

a fee that is “not proportional to services provided.” Who decides proportionality? By what standard? This invites endless litigation and regulatory uncertainty that will ultimately harm investors by increasing costs and limiting service offerings.

I urge my colleagues to reject this substantively flawed amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I urge all Members to vote “yes” in support of my amendment to prohibit junk fees and make all other fees more transparent to investors.

My amendment will make sure that hardworking Americans are safe from undisclosed or unreasonable fees. It will require advanced notice on fees before they are charged to an investor and will make public the amount that financial firms earn from fees.

□ 2120

I am sure you can agree that every American should have a right to know what they are paying for, and that is why I am asking for a vote on this amendment.

It has been acknowledged by the supporters that they are so pleased for this debate that we are having this evening. They have indicated it is long past due that consumers have this kind of advocacy and that consumers have this kind of support from the Members of Congress who understand the rip-offs and the fraud and the disrespect that they have received for far too long.

This amendment is supported by all of those organized unions and advocacy groups that I have spoken about earlier this evening. They all support this amendment as they support the bill that we have been working so hard for.

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, as we come to a close on what I believe is the final amendment of H.R. 3383, the INVEST Act, I thank my colleagues who have been so bipartisan in this package of 22 amazing capital formation bills that are going to lift up retail and mainstream investors, that are going to grow small business and entrepreneurs, and give more companies the possibility of having the capital for them to go public.

Mr. Chair, I thank my wonderful co-lead, Mr. GREGORY MEEKS from New York and JOSH GOTTHEIMER, and also Chairman HILL for their tremendous support in this effort and my entire Capital Markets Subcommittee, the staff, and the team that has brought what is years and years of hard work together that is going to grow this economy, grow jobs, and grow the future of the United States of America and our economy.

Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for the good, healthy debate this evening and the collaboration that we have, but I must say still, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this specific amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACKENZIE) having assumed the chair, Mr. WIED, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3383) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 with respect to the authority of closed-end companies to invest in private funds, had come to no resolution thereon.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 940

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Van Epps.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Van Epps.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 939. Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Resolved, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is an abuser of presidential power who, if left in office, will continue to promote the incitement of violence, engender invidious hate, undermine our democracy, and dissolve our Republic, that he 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 Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I. Abuse of Presidential Power by Calling for the Execution of Members of Congress.

In his conduct of the office of President of the United States, Donald John Trump, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has unfaithfully, dangerously, and unconstitutionally abused his official position by threatening Democratic lawmakers in Congress with execution.

President Trump called for the execution of six Democratic lawmakers, all of whom are currently serving in the U.S. Senate or U.S. House of Representatives and who previously served in the U.S. Military or in U.S. Intelligence communities, in response to a short video that they posted on November 18, 2025. In their video, the Democratic lawmakers appropriately urged current members of the military and intelligence communities to adhere to the Constitution and the laws of our country. They specifically said: “Like us, you all swore an oath to protect and defend this Constitution. Right now, the threats to our Constitution aren’t just coming from abroad, but from right here at home. Our laws are clear. You can refuse illegal orders. You can refuse illegal orders. You must refuse illegal orders. No one has to carry out orders that violate the law or our Constitution.”

On November 20, 2025, in response, President Trump called for their execution. In one social media post, he wrote: “It’s called SEDITIOUS BEHAVIOR AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL. Each one of these traitors to our Country should be ARRESTED AND PUT ON TRIAL. Their words cannot be allowed to stand—We won’t have a Country anymore!! An example MUST BE SET. President DJT.” In another, he wrote of the lawmakers: “SEDITIOUS BEHAVIOR, punishable by DEATH!”

Dangerously and unconstitutionally, he reposted a third party's post: "HANG THEM GEORGE WASHINGTON WOULD!!!"

President Trump's call for the execution of lawmakers is a reckless and flagrant abuse of presidential power that promotes extra-judicial punishment and the assassination of Members of Congress, and warrants impeachment by the U.S. House of Representatives and trial by the Senate.

ARTICLE II. Abuse of Presidential Power to Intimidate Federal Judges in Violation of the Separation of Powers and Independence of the Judiciary.

In his conduct of the office of President of the United States, Donald John Trump, in violation of his constitutional oath to faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has unfaithfully, dangerously, and unconstitutionally abused his official position by threatening federal judges.

President Trump has fostered a political climate in which lawmakers and judges face threats of political violence and physical assault; and in this climate has made threats and vituperative comments against federal judges, putting at risk their safety and well-being, and undermining the independence of our judiciary.

Case in point, in response to a federal district court ruling with which President Trump disagreed, he posted: "This Radical Left Lunatic of a Judge, a troublemaker and agitator who was sadly appointed by Barack Hussein Obama, was not elected President. . . This judge, like many of the Crooked Judges' I am forced to appear before, should be IMPEACHED!!!"

Another U.S. District Chief Judge has reported receiving increased numbers of violent threats, particularly after he began hearing arguments in a lawsuit against the Trump administration.

In 2025, roughly a third the federal judiciary has been flooded with threats, with data showing that these threats spike each time Trump uses abusive rhetoric against judges.

On May 2, 2025, Reuters reported that U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson addressed President Donald Trump's attacks on the judiciary. The relevant part of the article stated as follows:

1) "U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson said on Thursday attacks by Republican President Donald Trump and his allies on judges were 'not random' and seemed 'designed to intimidate the judiciary.'"

2) Specifically, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Jackson remarked that, "The attacks are not random. They seem designed to intimidate those of us who serve in this critical capacity."

3) Justice Jackson added, "The threats and harassment are attacks on

our democracy, on our system of government. And they ultimately risk undermining our Constitution and the rule of law."

The judiciary is afforded power over "all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made" and "to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party." U.S. Const. art. III, sec. 2. Intimidating judges, and recklessly calling for the impeachment and removal of judges who disagree with him demonstrate a willingness by Trump to usurp authority afforded by our Constitution to the judiciary and demonstrate a disregard for the Constitution and the careful balance of powers that protects our country from abuses by any single branch.

President Trump's threats place the lives of federal judges, court officials, and innocent bystanders at risk, promote the incitement of violence, and undermine our democracy, which cannot survive where President Trump's incendiary comments engender invidious hate and where dissent is punishable by death.

In all of this, Donald John Trump has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Donald John Trump, by such conduct, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

□ 2140

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

AND STILL I RISE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise to note that tonight I have called for the impeachment of Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America.

He is an abuser of Presidential power. He has called for the execution of Members of the House of Representa-

tives, of this very House. He has demeaned Members of the judiciary.

He has conducted himself in office such that persons are now threatening Members of the judiciary, threatening Members of the House of Representatives, and threatening Members of the Senate.

Donald John Trump, by his conduct, merits impeachment, trial, and conviction in the Senate of the United States of America and should never hold any office of public trust ever again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TURNING HEALTHCARE INTO FINANCIAL ENGINEERING

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, the good news is we have only until 10:00. The bad news is I am going to use every second of it. Let's race through this because originally, I think I was going to go almost an hour. Maybe this is mercy.

I want to walk through just a couple of concepts here. One, we are going to talk about one of my intense frustrations. I have talked about this for a decade or more. Please, how do I get my brothers and sisters on the left and those on the right to understand we have turned the whole discussion of healthcare into financial engineering? Work with me on this.

Many of us know ACA as ObamaCare. It is a financing bill. It has community rating in it, so the guaranteed access, but it is a financing bill. It is who gets subsidized and who has to pay. Our Republican alternative was a financing bill. It just had a little better actuarial modeling in it. Medicare for all is a financing bill.

We don't have the discussion about what we pay, the waste, the fraud, the adoption of technology, the adoption of cures, the adoption of how we deliver, the adoption of making us autonomous because we can wear our medical lab on our body now. I wear one of the data rings, and I experimented with a Dexcom in the last couple of weeks.

Instead, we are going to beat each other up around here. The Democrats are going to try to make a political issue out of it. We are going to basically fumble because we had trouble explaining that we have turned healthcare into financing. They want to hand out billions and billions of dollars more to insurance companies to buy down rates.

Let's actually walk through some points I want to make. This is the first one. I desperately hope this number evens out as we go through the rest of the year.

Our model right now says in the first quarter of this fiscal year—remember, October 1, we began the 2026 fiscal