

this is over the line. He knows this was over the line, and he knew it when he was doing it. Let's make sure that we stop it in its tracks and give these young people, young women in particular, the type of assistance that they need.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I move adoption of H. Res. 1498, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

# RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND MICHAEL JOSEPH IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1504) which is printed in House Report 119-693, regarding proceedings against Michael Joseph and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 1504

*Resolved*, That Michael Joseph shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with the subpoena *duces tecum* issued to him on September 11, 2025.

*Resolved*, That Michael Joseph shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with the subpoena *ad testificandum* issued to him on September 11, 2025.

*Resolved*, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the Report of the Committee on Ethics, detailing the refusal of Michael Joseph to produce documents and appear before the Investigative Subcommittee as directed by these subpoenas, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Joseph be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoenas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

□ 1510

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution printed in House Report 119-693.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Committee on Ethics, I rise in support of the resolutions which call for Michael Joseph and Hector Roos to be held in contempt of Congress for their failure to comply with documentary and testimonial subpoenas issued on September 11, 2025, and August 12, 2026, respectively.

Article I, Section 5 of the Constitution provides that each House may punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

The House has charged the Committee on Ethics with the duty of implementing this provision on its behalf. The committee recommends and enforces ethical standards that ensure Members and staff act in a manner befitting the public trust.

Pursuant to that authority, the House has authorized the committee and its subcommittees to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and their production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary to carry out its investigative functions.

House rules do not specify that personal service is the only method of effecting service of its subpoenas. An individual has a legal obligation to comply with a duly issued and valid congressional subpoena, unless a valid privilege or other legal justification excuses compliance. An individual who fails to comply with a House subpoena may be cited for contempt of Congress.

In this case, the committee impaneled an investigative subcommittee to inquire into certain allegations regarding former Representative Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick.

In order to conduct a thorough investigation, the investigative subcommittee authorized, and the committee issued, subpoenas for documents and testimonies to Mr. Joseph and Mr. Roos.

Mr. Roos was a senior campaign staffer who filed inaccurate reports with the Federal Election Commission and made in kind contributions to the campaign.

Mr. Roos was served with documentary and testimonial subpoenas issued on August 12, 2025, by the United States Marshals Service. He did not appear for his deposition on September 25, 2025, nor did he produce the documents at any time. Mr. Roos did not

provide a valid legal justification for his noncompliance.

Mr. Joseph was the President of a company that improperly provided corporate funds for the Congresswoman's campaign and influenced her staff to submit community funding project requests for entities that he supported.

Mr. Joseph was served with documentary and testimonial subpoenas issued on March 11, 2025. Mr. Joseph accepted service. Later, he responded he could not comply because as an attorney it would violate attorney-client privilege.

Committee rules provide that the presiding member of the subcommittee may consider objections on the basis of privilege and request his objection be put in writing. Although Mr. Joseph did not do so, the investigative subcommittee nonetheless considered his objection and determined it was not a valid assertion of the attorney-client privilege.

Nonetheless, Mr. Joseph did not appear for his deposition on October 7, 2025, nor did he produce documents at any time. Mr. Joseph did not provide a valid legal justification for his non-compliance.

The investigative subcommittee offered both Mr. Roos and Mr. Joseph a final opportunity to comply with subpoenas, but neither did so.

Therefore, the investigative subcommittee voted on March 18, 2026, to adopt reports recommending the committee submit a resolution recommending the House cite Mr. Roos and Mr. Joseph for contempt of Congress pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 194 and 192.

On May 13, 2026, the committee adopted its own reports incorporating by reference the reports of the investigative subcommittee and concurring with this recommendation. The reports were transmitted to the Clerk of the House and made public on June 22, 2026, and have been made available to Members of the House and the public on the committee's website since Friday.

The committee cannot fulfill its obligations to safeguard the integrity of the House when witnesses ignore its subpoenas, and the House cannot accept such willful disregard of its authority.

Mr. Roos and Mr. Joseph willfully failed to comply with multiple subpoenas issued by the committee. They impeded the investigative subcommittee's investigations into the allegations concerning former Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.

Those allegations were serious and included violations of Federal law to which Mr. Roos and Mr. Joseph were party. Their conduct warrants referrals to the United States Department of Justice for contempt of Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution holding Michael Joseph in contempt of Congress for his failure to

comply with duly authorized subpoenas issued by the Committee on Ethics.

At a time when public confidence in Congress is at historic lows and the House's ability to self-police Member conduct is under intense scrutiny, enforcing lawful congressional process is vital to delivering swift transparency and accountability for any misconduct.

A witness who refuses to cooperate with the Ethics Committee hinders the thoroughness and swiftness of an investigation. If the committee must authorize and issue a subpoena for that witness, more delays result.

If after those additional steps the witness decides to flout the subpoena, the committee is ultimately deprived of key evidence needed to resolve the allegations.

A subpoena from the House Ethics Committee is not a suggestion. It is a lawful demand for information needed by the House to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities to enforce the official code of conduct, adjudicate violations, and to impose appropriate discipline.

The investigative subcommittee in the matter of Representative Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick repeatedly sought documents and testimony from Mr. Joseph, yet he failed to comply with voluntary requests for information and multiple subpoenas in the 118th and 119th Congresses.

While other witnesses did not fully cooperate with the committee's investigation, Mr. Joseph's conduct went further. Twice he failed to appear for subpoenaed testimony in the current Congress, and he was made aware numerous times that his failure to comply with the subpoenas could result in contempt proceedings. He had notice of and was properly served all the subpoenas by the investigatory subcommittee, and he never asserted any valid privilege or basis for noncompliance.

The bipartisan investigative subcommittee unanimously found, and the full committee agreed, that his conduct was contemptuous. His noncompliance also unnecessarily and significantly delayed the committee's investigation.

Contempt referrals like these are a rare step because almost all subpoenaed witnesses cooperate with the committee before contempt proceedings need to be initiated.

But the rareness of this step should not obscure its importance. The effectiveness of the committee's oversight hinges on the expectation that subpoenas cannot and will not be ignored.

This contempt resolution is not intended to be a punitive measure. It is a deterrent to future noncompliance and obstructive conduct by witnesses in future investigations.

With this resolution, we can establish a clear and necessary boundary for future witnesses. If you are subpoenaed by the committee, you cannot simply decide that compliance is optional.

By demonstrating that noncompliance has consequences, this resolution

will empower the Ethics Committee in its continued efforts to uphold civic confidence and the integrity of this body.

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

□ 1520

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM).

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this to the floor today.

Whenever I tell people I am on the Ethics Committee in Congress, people tend to ask me the same questions: Why doesn't the Ethics Committee move faster? What is taking so long? Why are these investigations taking so long? Justice delayed is justice denied.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons is because a lot of times witnesses and people with information string our committee along. Even their lawyers tell them to ignore our subpoenas, ignore our inquiries, or delay us as much as possible.

This subpoena, in particular, was issued September of last year, and that was after a very long process of trying to get this witness in, going back to before I was even in Congress. That was more than 2 years ago. There have been multiple requests, multiple failures to appear.

If we don't enforce these subpoenas, then everyone will ignore our investigations. They will string us along, and they will draw out these investigations for months or sometimes years, like in this case, and the American people will lose faith in this body's ability to investigate our own.

The Ethics Committee will never be as fast as the news cycle, and we will afford everyone due process. Today's vote is a message that we, as a committee, do intend to move swiftly in these investigations. It is a message that Congress does intend to hold people accountable if they don't comply with our subpoenas, whether it is Members or people with information.

I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on this, and I ask the body to support this motion.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I move that the rules be suspended and that this body agree to the resolution printed in House Report 119-693 regarding proceedings against Michael Joseph, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1504.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND HECTOR ROOS IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1505) which is printed in House Report 119-694, regarding proceedings against Hector Roos and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1505

*Resolved*, That Hector Roos shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with the subpoena *duces tecum* issued to him August 12, 2025.

*Resolved*, That Hector Roos shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with the subpoena *ad testificandum* issued to him August 12, 2025.

*Resolved*, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the Report of the Committee on Ethics, detailing the refusal of Hector Roos to produce documents and appear before the Investigative Subcommittee as directed by these subpoenas to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Roos be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoenas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution printed in House Report 119-694.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I reemphasize my comments made earlier regarding these matters and would urge adoption. At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution holding Hector Roos in contempt of Congress for his failure to comply with duly authorized subpoenas issued by the Committee on Ethics.