry to replenish our stocks, funds necessary operations for our forces in the region, and sends a strong signal that the United States will not back down.

I am grateful for the support of Chairwoman GRANGER, Chairman DIAZ-BALART, Republican leadership, and the dozens of Members who have cosponsored this bill. I am also grateful for the support expressed by many of my friends across the aisle. We have an opportunity today to come together and send a strong message that the United States stands with Israel.

I want to address the position of the Democratic leadership, including

President Biden’s veto threat. Assertions that this bill plays politics are patently false. Last November, Democrats said they wanted a clean bill. That is exactly what this is. This bill simply provides necessary resources to our closest ally in the region and our own military. I introduced this bill because it is the right thing to do. The only people making it political are those who oppose it.

Tomorrow is the 4-month anniversary of the horrific October 7 terrorist attack, which is an act of war. Israel knows that we stand with them, and today we can send a clear message that we support their efforts to eradicate Hamas, the only way to truly bring peace to the region.

Likewise, our American military men and women should know their government stands fully behind them as they respond to these numerous attacks. Terrorists and those supporting them should have no question of American resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 122 days ago, Hamas terrorists murdered over 1,000 Israelis and at least 30 Americans in cold blood. They took hundreds hostage in the worst attack on Jewish people since the Holocaust.

President Biden’s supplemental funding request for Israel, Ukraine, the Indo-Pacific, and for our border has gone all but completely unanswered by this historic do-nothing majority. For months our colleagues in the majority insisted that any foreign assistance bill must include border policy changes. So spoke Speaker JOHNSON at the White House several months ago, and he said that we needed a bipartisan border security agreement that would open and unlock the door for funds for foreign assistance.

Yet, Republicans have rejected a bipartisan bill that would accomplish exactly what they have asked for.

While declaring that bill dead on arrival in the House, the majority has opted to consider a bill that we know the President will veto. This is a political stunt that makes it less likely that Israel gets its funds while endangering U.S. national security. This accomplishes nothing and delays aid getting out to our allies and providing humanitarian relief.

Our allies cannot wait, our border communities cannot wait, and our cities cannot wait.

I wholeheartedly support funding for Israel. I have written aid to Israel supplemental appropriations over the last several years. However, I cannot support this bill which falls dangerously short of what this moment calls for. Our allies are facing existential threats, and our friends and foes around the globe are watching and waiting to see how America will respond.

Putin is watching, Xi is watching, and the Ayatollah Khamenei is watching. Russia, China, and Iran are watching, and our allies are watching.

This bill does not provide a penny in humanitarian assistance. We cannot abandon the innocent civilians caught in the crossfire of these conflicts, particularly in Gaza. The costs of Hamas' rule over Gaza and the war against Israel are borne by innocent Palestinians. Israel's harsh response has raised these costs further. Families and children are facing unthinkable circumstances. Millions are facing starvation because of this conflict. No one with clear eyes would say otherwise.

Furthermore, if this bill were to become law, there is no path to support Ukraine. We are witnessing the first land war in Europe in a generation, and through inaction, this Congress is handing a sovereign nation over to a ruthless autocrat jeopardizing U.S. national security. Vladimir Putin wants Ukraine. If he overtakes Ukraine and moves against a NATO ally, then we will see U.S. troops in a ground war.

If we do not provide Ukraine with what they need, then the ultimate legacy of the 118th Congress will be the appeasement of a dictator and the destruction of a free nation.

Our allies and our enemies in Europe and around the globe will know that the United States is no longer a trusted partner in the security of the free world. Yet, we know that a supermajority of this body supports Ukraine.

There are unquestionably more than 218 votes in the House for a supplemental appropriations bill that includes Israel, humanitarian assistance, Ukraine, and Indo-Pacific assistance. Yet, House Republicans are refusing to take that path. The Senate bill acts now to address the border that is in crisis. The status quo is unacceptable, but Republicans say no to moving forward.

We should reject this unserious effort, this political ploy, and insist on a bipartisan product that supports our allies and protects the integrity of our border.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan effort. This is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), who is the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7217, a bill that will provide additional support for Israel, and I want to thank Chairman CALVERT for the leadership on this bill that he has given.

Nearly 4 months ago, we watched Hamas brutally attack the Israeli people. Unfortunately, the situation in the region has only gotten worse. Israel, and now U.S. forces, have been attacked by terrorist groups backed by Iran. Funding is needed to address the growing threats we face.

The bill before us provides a total of \$17.6 billion in emergency resources. Specifically, the bill includes funding for Iron Dome, David's Sling, Iron Beam defense systems, and other weapons through the foreign military financing program.

To ensure that U.S. support does not impact our own military readiness, the bill restocks the items we have already sent to Israel. It is also providing \$3.3 billion to support our military operations in the region.

Now more than ever, we must stand firm with Israel. The bill sends a strong message that the United States supports our great ally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the important bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member DELAURO for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces two immense national security challenges, and Congress must address them both: Russia's illegal and unjust invasion of Ukraine, which threatens their territorial integrity and the security of Europe; and Israel's response to the Hamas terrorist attacks on October 7, which has spiraled into a regional conflict between the United States and Iranian proxies.

Tragically, three U.S. servicemembers have lost their lives in this conflict.

Our Nation and the world need decisive action from Congress. The Hamas attacks of October 7 were barbaric, and Israel does have the right to defend itself.

I have long supported missile defense priorities like Iron Dome in the Defense Appropriations bill, but this is not the way to get more aid to Israel.

The Senate and the White House do not support this action. This bill was introduced to get ahead of the Senate's bipartisan security supplemental which does address all of our national security priorities. The Republican House bill plays politics with our national security, and that is wrong. It is a non-starter for those of us who seriously want to address these crises in a comprehensive manner.

Here is how we do that: We do provide the assistance to Israel, but it is equally as important to get more life-saving humanitarian aid into Gaza because if we don't, then the situation for civilians will continue to deteriorate; starvation will grow, disease will spread, and Palestinian civilians, most of them children, will continue to suffer, and many will die.

□ 1715

Because of this, Israel's security situation will worsen if we don't do the humanitarian aid.

We need to support our national priorities around the world. Our service-

members are working nonstop to defend commercial shipping routes and deter broader regional conflicts with Iran. They deserve our support.

We must provide additional security assistance to Ukraine. The situation there is desperate, Mr. Speaker. Ukrainian civilians will continue to be murdered, and their military faces a serious shortage of ammunition. We must remedy that.

Congress cannot afford to ignore any of these challenges because America cannot afford to ignore them.

We must lead. The Republican majority, in my opinion, is failing to do just that. If we fail here, the national security consequences we will face abroad are that we will leave both Israel and U.S. troops in the Middle East in a more dangerous position when it comes to Iranian activities; we will condemn more Palestinian civilians in Gaza to die; and we will doom the Ukrainian people to face a dark future with their democratic aspirations crushed by Putin's boot.

We will leave our European allies, who have just approved a 50-billion-euro package for Ukraine, to face a resurgent Russian military on their borders.

The majority has left us no choice but to vote "no."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is regarding Israel. We have time to debate Ukraine at a later date, but today, this is regarding aid to Israel, which we need to do immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a member of the Appropriations Committee's Defense Subcommittee and chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Chairman CALVERT, for giving me an opportunity to speak on this very vital piece of legislation.

It is our solemn duty, Mr. Speaker, to protect our allies and defeat our common enemies. I think we have agreement on both sides of the aisle that we need to do that.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas launched a brutal attack on our friends in Israel. We have all seen the carnage, the assessment of damage, and the terrific loss of life in Israel.

This unwarranted and unprovoked attack was a cruel display of the worst of humanity. We should all agree to that.

Israel is a stabilizing force in the Middle East. It has to be supported at all costs.

From my time as a commander of forces in the Sinai Peninsula, where I had a close working relationship with the IDF, to my time as a Member of Congress on this important subcommittee, I have always been a strong supporter of Israel and will continue to advocate on its behalf.

This \$17.6 billion appropriated will save Israeli lives, and it will work to

defeat Hamas terrorists. The funding will replenish and procure advanced weapon systems, defense articles, and defense services. It will provide for the procurement of the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Iron Beam defense systems to combat short-range rockets and support U.S. military operations in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, in short, we need to pass this bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to take a serious look at it. Pass the bill. Let's get it to the Senate and get it to the White House.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Israel's absolute right to exist, to defend itself, and to bring home its citizens—and ours—who are still held captive after 122 days.

Over those 122 days, President Biden has firmly backed Israel's response to genocidal Hamas terror. He helped free over 100 hostages and continues working tirelessly to bring them all home. He has forcefully countered malign forces who attack our troops and oppose any future peace.

Meanwhile, for 122 days, Republicans have ignored President Biden's urgent request: Safeguard our democracy and our allies from adversaries who seek chaos, death, and destruction.

This abdication of responsibility fails our constituents, our allies, and our national security interests.

After months of waiting, I won't hesitate to vote for Israel's defense in this moment of crisis.

I am enraged that Republicans are playing political games, caving to Trump and the extreme fringe of their party at the expense of our most sacred national obligations. They cynically pound the table about Iran, but they are suddenly blind to Putin's wrath in Ukraine and deaf to Xi's threats against Taiwan. They callously disregard the humanitarian tragedy facing Gazans, who are also victims of Hamas, eroding our credibility and undermining future prospects for a just and lasting peace.

I am appalled that after 3,300 anti-Semitic attacks in this country in just 3 months, they will pass a dozen non-binding resolutions only to turn around and defund basic protections for Jewish Americans.

We could have passed the President's emergency request months ago in a massive bipartisan show of strength. Instead, Republicans are needlessly weaponizing these vital efforts to score cheap political points.

It took far too long to get here. Yet, this bill still falls short of our needs.

As a Jew and proud Zionist, my conscience demands that I vote with Israel in her hour of need in this moment of crisis. I won't pretend this bill comes close to meeting our security needs.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 7217, the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act.

In the face of terror and absolute unprovoked aggression, Israel is in the fight for its existence. The United States must not shirk its duty and must support Israel. Israel has the absolute right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, the world is essentially on fire. If you do not combat dictators, if you do not combat terrorists, we are shirking our duty.

Today, with the United States being Israel's greatest ally, we must support them. We already sent the Senate a support bill. We sent them a support bill for Israel. We did that barely a month after the Hamas attack on October 7.

What have Senator SCHUMER and Senate Democrats done? They have sat on it. Now, they want to send us a bill to try to fix their crisis at the border in the guise of support for Israel.

By the way, their crisis at the border, President Biden's crisis at the border, has cost this Nation \$450 billion. That pales in comparison to the \$17 billion that we are asking for Israel.

We don't need gimmicks. We don't need a bill, which hasn't even been passed by the Senate, that will allow more and more illegals to come into this country. What we need is a singular bill to support Israel, our greatest ally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 7217.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for emergency funding for Israel and for U.S. military operations in the Middle East.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas terrorists brutally attacked Israel, murdering, maiming, and raping innocent women, men, and children, and taking 240 hostages, many who remain in dark tunnels being starved and abused.

Adding fuel to the fire, Iran proxies are shooting rockets into Israel, jeopardizing commerce in the Red Sea and killing American soldiers on military bases.

Funds from this bill will enable Israel to defend itself and the U.S. to protect our own military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and respect the concern of friends who support Israel but want other also important issues to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, the perfect should not be the enemy of the good.

Let me be clear: My vote will be for what is in this proposed bill and not a rebuke of what is left out.

I fear that a divided Congress will embolden Israel's adversaries and put our own military in harm's way. Israel's security is our security.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Israel. I stand with humanity. I urge my col-

leagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to show my strong support for this aid package that will support our closest ally, Israel.

Providing much-needed assistance for Israel and for U.S. forces in the Middle East region reaffirms our unwavering commitment to democracy, security, and peace in the Middle East.

This is a funding package that will enhance Israel's defense capabilities, specifically in the area of missile and rocket defense, with significant allocations for the Iron Dome and David's Sling systems and the innovative Iron Beam system designed to counteract shorter-range threats.

All of these are made even more necessary due to Iran's investment in weapons for terrorists around the region, including Hamas, the Houthis, Hezbollah, and others. These groups are expanding their attacks on U.S. troops.

This aid package should transcend partisan lines. It is about more than supporting Israel's right to defend itself. It is about securing our strategic interests and showing support for our closest ally, Israel.

That is why I was shocked to see that President Biden swore to veto this legislation, which provides our ally, Israel, with essential aid.

There are no policy riders or poison pills. It is a clean bill supporting the State of Israel. This should not be political, and it shouldn't be that complicated. Yet, for whatever reason, Joe Biden has indicated he would veto this bill, and House and Senate Democrats are falling all over themselves to oppose it.

It has been 122 days since the terrorist attack of October 7. The House passed an aid package months ago. The Senate did not act. According to reports, the Senate may not even have the votes tomorrow to pass their supplemental bill. Therefore, this may end up being the only bill in town.

Mr. Speaker, I just can't understand my Democratic colleagues. Whether you think it is political or not, vote "yes." What, are you crazy? I just don't even understand the logic. It is a clean bill. Vote "yes."

Ultimately, even if the Senate does pass their bill and it does come here, then we will deal with that. Why would you ever want to be on the record, on a clean bill, opposing aid to the State of Israel? It is foolish.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that all of my colleagues will find the moral courage to support this funding package and support Israel at her time of need while providing critical resources to our troops overseas. A little common sense here—vote "yes."

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, maybe I can help my confused friend from New York so that he might understand what is at stake here and why Democrats are going to vote “no.”

I stand here with some trepidation because, for a decade and a half, I have stood here and proudly voted to support Israel, and Israel has been attacked. I know that we will pass Israel aid.

Make no mistake, what we are seeing today is a profoundly cynical political maneuver. For my friend from New York, let me explain it.

Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, and I were in the White House when the Speaker—all of 2 days as Speaker of the House—looked at the National Security Advisor and said that we will do border first, Ukraine, Taiwan, and Israel. He demanded that. The White House said, no, we shouldn’t bind those things up because that creates the possibility that we don’t get any of that done.

Then, we made very real progress. We have a bipartisan package that does all of those things. It counters Putin’s murderousness in Ukraine, supports Taiwan, stands with Israel, and provides humanitarian aid. It offers a once-in-a-generation opportunity to do a border and immigration deal, an immigration deal that the Border Patrol union has endorsed.

□ 1730

My Republican colleagues trot out the Border Patrol every day and say, look at these poor guys.

The Border Patrol union has endorsed this bill. This should pass. It is a historic opportunity to stand up for what we believe as Americans, but then something happened. Donald Trump called.

Donald Trump called the Speaker, and the Speaker said it. He said, we know how he feels about Ukraine. He said, don’t do the border deal, a border deal negotiated with one of the most conservative Senators in the United States Senate.

Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, and I heard MITCH MCCONNELL say: This is a better deal than we get if Donald Trump is President and we have the House and the Senate, but Donald Trump called.

I need to put another name out there: Neville Chamberlain, 1938, “peace for our time” because he kowtowed to a dictator. That is what is at stake.

We will hang the legacy of Neville Chamberlain around our necks if we don’t seize this historic opportunity to do a comprehensive security bill and reject this political cynical maneuver.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the House was excluded from all negotiations regarding the Senate supplemental, and today we are talking about assistance to Israel that is needed immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill authored by my good friend from California, KEN CALVERT.

This legislation provides additional security assistance to ensure Israel, our greatest Middle Eastern ally, survives the most significant threats to its existence to date.

The Jewish people are confronting the unspeakable evil of Hamas, which perpetrated a callous, barbaric attack against the State of Israel, and continues to hold more than 132 people hostage in Gaza, including fellow Americans.

Israel needs our support to ensure they can win this war and bring every hostage home, as well as counter the other threats to their national security. This bill reaffirms the United States’ strong commitment to supporting the people of Israel by providing critical funding to reinforce the Israeli defense system and does so without compromising our own readiness.

In addition, it ensures our ability to protect U.S. citizens and personnel in Israel. We cannot, and must not, turn our back on our ally. Doing so would only embolden Hamas, incentivize Iran to continue funding ruthless attacks on Israel, and weaken the security of American personnel in the region, not to mention the harm it would eventually bring to our own Nation here at home.

We either ensure that Israel has the resources to win, or we will eventually be forced to fight the same enemies here. Those who want to annihilate Israel wish to do the same to America.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, Israel is fighting an existential war against Hamas, a death cult dedicated to the genocide of Jews and the annihilation of the Jewish state, while also being attacked by Hezbollah, the IRGC and Iranian proxies, and Houthis.

There is no question that the United States must support our ally, Israel, but to my colleagues, I say it is folly to think that what is happening now in the Middle East is not connected to what is happening concurrently in Ukraine.

If Ukraine falls, the aid we are providing Israel in this bill is only going to be a small downpayment to what will be needed when Israel faces a strengthened Hezbollah, backed by an emboldened Iran, encouraged by a newly-empowered Russia.

And the United States will likely need to spend billions of additional dollars stationing more U.S. troops alongside our NATO allies in Europe.

We are selling ourselves and our allies short by not taking the responsibility of leadership this country should be taking. If we don’t continue, it is

going to cost our kids and our kids’ future.

It is shameful that the Republicans and Speaker JOHNSON are using our most important ally, Israel, as a political cudgel. It threatens not only Israel’s security, but America’s security and our children’s future.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that, in fact, I agree with him this one time. These events are connected, and the connection is the incredibly weak strategy the Biden administration has shown. That is why Putin invaded Ukraine and that is why Hamas has gone crazy in Israel.

Immediately following the attacks of October 7, I went to Israel and I witnessed what Hamas did to the Jewish people, and as a retired Navy SEAL combat medic, it put me on my heels.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there was a cease-fire on October 6; that there was a de facto two-state solution on October 6, and that was broken by Hamas. Unlike the vast majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I spent my entire adult life either training for, training others for, or at war myself.

There is a difference between the conflict in Ukraine and what is taking place in Israel right now. Vladimir Putin is a war criminal, and he is after territorial gains. Hamas is a group of savages that are after the utter destruction of the Jews as a people. They want to eradicate them.

There is a Member of the other party that has been censured on this floor for grossly anti-Semitic remarks, and that is what is taking place.

Do not be fooled by this political rhetoric. I stand with the Jewish people now. I will stand with them from the beginning to the end, so the river to the sea never takes place.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I will vote “no” today on the \$17 billion aid package which provides a blank check to Netanyahu, Ben-Gvir, and the extreme rightwing government in Israel.

How dare Ben-Gvir, Israel’s national security minister, have the gall to criticize America while calling for the mass expulsion of Palestinians?

I will vote “no” because this bill includes zero humanitarian aid while children are dying and 400,000 Gazans face famine.

I will vote “no” because this bill undermines human rights and international law, ignoring the recent ICJ decision calling on Israel to do more to protect Palestinian civilians.

I will vote “no” because it is painfully obvious to the entire world that what is needed today is a permanent cease-fire and the release of all hostages.

There come moments in a Nation's history when our actions reveal our values. This is such a moment. We must stand for stopping the bombing, for ending this brutal war, and for justice in the Middle East with a Palestinian state with equal rights living side by side with Israel.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,200 Israelis were killed on October 7 and 136 remain hostage. In response, 27,478 Palestinians have been killed, 70 percent of whom are women and children, and most Gazans today cannot reach a fully functioning hospital.

This is not war; this is slaughter.

And yet, after all this destruction and devastation, the Netanyahu government is still nowhere close to their stated objective of destroying Hamas.

Moreover, the United States has our own requirements outlawing the transfer of weapons to forces engaged in gross human rights violations. We have a responsibility to honor those laws, to facilitate a bilateral cease-fire, to move to end this campaign of mass casualty and loss of life that risk bringing the entire region closer to a wider, deadlier conflict.

This bill contains \$17 billion on top of the billions we already transfer every year with no conditions and no humanitarian aid for the most vulnerable. Everyday Americans should not tolerate this squandering of our resources without oversight on such an inhumane and ineffective operation, especially when we are living paycheck to paycheck, and they cannot see their Congress address their most basic material concerns.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, sending \$17.6 billion of U.S. tax dollars with no conditions attached to Netanyahu's extremist government to drop more bombs on innocent Palestinians.

The Israeli Government has already killed 27,000 people, 11,500 of whom were children.

I am tired of my colleagues coming to me, whispering: I don't really like Netanyahu. Well, then, why are we sending him billions of dollars with no conditions?

He literally is telling us over and over again what his intention is.

I am tired of my colleagues coming to me and whispering to me: RASHIDA, I support a two-state solution. Great. Then send money that has conditions for a two-state solution because Netanyahu has over and over again told us he never wants to see a Palestinian state.

I am tired. I oppose Netanyahu's war crimes and want him gone, too, but

many of my colleagues that continue to tell me that do not want a condition to aid. They will just give it to a genocidal maniac.

My message to my colleagues is simple: If you don't support Netanyahu, if you are disgusted by the countless videos of lifeless children pulled out of the rubble, if you actually believe in upholding human rights and international law, vote "no" on a blank check to Netanyahu's genocide.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the folks that believe in genocide is Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the Chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for his leadership in drafting this critical bill, along with Chairwoman KAY GRANGER and the leadership for bringing this forward.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. CALVERT just said, yes, there has been genocide, but the genocide has been from Hamas.

If the world needed yet another reminder of the importance of Israel as a safe haven for the Jewish people, then the attacks of October 7 should be that wake-up call.

This is not that complicated. I have been disgusted and shocked by some of the things we have been hearing, including the sheer glee displayed in celebrations even in this country because of the murders on October 7.

Remember, those grotesque celebrations and demonstrations happened before Israel even began its military action to defend Israelis in Gaza.

Let's be clear: Those demonstrations, those statements, those celebrations were and are in favor of the terrorist group Hamas. The despicable anti-Semitism which has dramatically increased since October 7, that we have even seen here sometimes on this floor, has to be condemned and has to stop.

Israel is on the front line in the battle against terrorism—the terrorists of Hamas, Hezbollah, ISIS, you name it. All of them continue to wait for an opportunity to strike at Israel, as they have, just like they want to strike here at the American people of the United States.

Israel and the United States do not want violence, but the problem is that the terrorists do, and they are the ones who have killed and butchered and maimed innocent Israelis.

Last November, the House passed another Israel security supplemental, which was fully offset by a rescission of the IRS funding, and that was the reason why the White House claimed that they opposed that bill.

Now, there are zero excuses to oppose this bill. This bill does one thing, Mr. Speaker. It provides urgently needed funding for our friend and ally, Israel, to defeat the terrorists that they are dealing with. The United States must stand with Israel to eradicate terrorism.

This is not that complicated. You can use every excuse in the world with the purpose of supporting Hamas and justifying the murders. This bill stands with Israel—no ifs, no ands, no buts.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Chairman CALVERT for bringing this important piece of legislation, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the distinguished ranking member of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

□ 1745

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her strong, strong leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 7217. The United States and the world are facing a very dangerous time, with the risk of being pulled deeper and deeper into conflicts across the globe. Meanwhile, millions of people around the world are facing violence, dislocation, and hunger. This bill really is not a serious effort.

As the ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee, I cannot support a bill that fails to meet the challenges of this moment and abandons those most in need of humanitarian assistance. Yes, this bill undermines the United States' policy which supports a two-state solution. This bill is a blatant political stunt that is dead on arrival in the Senate, and so I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, my colleague from Arkansas said it is our solemn duty to protect our allies. Indeed, it is our solemn duty to protect our allies. Our ally in this case is Israel, yes, and we support Israel. Our ally is Ukraine, and we need to continue to support Ukraine. Our ally is Taiwan, and we need to support Taiwan.

We have a solemn duty, yes, to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians. We have a solemn duty to protect our border. These are not the issues that are part of this bill. This bill does not meet those solemn obligations.

My Republican colleagues do not want to help Ukraine or the Indo-Pacific and Taiwan. They do not want to address border security. They talked about border security as being the key to opening up the door to foreign assistance. They said it in the White House—the Speaker did that—and now they have walked away from it. It is really a political sham. They do not

want to promote humanitarian assistance and leave millions of innocent civilians without food, shelter, and clothing.

When I asked about Gaza in a conversation with the Director of the World Food Programme, Cynthia McCain, she said to me: ROSA, these people are starving. It is a famine. I believe that in this process of providing assistance to just Israel and not our other allies, they do hurt Israel and isolate Israel. It is time for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put our country and our national security ahead of partisan politics. What we should do is to vote this bill down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The gentlewoman is correct. This bill is not about Ukraine or INDOPACOM or some other things that I would love to have some discussions about in the future. This is about Israel.

I think my friends on the other side of the aisle know I am not a cynical person. I have been in favor of moving an Israel bill for some time, and now is the time. I think it is just simply the right thing to do.

Let's pass this bill. Let's support Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7217, the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act. As tensions grow in the Middle East, the state of affairs is becoming increasingly dangerous for the Israeli people and United States servicemembers. Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East, and the Israeli people are still recovering from the horrific October 7th terrorist attacks. This standalone Israel supplemental package ensures our great ally has the resources and tools they need to defeat Hamas, as well as provide important funding for our military forces in the region to deter terrorists and other enemies. The United States must send a clear message to the rest of the world—that we will continue to stand with Israel. I proudly support that message and will vote yes on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to stand with our great ally Israel, and vote yes on this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. Let me be absolutely clear, I vehemently oppose the ideology and actions of Hamas as demonstrated by my vote in favor of H. Res. 793, which, among other things, condemned Hamas for attacking Israel, taking hostages, and for threatening hostages. Moreover, I have voted in favor of over \$50 billion in funding for Israel. The Israeli people have suffered a grave injustice. However, committing an injustice in the name of justice is still an injustice. We must take care not to fall into the belief that any action taken in war is justified, especially the mass killing of innocent Palestinian babies when war has been declared on Hamas.

Today, I am compelled to vote against the Israel Supplemental Legislation that Speaker JOHNSON brought to the floor. I take this stance because of the humanitarian disaster that now exists in Gaza. This bill's narrow

focus on only providing military aid to Israel, with no accompanying humanitarian aid for the innocent civilians of Gaza, is unconscionable. I cannot ignore the men, women, and especially children in Gaza who are suffering through catastrophic conditions resulting from Israel's war on Hamas. Babies have lost their parents and parents have lost their children to artillery and bombs that were paid for in whole or in part because of U.S. funds provided to Israel. I will not be complicit in the slaughter of innocent babies. Furthermore, the mass destruction in Gaza has resulted in the decimation of homes and infrastructure and has made Gaza unlivable.

The lack of meaningful humanitarian aid from this legislation at a time when Gazan civilians are at risk of starvation, disease, and death is unconscionable. For these and other reasons, I oppose this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7217.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. DELAURO. 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 motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1727, if ordered;

Adoption of H. Res. 863, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 7217.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1727) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 2, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—427

Adams	Craig	Hageman
Aderholt	Crane	Harder (CA)
Aguilar	Crawford	Harris
Alford	Crenshaw	Harshbarger
Allen	Crockett	Hayes
Allred	Crow	Hern
Amo	Cuellar	Higgins (LA)
Amodei	Curtis	Hill
Armstrong	D'Esposito	Himes
Arrington	DeJarlais	Hinson
Auchincloss	DeLoach	Horsford
Babin	Davis (IL)	Houchin
Bacon	Davis (NC)	Houlihan
Baird	De La Cruz	Hoyer
Balderson	Dean (PA)	Hoyle (OR)
Balint	DeGette	Hudson
Banks	DeLauro	Huffman
Barr	DelBene	Huizenga
Barragán	Deluzio	Hunt
Bean (FL)	DeSaulnier	Issa
Beatty	DesJarlais	Ivey
Bentz	Diaz-Balart	Dingell
Bera	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bergman	Donalds	Jackson (NC)
Beyer	Duarte	Jackson (TX)
Bice	Duncan	Jackson Lee
Biggs	Dunn (FL)	Jacobs
Bilirakis	Edwards	James
Bishop (GA)	Ellzey	Jayapal
Bishop (NC)	Emmer	Jeffries
Blumenauer	Escobar	Johnson (GA)
Blunt	Eshoo	Johnson (LA)
Boebert	Espallat	Johnson (SD)
Bonamici	Estes	Jordan
Bost	Evans	Joyce (OH)
Bowman	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Boyle (PA)	Fallon	Kamlager-Dove
Brown	Feenstra	Kaptur
Brownley	Ferguson	Kean (NJ)
Buchanan	Finstad	Keating
Buck	Fischbach	Kelly (IL)
Bucshon	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Budzinski	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Burchett	Fleischmann	Khanna
Burgess	Fletcher	Kiggans (VA)
Burlison	Flood	Kildee
Bush	Foster	Kiley
Calvert	Foushee	Kilmer
Cammack	Fox	Kim (CA)
Caraveo	Fox	Kim (NJ)
Carbajal	Frankel, Lois	Krishnamoorthi
Cárdenas	Franklin, Scott	Kuster
Carey	Frost	Kustoff
Carl	Fry	LaHood
Carson	Fulcher	LaLota
Carter (GA)	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Carter (LA)	Gallagher	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Gallego	Landsman
Cartwright	Garamendi	Langworthy
Casar	Garbarino	Larsen (WA)
Case	Garcia (IL)	Larson (CT)
Casten	Garcia (TX)	Latta
Castor (FL)	Garcia, Mike	LaTurner
Castro (TX)	Garcia, Robert	Lawler
Chavez-DeRemer	Gimenez	Lee (CA)
Cherfilus-	Golden (ME)	Lee (FL)
McCormick	Goldman (NY)	Lee (NV)
Chu	Gomez	Lee (PA)
Ciscomani	Gonzales, Tony	Leger Fernandez
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez,	Lesko
Clarke (NY)	Vicente	Letlow
Cleaver	Good (VA)	Levin
Cline	Gooden (TX)	Lieu
Cloud	Gosar	Lofgren
Clyburn	Gottheimer	Loudermilk
Clyde	Granger	Lucas
Cohen	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Graves (MO)	Luna
Collins	Green (TN)	Luttrell
Comer	Greene (GA)	Lynch
Connolly	Griffith	Mace
Correa	Grijalva	Magaziner
Costa	Grothman	Malliotakis
Courtney	Guest	Maloy
	Guthrie	Mann

Manning
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McBath
 McCaul
 McClain
 McClellan
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McCormick
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 McHenry
 Meeks
 Menendez
 Meng
 Meuser
 Mfume
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Mills
 Molinaro
 Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran
 Morelle
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nehls
 Newhouse
 Nickel
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunn (IA)
 Obernolte
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Ogles
 Omar
 Owens
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peltola

Pence
 Perez
 Perry
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Pfluger
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Quigley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Salinas
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scholten
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Self
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Simpson
 Sorensen
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spartz
 Stansbury
 Stanton

Stauber
 Steel
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Strong
 Swalwell
 Sykes
 Takano
 Tenney
 Thanedar
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tokuda
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Dуйne
 Van Orden
 Vargas
 Vasquez
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Waltz
 Bean (FL)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym
 Zinke

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 216, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—214

Aderholt
 Alford
 Allen
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Good (VA)
 Gooden (TX)
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Greene (GA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Bice
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NC)
 Boebert
 Bost
 Brecheen
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Burlison
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Carey
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chavez-DeRemer
 Ciscomani
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Collins
 Comer
 Crane
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 D'Esposito
 Davidson
 De La Cruz
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donalds
 Duarte
 Duncan
 Dunn (FL)
 Edwards
 Ellzey
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ezell
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Ferguson
 Finstad
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flood
 Foxx
 Franklin, Scott
 Fry
 Fulcher

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Amo
 Auchincloss
 Balint
 Barragan
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bowman
 Boyle (PA)
 Brown
 Brownley
 Buck
 Budzinski
 Bush
 Caraveo
 Carbajal
 Cardenas
 Carson
 Carter (LA)
 Cartwright
 Casar
 Case
 Casten
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Cherfilus-McCormick
 Chu
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Craig
 Crockett
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Davids (KS)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (NC)
 Dean (PA)
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deluzio
 DeSaulnier
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espaillat
 Evans
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Foushee
 Frankel, Lois
 Frost
 Gallagher
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)

NAYS—216

Garcia, Robert
 Golden (ME)
 Goldman (NY)
 Gomez
 Gonzalez, Vicente
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva
 Harder (CA)
 Hayes
 Himes
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Hoyle (OR)
 Huffman
 Ivey
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson (NC)
 Jackson Lee
 Jacobs
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Kamlager-Dove
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim (NJ)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Landsman
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Lee (PA)
 Leger Fernandez
 Levin
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lynch
 Magaziner
 Manning
 Matsui
 McBeth
 McClellan
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 Meeks
 Menendez
 Meng
 Mfume
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moskowitz
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nickel
 Norcross
 Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Perez
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Quigley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Ross
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan
 Salinas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scholten
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Sorensen
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Swalwell
 Sykes
 Takano
 Thanedar
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tokuda
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Vasquez
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—1

Scalise

□ 1840

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moore of Utah moves to reconsider the vote on adoption of House Resolution 863.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

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

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—2

Brecheen
 Green, Al (TX)

Davidson
 Scalise

□ 1827

Mr. BRECHEEN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BROWN changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPEACHING ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 863) impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors will now resume.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ISRAEL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7217) making emergency supplemental appropriations to respond to the attacks in Israel for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 180, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—250

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga
Alford	Donalds	Hunt
Allen	Duarte	Issa
Amodei	Duncan	Jackson (TX)
Armstrong	Dunn (FL)	James
Arrington	Edwards	Johnson (LA)
Auchincloss	Ellzey	Johnson (SD)
Babin	Emmer	Jordan
Bacon	Españillat	Joyce (OH)
Baird	Estes	Joyce (PA)
Balderson	Ezell	Kean (NJ)
Banks	Fallon	Kelly (MS)
Barr	Feenstra	Kelly (PA)
Bentz	Ferguson	Kiggans (VA)
Bergman	Finstad	Kiley
Bice	Fischbach	Kim (CA)
Bilirakis	Fitzgerald	Kustoff
Bishop (NC)	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Bost	Fleischmann	LaLota
Brecheen	Flood	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Foxx	Lamborn
Buck	Frankel, Lois	Landsman
Bueshon	Franklin, Scott	Langworthy
Burchett	Fry	Latta
Burgess	Fulcher	LaTurner
Burlison	Gallagher	Lawler
Calvert	Gallego	Lee (FL)
Cammack	Garbarino	Lee (NV)
Carey	Garcia, Mike	Lesko
Carl	Gimenez	Letlow
Carter (GA)	Golden (ME)	Levin
Carter (TX)	Goldman (NY)	Lieu
Cartwright	Gonzales, Tony	Loudermilk
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez,	Lucas
Chavez-DeRemer	Vicente	Luetkemeyer
Cherfilus-	Gooden (TX)	Luna
McCormick	Gottheimer	Luttrell
Ciscomani	Granger	Mace
Cline	Graves (LA)	Malliotakis
Cloud	Graves (MO)	Maloy
Cole	Green (TN)	Mann
Collins	Griffith	Manning
Comer	Grothman	Mast
Correa	Guest	McBath
Costa	Guthrie	McCaul
Craig	Hageman	McClain
Crawford	Harris	McClintock
Crenshaw	Harshbarger	McCormick
Cuellar	Hern	McHenry
Curtis	Higgins (LA)	Menendez
D'Esposito	Hill	Meng
Davis (NC)	Hinson	Meuser
De La Cruz	Houchin	Miller (IL)
DesJarlais	Hudson	Miller (OH)

Miller (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Miller-Meeks	Rose
Molinaro	Rosendale
Moolenaar	Rouzer
Mooney	Rutherford
Moore (AL)	Salazar
Moore (UT)	Schiff
Moran	Schneider
Moskowitz	Schweikert
Mrvan	Scott, Austin
Murphy	Scott, David
Nehls	Self
Newhouse	Sessions
Nickel	Sherman
Norcross	Simpson
Nunn (IA)	Smith (MO)
Obernolte	Smith (NE)
Ogles	Smith (NJ)
Owens	Smucker
Pallone	Sorensen
Palmer	Soto
Pappas	Spartz
Peltola	Stanton
Pence	Stauber
Perez	Steel
Perry	Stefanik
Pfleger	Steil
Posey	Steube
Reschenthaler	Stevens
Rodgers (WA)	Strong
Rogers (AL)	Tenney

NAYS—180

Adams	Frost
Aguilar	Gaetz
Allred	Garamendi
Amo	Garcia (IL)
Balint	Garcia (TX)
Barragan	Garcia, Robert
Bean (FL)	Gomez
Beatty	Good (VA)
Bera	Gosar
Beyer	Green, Al (TX)
Biggs	Greene (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Harder (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Hayes
Boebert	Himes
Bonamici	Horsford
Bowman	Houlihan
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer
Brown	Hoyle (OR)
Brownley	Huffman
Budzinski	Ivey
Bush	Jackson (IL)
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)
Carbajal	Jackson Lee
Cárdenas	Jacobs
Carson	Jayapal
Carter (LA)	Jeffries
Casar	Johnson (GA)
Case	Kamlager-Dove
Caste	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Keating
Chu	Kelly (IL)
Clark (MA)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Kildee
Cleaver	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kim (NJ)
Clyde	Krishnamoorthi
Cohen	Kuster
Connolly	Larsen (WA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)
Crane	Lee (CA)
Crockett	Lee (PA)
Crow	Leger Fernandez
Davids (KS)	Loifgren
Davidson	Lynch
Davis (IL)	Magaziner
Dean (PA)	Massie
DeGette	Matsui
DeLauro	McClellan
DelBene	McCollum
Deluzio	McGarvey
DeSaulnier	McGovern
Dingell	Meeks
Doggett	Mfume
Escobar	Mills
Eshoo	Moore (WI)
Evans	Morelle
Fletcher	Moulton
Foster	Mullin
Foushee	Nadler

Thanedar	Thompson (PA)
Tiffany	Timmmons
Torres (CA)	Torres (NY)
Turner	Valadao
Van Drew	Van Dine
Van Oorden	Vargas
Walberg	Waltz
Wasserman	Schultz
Weber (TX)	Webster (FL)
Wenstrup	Westerman
Williams (NY)	Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Womack
Yakym	Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1850

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. 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. 999

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

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: MR. GOMEZ.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE 23D HEADQUARTERS SPECIAL TROOPS AND THE 3133D SIGNAL SERVICES COMPANY, KNOWN COLLECTIVELY AS THE "GHOST ARMY", IN RECOGNITION OF UNIQUE AND HIGHLY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 84, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 84

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO "GHOST ARMY".

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be

used on March 21, 2024, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Services Company, known collectively as the “Ghost Army”, in recognition of unique and highly distinguished service during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES WHO JOINED THE WORKFORCE DURING WORLD WAR II, PROVIDING THE AIRCRAFT, VEHICLES, WEAPONRY, AMMUNITION, AND OTHER MATERIAL TO WIN THE WAR AND WHO WERE REFERRED TO AS ROSIE THE RIVETER, IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE INSPIRATION THEY HAVE PROVIDED TO ENSURING GENERATIONS

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 85, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO “ROSIE THE RIVETER”.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 10, 2024, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other material to win the war and who were referred to as “Rosie the Riveter”, in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 793

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 793, a bill originally introduced by Representative BILL JOHNSON of Ohio, to strengthen the American workforce, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1900

RECOGNIZING DANI KUGLER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dani Kugler of Kersey, Pennsylvania, Elk County.

Dani currently serves as the city of St. Mary's Parks and Recreation director. She was recently recognized by Parks and Recreation magazine with the National Recreation and Parks Association's “30 under 30” award for young professionals leading the way in 2024.

This award is given to young professionals who raise the bar for the parks and recreation profession. Dani was selected from a pool of over 100 applicants and scored on the impact on the agency's community and service population; contributions to the professional development of the field of parks and recreation; and for innovative ideas, programs, or research in the field of parks and recreation.

Dani was hired as the first year-round and full-time director in June 2019. In her 5 years serving the St. Mary's area, she has established a strong social media presence and increased membership and program participation by 40 percent. She has also successfully increased the city's 15 summer-only program events to 45 year-round programs and events.

This is the first time in St. Mary's history that its park director has been recognized for this award.

I congratulate Dani on this much-deserved recognition. I look forward to seeing continued growth and development of the St. Mary's Parks and Recreation Department.

RISING COSTS

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, listening to constituents is the most important thing we can do, and they are telling me back home about the burden of high costs.

One constituent shared: “I have to continue working even after retirement. My husband cannot afford to retire due to rising costs. I also have to assist my mom with her bills, which puts further strain on our finances.”

Too many find it challenging to make ends meet while caring for an elderly parent.

Another constituent shared: “My income doesn't cover common life. I can't afford decent housing, meats at the grocery store, or basic life necessities. It is harder now.”

Madam Speaker, Congress must take every possible measure to ensure that residents of eastern North Carolina, rural America, and those across America do not feel the financial strain in their pocketbooks and wallets.

CELEBRATING JAMES W. PUTNEY, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate James W. Putney, Jr., a veteran, patriot, and grand marshal of the 2023 Savannah Veterans Day Parade.

Mr. Putney proudly led the annual Veterans Day parade in Savannah, which is dedicated to celebrating America's heroes.

His devout service and leadership have been evident since answering the call to join the United States Army at 17 years old. Over two decades of honorable service resulted in his retirement as a staff sergeant at Fort Benning, Georgia.

In his military journey, James played vital roles as a construction and combat engineer. Post-retirement, he returned to his roots in Savannah, transitioning to a career at the Chatham County Courthouse, where he continued his service until 2016.

Even in retirement, James remained actively involved in various local organizations, as he continues to exemplify dedication and leadership to his community and to his country.

I congratulate James and thank him for his service to our country and our community.

CELEBRATING BLACK WOMEN AT THE GRAMMYS

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Black women who won big at the 66th Grammy Awards, which were held in the heart of my district.

Best Album nominee SZA came away with awards for Best Progressive R&B Album, Best R&B Song, and Best Pop Duo/Group Performance.

Victoria Monet became the third Black woman in 4 years to take home the Grammy for Best New Artist, following Samara Joy, who won Best Jazz Performance this year, and Megan Thee Stallion.

At the age of 22, Tyla became the youngest South African artist in history to win the Best African Music Performance award for her mega-hit, "Water."

Coco Jones came away with Best R&B Performance.

Still, the biggest awards—Best Album, Record of the Year, and Song of the Year—are seldom won by Black women. As Jay Z alluded to, a Black woman has not won the top prize, Best Album, in 25 years.

I mean, how much lemonade do we have to make?

NEED FOR ISRAEL

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise before the House tonight in support of the Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Israel has been our longtime ally, and they need us more than ever at this point with the unwarranted, unprovoked attacks that happened on October 7 to many, many innocent people by the terrorist group Hamas and others that they are surrounded by in their country.

Israel has been under attack since the first moment of its existence in the 1940s, and even going back a millennia.

Israel is a fantastic partner in developing new technologies, improved medical technology, improved medicines, improved drip irrigation, and improved missile defense systems. They are a great partner with us and, indeed, a shining beacon in the Middle East as a representative republic unlike any other there.

Even Arab Israelis would rather live in Israel than in some of those other places because they know it is good, right, and just.

It is our obligation—indeed, it is our privilege—to stand with Israel as an ally in their time of great need.

Madam Speaker, we need to get over ourselves a little bit around here and step forward and get this work done.

FIGHTING TO FUND UKRAINE, TAIWAN, AND HUMANITARIAN AID TO PALESTINIANS

(Mr. LANDSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANDSMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in absolute disbelief and genuine disgust with what the Speaker did tonight.

He knowingly allowed a bill to fail that would have provided critical support for our troops fighting terrorism in Iraq and Syria and for critical support for Israel. He did it because he wanted to embarrass Democrats.

He also intentionally left out much-needed humanitarian aid for Palestinians in Gaza, essential support for Ukraine, and essential support for Taiwan. He chose this horrific, dangerous new brand of partisan politics over our troops, our allies, and millions in need. The fact that Palestinians need humanitarian aid, Ukraine needs to defend itself against Putin, and Taiwan needs support against China is absolutely of no interest to the Speaker.

Representative GOLDMAN and I attempted to amend this bill to include aid for all three, but we were denied.

We will keep fighting to fund Ukraine, Taiwan, and humanitarian aid to Palestinians in Gaza. This is what the American people want. It is what our global partners need. It is what this moment requires of us.

SALUTING CHIEF BOBBY HUGHES OF THE EAST MEADOW FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to salute the long, storied career of Chief Bobby Hughes of the East Meadow Fire Department. He has been in the Nassau County Fire Service for over 40 years.

He rose through the ranks, becoming the chief of the department from 1997 to 1998. He was instrumental in forming the East Meadow Fire Department Chiefs Association.

He is the current band leader of the Nassau County Firefighters Pipes and Drums and led that very band down Pennsylvania Avenue for the inauguration of President Trump.

He joined the Nassau County Fire Service Academy as an instructor in 2003 and has risen through the ranks.

This week, he will walk out of the Nassau County Fire Service Academy for the last time as the chief instructor. He has made it a beacon of education and training, not just in Nassau County but across the country.

Madam Speaker, I join the Nassau County Fire Service in saluting Chief Bobby Hughes and thanking him for his career in keeping our county safe and training the future of the fire service.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO FALLEN SERVICEMEMBERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the ultimate sacrifice made by five of our Nation's most heroic men and women in uniform. Each was defending liberty in dangerous territory, and each possessed raw courage, selflessness, and total dedication to duty for the sake of our Nation. Each of us is privileged to live under liberty's umbrella because of them.

Special Warfare Operator First Class Christopher Chambers and Navy Special Warfare Operator Second Class Nathan Ingram were lost far from home in rough waters on the Red Sea on January 11.

Then, 17 days later, on January 28, an enemy drone targeted Tower 22 in Jordan. The drone operated by Iranian-backed militia terrorists wounded more than 40 U.S. servicemembers, killing 3 of America's finest: Staff Sergeant William Rivers, Specialist Kennedy Sanders, and Specialist Breonna Moffett.

While all five hailed from different hometowns, they served together for one united purpose: liberty, defending America against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

These brave soldiers and sailors were guarding us against the hastening spiderweb of terrorism and tyranny halfway around the world.

Let us pay homage and honor each of these young men and women for their ultimate sacrifice. May they rest in peace.

May God bless America.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD my guest essay.

GUEST ESSAY: ESTABLISHING 'GAZA-PALESTINIAN PROTECTORATE' WOULD GO A LONG WAY

(By U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur)

Halfway around the world, the war between Hamas' terrorist units and Israel is a piercing global tragedy. It demands a global response. Yet, "Peace and Justice" have eluded solution in this troubled region for over a century. It will be even harder to achieve after this conflagration ends. The extraordinary death toll will resound for generations forward. How does one create a lasting peace borne of such fierce, enduring hatreds?

The invasion Hamas' fighters launched from Palestinian Gaza into Israel on Oct. 7, 2023 broke the cease-fire that had tensely hung over that very troubled region. More than 1,200 innocent Israeli civilians were slaughtered in a barbaric attack, with more than 100 Israeli and some American hostages still remaining in captivity. More than 250,000 Israelis were evacuated and displaced from their homes. In Gaza, 1.7 million Gazans have subsequently been displaced with Hamas health officials claiming more than 25,000 civilians dead, and more than 60,000 injured with two-thirds of the victims being women and children.

How does any army defeat a hostile enemy positioned amidst a civilian population and underground in a vast "bunker city" with miles of interconnected tunnels, dug for purposes of war, not peace?

Over 140,000 Hezbollah terrorist forces supplied by Iran, are positioned in southern Lebanon, shooting rockets down on Israel now. It is no accident Yemen's terrorist Houthis

adherents, also supplied by Iran, have been purposefully shelling private cargo ships as well as targeting U.S. naval vessels in the Red Sea to disrupt global trade in this conflicted region. Russia's role in exacerbating resurgent unrest was made clear when top Gen. Sergei Shoigu recently visited Iran. And a Hamas delegation was in Moscow not long after it attacked Israel.

Across the Middle East, a spiderweb of terrorism is hastening, hell-bent on evil. Iranian drones and missiles are being used against Ukraine, Israel, the United States, and our allies in Iraq, Pakistan, Syria, and Jordan. North Korean missiles are likewise in use against Ukraine. The global distinction between tyranny and liberty could not be clearer. The world community of nations must not allow terrorist forces enabled by Iran and Russia to foment unrest and carnage. The sacred boundaries of nations must be respected, defended, and enforced.

The history of the Middle East instructs that former adversarial nations can make peace among themselves. For nearly five decades, dating back to my days of service in the Carter administration, proposals for a two-State solution have been advanced for Israel and Palestine.

Ironically, the depth and brutality of this present conflict may create an opening for a far-reaching solution. If the world community could spend as much money on peace as it has on war, both the Israelis and Palestinians could have thriving homelands.

To move forward, I propose that the United Nations, or a coalition of willing nations, begin to negotiate a "Gaza-Palestinian Protectorate." The parties involved should aim to negotiate a long-lasting solution to the conflict in Gaza, address challenges in the West Bank, and divide the contested territory securing their existence with an International Multilateral Security Force to separate warring factions.

If the civilized world could achieve this with a divided Korea, why not with Palestine and Israel?

The goals of the Protectorate would be fourfold:

(1) an international coalition of nations should be assembled and involved in organizing its administration and staffing;

(2) Gaza would be demilitarized of weapons, war, tunnels, and fortifications;

(3) Hamas would have no role, politically, administratively, or economically;

(4) Palestinians from Gaza should be involved in the administration of the Protectorate's on-site operations, including its police forces.

The Protectorate would have three immediate tasks. The first would be to quickly secure resources and provide food, water, shelter, and medical care to the almost 2.3 million people of Gaza.

The second is to provide an international military coalition that can demilitarize Gaza as quickly as possible. Gaza must never again be a threat to its neighbors.

The third is to physically separate Gaza and Israel, by creating a demilitarized zone between the two, that is virtually impenetrable, as is the DMZ between North and South Korea. As part of the separation, the infrastructure to provide water, sewage treatment, and energy needed by Gaza should be located in Gaza and staffed by the people of Gaza.

One of the long-term missions could be to rebuild what is now a destroyed area under a new vision of peace and prosperity. Gaza has many undeveloped resources, the primary of which is its land and location. While small in size, Gaza is located in one of the most attractive parts of the Mediterranean, with miles of undeveloped, beautiful beaches that could become a recreational center of the region.

With peace and stability, Gaza could become a financial and economic hub that attracts capital and businesses from around the world. Gaza and the West Bank have the thousands of workers needed to rebuild what has been destroyed along with necessary staff to renew the economy. A "Gaza Development Authority" as part of the Protectorate could create and administer a long-term development plan to bring prosperity and transparency that would forestall the corruption that so often accompanies unfettered development.

Hope must arise from this cruel war. Old diplomacy, and old solutions should be shelved. They should be replaced with a forward-looking approach that could bring peace, justice, and prosperity to this war-torn region. Succeeding would give hope to a civilized world that hungers for peace in these troubled lands.

SUPPORTING ISRAEL, UKRAINE, AND TAIWAN

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, the skulduggery of the Speaker of the House was on display today. He has no real interest in helping Israel. He has interest in scoring political points with Donald Trump. He used Israel to do that today, and he did it a month ago.

A month ago or so, he said he would support aid to Israel if it was set off with \$13 million or \$14 million in cuts to the IRS, which would have only benefited the wealthiest tax cheats in our country. To condition aid to Israel on helping out rich tax cheats is despicable, and the skulduggery today was to separate Israel from Ukraine, a country similar to Israel that is being invaded by Russia to try to deny its territorial integrity and to commit a genocide, just as Hamas has tried to commit a genocide in Israel.

I support Israel. I also support helping with humanitarian aid the people in Gaza who have been hurt, injured, or killed. I also support helping Ukraine for having Russia do the same thing. I also support Taiwan.

I do not support the Speaker. He is a man without good faith.

PRAISING ILWACO COMMUNITY RESILIENCY

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

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in praise of the resilience of my community in southwest Washington.

Last month, a fire broke out at one of two seafood processing facilities near the Port of Ilwaco in my district. In the aftermath of the catastrophic fire, the unity and support demonstrated by the Ilwaco community have been remarkable.

Whereas lesser men would have seen an opportunity for competitive advantage, these folks chose to stand together and see each other as neighbors,

lending out crab pots to each other, which they didn't have to do.

I am incredibly grateful to come from a community that supports each other in the wake of a tragedy. Their community spirit is a competitive advantage that money cannot buy and natural disasters cannot shake.

I extend my thanks to the brave first responders who responded to the fire. Several of them were treated for heat exhaustion, a testament to their tireless effort in combating the blaze for hours.

I also recognize the folks in Ilwaco who stepped up to help local crabbers, dropping off sandwiches and shipping up crab pots from as far as California and Alaska.

Rebuilding and recovery will take time. They will never get back those hours of sleep, the heartache, or the monetary loss, but their moral fiber has been revealed in a way that is durable and will strengthen the community. It is its own reward.

Madam Speaker, I stand with them in their fight, and I am so grateful for their leadership.

□ 1915

FUNDING FOR ALL IN NEED

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the American people might wonder just what happened here today.

Well, first of all, the southern border deal never got anywhere, and all of the logistics and all of the cloak and dagger and what was going to be in it failed to even get the attention of the Speaker of this House or any of the Republican Members.

Yet, all of a sudden, an unfounded legislative initiative that was allegedly to advocate for the needs of the people in the Mideast wound up on the floor of the House. You wonder what we did today. It wound up on the floor of the House with no conscience, no thought, no commitment, and that is why I was not able to vote for it.

I was willing to join an amended initiative to ensure that all of the people that are in need in the Mideast would be taken care of; that we would have the funding for Israel; that we would have the funding for the Palestinians and the aid that is needed in Gaza and the ability to deal with the crisis of debt that they have been facing; that we would have the money for Taiwan; and, yes, that we would have the money for Ukraine.

I have been to the border of Ukraine. I have seen the violence against the children. I have seen Russia steal children. I have seen parents die in the streets. It is necessary that we do this right, and that is funding for all of those that are in need, and do it now.

The Speaker of the House needs to work in a professional way for the

American people to show we care about the nations and we care about the Midwest.

POVERTY AND INEQUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAGEMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, 6 years ago, I held a Special Order on a subject matter that I think is extremely important to this country and the developed world, the issue of growing inequality. It has been 4 years since the COVID-19 pandemic began, and it is more relevant now than ever because, unfortunately, it has gotten worse.

The concentration of wealth in the United States of America is not fair, it is not American, and it is driving multiple social and behavioral health issues that more and more research points to and verifies.

The pandemic has laid bare the deep disparities that exist in the United States and worsened the gap between the richest and poorest Americans, and it has helped eviscerate in many ways the American middle class.

The President has tried his very best and, in the 2 years that Democrats had control of both Houses and the President was in the White House, we did much to begin to change this rising tide of inequality. Rising inequality incurs costs that harm us all, but not just those at the bottom of the income distribution; it hurts America.

Next to me is a statistical diagram of the Gini quotient that is accepted by economists around the world as the best statistical measurement for inequality. As you can see, just since 1993, it has steadily gone up with the pandemic at the end.

I am pleased to have a couple of my colleagues and friends to be here to speak on this. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) to make a few comments.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am pleased to join you because this is such an important topic and a topic that I have been talking about for a long time.

The income inequality in our country has grown and grown, and the tax cuts of Donald Trump, which I voted against, contributed to it greatly—tax cuts that gave the wealthy much more money, corporations and individuals,

and did not help the poor and didn't really help the middle class much.

My district is in Memphis, Shelby County and Tipton County, just north of Memphis. Because of that, I am no stranger to high levels of poverty and inequality.

According to the 2023 Poverty Fact Sheet by the University of Memphis, 21.4 percent of Memphians live in poverty. The overall poverty rate for Black and Latino Memphians is almost double that of White and Caucasian residents; roughly 27 percent for Black and Latino residents, compared to 10 percent of Whites.

The child poverty rate is 32.7, a number that has been declining in recent years due to the child tax credits, but still far too high, and we don't know how much the child tax credits will be available to people this coming year.

In 2022, the child poverty rate in African-American and Latino communities was three times that of White families, 30 percent to 10. What hope does that give young African-American and Latino children?

The root causes of poverty often come down to access and opportunity. Childhood poverty is directly related to the financial status of the children's parents.

Many young adults in Memphis have parents and grandparents who are prohibited from buying houses in certain areas, redlining, which is still a practice in Memphis, and has been highlighted recently when one of the banks in Memphis was charged with such and pled guilty to such, I believe. That has restricted access to home loans and mortgage protections, as well.

Because of redlining, many families did not have the opportunity to buy desirable houses. These policies were legal until 1968, so it is not ancient history.

The impact of redlining continues as many families were unable to build generational wealth.

Now, poor families need access to services like citywide internet, subsidized childcare, and supportive mortgage rates.

And we tried to do some of those things, but unfortunately, it has not been a bipartisan effort. It has mostly been an effort by Democrats.

Tennessee is nationally ranked as a low-tax State, but that is not the case for the poorest families. The taxes are regressive. It is a sales tax-dependent State that taxes the poor in the most regressive manner.

The poorest 20 percent of Tennessee residents pay a significantly higher percentage of their income in State and local taxes than any other group in the State.

Low-income families are paying high amounts of taxes, while at the same time receiving lower levels of access to services and opportunities for economic mobility. Tennessee remains one of the 10 remaining States that have not expanded Medicaid. That is truly sorrowful and immoral.

If Tennessee were to expand, as 40 other States and the District of Columbia have, lower earning workers would have access to affordable healthcare, and their families would worry less about the impacts of seeking treatment for an illness.

A billion-plus dollars a year have been turned down by our State legislature because they don't care about taking care of the poor.

Matthew 25 talks about healing. I saw people that were naked, and I clothed them. I saw people that were hungry, and I fed them. I saw people who were sick, and I healed them.

Some people say they live by the Bible. If you want to know where my politics are just look to the Bible. Well, some of those people who speak it the most don't know Matthew 25.

Measures combating childhood poverty and closing the income/wealth gap among diverse groups are vital in my district, enough to make more progress on the issue.

I will continue advocating for the child tax credit, which Ms. DELAURO has championed, encouraging Tennessee to expand Medicaid, seeking additional funds for education and job training, and supporting other policies to help those in need.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. DESAULNIER for having the moral courage and the will to bring this Special Order to the people that are watching. It is an important issue, and it pains me to see our country becoming more and more divided.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who was someone who spoke at my first effort at this, the very esteemed ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so very much for yielding. I so appreciate what he is accomplishing here this evening as to shine a light on the issue of poverty in this Nation. You know, we have searched and searched and searched over decades for what the antidote is to poverty and, particularly, child poverty.

I am often reminded—this might sound a little nerdy, but the Nobel laureate in economics, Joseph Stiglitz—and this is a paraphrase of what he said—that inequality is not the result of globalization or modernization, but it is the result of policy choices.

This body that we are blessed to serve in deals with policy choices, which means that we can have a profound effect on poverty, child poverty, and reducing that in our Nation.

I suppose I will just reflect and pick up a little on what Congressman COHEN said. The House passed a tax bill last week that would continue to exacerbate child poverty in the United States—public policy choices.

Madam Speaker, I say thank you to Mr. DESAULNIER for bringing us together tonight. As I stated last week,

in good conscience, I couldn't vote for a deal that was so lopsidedly benefiting big corporations while failing to ensure a substantial tax cut to middle- and working-class families.

It was deeply inequitable. We have seen the greatest rise in inequality, and we have seen corporations make super profits at the expense of the consumer. For me, it was a mockery of who representative government works for.

Who are we here to support?

The bill delivers massive tax cuts for big corporations, and it denies middle-class families economic security that they had, and we were successful with, in the American Rescue Plan.

We were successful in having a child tax credit, and to be truthful, I started out wanting to make it permanent. I was told that it was too expensive; that it should be for 5 years. They said: No, it can't be for 5 years. What about 3 years? No, it can't be 3 years. I said: 1 year? I was asked: Will you take 1 year? Of course, with the expanded child tax credit, you received \$3,000 for kids 6 to 17; \$3,600 for 6 years and under, monthly benefits for a family, so I said yes.

Then I was also told, at that time: Rosa, once it is out there, it is not going to go away. It went away. It expired. We had a chance last week to redress that balance and bring it back, and in my view that was a missed opportunity.

Once again, it is their taking away, pulling the rug out from under working families, middle-class families, vulnerable families, and driving them into poverty, once again, because we had reduced the poverty rate.

That is what the bill did. Now, it has gone from 5.2 percent to 12.4 percent. Hunger has risen, and it went down when we had the child tax credit. The tax credit was the largest middle-class tax cut in history.

□ 1930

We got billions of dollars in tax relief for the wealthy and, the way I put it, pennies for the poor. That is what it is about.

If you want to talk about cost benefit, the child tax credit returns \$8 for every dollar spent. Child poverty in the United States costs us a trillion dollars every year, and we would return 84 cents on the dollar to the taxpayer with the child tax credit.

You know, it is a vast giveaway to billionaires and corporations. Just a couple of examples. DISH Network, FedEx, Salesforce, T-Mobile, these corporations pay no Federal income tax under the Trump tax law.

Think about it for a second. Netflix will have a negative tax rate in 2024 and 2025 because of this tax bill. That means that they get money back. They pay no taxes. On top of that, in November 2023 they announced they would raise prices on subscribers, adding an extra \$24 to \$36 to what subscribers have to pay each year to maintain

service. Yet, these same families will not see a child tax credit like they did under the American Rescue Plan.

It is absurd. Think about what people are telling you, my colleague in California and my colleague in Tennessee. Families today are living paycheck to paycheck. If something goes wrong, they can't make a \$400 payment. That is what is going on in their lives. They are struggling to put food on the table, to pay their healthcare bills, to be able to get childcare. Groceries have skyrocketed. It is all there. Childcare has skyrocketed.

Corporate profits, though, were \$3 trillion in 2023. They are not living paycheck to paycheck. They are going to take that money and buy back stock, which is what they have done in the past with this thing. It is our families that are bearing the brunt of inflation and high interest rates.

The child tax credit is the answer to child poverty in this country. It is a successful tool that lifted millions out of poverty literally overnight.

What has happened happened. We move forward, and we will continue to make the fight for a permanent child tax credit in this country because we know how successful it was. We know what it did for families. To the naysayers who said, one, we couldn't raise it to \$3,000 or \$3,600 and that we could never get it monthly, well, so be it, we did it, and it succeeded. There were those who said that people are going to dog it, they are not going to go to work, they are going to buy drugs with it.

There is data from the Columbia School of Social Policy that said people went to work because they could afford childcare, and they were able to use this money for essentials, necessities, to buy those groceries, and maybe for their kid they could send them on a class trip which they weren't able to do because they couldn't afford it in the past.

It is the best thing that we can do to improve the economic well-being and security of American families today. Let's bring back the largest middle class tax cut in the history of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue to shine the light that it is our public policy decisions that create inequity and inequality. Let's turn that around and deal with the policies that do turn that around. I can't thank the gentleman enough for putting together this Special Order.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, some people on the other side accuse us of socialism. The gentlewoman and I learned our rosary in our Catholic and Christian upbringing. It was about the social contract of St. Matthew, and in the Bible it says: To those who much is given, much is expected.

Ms. DELAURO. Our Catholicism is rich with social justice, and I look at "In God We Trust," and this body really needs to carry out social justice in a way that it doesn't do these days.

Mr. DESAULNIER. You can have individual responsibility in this country, and you can have social responsibility. That is when we have been the most successful.

When Eisenhower was President, when the middle class was strong and the union movement was strong, people got the GI Bill, and he implemented in his own way what Franklin Roosevelt put together. That is when this economy was the best. It was growing at over 6 percent GDP year over year, and it was benefiting everybody.

I tell you, one of the things that brought me to this was when I was a Republican restaurant owner, you would read in the trade journals about disposable income. This is our friend Bob Reich's argument and Stiglitz' argument: If you don't have disposable income, it hurts everybody.

Unfortunately, now people in places like the Roosevelt Institute, our friends, say that, no, more and more the top 1 percent is just selling to themselves and gaining themselves off.

As Thomas Piketty has said, the inevitability in Western history, when you get to this level of inequality, is social disruption and civil distress. If we don't fix it here, we will have more of what happened a few years ago outside this Chamber.

Ms. DELAURO. Amen. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I am going to go through my presentation, but I do want to thank my two colleagues. There may be one or two others on the way.

I will start by talking about poverty in America. I am going to date myself again. Michael Harrington, "The Other America," talked about poverty over 50 years ago about how people in rural America were suffering, but we had the optics of how well people were doing in places where we are fortunate enough where many of us live, but it was rural America that Michael Harrington talked about. Again, he was talking about the social contract in the Gospel of Matthew.

Nearly 40 million people, or 11 percent of the U.S. population, lived in poverty in 2021. One in three Americans live in a household making \$55,000 or less, and while many of them are technically above the official poverty line, they are still struggling to make ends meet, that \$400 in unexpected expense.

In 2019, the U.S. child poverty rate was double that of our peer nations including Germany, Canada, and South Korea. The relief we delivered to families during the pandemic made a massive impact on people's lives, including the leadership of Ms. DELAURO. The expanded child tax credit, which she mentioned, robust unemployment insurance, and emergency rental assistance all helped to keep families afloat during unprecedented economic hardship in an international pandemic.

Now we are coming out of it, and those funds are going away. They did their intended purpose, but now we are at a tipping point.

The expanded child tax credit alone led to a stunning reduction in child poverty. This effort, spearheaded by my good friend Ms. DELAURO, kept 5.3 million people above the poverty line. Between 2020 and 2021, the child poverty rate plunged to 4.5 percentage points. As Ms. DELAURO said, they weren't spending this on anything but trying to survive—provide shelter, transportation, and get to work—for their family and their kids.

After House Republicans allowed the child tax credit to expire, the poverty rate for children more than doubled, from the historic low of 5.2 percent in 2021 to 12.4 percent the next year. If the child tax credit had been sustained at the levels from the pandemic, 3 million additional American children would have been kept out of poverty. I wonder what they are doing this evening.

According to the analysis of the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, with the child tax credit in 2021, in 6 months we reduced child poverty by almost half.

Mr. Speaker, we know how to do this. We know what works. We just have to invest and prioritize, lifting up the most vulnerable people amongst us. What will they do? The vast majority will work and be honorable and take that money for a very high return on investment for all of us.

Wealth distribution. As you can see in this chart, data from the Congressional Budget Office shows that from 1989 to 2019, the total wealth held by families in the top 10 percent increased by 240 percent, from about \$24 trillion to \$82 trillion, while the wealth held by families in other percentiles increased far more slowly or even remained flat.

Wealth is skewed to the top of the wealth distribution in the United States of America. Families in the top 10 percent of distribution have held more than two-thirds of all wealth, and families in the bottom half of the distribution held only 2 percent of total wealth.

I, like most Americans, want people to be compensated for their creativity, for their innovation and hard work, but this distribution punishes 90 percent of the American public and even higher when you get deeper into the numbers.

The total wealth held by American families tripled from 1989 to 2019, but the growth was far from uniform for everyone. Over those three decades, 30 years, families in the top 10 percent saw their share of wealth increase by around 30 percent.

For families in the bottom half of the wealth distribution, their share declined from 4 percent to just 2 percent. Even before the pandemic started, which we know has worsened this, the concentration of wealth among those at the very top has gotten significantly worse.

This is not about class warfare. This is about fighting for all of us. This has been true in our history. When we went through the gilded age, a similar thing happened. We had the Depression and

two World Wars. Who fought those wars? Who fought to try to get back so that they could take care of their families? Not the wealthiest, but most Americans who are going out and working hard to get a paycheck.

As Ms. DELAURO said, unfortunately, history is repeating itself, and my fear is coming out of the pandemic, even with our growth, even with what the President has done, with unemployment at historic lows and wages coming up, it is not enough. We have to change this, and it should be on a bipartisan, analytical basis in this House and in this Congress.

What we have done has had real impacts on those who were left out. It is not just that those at the top are better off than everyone else, as the richest among us are able to concentrate their wealth. They lock away their money in investments that research shows never gets spent in the economy. Middle-income people spend their money. They consume. They go to restaurants. That is better for everybody. With wealthier people, as researched by Stiglitz and others, that wealth is generally retained in that group of people, and it is even more so. It is becoming more concentrated as they spend money amongst themselves and leave everyone else out.

As inequality increases, it becomes more difficult for those not born into privilege to climb the ladder and build a better life, further enriching and growing inequality. This country is supposed to be merit and hard work and equality of opportunity. We are doing the opposite right now in this country, and it is because of policies here.

Let's talk about worker compensation. This is not worker compensation as when you get injured, although that should be better, this is wages versus capital. In Lincoln's first address to Congress before the Civil War when he was trying to hold the country together, he famously said: Wages—labor, in his word—and capital must always be equal and balanced in the United States for if capital ever becomes dominant, we have lost democracy.

Despite working harder, despite being more educated, despite being more productive, the wages of most American workers have grown exceptionally slowly compared to the growth in productivity compared to the CEO compensation. For the last 40 years, the gap between productivity and worker compensation—wages—has increased significantly. Americans are working in a more productive fashion. They are working more productively versus their international competitors, but they are not seeing their wages go up, and their disposable income sacrifice is even more.

A typical worker's wage growth has lagged far behind gains in productivity over that time. The idea that if you worked harder and were more productive, individual merit and responsibility is not borne out in the research and the numbers.

If we look at this graph, we can see productivity has grown by nearly 62 percent over the last 40 years, but the average hourly pay of the typical worker grew by only 17 percent. This gap makes the difference between people being compensated fairly in their wages versus people who have the good fortune to be able to invest in capital, and this is what Lincoln was talking about.

Put simply, workers are more productive than ever before but are not properly compensated for it. Until the late 1970s, workers' compensation—wages—climbed together with productivity, but then it began to change and diverge. It diverges when we abandon the policies that prioritize spreading the benefits of growth to workers, to all Americans, wealthy and middle-income, instead of what we are doing now. It benefited from a strong labor movement.

President Eisenhower once famously said: Only a fool would try to keep an American worker from joining a labor union. President Eisenhower said that.

□ 1945

CEO pay: Another contributor to rising inequality is rising CEO pay. This is an ongoing issue, but it is something we have really seen balloon over the last 3 years. While so many hard-working Americans have struggled to make ends meet during the pandemic, some CEOs are making more money than ever.

The average top CEO compensation in 2022 was \$25.2 million, and it continues to increase even as low-income Americans and middle-income Americans are forced to make do with wages that, year after year, afford them less in terms of purchasing power.

In 2022, CEOs were paid 344 times as much as a typical worker. The ratio of CEO to typical compensation was 344 to 1. In 1989, that ratio was 59 to 1. In the fifties and sixties, it was even lower. In 1965, it was 21 to 1.

I have introduced the CEO Accountability and Responsibility Act, which would increase corporate taxes on companies with extreme disparities between their CEO and their workers' pay.

We need bold proposals like this one to help put an end to runaway corporate greed and restore the balance of power back to workers—a balance, as Lincoln said.

Stock buybacks: Over the last 40 years, tax laws, regulatory changes, court decisions, and new corporate behaviors have led to shareholder-first corporations—that is the corporate veil they hide behind—where CEOs and managers focus on share price and investors, directing corporate funds to shareholder payouts.

Corporate profits or even corporate debt may have once funded innovative new projects in research and development, new hires, worker wages, or, like the Germans do, reinvested in continuous training back in the community

colleges and apprenticeship programs for a lifetime of learning for workers and craftsmen.

In the 1960s and 1970s, 40 cents was invested for every dollar a company earned or borrowed. Since the 1980s, less than 10 cents of each borrowed dollar is invested that way.

Instead, executives are using the profits to pay themselves and their wealthy shareholders. Over the past 30 years, payouts to wealthy shareholders have averaged 90 percent of all corporate profits. We need Robin Hood.

This has led to skyrocketing use of stock buybacks, when companies purchase back their own stock from shareholders in an open market and reabsorb the ownership that was previously sold to other investors.

The use of stock buybacks was essentially banned except under rare circumstances until Ronald Reagan and his Securities and Exchange Commission in 1982, a strategy for companies to artificially raise their open market stock prices and boost earnings per share.

In 1982, during the Reagan administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission passed a rule that deregulated buybacks, allowing companies to buy their own stock without being charged with stock manipulation, and incentivizing them, as Ms. DELAURO said, to avoid taxes.

Where did those taxes go? Not to all of us but back to the top 1 percent and their investors. Again, Lincoln: Wages and capital should be balanced.

The increased stock prices do not reflect an actual improvement in the processes of the company and may serve as a cover for financial difficulties in the long run.

This is why I think Republicans and Democrats should be concerned—perhaps for different reasons and motivations—but the underlying rot in our economy is a problem, as exemplified by Thomas Piketty and as he illustrated in his detailed history of other economies when this happened around the world.

Stock buybacks are just an excuse for companies to reward stockholders and increase dividends while avoiding employee wages and compensation and investments back into their companies.

In an investigation of 449 companies listed on the S&P from 2003 to 2012, companies used 54 percent of earnings to buy back their own stock and 37 percent on dividends of those earnings.

The increased use of stock buybacks by corporations is a way that companies pad their profits and their mediocre corporate management and support their executives at the expense of all of us and their workers.

Over the last 5 years, the top 20 S&P 500 companies spent a staggering \$1.24 trillion buying back their own shares.

Last year, Chevron, which is headquartered in my district, said it would triple its budget for stock buybacks from \$75 billion, and Meta, the parent of Facebook, which is near

my district in the bay area, unveiled a \$40 billion buyback.

The Brookings Institute looked at the actions of 22 iconic American corporations that alone employ over 7 million frontline workers, including the world's most popular brands in retail, delivery, and entertainment sectors like Amazon, Disney, FedEx, Home Depot, and Hilton.

In the first 2 years of the pandemic, they earned even more. In that time period, company shareholders at these companies grew \$1.5 trillion richer while workers got less than 2 percent of the benefit.

\$1.5 trillion and 2 percent of the benefit for their workforce doesn't sound like what Lincoln wanted. They spent nearly 40 percent of their profit on stock buybacks.

Rising shareholder payouts are linked with declining employee compensation and increased income inequality. Gains of stock buybacks are also concentrated amongst the already uber-wealthy. Around 58 percent of American households own stock. That is good. About 93 percent of households' stock market wealth is held by the top 10 percent.

While our investment in good, strong pensions and retirement—I am proud to be the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions of the Education and the Workforce Committee. Those investments in everybody's pensions are good. They benefit everybody.

The problem is, most of those investments are going to the wealthiest among us, and it creates risk for all of us when this stops and is not handled appropriately for everyone's benefit.

An analysis by the Institute for Policy Studies showed that the richest 10 percent of U.S. households own roughly \$42.7 trillion in stock market wealth, and the richest 1 percent own \$25 trillion.

The bottom half of households own less than half a trillion dollars. The top 1 percent owns \$25 trillion in the stock market, just 1 percent of stock market wealth. Sad.

Corporations are spending more and more of their net incomes on buybacks rather than innovation and capital improvements and compensating their workers well for more productivity and, ultimately, more innovation and more disposable income for people like myself when I was in the restaurant business to go out and support those other jobs.

Corporations are spending more and more of their net income for buybacks in recent years to enrich their executives and their shareholders. It comes at a real cost for their employees who have decidedly not seen the same kind of increases in their take-home pay, their disposable income, or their ability to go out and consume and take care of their kids.

Labor unions and strikes: Workers across industries are fed up with lagging wages and the benefits that are

disproportionately given to the top 1 percent.

This year, more workers are recognizing their collective bargaining power and are walking off the job or threatening to do so to fight for their rights. In Hollywood, in auto factories, in food service across the country, workers are fighting for fair compensation, safe workplaces, and job security.

Public approval for labor unions in this country has skyrocketed to over 60 percent. Americans are waking up to these disparities, the unfairness, and the lack of us supporting the American Dream for everybody and rewarding hard work and responsibility.

There is outside influence of the uber-wealthy in elections right here in this House. It has been a big issue in the United States and has drastically expanded since the 5-4 Supreme Court decision on Citizens United, allowing for independent expenditures.

The Citizens United decision enabled corporations and other outside groups to spend unlimited amounts of money on elections.

It opened the door to unlimited donations to super-PACs, which function as a surrogate to campaigns despite being banned from coordinating directly with them.

These numbers have skyrocketed. The impacts have been far-reaching and continue to get worse every election cycle.

Billionaires alone provided 15 percent of all Federal midterm election financing in 2022, according to a Brennan Center analysis. Just 21 of the biggest donor families, 21 families, each spent at least \$15 million in one election cycle, or a total of \$783 million in that cycle.

Do you see the connection between our policy and how people get here and stay here?

The effective deregulation of campaign money and the expansion of dark money groups that don't have to disclose their donors are destructive to democracy, clearly.

Citizens United has helped reinforce the view that our government primarily serves the interests of the rich, all of our government, all three branches all too often, and that there is no need for most citizens to participate in democracy.

Those are the economic and social concerns that I have and what we are under. It doesn't sound good.

Now, there is more and more research on the connection to you as individuals in this country, to the people who despair, the so-called diseases and deaths of despair that are all too frequent in rural areas in the Midwest and the South regionally, but they are all across the country, including in the bay area, which I represent.

Behavioral health, substance abuse, and opioid addictions have been well recorded by research and writing. This, to me, is where the tragedy of tragedies is far beyond policy. It is the reality of how Americans have to live,

that \$400, the despair, the anxiety, and the distrust in this institution.

As my friend and colleague Elijah Cummings used to say all the time, we are better than this, Republicans and Democrats.

Let's talk about health consequences of inequality. It is important to look at the effect it has on health, physically and mentally, and on the fabric of our society. Economic inequality is a cause of poor health. As one English researcher said 20 years ago, inequality in a society is in lockstep with individual suffering.

As the gap between the richest and the poorest Americans gets larger, the health discrepancies between these groups increase as well, and they are getting exponentially worse.

As health declines, it has adverse effects on quality of life, our economy, our workforce productivity, and our healthcare costs.

Life expectancy in the United States has been declining for decades. A lot of this is directly attributable to these diseases of despair.

It has only worsened since the beginning of the pandemic. I thought we would come together, but instead, it has gotten worse.

There are stark differences in the average life expectancies of Americans at the bottom of the income distribution and those at the top. The health of the wealthiest Americans has remained relatively stagnant, while that of the poorest Americans has fallen significantly.

In spite of the ACA, we are still spending the most as a percentage of GDP on quality healthcare. Unfortunately, if you are wealthy, even with the ACA, you are going to get better healthcare in a caste system of healthcare, which will cause your own life expectancy to go down.

This is a regional problem, and there are differences in regional problems as exemplified in an extensive study by the Kaiser Foundation.

There is a strong relationship to the level of income inequality and the percentage of population that suffers from mental health issues, so it is physical health and mental health. The prevalence of anxiety disorders, impulse control disorders, and even severe mental health illnesses are correlated to inequality.

Chronic stress or lack of social support increases the risk of ill health, both physical and mental. The CDC has recently highlighted the concerning trend—not concerning trend, the outrage of the mental health of high school students, our kids, which was worsened by the COVID-19 pandemic.

□ 2000

In 2021, more than 4 in 10 students felt persistently sad or hopeless and depressed. More than 1 in 5 seriously considered attempting suicide, particularly for young women, as the CDC and the Surgeon General has pointed out to us.

This is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. For all of us who are fortunate to have kids, we should be extremely sensitive to what we are giving as a legacy and the tragedy that we are committing to the future of this country and young people, irrespective of where they live or which party their families and parents are registered to.

We should be doing a lot more to support mental health and behavioral health in this country, and that includes making mental health care more affordable and more accessible.

Since the ACA parity, there has been a 300 percent increase in people seeking out behavioral health. There has been a similar decrease in the number of young people going into the field because of the exorbitant cost of getting a degree.

Talk about supply and demand.

Social support and social networks are important for psychological well-being. Both are individuals in this country, and there is a very tied connection.

These are important determinants of population health, and they deteriorate in unequal societies.

Aggressively targeting income inequality will lead to better health outcomes for more Americans.

The same research by English experts years ago said that, again, there was a correlation between both, but they also said the remedy was not just more services. The biggest, most effective remedy is dealing with the societal tax and regulatory impact of this concentration of wealth and continuing to reward it.

So let's talk about global income inequality, because America, as bad as we are, and we have led on this unfortunately, it is an economic toll across the country and the developed world.

The rest of the developed world, as you have heard me say, creates more safety nets, but it is still a problem in a global economy.

The economic toll of the pandemic has been highly unequal. A report from March of 2020 to the end of 2020, global billionaire wealth—global, not the U.S., the previous numbers were in the U.S.—has increased by almost \$4 trillion.

By contrast, global workers combined earnings fell by \$3.7 trillion.

Individuals owning more than 100,000 in assets make up 13 percent of the global population, but they own 85.2 percent of the global wealth.

Globalism did not raise all boats, as we were promised. Our rising tide, as Jack Kennedy said many years ago, in this economy globally and in the United States, turns out has only raised those with the very biggest yachts.

Having said all that, wealth concentration in the U.S. is worse.

Statistics show the top 1 percent of the United States holds 40 percent of the national wealth, a far greater share than in other developed countries. In other industrialized nations, the rich-

est 1 percent own 27 percent. Pretty bad, but not as bad as 40 percent.

U.S. median wealth is lower than in many other countries. The United States has more wealth than any other nation. The wealthiest country in the history of the world, but the top-heavy distribution of wealth leaves typical American adults with far less wealth than their counterparts in other individual countries.

Changes to tax policy that benefit the rich and large corporations are the key driver, as Ms. DELAURO said, in rising inequality. Our actions here, particularly under the last administration, not only increased the deficit dramatically but they increased the lopsidedness of fairness in the American economy and politics.

According to the Institute for Policy Studies analysis by data collected by a known, wonderful economist, Emmanuel Saez, a neighbor who teaches at the University of California at Stanford, the share of U.S. taxes paid by the top 1 percent was just slightly higher in 2018 than in 1962, despite the more than tripling of their share of the Nation's wealth.

By contrast, the bottom 50 percent saw their share of U.S. wealth drop by more than half during this period. The top marginal rate in 1962 was 91 percent compared to 37 percent in 2018.

Our policies have made things worse.

I have always believed that that expression in the Bible, to those who are given much, much is expected, that used to be what the Greatest Generation and their CEOs believed; great companies like Motorola, General Motors, and Ford.

In those days, as Ford said when they founded the Model T, he wanted his workers to be able to afford his car. That was the magic of an America that was a free market/mixed-market economy that benefited everybody, and the wealthy lived, appropriately, very well, but not with obscene concentrations of wealth.

I often think that you can't take it with you. What are you going to take with you? Hopefully, a guilty conscience when you realize that when this country needed you, what did you do? You just kept making more and more for yourself but not realizing how important it was for the rest of the country and what would happen to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with a quote by Louis Brandeis. Lincoln spoke in 1841, at the beginning of what would become the Civil War. Brandeis was a brilliant jurist who said—and similarly when we were struggling with disparities of wealth and making sure every American felt that they were part of this, they were part of something, even if it was a simple thing; a Frank Capra, a simple thing, that you are part of something bigger than yourself. That you are a Harry Bailey being responsible for the homeowners who came in and borrowed money from your savings and loan.

Louis Brandeis said: “We can have democracy in this country or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of the few, but we can’t have both.”

It is our decision, Members of Congress, if at this moment, Republicans and Democrats could start looking at this and realizing, as I did when I was a small successful restaurant owner in the Bay area, I looked every day at those journals for point-of-sale retailers, and I realized that the working people who came into my restaurant couldn’t go out to eat. It is one of the first things people stop when they can’t afford extras, when they have to worry about paying their mortgage, or paying for their car, or getting their kids to childcare, if they can afford that.

Those are the moments that we are confronting.

Jack Kennedy said at his first inaugural speech out here on the east steps in his “Ask Not” speech—one of my favorite quotes—he said: Few generations get to defend freedom at its ultimate moment of threat. He said: I don’t despair of this, I don’t shrink from this, I embrace it.

He said: The fight we put to this—I am paraphrasing—will bring light to the world.

That is the challenge we have, whether you are a conservative Republican who believes in the Chicago School of thought, which I believe caused all these problems, trickle down doesn’t work. It works sometimes but sometimes it doesn’t work.

We have a problem with the American economy. It is affecting our physical health, our life expectancy, and our mental health.

To paraphrase Brandeis, we can have a democracy or we can have opportunity; opportunity that is rich for anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPUBLICANS HAVE WORK TO DO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAGEMAN). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman talking about the state of affairs. We disagree on a number of policies but might actually share some sentiment.

I, too, believe that we have significant issues we need to deal with right now with respect to the economy, the state of affairs for American families, hardworking Americans who are getting left behind, Americans who are not of the belief that they can actually achieve the American Dream. We are raising a generation—or now two—who do not believe they will be able to live in an America stronger than the one they have inherited from their parents.

That is true. I think the question here is: What is actually the culprit?

I think it is worthy to have debate about tax policy and the implications of taxes on corporations and families. Where do you spread the burden?

My Democratic colleagues are too often mesmerized by this attack on trickle down and corporate tax rates, and somehow that is blowing a hole into the revenue of the United States Government, which is simply not true.

In 2022, the United States Government brought in about 19.6 percent of GDP in terms of revenue to the Treasury. That represented the third highest mark in American history—or among the three highest marks—at a level seen only right after World War II and the end of the dot-com boom and the end of the nineties.

Now, why do I bring that up? Because my Democratic colleagues refuse to acknowledge that we are, in fact, bringing in massive amounts of revenue.

Now, where I might agree is maybe that revenue needs to be allocated slightly differently in terms of the impact on corporations or the wealthy or middle class. We can have those debates, but we are bringing in massive amounts of revenue.

I think the question here really is: What is making it difficult for American families to live? I think we all agree it is really difficult right now for an American family to live. I know my family feels it. I know my friends’ families feel it. They are trying to figure out how to live, how to afford anything; whether they can send their kids to school; whether they can pay for healthcare.

I would suggest, and my Democratic colleagues would disagree, but I think most of my Republican colleagues would agree, the fundamental problem is that we have inserted the government into every aspect of our life.

Literally, every stinking thing we do the government has a hand. It is regulating us to death, choking out every bit of entrepreneurial spirit, every bit of the ability to get through the day without having to figure out what regulation or what law, what rule you have to abide by.

I can’t even get in my car and figure out how to turn something on without figuring out some safety device. I can’t fix the windshield without having to fix some regulatory thing that is allegedly there to make me safer that makes the car twice as expensive.

We are making ourselves absolutely incapable of achieving the American Dream. We are doing it to ourselves. That is what is happening. Yet, we just keep doing it over and over again.

This is, I think, the question of the moment: What are we going to do to restore the American Dream for the American people?

We, the Representatives, here in the House of Representatives, the people’s House, what are we going to do?

Today wasn’t the best day on the political scoreboard for Republicans. I am not going to lie. We spent a day, we came down here, we had a vote on im-

peaching Alejandro Mayorkas. It was a tie. We had to pull it down.

Then we had to vote on Israel, which was a suspension of the rules that fell short of the votes necessary to move on, so we are going to have to address all these things again.

But there is a bigger issue at play right now. There is something much more important going on. This town has been badly broken. This swamp that President Trump ran against has been consuming any ability for representation, for a government to actually serve the people.

What we have instead is effectively a bipartisan uniparty for decades now that has been driven almost entirely by spending massive amounts of money for government programs and for foreign aid, and for, most importantly, the defense complex, the defense world, driven heavily by war.

We have done that, and we have been messing around with tax policy.

What else? We pass a bill here and there; we do something here and there.

The fact is this whole system has been focused for entirely too long on spending other people’s money, borrowing money, to try to buy votes with programs or to use the threat and the fear of war or supposedly our need to stand with some other country. All of that has been used as a political weapon every year to spend your money and spend us into oblivion and grow government and not do the things we say we will do otherwise.

□ 2015

What do I mean by all of that?

For the bulk of this entire century, we have been at war in some form or fashion. Not a declared war. We have had a couple of authorizations of the use of military force. We haven’t declared war formally, but we have nevertheless been effectively at war for the bulk of the 21st century.

We spent \$7 trillion, \$8 trillion. We lost almost 10,000 Americans. We have had 75,000, 80,000 injuries. That is not talking about post-traumatic stress. That is not talking about the hundreds of billions of dollars we just set aside for burn pits. We have ongoing conflict right now.

We just had the President of the United States engaging in Syria and Iraq because we have troops in Syria and Iraq getting fired upon, and nobody in America knows why. Shouldn’t this body speak to that? Shouldn’t this body do something about that?

We are sitting back watching the President of the United States using powers under the Constitution to carry out defense of our men and women in uniform, which everybody in this Chamber with half a brain and heart wants to see us defend our men and women in uniform, but we are doing it because they are over there in a constant perpetuation of whatever this body did 20 years ago to sign an authorization of the use of military force for things that don’t even exist now.

Saddam Hussein is dead. What the hell are we doing? When is this body going to actually stand up and decide what we are going to actually do and mean it?

Right now, today, we had to vote on whether or not we are going to fund Israel. I am a Christian. Israel is at the epicenter of my faith and the epicenter of most people in this world's faith. I have Jewish friends who are absolutely devastated about what happened in Israel on October 7. Of course we must and should stand alongside Israel, because the attack against them isn't just an attack against Israel, not just an attack against our ally. It is an attack against our way of life in western civilization, nothing less. Of course we should stand by Israel.

I voted to fund Israel in November, \$14.3 billion. Today I voted "no." I did not want to vote "no" with respect to a vote about standing alongside our brothers and sisters in Israel, but the people I represent at home, the American family trying to get by, are sick and tired of this town continuing to do the same thing over and over again. Pick a conflict, fund it; pick another conflict, fund it. Send our men and women in uniform overseas, fund it, with money we don't have.

We are not passing war bonds. We are not limiting sugar. We are just rolling around acting like nothing is actually happening, while we have \$34.2 trillion of debt, and it is adding up something like \$80,000 a second. What are we doing?

We should pay for that. Now it is not \$14 billion but \$17.6 billion. We have loads of slush funds around this town just sitting there, we could go grab and pay for it. Our Democratic colleagues refuse to do it. Republican colleagues tried to do it. Now we are walking away from that. I disagree. I disagree with walking away from that just so we can try to send a political message over to the Senate and embarrass SCHUMER and embarrass Biden. I think we should actually mean it when we say we should pay for supplemental spending. I don't just mean it for Israel. I mean it for Ukraine.

Senate Democrats, with a handful of Republicans, tried to just jam the American people with a \$118 billion monstrosity that would fund Ukraine \$60 billion; fund Taiwan; fund Israel at \$17.6 billion; and fund, allegedly, border security to the tune of \$20 billion. That bill is falling apart in the Senate because it doesn't actually secure the border.

Most Americans are sick and damn tired of getting sold a bill of goods, a bill that wouldn't secure the border that costs them \$120 billion that is not paid for.

God bless, I am not afraid to criticize my friends on this side of the aisle. Republicans united, at least here, to tell the American people the truth about the bill they are trying to jam through in the Senate, and it looks like it is dead.

Going back to my original point, this town operates on autopilot, spending money to fund wars, spending money to fund government, to fund programs, and if you dare challenge that, the establishment bites back. That is what was happening in the Senate. That is what was happening with MITCH MCCONNELL. That is what is happening with the cadre of people in this town who desperately want that \$60 billion funding for Ukraine. It is not about the border.

They head pat people and say: We will give you some crumbs on the border; give us our \$60 billion for Ukraine. We will go out, thump our chest, put a blue and yellow flag pin on our lapel, say we love people, and then we are going to go out and keep the war machine going. That is the truth.

Let's be very clear. I love Israel. If you talk to Israelis, they will tell you a part of our annual \$4 billion that we send to Israel is a part of the same operation. That \$4 billion, we will spend that money, it will come back over here to defense contractors to keep doing what they do.

Are they getting the right planes? Are they getting the right supplies? Is it the right cost? Is Israel able to defend itself without the United States, or is that \$4 billion annual MOU, which I support—maybe that is counterproductive. Maybe we want Israel to be standalone over there. When are we going to do something different? When are we going to peel all of this back?

I would posit, to great credit to my Republican colleagues right now, we are wrestling with changing this town. That is why it is messy.

I am not afraid to criticize colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including my Republican colleagues, like I said. Right now, I am actually proud of a Republican Conference that is struggling to try to find a way to stop an out-of-control executive branch led by President Biden and my Democratic colleagues, trying to save this country, trying to step up and protect American families, trying to secure the border of the United States, trying to find a way to limit spending, trying to find a way to stand with Israel, but to do it responsibly.

At every damn turn, my Democratic colleagues are trying to thwart us, because they are more interested in political posturing than figuring out how to stand up for the hardworking men and women of this country. They are more interested in advancing a radical leftist agenda that is advancing their crazy climate agenda, advancing wide open borders, advancing open streets where criminals are running lawless, judges in place that won't prosecute criminals, cops that are getting persecuted, walking away from Israel, and undermining Israel's sovereignty.

That is the face of the Democratic Party: open borders, dangerous streets, undermining the American family, forced transgender surgeries, girls in boy bathrooms, boys swimming against

girls in swim meets. It is a radical leftist Democratic Party trying to destroy the America we know, western civilization, and our way of life on a daily basis.

Republicans are trying to stand to thwart that, with a bare minimum majority, and it is messy. That part is okay.

The question here is what are we doing now as Republicans? We cannot lose sight of the unity we have as Republicans that there is a way to secure border, we know what it is, we are going to stand up for it, and we are going to fight for it. We are going to keep fighting for it now. We are going to fight for it in this Congress. We are going to fight for it through the elections. We are going to fight for it next year when, Lord willing, there will be a Republican President.

No, we are not just going to pass the buck and say that any President can walk in and secure the border. I saw former President Trump make an allegation earlier today on one of his social media posts that all a President has to do is declare the border is closed and it is closed. With all due respect, that didn't happen in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020. There were millions of people who came into the United States during those 4 years.

What did happen was that that administration, led by the President, led by people who believe in America, led by strong leaders at DHS, worked to secure the border. They worked to get those numbers down, and they worked to force Mexico to hold people in place with the migrant protection protocols.

Now, we have got a job here as Republicans. Are we going to stand up and pass legislation to force this administration to do its job and to set the stage for a future administration to do its job?

There are loopholes in the law. I have many Republican colleagues who will go out and say it is fine; we will just let the President do it. No. We have many things we need to fix in the law: asylum reform, parole reform, catch and release.

Our job is to stand up and fight and not walk away from what we have accomplished. This whole debate has been on our side of the field, which is border security. We are not talking about amnesty. We are not talking about wild-eyed future flowing immigration. We are talking about border security. That is precisely where the American people want us to be. That is precisely where we ought to be. We just need to finish the job.

You are not going to get solutions in this town with gangs of eight coming out of the Senate. All of these backroom deals that get cooked up and dropped on a weekend always fail, every time.

They come through the hard work of doing the process. Let's rewind the clock to last year for a second. People criticized the debate over the Speaker. We had a fight over the Speaker a little

over a year ago, and then we started working. We started working to pass bills through regular order, with single subject, with 72 hours to review it, and with amendments in committee.

Guess what. We passed the best border security bill that has ever been passed, and it was focused on border security and it would work. We passed the best National Defense Authorization Act, and it undid all of the woke nonsense that is destroying the military and refocused it on its mission. We passed caps to spending. Not what I wanted. But through Limit, Save, Grow, we set the standard, and we ended up working out a deal that Democrats signed onto that put caps in place.

We passed seven appropriations bills off of this floor and sent them to the Senate. We passed three other appropriations bills out of committee and to the floor. We had two others ready to go. We moved the ball forward. We processed 1,100 amendments. We were doing what we should do and it created unity.

That is the process we must go back to. For the last 3 months, we have been passing legislation through suspension of the rules, jamming through big bills for political points, and that is when you fail. That is when things fall apart.

The eyes of the world and the eyes of the American people are now on this place. There is no more hiding. There is no more cooking up backroom deals. The deals will be exposed, and the truth will come out. The bills that say they secure the border but don't will be exposed, as the one in the Senate just was. The big spending bills, the eyes of the world will see.

People are capable of making a decision. They are able to look up and say: You know what? I love Israel. I want Israel to wipe Hamas off the face of the planet, but I am not comfortable with giving them another \$17.6 billion unpaid for, borrowed, while our border is wide open, exposed to terrorists coming across, while the Democrat administration, funded by our own body, is funding UNRWA and the United Nations, giving dollars that are going to the Palestinian authority and Hamas. We are funding the enemies of our allies, while Secretary Blinken is going to Israel and going around the world and undermining Netanyahu, undermining the domestic tranquility of Israel, purposefully.

□ 2030

All of that is going on, and we are going around saying: Oh, we must pass this check, we must give them money for munitions. Meanwhile, our own administration is slow-walking the munitions getting from America to Israel.

The American people get the joke. They see what is happening, and that is what you are seeing unfold on the House floor, Madam Speaker. People don't know what to do. The normal machinery in this place was designed to move large bills driven heavily by

lobbyists, driven mainly by defense spending and some negotiation of defense versus nondefense in order to get a massive, bloated bill that would buy votes in November. That has been the MO of the United States House for as long as I can remember.

The gig is up. The American people are on to it. The American people are getting tired of being taken for a ride. They want us to actually do what we said we would do. They want us to actually secure the border. They want us to actually cut spending. Yes, they want us to stand with Israel, but they don't want us to write blank checks. This is not that hard.

Our colleagues in the Senate want to jam us here in the House. Democrat colleagues and some Republican colleagues in the Senate want to send over now with their border effort—not to secure the border but border political effort—very specifically designed as cover for our Democratic colleagues to have some reason to be able to run in November and say that it is Republicans' fault that the borders are wide open and not President Biden's.

Our Senate colleagues want to send to us now a Ukraine package with Israel. So for all of the viewers at home, what is happening is that we are responding by saying: Well, we are going to jump in front of that by sending a clean Israel bill, so we can separate Ukraine.

None of this is the regular order that the American people would expect. Put a bill on the floor, offer amendments, and let it rise or fall. Put Israel on the floor, put an amendment that would pay for it, and see what happens. Put an amendment on it that would cut UNRWA funding because why are we funding Israel while we are also funding their enemies?

Why don't we just put that on the floor with amendments and see what happens?

How about FISA?

Do all you Americans out there love being spied on?

Let's put FISA on the floor, let's put four or five amendments on it, and see what happens.

See if the American people want us to have warrants when people's information is being looked at.

Put the bills on the floor.

Ukraine, put the bill on the floor. Make a decision: yes or no, up or down.

Are we going to fund it?

Where are we getting \$60 billion?

Are we just going to print it?

Do you want to know why your inflation is up, Madam Speaker?

Put it on the floor. Have a vote.

Madam Speaker, \$60 billion. What is the mission?

What are we going to get out of it?

What are the limits?

Are the oligarchs getting it?

Are we paying for pensions?

Is it lethal aid?

Are we expecting to get Crimea and Donbas back, or are we expecting just to have a sovereign nation and Russians to be pushed back out?

Is that our call?

Do the American people want to spend their treasure?

Seriously. This is the question, and yet today we did it with Israel.

Why?

It is because we love Israel. Israel holds a special place in our heart. They are our friends and our allies, but, importantly, we all get the truth, it is our faith. We don't want to see Israel attacked.

Many of my colleagues have a Biblical belief that they have to stand by Israel. I do, too. I think it is important, but if we don't have rules, then we lose our own country. There will be no America to stand with Israel if we don't have sovereignty and we have open borders and terrorists coming in who are undermining our security.

There will be no America to stand with Israel if we are bankrupt and \$34 trillion in debt and we are spending money we don't have even if it is for Israel. There have to be some rules. There have to be.

We go home, and we campaign we are going to cut spending, but we don't do it. We are going to vote in 3 weeks allegedly on omnibus or minibus spending bills. What that means is a big package of bills all brought over from the Senate with maybe some policy changes for the next 6 months, I doubt much, that spends \$30 billion more than NANCY PELOSI's bloated spending levels that we all campaigned against.

How is that changing Washington or cutting spending or draining the swamp or fiscal responsibility or balancing the budget?

It is none of those things. It is none.

Yet my colleagues will run on passing balanced budget amendments which will not happen. We are going to go spend \$17 billion and throw that out there to go fund Israel because they are our friend. I agree, but we are going to do that unpaid for.

So we just racked up another \$17 billion on top of the \$13 billion we appropriated last November for hurricanes and emergency relief, and now they ask for \$60 billion for Ukraine.

When is that madness going to stop?

Meanwhile, my people in Texas are saying: When is the border going to get secure?

They want to know when the fentanyl is going to stop pouring into their communities and when migrants are not going to be walking through the streets grabbing people. An MS-13 gang member is grabbing young women and dragging them out of bathrooms. They killed a young woman, and a mom is saying: Where are you, America?

Do we not have a duty to defend this country?

Nevertheless, we are not going to do that.

We are going to vote to fund the government in 3 weeks that leaves this country exposed to criminals, to terrorists, to cartels, and to fentanyl. We are going to do it, Madam Speaker, you

watch. A bipartisan, uniparty bill will get voted off of this floor that does not a damn thing to fundamentally alter what is happening at the border while Texas takes it on the chin.

Why should Texans pay their Federal taxes? Why?

Why should Texans give a rip about what we do in this body when it is all against them? It is all against us as Texans?

For that matter, why should anybody pay taxes?

The rule of law matters if you want people to follow it. If we are printing money, destroying the dollar, and destroying the economy and bloating the government in hiring and funding bureaucrats to undermine your liberty to pass regulations to take away your happiness and undermine your ability to prosper, you are printing money and borrowing money to do that, what is the point of paying your taxes?

It hurts to write that check. It hurts to lose that money to go to the Federal Government, but if the Federal Government is just going to spend money anyway, why do Americans believe that they have a duty to go pay their taxes?

So we pay \$2 trillion in taxes but borrow \$2 trillion or pay \$4 trillion in taxes but borrow \$4 trillion?

That is crazy. I have got some colleagues who are waiting to come out on the floor, so I am going to in a few minutes yield.

Madam Speaker, here is the thing. This country is not done yet, but it is getting damn close. That is where we are. We cannot be a free and secure country if we are \$34 trillion in debt and bleeding \$2 trillion a year.

We cannot be a free, secure, and sovereign nation if our borders are wide open, terrorists are coming in, cartels are coming in, and fentanyl is pouring in.

We cannot be a free, secure, and sovereign nation if we are printing money to fund foreign conflicts that we don't have an actual vested interest in or if we do we are not acting like it, when we never declared war and we never really specifically authorized the force and we continue to fund it so that the machine in this godforsaken town can keep making money.

Why are the seven wealthiest counties in America right here?

We are printing money and funding it.

Three-quarters of the cars I drive by in this town are a hell of a lot nicer than any of the cars that I have got or that any of the hardworking people whom I represent have because we are printing money and funding this place to stick it to the American people every single day.

This is what the American people are on to. They are sick of the same game. They are sick of bills that come to this floor and are designed for a political purpose rather than to achieve an end that is constitutional, that is paid for, and that is responsible.

I was spending a lot of time in the last month out on the campaign trail, and my friend, the Governor of Florida, Governor DeSantis, would talk about his time in service in the United States Navy, but, more importantly, he would talk about when flying into Ronald Reagan National Airport looking out of the left side of the plane and seeing the Washington Monument, the United States Capitol, the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and the White House, and all of these monuments to our ideals, who we are as a people, the inspiring white buildings. Nevertheless, then he would point out that if you look out of the right side of the plane, Madam Speaker, when you are coming in that northern route down the Potomac River, you see a whole bunch of other monuments, evenly distributed, small, and all identical of the 400,000 men and women who are buried there having fought under that flag, the American flag, the 13 stripes and the 50 stars.

When we come here on this floor, all 400,000 of them, all of the hundreds of thousands buried around this country, all of those who have given the last full measure of devotion for something bigger than themselves, we carry that burden. We have to actually do the hard work of representation.

That does not mean flying here on Monday for a fly-in vote, having a dinner with some meaningless votes, getting up on Tuesday and Wednesday to do a series of preprogrammed votes for political purposes, and then flying out Thursday to go do a damn fundraiser back home.

That is what we do.

We have a responsibility to actually finish the work that those 400,000 started, that George Washington called "the sacred fire of liberty."

Liberty depends on us, though, and we are not going to be free if we are mortgaging our future.

We are not going to be free if we come down here and we are forced to choose to stand by our friend Israel or print more money.

That was the choice I was given. That is not a choice. That is not a choice we have to make; we choose to make it. We choose to take the easy path. We choose to fail to do our job and to actually follow some rules that will keep us somewhere close to the straight and narrow of caring for the legacy of those who came before us.

□ 2045

The hardworking American family out there today, right now struggling to get by, is looking to us to fix it.

It is not acceptable for a migrant to come into this country illegally, beat a cop in New York, get sent out on no bail, flick off the American people. That will destroy our country more than anything else.

That is not acceptable. It is not acceptable, and we have to end it, or we won't have a country left.

We have to stop spending money we don't have. We have to. It is not hyper-

bole. You can't make a good decision here about balancing interests if you just write blank checks. You can't do it.

One of my strong Jewish friends out in conservative radio was pointing out we are \$34 trillion in debt—hell, \$300 trillion in debt if you look at the entire Fed's balance sheet and everything that we have going on. What is \$17 billion? That is exactly right, except I have to say it is exactly wrong, or we will never change this place.

I came here and said I wouldn't vote for unpaid-for supplemental spending, and even if my best friend is out there getting hurt, I have to find a way to do it the right way, or we are going to lose this country. Then, as I said, there will be no America left to stand with Israel. There will be no America left for some people to go to, no America left for migrants to seek to come to, to live a better life because the rule of law will be gone. The fiscal health of our country will be gone. The American Dream will be unattainable.

I think we can choose a different path, and I think Republicans are actually in the process of choosing a different path right now by challenging the status quo of this town that our Democratic colleagues want to continue to exploit to grow government and to regulate and to have open borders and to have our streets wide open. Republicans are standing athwart that, and right now is the opportunity for Republicans to make good on what we have been saying for my entire life. That is that the American Dream depends on what we do here to ensure that the Federal Government is not meddling in the lives of the American people, undermining their ability to prosper, undermining the American economy, making us less secure, empowering our enemies, emboldening those who want to do us harm, undermining Western civilization.

We can stop that. We can, in fact, as William Buckley said, stand athwart history yelling stop. The progressive movement that is designed to undermine our very way of life needs to end right now, and it ends by Republicans standing up on the wall and saying no.

That is our calling. That is what we need to do. If we do that and if we unite, then we will actually have the majority that we tend to try to buy with single votes on the House floor when, instead, you earn them by doing what we are supposed to do under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING FRED ZEILBERGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an incredible man

and Fourth District neighbor, Fred Zeilberger.

Mr. Zeilberger is a Holocaust survivor, Korean war veteran, dedicated husband, proud father, and an American whose life is a testament to the power of perseverance.

Born in 1929 in Wurzberg, Germany, Fred faced extreme hardship at the hands of Nazi forces, who forced him into a camp in Latvia and later the Stutthof concentration camp in Poland, where he was eventually liberated.

While Fred survived, the evil Nazi war machine murdered his mother and sister. Fred's father also died shortly after being liberated from the Buchenwald concentration camp.

After surviving the horrors of World War II, Fred emigrated to the United States of America in 1947 in search of new opportunities. A few years later, in 1951, Fred donned the uniform of his adopted country after being drafted into the United States Army during the Korean war, where he served as a butcher.

Fred's tenure in the Army was followed by a lengthy career in the wholesale meat industry, where he established his own business in 1956. This proud businessowner chose to make his home in Cedarhurst, alongside his wife, Elaine, and three children, Jenna, Rachel, and Zane.

Fred has long been an important part of the village of Cedarhurst community and locales far beyond. His ongoing service as a Holocaust educator provides younger generations an important witness to the atrocities that occurred during that dark time in human history.

I am immensely grateful for Fred's life of service, the sacrifices he made in defense of this Nation, and his lifelong commitment to never forgetting the Shoa.

In that vein, I was happy to see Fred recognized during this year's Holocaust Remembrance Day service in Nassau County by County Executive Bruce Blakeman, where attendees were able to learn of his story and struggle.

Fred Zeilberger has culturally enriched the communities that comprise New York's Fourth Congressional District, and I am grateful to call him a Nassau County neighbor.

I thank Mr. Zeilberger for his work and his dedication to the truth, to his family, to history, and to this country.

HONORING BOB BECKWITH

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today on a sad occasion to honor the life of a dedicated family man, committed first responder, and proud American who passed away this past Sunday, Bob Beckwith, of Baldwin, New York, a resident of the Fourth Congressional District.

Bob Beckwith had a storied career serving the people of New York City as an FDNY firefighter. Bob joined the FDNY in 1965 and was assigned to Ladder 117 in Astoria, Queens, before transferring to Ladder 164 in

Douglaston, where he served until his retirement in 1994.

During Bob's 29-year tenure in the FDNY, he faithfully protected the people of the city of New York, but in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, Bob became more than just a hero for New York. He became a national symbol of American resilience.

Even though Bob was retired, he made his way to Ground Zero after the attacks to help search for survivors. While there, he stood shoulder to shoulder with President George Bush when the President delivered his famous "I can hear you" speech that rallied a Nation in mourning.

You see, Bob handed over a megaphone so that the people at Ground Zero could hear the President, but little did he know that that megaphone would allow the people across the world to hear the President that day.

His presence alongside President Bush demonstrated that, even in one of this country's darkest hours, there were still brave Americans giving it their all to rescue neighbors. The image of Bob standing atop the wreckage of Engine 76 will forever be etched into our Nation's history.

The Nation heard President Bush's rousing speech on that day in 2001, but everyone watching also witnessed Bob Beckwith's quiet courage.

While Bob left us last weekend, I know his spirit will live on in the lives of his 6 children, 10 grandchildren, 2 great-grandchildren, the heroes of the FDNY, and every American who loves this country as much as Bob Beckwith did.

Rest in peace to a Fourth Congressional District neighbor, a dear friend, an American hero, Bob Beckwith.

My thoughts are with his widow, Barbara, and the entire Beckwith family during this difficult time.

Mr. Beckwith, a final tip of the helmet to you.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, last week, I promised we were getting close to actually finishing our math in regard to what was the true story of what was happening with Social Security. A couple of our Ph.D. economists have spent months, and we have put it together.

However, I first want to talk a little bit about the politics of telling the truth around this place. Then I want to talk about the reality that the Democrats, our brothers and sisters on the left, either willfully or through ignorance, their solution just doesn't get you there, and the immorality.

Let's first walk through something. How many of you have heard over and

over from me behind this microphone that, in 2033, 2034, a 25 percent cut, because the Social Security trust fund is emptied? I had a debate the other day with a Democratic Member here who is running for another office, and she was saying Social Security doesn't contribute at all to the debt and deficit.

She is absolutely right. That is not what we are discussing. What we are discussing is, in 8 or 9 years, we are going to double senior poverty, the average couple in America. In 2033—I am going to use 2034 because at least that is more of a consensus number for the exhaustion of the trust fund. That average couple in America will take a \$17,400 cut. Articles that we have been collecting on the number of baby boomers who are ending up homeless—they are ending up on the street. We are looking at numbers that would explode that type of dystopian vision. Yet, if you get behind this microphone and tell the truth about the math, right now, some troll in a basement is writing something saying: SCHWEIKERT mentioned Social Security. Let's attack.

It is the same thing with Medicare. This society is absolutely immoral. We have this obligation to modernize, to save, to protect. If you step up to try to do it, you will be attacked. There is a reason we call it the third rail.

Well, screw them. We are going to tell the truth here. Part of the morality here is: How do you save something? How do you modernize it? How do you protect seniors?

Everyone runs away from the discussion, runs away from the actuarial reports, because the moment you start to tell the truth, you are a target. Now, most of it is not true. I had someone in my office a couple of hours ago bring me something saying: Look, this person is writing editorials in your district saying you voted against Social Security.

I am going, okay, let's see. I actually used to chair the subcommittee over Social Security, trying to work out the math and those things to save it. I don't remember ever having a vote in this place to change it.

We looked it up. There hasn't been, but this is the way politics works anymore. Make crap up. Then you wonder why it is toxic. It is so much easier around here to pretend, somehow pretend magic is going to fall out of the sky and everything is going to be fine.

Let's actually walk through a couple of things here. One of the things, just because this bothers me, my sarcasm that this is a math-free zone, I listened to a number of people, both Republicans and Democrats, get behind these microphones today, and they have no understanding of the scale of the problem.

Therefore, let's actually do a little bit of very simple math off the top of our heads so you understand some of the scale. Yesterday, interest rates popped up a bit. They came down a bit today, but I think, at one point yesterday, they were up 14 basis points. I just

need this to be an example. The math is not going to be perfect. One percent on \$34.2 trillion would be \$342 billion of interest, right?

□ 2100

And a basis point is 1/100, so 1 basis point would be \$3.4 billion, right?

Just agree with me.

So the 14 basis points movement in interest rates yesterday on 10-year sovereigns, if that had stuck throughout this year, that is \$48 billion.

Understand we are here knifing ourselves over fractions and fractions of a day's interest. We borrow about \$7.5 billion a day. We borrow \$85,000 a second, but here is the scam: We will knife each other back and forth over math—these are real numbers. This is important, but we are doing everything we can to avoid explaining the scale when a single day's interest rate movement is almost \$50 billion.

Then you hear Members come behind the microphone, it was \$6 billion. Well, that was less than a day's worth of borrowing interest. I don't mean the total borrowing.

I know I have been exacerbated, but I am frustrated because there is this unwillingness to understand the scale of the problem.

Let's actually start to walk through the charts and try to get this. I have a mistake on this chart and I owe everyone an apology. Our math right now is, we are heading towards borrowing between about \$2.7 to over \$3 trillion this year.

Remember, it was only several months ago, CBO and OMB and all those were saying, it is only going to be like a \$1.6 trillion borrow. Something is horribly wrong. We have doubled it, but we have doubled it at a time when the economy is actually doing fairly well.

Understand what these higher interest rates mean. Understand what the growth in healthcare costs mean.

Right now this was our projection. We are going to borrow \$1.45 trillion. That is our Social Security. That is coming out of the trust fund and out of the taxes you are paying every single day.

The next line item is where we had a mistake. We were saying gross interest was going to go over \$1 trillion, making interest the second most expensive thing in this government. We also came back and showed that net interest was still the second most expensive.

The difference between net and gross is gross is the interest we pay back to trust funds for borrowing the money. Net is only publicly held. The rest of the world doesn't make that distinction. It is just one of the things we do in the United States. That is why if you ever see something from OECD, they have the United States at like 144 percent of debt-to-GDP. It is because they put back in the borrowing from trust funds.

It turns out Treasury a few hours ago did one of their monthly updates, and I

have to apologize to everyone that gross interest for the year wasn't \$1.003 trillion. I got it wrong. It turns out it is going to be \$1.67 trillion, and we think this number is off because we had been looking at the Treasury receipts, the growth of spending, growth of healthcare, growth of interest. My math now is just interest. Just interest this year will be \$1.100 trillion. No one knows what 12 zeros are.

When I speak about a trillion dollars with my brothers and sisters, Members of Congress, our staff, they just sort of stare at you. What you need to understand is, this is a disaster. It is an absolute disaster. Trillion, thousand, billion, but yet we are going to sit here and knife each other for months and months and months over a fraction of a fraction of a fraction of this because we don't want to actually deal with the actual structural crisis.

We got old. The fact of the matter is, it is uncomfortable to talk about, but unless we do some things revolutionary on the cost of healthcare and dramatically change government, it doesn't work.

Basic math: Every dime of defense is now borrowed. Every dime of discretionary now is borrowed and if you start to look at this math, it is about \$1.4 trillion of Medicare, the stuff we don't even get to vote on.

Every dime a Member of Congress votes on is now borrowed. We are clicking off another trillion dollars of borrowing every 140 days. And if you think you are going to fix that by a rounding error on this little piece of discretionary or this little piece here, it is a game of avoidance.

I have had Members here who will, when I start to talk about a deficit commission where we are going to have to do a major redesign, they say, oh, DAVID, I can't vote for that. I will, however, fight like hell to save a few hundred million here and there. That is real money.

We are borrowing \$85,000 a second, \$7.4 billion a day, but it is great theater for our voters. It is horrible math, but great theater.

So understand, even the Treasury statement now confirms my math. We are borrowing over a trillion dollars in interest. That is just the interest borrowing. And total borrowing looks like it may be coming in closer to \$2.7 to \$3 trillion this year.

Let's do a quick walk through before we get to the stuff where I soak myself in kerosene and light myself on fire.

What happened between the 2022 fiscal year and 2023 fiscal year? Well, first off, if we actually take a look, Social Security spending—but it comes out of the trust fund, comes out of tax receipts—was up 11.1 percent in a single year.

Between fiscal year 2022 and 2023, if you take a look at the spending on Medicare, not Medicaid, not Indian Health Services, not veterans, just Medicare, spending was up 12.3; interest was up 38.7 percent.

Anyone see a trend here?

We are trying to track these same sort of numbers for this fiscal year. Maybe no one really cares. I know these numbers are really big. It is easier to scream and yell and worry about a shiny object or some latest conspiracy theory. You don't need a conspiracy theory. Just look at the math.

Let's actually have an honest conversation of how much trouble Social Security is in and why it is absolutely moral that we keep our promises. We actually tell the truth about how we are going to modernize it, here is how we are going to save it, here is what we have to do to fix it. The reality of it is it has to be done with our Democratic colleagues.

They have got to stop using it as a tool to win elections. And what is fascinating in the polling, I think FreedomWorks did some polling recently, saying if you are under 45, under 50, you understand this math.

If you are over, you don't. You are almost pretending it doesn't exist. What happens to you? Think about yourselves. What happens to you if it is 8 years, 9 years from now and you get a nice letter from Social Security saying we are cutting your check by 25 percent?

I am going to show a chart here, but remember my words: The average will be a \$17,400 cut in 2033 or 2034, depending on if you use CBO's number or Social Security's actuaries.

One of our structural problems is, in 1960, we had 5.1 workers. In 2035, we were saying 2.3. We have been told this number is wrong. It is actually less, but we are trying to vet that number.

Remember, Social Security was designed as a pay-as-you-go system. If you pay attention to some of these presentations—I have come here a dozen times and shown the average couple gets every dime back they put into Social Security plus about 72,000 SPIF.

□ 2110

It is a horrible rate of return, but you do get your money back plus a little bit of a SPIF, but it is a horrible rate of return. I want all of you to remember as we talk about this potential misery that 20 years ago, when Republicans got up and said, if we could just take a little sliver and do some other things with it, when we got to the 2030s, we would have a system that is actually more robust and people would have a much higher rate of return. It turns out they told the truth.

When those activists told you, oh, they are trying to steal your money, this and that, try to remember this. They lied to you, and we now have 20 years of data to prove it.

However, the big lie around here continues because it is great politics. Scare the crap out of people, and then make sure they don't actually read an actuary report because that might require math, and this is a math-free zone.

Let's actually walk through this. We are going to use 2034 because that is the one date we absolutely can vet, even though CBO says 2033. They both agree on a 25, 25.2 percent cut in benefits. In 2034, our best math is that very first year, single year number, \$616 billion shortfall. That just means the trust fund is emptied, and without the trust fund to back up, the payroll tax that is coming in and the offset to beneficiaries, if there is more beneficiary checks, oh, oh, we have got a \$616 billion shortfall. That is where you get your 25 percent cut.

You start to understand, for lower-income workers who are receiving Social Security, as a couple, that is a \$10,600 cut. For the average, it is that \$17,400 I was talking about. For high-income couples, it is over \$23,000. Remember, there is actually a formula within Social Security where lower-income workers with their 40 quarters get a little bit more than higher-income workers. It is part of the formula.

Here is the math. It is conservative math. We worked like hell—well, the Joint Economic economists worked like hell on this. My job was just to torment them. In 2034, if you do the Democrats' and the President's solution of saying, hey, just take people over \$400,000 and make them pay the 12.4 percent. Okay. Right now I think this year it is 168 something is subject to Social Security tax, and you have this, like, doughnut hole in this plan. For everyone else in today's world, you hit that 168, if you are above that, you are not paying the Social Security tax anymore.

On this math, understand this, this is sort of the Democrats', the President's plan, we are just going to tax people who make \$400,000 and up, make them pay the 12.4 percent, but we are not going to give them any benefits for it.

Okay, fine. It doesn't get you close. This is your new revenue. Our best model is you might get about \$259 billion of income into Social Security doing it that way, but you slow down the economy. That would be general tax revenues.

Over here is your still-remaining shortfall. You still have, what is that, \$417 billion shortfall in that single year. You have already done the Democrat plan, and you still have a \$417 billion shortfall. The next time you see an AARP attack ad on someone because they were willing to try to talk about saving Social Security, I hope they tell you the truth and say, our plan, we have supported raising this tax, but it looks like it doesn't even cover half. As a matter of fact, it only covers like 30, 40 percent of the shortfall.

Let's actually go to the next level. I did this chart to just basically reemphasize what is going on in the math. The shortfall, tax receipts, tax receipts with the higher tax, tax receipts without it because it also actually has an effect on the general fund. The general fund, tax receipts go down.

Now let's go to the other proposal. Let's not do people \$400,000 and up.

Let's do everyone \$250,000 and up. Remember, this is 8, 9 years from now, okay? Remember, we should be working—it is not like we are doing anything useful here—on the 2025 fiscal year budget. Now we are talking about the 2033, 2034 fiscal budgets.

Well, if you take everyone that makes \$250,000 and up, and you subject them to the 12.4 percent, okay, fine, you get, our best model, about \$380 billion of taxes, leaving \$237 billion short, and you have slowed down tax receipts by \$88 billion, so you are going to have a \$325 billion shortfall.

Okay. Well, that is not good enough. Let's just get rid of the caps all together. If you were making 168 today, it doesn't matter there is no 168, everyone pays the 12.4 percent. You still have pretty much the exact same shortfall because that gap doesn't produce that much tax receipts between no cap and the \$250,000 cap.

Still, the model is almost identical. You slow down tax receipts by \$88 billion. The shortfall is \$234 billion, so you are basically back to, what, \$324 billion? No, \$322 billion.

The reason I do this is not to end my political career, but to tell the truth. Is it moral to be basically—it is right in front of us. It is coming. We know it is coming. There are actuary reports from Social Security, from CBO, from private groups, those around us, then there is the political ones who just lie to you because they want you to send them a contribution or they want Democrats to win the next election, which I believe those groups are absolutely immoral. I believe what the Democrats have been doing is absolutely immoral, but damn it, they care about winning the next election a hell of a lot more than they care about doubling senior poverty or the number of baby boomers who are expected to be homeless in a decade.

Somehow when they say, oh, we will just take care of the shortfall, we will just get rid of the cap on rich people, it doesn't get you where you have got to go. Is there any leadership around here other than me as an idiot getting behind this microphone and telling people the truth?

I have done presentations on also what is happening on Medicare. Guess what? It is multiples of the problem of this one. The difference here is we have a specific trust fund, so we can see the date it expires.

I beg of you, if you are a voter out there, don't let some politician squirm out of, well, if we just tax rich people more, we would have plenty of money. That is not true. Look, I don't have all the answers, but I bet you I can make this work. It would be painful, but I bet you I can find a way to not let the collapse happen. Demand the morality that this government is going to keep its promises.

This chart here is now 2 years old. The top line here is not \$116 trillion of debt. Now it is assumed to be closer to \$130 trillion of debt over the next 30

years. Every dime of debt between today and 30 years—and I don't know if the mics are picking the sound up, but my 19 month old is in the back in the screaming. Yes, I have a 19 month old. That is a different discussion. Does that child deserve to have the same life the rest of us have had?

Here is the math. 100 percent of the borrowing, it is coming. Interest. The shortfall of Medicare, because remember the vast majority of Medicare spending comes straight out of the general fund, and the Medicare trust fund is scheduled to be empty in, what, 7 years, okay? Part A trust fund is really primarily just hospital coverage.

This is if we actually say we are not going to fix the Social Security trust fund, we are just going to borrow the money, we are just going to borrow the money. If you update what that means, it is about \$130 trillion of borrowing. The crazy thing is the CBO math is actually the rest of government, military, discretionary, which military is discretionary, but all nondefense discretionary actually over the 30 years when adjusted for inflation actually falls. That little portion actually has like a \$3 trillion positive. The rest of it is about \$130 trillion negative.

□ 2120

Who is going to tell you that? It is all over. I mean, if anyone actually reads the reports, it is there. That is uncomfortable.

We will spend maybe this next year doing really important stuff with failed legislation, failed votes. Every single day, we are going to click off another \$7 billion, \$7½ billion of borrowing. We will give some beautiful speeches about how we are fighting to save this little tiny bit of money, but we are not going to tell you it is little tiny.

I have seen fights on the floor that in the time the fight on the floor took, the interest clock on U.S. borrowing used up more money than the debate was fighting to save.

In Washington, D.C., it is always about the money. Group after group is wandering the hallways this time of year, all with wonderful things for us to spend more money on. Many of the things are things you really like. They get outraged at you when you start to pull out these charts and say, can we talk about what is going on?

Once again—I will do this as my closing—every dime of defense is borrowed, every dime of discretionary is borrowed, and now \$1.4 trillion of mandatory, things we don't even get to vote on, is now borrowed.

We are going to give these beautiful speeches about trying to save \$16 billion, which is a lot of money, except it is like 2¼ days of borrowing.

We fought over that sort of amount for 7 months, and in that time, we clicked off well over another trillion dollars of borrowing because we fight over the shiny little objects instead of the willingness to actually have an honest conversation about the structural crisis because this is politically

easy. You get a nice little spot on Twitter or Facebook or on social media, maybe even a hit on cable television, but it is a lie.

How do you save this place when it won't even put batteries in its calculator?

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 2024, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3057. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of termination of a Mid-Tier Acquisition program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3201 note prec.; Public Law 114-92, Sec. 804 (as added by Public Law 116-283, Sec. 805); (134 Stat. 3742); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3058. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's advisory opinion — Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure received January 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-3059. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Fair Credit Reporting: Background Screening received January 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-3060. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, CNCS (operating as AmeriCorps), Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Volunteers in Service to America (RIN: 3045-AA70; 3045-AA79) received January 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3061. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, CNCS (operating as AmeriCorps), Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — National Service Trust Education Awards (RIN: 3045-AA66) received January 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3062. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Older Americans Act: Grants to State and Community Programs on Aging; Grants to Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian Grantees for Supportive, Nutrition, and Caregiver Services; Grants for Supportive and Nutritional Services to Older Hawaiian Natives; and Allotments for Vulnerable Elder Rights Protection Activities (RIN: 0985-AA17) received January 31, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3063. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medications for the Treatment of Opioid Use Disorder (RIN: 0930-AA39) received January 31, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3064. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's revision to policy statement — Revision of the NRC Enforcement Policy [NRC-2023-0196] received January 5, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3065. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Participation by Religious Organizations in USAID Programs (RIN: 0412-AA69) received January 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3066. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, Office of Acquisitions and Assistance, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Various Administrative Changes and Clauses to the USAID Acquisition Regulation (RIN: 0412-AA78) received January 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3067. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, Office of Acquisition and Assistance, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation (AIDAR): Preference for Privately Owned U.S.-Flag Commercial Vessels (RIN: 0412-AA82) received January 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3068. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Management, M/M/S/Information and Records Division, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Freedom of Information Act Regulations (RIN: 0412-AA89) January 10, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3069. A letter from the Biologist, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to U.S. Navy Construction of the Pier 3 Replacement Project at Naval Station Norfolk [Docket No.: 23050-0126] (RIN: 0648-BL81) received January 30, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3070. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts [Release Nos.: 33-11263; 34-99276; IA-6521; IC-35085] received January 12, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3071. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and

Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of the Tribal Non-Federal Share Requirement (RIN: 0970-AC99) received January 31, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7023. A bill to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 118-375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7243. A bill to reimburse States for expenses incurred relating to securing the border; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BALINT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TLAB, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 7244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat transfers of appreciated property to certain tax-exempt organizations the same as transfers of appreciated property to political organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York (for himself, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 7245. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALFORD (for himself, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 7246. A bill to prohibit certain persons from purchasing real estate in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 7247. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require Federal Reserve banks

to interview at least one individual reflective of gender diversity and one individual reflective of racial or ethnic diversity when appointing Federal Reserve bank presidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 7248. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a process for the qualification of nonclinical testing methods to reduce and replace the use of animals in nonclinical research, improve the predictivity of nonclinical testing methods, and reduce development time for a biological product or other drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 7249. A bill to require submission of the National Security Strategy and the budget of the President before the President may deliver the State of the Union address; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 7250. A bill to strengthen Federal data collection regarding the teacher and principal workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK):

H.R. 7251. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BEYER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GOMEZ, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 7252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable for certain taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELUZIO (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 7253. A bill to amend section 3706 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the submission of cost and pricing data after agreeing on the contract price as a defense to contract price adjustments for defective cost and pricing data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 7254. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid to clarify that fully implanted active middle ear hearing devices are prosthetics and are not subject to the hearing aid coverage exclusion under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. FRY, Ms. MACE, and Mrs. PELTOLA):

H.R. 7255. A bill to require a page on each website of an agency related to discretionary or competitive grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 7256. A bill to require a full review of the bilateral relationship between the United States and South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. STEIL, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 7257. A bill to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 7258. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide community-based training opportunities for medical students in rural areas and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 7259. A bill to provide for expedited removal of certain illegal aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 7260. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. BALINT, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. ROSS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7261. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out professional development for arts educators and creative arts therapists to learn how to best accommodate children with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 7262. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to base the numerical limitations for H-2B nonimmigrants on economic need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 7263. A bill to authorize amounts collected in certain visa fees to be made available to reduce visa wait times, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself and Ms. BUSH):

H.R. 7264. A bill to prohibit certain defense industry stock trading and ownership by Members of Congress and spouses of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury should investigate the use of cryptocurrencies by Hamas (also known as Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya), and whether any cryptocurrencies were exchanged between Hamas and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. LANDSMAN, and Mr. BACON):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York (for himself, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. ELLZEY, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. DE LA CRUZ):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution condemning the Biden administration for its ban on the issuance of liquefied natural gas export permits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 999. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. JAMES):

H. Res. 1000. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 4, 2024, as "National Cancer Prevention Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. POSEY, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FRY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PALMER, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. CARTER of

Texas, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MANN, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Mr. MILLS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. SELF, Mr. MAST, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. STRONG):

H. Res. 1001. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that former President Donald J. Trump did not engage in insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or give aid or comfort to the enemies thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure reimbursements for states that take measures to secure the border

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 7244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
End tax breaks for dark money.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York:

H.R. 7245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Legislating

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 7246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence

The single subject of this legislation is:
Protection of U.S. homeland public and private real estate

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 7247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Financial Services

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 7248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a process for the qual-

ification of nonclinical testing methods to reduce and replace the use of animals in non-clinical research, improve the predictivity of nonclinical testing methods, and reduce development time for a biological product or other drug, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 7249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 and Article I Section 9, Clause 7

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires the President to submit the yearly budget and National Security Strategy before being invited to give a State of the Union Address.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 7250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

The single subject of this legislation is:

To strengthen Federal data collection regarding the teacher and principal workforce.

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER:

H.R. 7251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 7252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:
child care

By Mr. DELUZIO:

H.R. 7253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
The single subject of this legislation is:

Armed Services

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:

H.R. 7254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Medical Device Clarification

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 7255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Grant Transparency and Accountability

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 7256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Foreign Affairs

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 7257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 7258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Health Care

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 7259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To deport any illegal alien who entered the United States on or since January 20, 2021.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 7260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Expanding access to postsecondary education

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 7261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Art Education

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 7262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would strengthen the H-2B guest worker visa program by updating the H-2B visa cap so that it is tied to the number of labor certifications that the Department of Labor approved in the previous fiscal year and exempt seasonal and rural locations from the annual H-2B visa cap.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 7263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize amounts collected in certain visa fees to be made available to reduce visa wait times, and for other purposes.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 7264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill prohibits Members of Congress, their spouses, and their dependent children from owning any financial stake in any entity conducting business with the Department of Defense.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 16: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. JACOBS.

H.R. 82: Mr. FLOOD.

H.R. 148: Mrs. LESKO, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. MOONEY.

- H.R. 232: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 239: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 253: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 345: Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 431: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 537: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE of Florida, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 603: Mr. HOYER and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 654: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 700: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 724: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 894: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 914: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 926: Mrs. TORRES of California and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 927: Mr. CASAR.
H.R. 984: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1077: Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1179: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHIL.
H.R. 1184: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 1235: Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 1359: Mr. KILMER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1385: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1447: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1491: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1507: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1536: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1582: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.R. 1588: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 1617: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1737: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 2389: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 2406: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 2407: Ms. PORTER and Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 2411: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2412: Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 2447: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 2621: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2722: Mr. CISCOMANI and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2845: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 2848: Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2849: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHIL.
H.R. 2878: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H.R. 2891: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHIL, and Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2904: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 2923: Mr. MFUME and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2955: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 2987: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 3039: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 3083: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3092: Mr. SOTO and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
H.R. 3139: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 3183: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3199: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3258: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
H.R. 3269: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3277: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3333: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3381: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 3413: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. BENTZ, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 3425: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3433: Ms. LETLOW, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 3481: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3646: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3684: Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 4035: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 4068: Mr. HIMES, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4150: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 4175: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 4189: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 4224: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4285: Ms. SALAZAR and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 4333: Mr. THANEDAR and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 4391: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4422: Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 4561: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4565: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 4571: Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 4579: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4591: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 4594: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 4635: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 4763: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 4848: Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRY, and Mr. OGLLES.
H.R. 4867: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 4878: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 4886: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 4974: Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California.
H.R. 5012: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 5048: Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. THANEDAR, and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 5112: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5113: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 5134: Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 5159: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 5224: Mr. MORAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 5266: Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. DUARTE, and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 5290: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5292: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5293: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5294: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5295: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5362: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 5403: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 5408: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 5487: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CASE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5530: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 5531: Mr. OGLLES.
H.R. 5563: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5566: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 5644: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 5646: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 5762: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 5801: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 5804: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5825: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 5829: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 5840: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5867: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5890: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5941: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 5957: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5970: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5987: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 6023: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 6046: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 6111: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 6173: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 6198: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 6203: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 6246: Ms. TOKUDA and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 6280: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 6281: Mr. DUARTE.
H.R. 6283: Mr. BEAN of Florida.
H.R. 6286: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 6300: Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 6319: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 6330: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 6335: Mrs. BICE.
H.R. 6373: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 6433: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 6451: Mr. PETERS and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 6466: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 6516: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6534: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 6538: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 6596: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 6603: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 6609: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H.R. 6628: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 6683: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 6704: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6724: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 6751: Mr. LIEU, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 6810: Mr. SOTO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 6860: Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 6944: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 6969: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MANNING, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 6973: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 6980: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6997: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 7003: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 7012: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7014: Mr. JACKSON of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 7027: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 7031: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 7035: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 7044: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 7055: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 7059: Ms. SHERRILL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 7060: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 7108: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 7109: Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 7127: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 7130: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BURLISON.
H.R. 7145: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 7148: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7152: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 7155: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7159: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 7171: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 7183: Mr. FALLON, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 7187: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 7195: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 7202: Mr. MCCORMICK and Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 7210: Ms. BALINT and Mrs. FOUSHEE.
H.R. 7216: Mr. LAWLER and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

H.R. 7217: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GUEST, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. EZELL, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. COLE, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. GONZALEZ-COLÓN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. KILEY, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 7231: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 7232: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.J. Res. 13: Ms. MCCLELLAN and Mr. THANEDAR.
H.J. Res. 37: Mrs. BICE.
H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H. Res. 50: Mr. TIMMONS and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 82: Mr. CLYDE.
H. Res. 108: Mr. CASTEN.
H. Res. 196: Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 333: Mr. LAWLER.
H. Res. 858: Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 901: Mr. JACKSON of Texas and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 907: Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 915: Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 935: Mr. STANTON.
H. Res. 962: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H. Res. 965: Mr. BUCK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. BERA.
H. Res. 985: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. GARBARINO.