

I beg you, Mr. President, that you would not dishonor the judiciary in this country.

Here is what I know: I know that you have the ability to say to a judge: You have issued your court order, now let me see you enforce it. That is my Justice Department—not AL GREEN's, the President's—that is my Justice Department. The head of my Justice Department has pledged fealty to me—not AL GREEN, the President—that is my Justice Department. Let me see you get my Justice Department to enforce your order, Mr. Judge.

More specifically, Mr. John Roberts, get my Justice Department to enforce your order. Let me see you get my marshals to enforce your order.

This President, whether wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that the Justice Department has pledged fealty to him.

Generals in the military: You don't get these positions now unless you have pledged fealty to him.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves to allow such a thing to have happened. Yes, generals in the military, the Justice Department, the courts, many of them are bending knees and genuflecting.

□ 1245

Somehow, you believe that you are showing respect, I suppose, or maybe you are just currying favor.

Be that as it may, the Justice Department, generals in the military, and many of the courts are giving a genuflect. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is setting himself up such that he is in a position and such that, at the end of his fourth year, he might attempt to do what he tried to do and failed to do at the end of his last term.

He tried his best to prevent the transition of power. He did all that he could. He encouraged persons to come over to the Capitol. People came, and they literally broke into the Capitol. I was here. They came, and they marched through the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, for doing it, the President has been given them the ultimate reward. You, you, and you—yes, you, too—all of you, you are pardoned. You are given some sort of amnesty. You are okay.

This is what the President has done. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is now in a position to make that same effort. Only this time, the Justice Department is with him, not with the Constitution. Generals in the military are with him, not with their oath that they have taken.

The President, wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that if he chooses to stay on beyond his term of office and if he chooses to do what a Member of Congress has suggested that might be done by law, which is to give him a third term—I hold no animus toward the Member of Congress who has filed the legislation; I have no animus to you, dear brother—but what we have done is

witnessed a President who, wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that he will have the power to enforce the inanity of not allowing a peaceful transfer of power.

He literally is putting himself in that position. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is.

As a result of his doing this, we have to not allow his incivility and his requirement of fealty to prevent us from taking the necessary actions to protect liberty and justice for all and to protect government of the people, by the people, and for the people. To protect what this country has in its great and noble ideals, we have to do what is necessary.

I believe that we have to engage in a level of positive, righteous incivility—positive, righteous incivility, the same kind of incivility that Dr. King engaged in and that John Lewis engaged in. This incivility would only be a counterbalance to the President's incivility.

I am not saying that we get into the name-calling and stoop to the level that he does. I am saying that, when there are moments for us to have righteous incivility, we should.

Now, I am back to where I started. I stood there in the well of the House, other Members with me. I never suggested to anybody that you do a certain thing. We did sing "We Shall Overcome."

It was an act of incivility, but I want people to know that it was in direct response to the President's incivility at the joint session of Congress. He has not been reprimanded. He has not been censured. He won't be reprimanded. He won't be censured.

However, there is one, as the President uses it, in his parlance, one card. There is one card that we have. You told the President of Ukraine: "You don't have the cards." Well, Mr. President, we have the cards.

There are 435 of us with the cards. The card, Mr. President, you know well because, on two occasions, these cards have been utilized to check you. You don't always get convicted when you are indicted, but you do get indicted.

If you continue with this line of behavior, you may not just simply be indicted. That means impeached. You may be more than impeached. There may be a Senate that has the will to live up to the ideals in the Constitution. When that Senate does so, you will no longer be President.

There are 435 cards. Mr. President, I have one of those cards. I have one of them. You are a Goliath. You are Goliath. You now have control of the Justice Department. You have the generals pledging fealty. You are a Goliath, Mr. President, but there are 435 Davids—435 Davids—435 with the power accorded to us by way of the rules of this House to bring Articles of Impeachment.

You may not be impeached the first time, but there is always a second, and there is always a third.

In the end, if you, Mr. President, continue with this behavior, you will be impeached, and I believe there will be the will in the Senate to convict.

I am not threatening anyone. I am talking about the rules that have been accorded to this House, which I happen to be a Member of and proud to be a Member of, and accorded to the Senate.

You are a Goliath, but, Mr. President, there are Davids among us. Your incivility can no longer be tolerated. It has to be met with righteous indignation and righteous incivility.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDOWELL). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FINDING COMMON GROUND

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. KILEY of California was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, we just heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) speak passionately on a number of topics.

It is his prerogative as an elected Member of Congress to speak from this floor on any topic he chooses. What is not his or any of our right is to stand up during the State of the Union and interrupt the President of the United States.

Imagine if everyone did that. Imagine if everyone took whatever grievance they have in the moment and decided to use the State of the Union to air that grievance. Imagine if, during President Biden's speech, each and every one of the Republicans in the House had stood up and objected to the President's open-border policies or his runaway inflation policies. The State of the Union could not be delivered. The institution could not function.

What is even more remarkable, though, than the conduct of this 1 Member is the fact that all but 10 of his colleagues on their side of the aisle chose not to censure this eminently censurable conduct. We held a vote today, and there were 10 Democrats who joined with the Republicans in voting for the censure. They are AMI BERA of California, ED CASE of Hawaii, JIM COSTA of California, LAURA GILLEN of New York, JAMES HIMES of Connecticut, CRISSY HOULAHAN of Pennsylvania, MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, JARED MOSKOWITZ of Florida, MARIE GLUESENKAMP PEREZ of Washington, and TOM SUOZZI of New York.

The other 200 Members who were present chose not to censure that conduct. I find that remarkable. Indeed, the antics on display during the joint session truly exemplified everything that is wrong with politics in this country today and exemplified everything that Americans are so tired of.

There was, of course, the outburst from the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

GREEN). There were the pathetic little protests of a handful of people walking out in the middle of the speech. There were the sad, little cards with statements like "Lies" on them.

Beyond all of that, there was a premeditated refusal from one side of the aisle, acting in unison, to stand and applaud for literally anything that the President said.

What were some of the things that they uniformly, acting as a monolith, refused to applaud?

They refused to stand and applaud for record-low illegal border crossings, for protecting women's sports, for stopping fraudulent payments, and for capturing a terrorist who killed 13 American servicemembers.

They refused to stand and applaud for supporting law enforcement, for improving military recruitment, for protecting free speech, for having our workers actually show up to work, for hiring people based on merit, for opening new power plants, for living in peace, for the signing of the Abraham Accords, and for returning manufacturing to America.

Not a single person stood. That is kind of the most incredible thing, that there was a willful decision to sacrifice any individuality to the orders being given by party leadership.

It got particularly disturbing when the President recognized a number of heroic Americans who were present, and we had our colleagues refuse to stand and applaud for a volunteer firefighter who provided a home to 40 foster children; to the victim of a deepfake who has become an advocate for other victims; to the family of Laken Riley; to the family of Jocelyn Nungaray; to a heroic Border Patrol agent; to the widow of an officer who was killed in the line of duty; to a 13-year-old survivor of brain cancer, such an inspiring young man; to a young man admitted to West Point; to a history teacher who has finally been brought home after being a political prisoner in Russia, sentenced to 14 years; and to the family of Corey Comperatore.

Each and every time the President recognized one of these individuals in the gallery, there was a premeditated refusal to stand and acknowledge them.

We know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know how to do it. During President Biden's State of the Union Addresses, which, by the way, his last one was one of the most caustic, partisan speeches I have ever seen, where he repeatedly compared himself to his predecessor; that is, his political opponent at the time. Dozens of times, Democrats stood and applauded.

By the way, on our side, for a lot of those times, we didn't stand and applaud because he was saying partisan things or things that we disagreed with.

When he said things that we agreed with, I would stand. Others on my side

would stand, as well. When he spoke to unifying ideas, ideas about what makes our country great, we would stand and applaud. When he highlighted people who were deserving of commendation, we would stand and applaud.

Yet, the contrast could not have been starker in President Trump's speech and the reaction to it here in the Chamber on Tuesday.

I think that is really unfortunate because Americans of all party affiliations—Republican, Democratic, Independent, Green Party, whatever the case may be—repeatedly say in overwhelming numbers that the political divisions in this country are a serious problem.

I believe it is weakening us as a country, and I think we need to find opportunities to come together. We need to be looking for common ground. The fact that we had one side that came to Tuesday's speech intent on finding no common ground whatsoever is a very unfortunate thing.

□ 1300

CALIFORNIA'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I formally requested that FBI Director Kash Patel open an investigation into California's High-Speed Rail.

My letter to Director Patel reads as follows: "While I know that many issues are competing for your time, one issue that deserves your attention is California's High-Speed Rail Project.

"Nearly 17 years ago, California and the United States were sold on the dream of high-speed rail in California. Originally projected to cost \$33 billion and scheduled to be completed by 2020, that dream has become a nightmare. According to the California High-Speed Rail Authority's own estimates, the total project cost has now ballooned by over \$100 billion above that original estimate. Moreover, California's auditor reports that the HSRA will miss its latest 2033 deadline . . . without having completed a single segment of the track. Indeed, The New York Times reported that, according to 'projections widely used by engineers and project managers, the train could not be completed in this century.'

"This malfeasance leads to questions that transcend mere incompetence. How is it possible to have spent over \$13 billion without a single station opening? Where have these funds gone? Who benefited?

"Because the project has consumed billions in Federal funding, the FBI has both the authority, and I would argue the responsibility, to pursue these questions and deliver answers to the American people. The public integrity division is uniquely qualified to root out any corruption, recover stolen funds, and restore confidence that our tax dollars are being stewarded carefully.

"On behalf of my constituents and the people of California, thank you for your consideration of this request."

I am hopeful that through this investigation we will finally see some accountability and a measure of justice for California taxpayers.

187,000 PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA ARE HOMELESS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the California Legislative Analyst has just released a new report on the amount of homelessness spending in California. It reports that since 2019, the State has spent over \$36 billion.

This is truly astounding when you consider what has actually happened with homelessness in California during that time. During the Governorship of Gavin Newsom, we have seen a 24 percent increase in homelessness. The population is now over 187,000 people, and roughly half of all unsheltered homeless in the United States are in California.

We have continued to spend more and more money, over \$36 billion over this time period, and the homeless population has only continued to grow. What is worse, the legislative analyst has found that the Governor's office lost track of most of that money.

This was in an audit that was released last year. In this new report, even since that audit, we are seeing the same problem with the new spending that has been authorized. Indeed, the LAO reports that, despite many requirements, as of this writing, no data have been provided to the legislature on how many people living in encampments have received permanent housing or any other type of housing. The legislature lacks other key outcomes data such as the number of encampments that have been resolved.

We continue to see the same problems in California: spending billions of billions, homelessness getting worse, and zero accountability.

The Governor even vetoed last year a bipartisan bill that would have allowed for greater transparency and accountability when it comes to homelessness spending.

Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely unacceptable, and it has gotten to the point where I believe we need to find ways to bring new tools of Federal oversight and accountability to the out-of-control homelessness situation in California.

We are looking at ways of doing just that.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION IS OUT OF CONTROL

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, I officially introduced the Coastal Commission Accountability Act to strip the California Coastal Commission of its powers under Federal law.

The Coastal Commission is simply out of control. It is one of the most out-of-control agencies in the whole country, and it has veered far from its purpose of protecting the coast.

From blocking SpaceX launches to obstructing fire prevention projects, the commission has repeatedly threatened the safety of Californians and weakened our national defense, while

needlessly undercutting innovation and economic progress.

The need to rein the commission in has now become urgent as we face the challenge of rebuilding Los Angeles following the fires, and that will not be possible if the commission is allowed to continue operating as it has been.

Just to give you a couple of examples of some of its abuses, one of them is specifically related to fire.

In 2019, the L.A. Department of Water and Power began replacing nearly 100-year-old wooden power line poles that are cutting through Topanga State Park.

The project, though, was halted because there was apparently an endangered plant, the Braunton's milkvetch plant that was in the area.

Now, the goal of this project was to improve fire safety for the Pacific Palisades area by replacing the wooden poles with steel, widening fire access lanes in the area, and installing wind- and fire-resistant power lines. This was all after the area had been identified as having an elevated fire risk.

What the Coastal Commission did, because of this Braunton's milkvetch plant, is they marched in, they halted the project, and they even demanded \$2 million in fines.

On top of that, the commission has blocked a desalination plant that had been proposed in Huntington Beach. It has stood in the way of housing, contributing to the housing crisis that we have in California, and it even tried to stop SpaceX from launching rockets out of Vandenberg.

This one was particularly remarkable because SpaceX and the Air Force came and said we want to increase our launch cadence at Vandenberg. These launches are very important for a number of reasons when it comes to innovation, space exploration and national security. That is why the Air Force was involved.

The Coastal Commission said, no, we are not going to allow that. What was the reason they cited? It had nothing to do with preserving the coast, which is their mission. It had nothing to do with maintaining the beauty of the California coast, one of the most beautiful places in the world, which is their mission.

No. The commissioners explicitly said during their meeting that the reason they were going to stop these launches, which the Air Force said are in the national security interests of the United States, is because they didn't like some of the political posts put on X by Elon Musk on completely unrelated topics.

This gives you a sense of what a rogue agency the Coastal Commission has become and the barriers that we will face to rebuilding Los Angeles if this is allowed to continue.

I am looking forward to advancing the Coastal Commission Accountability Act through the House and getting it signed by the President, who I know agrees with me on this issue. I

am hopeful that we can get bipartisan support throughout the process.

PROTECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS'S SPORTS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I am calling on California Governor Gavin Newsom to immediately issue an executive order to protect women and girls sports in California and ask the legislature for legislation codifying in law that men shall never compete in women's sports in California again.

Today, the Governor, on his newly established podcast called "This is Gavin Newsom," came out with a statement that surprised many on this topic. He said that when it comes to men competing in women's sports, he said: "I think it is an issue of fairness." It is an issue of fairness. "It is deeply unfair." Those were the Governor's words.

Now, this was surprising because his policies have been the 180-degree opposite. For example, he has signed legislation that has taken away the right of parents to be notified about decisions that their kids make at school with respect to how they identify, or on this issue of sports.

In June 2022, not that long ago, the Governor attacked the State of Tennessee for not funding men competing in girls' sports. So at that point, he was not only in favor of it, he thought that a State refusing to actively promote it and fund it was deserving of censure.

Okay. The Governor has changed his mind. I think that is great. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that polls show that some 90 percent of Americans support the basic predicate of sanity that men should compete in men's sports and women should compete in women's sports.

Now, that message has apparently not been received by the United States Senate, which recently refused to pass the bill we passed in the House, the Protecting Women and Girls in Sports Act, but the Governor has made his statement.

He claims this is his position. It would represent a change of heart, but it means nothing unless he acts on it if he continues to support policies that do the exact opposite.

If the Governor is serious, I am calling on him today to take executive action to protect women's sports and to get the legislature to take action as well, so that we can end this absurdity and unfairness in California once and for all.

MUCH-NEEDED COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT UNDER WAY TO MODERNIZE OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, there is at this time a much-needed comprehensive effort under way to modernize our government, to root out fraud, to root out inefficiency, to implement reforms that will save the taxpayers' money, and lead to a higher quality of government service while rightsizing the Federal Government.

This is an undertaking that is supported by a broad majority of Americans of all party affiliations.

I have been very appreciative of the administration's efforts to keep us informed as well as to solicit feedback from Members of Congress as to how things are playing out in our districts, knowing that such a massive undertaking that is being done at a much-needed aggressive pace will inevitably, from time to time, produce some effects that need to be looked at more closely.

□ 1315

One of the ways in which I have provided feedback to the administration is as it concerns the issue of fire protection in my district. Now, of course, we all saw the horror that unfolded in Los Angeles recently, but in recent years, these catastrophic events have become a recurring phenomenon. They have become, sadly, a fact of life for folks in California.

Several of the most devastating fires in State history have occurred in my district. In the wake of these fires, there has been a massive undertaking to do whatever we can to try to prevent similar events from happening in the future.

One of my very first priorities since I got to Congress is to bring unprecedented resources to our district for massive fire mitigation projects that will keep our communities safe. By the way, there is a lot of reform that we still need to do in terms of the regulations. There have been some minor improvements, but the Fix Our Forests Act, for example, is a bill that will go a long way.

We do need the resources, which we have managed to secure at an unprecedented level, and I have simply tried to emphasize the importance of protecting these efforts, especially given the fact that in parts of my district that have rather extreme weather, there is a pretty short window of time right now to get some of these projects started and to get them completed.

Just as a few examples, the Plumas County Fire Safe Council has a grant of nearly \$7 million that is very important for fire mitigation efforts.

The Nevada County Board of Supervisors has significant grants that have come in for vital wildfire mitigation projects, shaded fuel breaks, evacuation planning, and community wildfire protection planning.

The Mono County Board of Supervisors has a public safety and law enforcement grant related to staffing of the forest protection officers and law enforcement officers, as well.

American Rivers, there is a \$16 million grant that is being funded by National Fish and Wildlife. There are matching funds as well with a number of regional partners. The purpose of the project is to restore high-severity burned areas near the South Fork of the American River and Cosumnes River to prevent erosion and flooding

as well as to protect water quality and for drinking, irrigation, and hydropower.

There is also the Eastern Sierra Climate and Communities Resilience Project. This is in Mammoth Lakes. There is \$6.7 million for implementation funds as well as a number of other types of funds. This is a project that, again, is designed to do important fire mitigation work. There are potentially 1,609 acres with a reduction of 77 percent of total acres that is now potentially being faced.

We have then as well some reports of folks with the Forest Service and positions that are in jeopardy.

In the Camino Fire Safe Council, we have also gotten some reports of activity when it comes to their grants, as well.

That is just to emphasize that this is an issue of the highest importance for folks in my district and that we need to absolutely—and I have been advocating this since I have been in elected office—have much more sensible policies when it comes to forest management, when it comes to the laws and regulations that we have that make it so difficult to do this needed work.

We also need to do the work at a scale, and the resources to do it at a scale that is much higher than we have done in the past. I have been extremely critical of the Governor, for example, of not doing that, of exaggerating the amount of fire protection work done by almost 700 percent, according to Capital Public Radio. We have made good progress in terms of bringing Federal resources to get this work done, and I will continue to advocate for that here in every way that I can.

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

IMPOSING SANCTIONS ON THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-23)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), section 212 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1182 (f)), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have exercised my authority to declare a national emergency in order to halt efforts by the International Criminal Court (ICC) to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute persons in America and our close ally Israel through blatant lawfare. I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

The ICC has, without basis, asserted jurisdiction over and opened investigations into personnel of the United States and certain of its allies, including Israel, and has further abused its power by issuing baseless arrest warrants targeting Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Former Minister of Defense Yoav Gallant. The ICC has no jurisdiction over the United States or Israel, as neither country is party to the Rome Statute or a member of the ICC. Neither country has ever recognized the ICC's jurisdiction, and both nations are thriving democracies with militaries that strictly adhere to the laws of war. The ICC's recent actions against Israel and the United States set a dangerous precedent, directly endangering current and former United States personnel, including active service members of the Armed Forces, by exposing them to harassment, abuse, and possible arrest. This malign conduct in turn threatens to infringe upon the sovereignty of the United States and undermines the critical national security and foreign policy work of the United States Government and our allies, including Israel.

Pursuant to the national emergency that I have declared, the United States will impose tangible and significant consequences on those responsible for the ICC's transgressions, including by blocking property and assets, and suspending entry into the United States of ICC officials, employees, and agents, as well as their immediate family members. I have directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, to identify and sanction any foreign person found to have, among other things, directly assisted in any ICC efforts to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute a protected person without consent of that person's country of nationality.

I have further determined that the unrestricted immigrant and non-immigrant entry into the United States of any covered alien found to have participated in any ICC efforts to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute a protected person, as well as immediate family members of such aliens, or aliens determined by the Secretary of State to be employed by, or acting as an agent of, the ICC, would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, as immigrants or non-immigrants, and therefore have suspended such immigration except where the Secretary of State determines that the entry of the person into the United States would not be contrary to the interests of the United States.

In addition, I have determined that donations of articles specified in section 203(b)(2) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(2)) by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose assets are blocked, would impair my ability to address the national emergency I de-

clared. I have therefore prohibited such donations.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 2025.

NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS THE SYNTHETIC OPIOID SUPPLY CHAIN IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE FLOW OF ILLICIT DRUGS ACROSS OUR NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN BORDERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-24)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with applicable law, including the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621) and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701), I am providing notice of certain actions I have taken to address the synthetic opioid supply chain in the People's Republic of China and the flow of illicit drugs across our northern and southern borders. As reflected in the Executive Orders described below, the sustained influx of illicit opioids and other drugs has profound consequences on our Nation, endangering lives and putting a severe strain on our healthcare system, public services, and communities. These actions are an expansion of the national emergency I declared in Proclamation 10886 of January 20, 2025 (Declaring a National Emergency at the Southern Border of the United States).

Executive Order 14193, as amended by Executive Orders 14197 and 14226, and Executive Order 14194, as amended by Executive Orders 14198 and 14227, expand the scope of the aforementioned national emergency to "cover the threat to the safety and security of Americans, including the public health crisis of deaths due to the use of fentanyl and other illicit drugs" and the failure of Canada and Mexico to arrest, seize, detain, or otherwise intercept drug trafficking organizations, other drug and human traffickers, criminals at large, and illicit drugs. Furthermore, Executive Order 14195, as amended by Executive Orders 14200 and 14228, expands the scope of the same national emergency declared in Proclamation 10886 to cover the failure of the People's Republic of China to arrest, seize, detain, or otherwise intercept chemical precursor suppliers, money launderers, transnational criminal organizations, criminals at large, and drugs. To combat these problems, I have determined that ad valorem tariffs on articles that are products of these countries are in order.