

118th Congress }
2nd Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND
ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN IN CONTEMPT OF
CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH
A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
ACCOUNTABILITY

FOR THE
COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 10, 2024

Serial No. CP:118-7

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: govinfo.gov,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

54-532 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2024

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RO KHANNA, California
GARY PALMER, Alabama	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	KATIE PORTER, California
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	CORI BUSH, Missouri
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
PAT FALLON, Texas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	GREG CASAR, Texas
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	
MIKE WALTZ, Florida	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

JAMES MANDOLFO, Chief Counsel for Investigations

JAKE GREENBERG, Chief Counsel for Investigations

RYAN GIACHETTI, Counsel

CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy Director

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

ORDER OF BUSINESS

	Page
Meeting held on January 10, 2024	1
Committee Assignments Approved	1
Resolution Reported	2

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Letter, from Jan 6 Committee to Rep. Biggs; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Letter, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Brooks; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Letter, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Jordan; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Letter, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. McCarthy; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Letter, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Perry; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Article, *Washington Examiner*, “Archer says one Dem claim about Biden business is ‘categorically false;’” submitted by Chairman Comer.
- * Fourth Bank Records Memo; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- * Article, *The Hill*, “Eric Swalwell and the politics of contempt”; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- * Subpoena, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Biggs; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Subpoena, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Brooks; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Subpoena, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Jordan; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Subpoena, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. McCarthy; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Subpoena, from Jan. 6 Committee to Rep. Perry; submitted by Rep. Moskowitz.
- * Article, CNN, “USCP says shooting of January 6 rioter Ashli Babbitt lawful”; Rep. Raskin.
- * Press Release, DOJ, DOJ Closes Investigation into Death of Ashli Babbitt; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Rep. Raskin tweet; submitted by Rep. Greene.
- * Statement for the Record; submitted by Rep. Connolly.

The documents listed are available at: docs.house.gov.

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND
ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN IN CONTEMPT OF
CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH
A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
ACCOUNTABILITY**

Wednesday, January 10, 2024

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Cloud, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, LaTurner, Fallon, Donalds, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, McClain, Fry, Luna, Langworthy, Burlison, Waltz, Raskin, Norton, Lynch, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Porter, Bush, Gomez, Brown, Stansbury, Garcia, Frost, Lee, Casar, Crockett, Goldman, Moskowitz, and Tlaib.

Chairman COMER. The Committee will please come to order. A quorum is present.

Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 5(b) and House Rule 11, Clause 2, the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

The first order of business is ratifying the new Subcommittee roster. The clerks have distributed the roster electronically. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee approve the appointments and assignments as shown on the roster.

Without objection, the Subcommittee roster is approved.

The Chair also notes that points of order pertaining to the engaging of personalities against the President will not be in order for the duration of this markup. Given the underlying subject matter of Hunter Biden's subpoena and this Committee's investigation, Members must be allowed to speak frankly.

Now, pursuant to notice, I call up a report containing a Resolution Recommending That the House of Representatives Find Robert Hunter Biden in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply With a Subpoena Duly Issued by This Committee. The clerk will report the report, which has been distributed in advance.

The CLERK. A report containing a House Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Robert Hunter Biden in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by this Committee.

Chairman COMER. I ask unanimous consent that the report be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to the contempt report, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the report.

Today, the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability will consider a resolution and report recommending the House of Representatives find Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress for his refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by the Committee.

The House Committees on Oversight and Accountability and Judiciary issued subpoenas to Hunter Biden for a deposition to be conducted on December 13, 2023. On December 13, Hunter Biden failed to comply with the deposition subpoenas relevant to the House of Representatives' impeachment inquiry and the Committees' oversight investigations. Instead, Hunter Biden appeared on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol where he read a short, prepared statement without taking any questions from the media.

Our investigation has produced significant evidence suggesting President Biden knew of, participated in, and benefited from his family's cashing in on the Biden name. Based on witness testimony, Joe Biden was the brand his family sold around the world to enrich the Biden family. The Bidens and their associates raked in over \$24 million from 2014 to 2019 from countries like China, Russia, Romania, and Kazakhstan. Witness testimony confirms then Vice President Biden met, spoke by phone, dined, and had coffee with his family's foreign business associates. President Biden has repeatedly lied to the American people about speaking with his son's associates. We have also traced how money from the Biden's China deals and other influence peddling schemes landed in Joe Biden's personal bank account.

We planned to question Hunter Biden about this record of evidence during our deposition, but he blatantly defied two lawful subpoenas. Hunter Biden's willful refusal to comply with the Committees' subpoenas is a criminal act. It constitutes contempt of Congress and warrants referral to the appropriate United States Attorney's Office for prosecution as prescribed by the law. We will not provide Hunter Biden with special treatment because of his

last name. All Americans must be treated equally under the law, and that includes the Bidens.

I now recognize Ranking Member Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that everyone subpoenaed by Congress, whether it is Hunter Biden or Jim Jordan or Andy Biggs or Steve Bannon or Scott Perry, should engage in good faith compliance with the Committee's requests and the Committee's subpoenas. We are here today because the Chairman has bizarrely decided to obstruct his own investigation and is now seeking to hold Hunter Biden in contempt after he accepted the Chairman's multiple public offers to come answer the Committee's questions under oath before the American people. This is at the same time that they stand by the categorical noncompliance of Republican Members of Congress, like Mr. Jordan, who will have material information about extremely violent attack—

[Disturbance in hearing room.]

Chairman COMER. One moment. The cameras cannot be in the well. Cameras cannot be in the well. Cameras cannot be in the well.

Proceed, Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you. I was just making the point that our colleagues who are arraigning Mr. Biden today on charges that he has not rendered 100 percent compliance, allegedly with a subpoena, are standing by Republican colleagues who have rendered zero percent compliance with their subpoenas, including Mr. Jordan, Mr. Biggs, and Mr. Perry, when they have material information about the violent attack on the Capitol, the Congress, and the Vice President of the United States on January 6, 2021.

In any event, for the last 11 months, the Chairman has repeatedly refused offers from Hunter Biden's attorney to meet with the Chairman and his staff and with Members of this Committee. On February 9, just 1 day after the Chairman's first letter to Hunter Biden, Mr. Biden's lawyer responded and offered Chairman Comer to "sit with you and your staff, including the Ranking Member and staff, to see whether Mr. Biden has information that may inform some legitimate legislative purpose and be helpful to the Committee." The Chairman never responded.

On September 13, Mr. Biden's lawyer again wrote to Chairman Comer after a Newsmax interview in which the Chairman falsely claimed that he never got a response back to his original letter. Mr. Biden's attorney explained the Chairman actually never responded to his offer to sit down and discuss the Committee's request but stated that he remained available to have the discussion, but the Chairman, again, completely failed to respond.

Two months later, on November 8, Chairmen Comer and Jordan issued subpoenas to Mr. Biden requiring his appearance for a deposition on December 13. In the cover letter, the Chairman noted, "Given your client's willingness to address this investigation publicly up to this point, we would expect him to testify before Congress." Throughout the fall, the Chairman urged Mr. Biden to come up here at a public Committee hearing on September 13th. On Newsmax, the Chairman stated Hunter Biden is more than welcome to come in front of the Committee. If he wants to clear his good name, if he wants to come and say, you know, they were not

20 shell companies, he is invited today. We will drop everything. On October 31, on a nationwide podcast, the Chairman stated, “We have mountains of evidence. Now we are ready to bring them in. We are in the downhill phase now because we have so many documents, and we can bring these people in for depositions or committee hearings, whichever they choose, and we can ask these questions with evidence.”

On November 6, again on Newsmax, our good Chairman stated, “I will extend that invitation on your show right now, Rob. If the Biden family wants to join Tony Bobulinski in an official Oversight Committee hearing and answer questions that the American people have, then that invitation is open right now. They can come on in and do that.” On November 28, Hunter Biden, through his lawyer, agreed to Chairman Comer’s multiple public requests. He agreed to appear precisely at a public hearing under oath to answer the Committee’s questions on December 13, exactly what our good colleagues, the Republicans who had information about January 6, never agreed to do. They never agreed to testify anywhere under oath about what they knew.

The letter that came in from Mr. Biden embraced the importance of having a public proceeding that “would prevent selective leaks, manipulated transcripts, doctored exhibits, or one-sided press statements, especially in light of the Committee’s past use of closed-door sessions to manipulate, even distort the facts and misinform the public.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an inquiry.

Chairman COMER. State your point.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, don’t we have House rules and Committee rules regarding subpoenas, and then rules about having hearings and having questions with witnesses, that must be followed?

Chairman COMER. We do.

Ms. GREENE. Please state the rules, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RASKIN. Chairman Comer, I would like to reclaim my time.

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Hold on.

Mr. RASKIN. We can just interrupt each other if there was an inquiry?

Chairman COMER. Your time was expired.

Ms. GREENE. I would like to know the rules of the House and our Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. They are available to every Member.

Chairman COMER. The rules state for a deposition, if that is what you are asking, 3 days’ notice. You have to have the stenographer and all of that. So that is—

Ms. GREENE. Just to clarify, we cannot have someone just walk in—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Raskin’s time has expired.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, a point of inquiry.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I did endure multiple interruptions in my opening. Could I finish with the—

Chairman COMER. You went over your 5 minutes, but I will give you 30 more seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. The Chairman refused to take yes for an answer from Hunter Biden. Instead on December 1, they pulled a bait and switch. They changed the terms of their request. They rejected his offer or his acceptance of their offer and insisted that he now come in and sit for a secret closed-door deposition. On December 6, Hunter Biden's lawyer reiterated that Hunter Biden was willing to accept the Chair's original request and once again offered to appear on December 13, or any other date in December to answer any questions pertinent and relevant to the subject matter. He again raised concerns about closed-door sessions.

That is what brings us to today, Mr. Chairman. He has materially, substantially in good faith complied with what your requests were.

Chairman COMER. He complied with a subpoena.

Mr. RASKIN. We would have—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. We would have loved—

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Chairman Comer. First of all, my first question is who bribed Hunter Biden to be here today? That is my first question. Second question, you are the epitome of white privilege coming into the Oversight Committee, spitting in our face, ignoring a congressional subpoena to be deposed. What are you afraid of? You have no balls to come up here, and—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, point of inquiry.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman—

Chairman COMER. The lady is recognized—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. If the gentlelady wants to hear from Hunter Biden, we can hear from him right now. Mr. Chairman, let us take a vote and hear from Hunter Biden. What are you afraid of?

Ms. MACE. I am speaking. Are women allowed to speak in here?

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Hold on. Order. Order.

Ms. MACE. Are women allowed to speak in here, or no? Are women allowed to speak in here?

Chairman COMER. Order.

Ms. MACE. You keep interrupting me.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I will interrupt the Chairman. I do not know that he is a lady.

Ms. MACE. I think that Hunter Biden should be arrested right here right now and go straight to jail. Our Nation is founded on the rule of law—

Mr. MFUME. Come on. Come on. Come on.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. And the premise that the rule of law applies equally to everyone, no matter what your last name—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Point of order.

Ms. MACE. It does not matter who you are.

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Biggs over here.

Chairman COMER. State your point, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. My point of order is this. Are we going to continue on with this blatant interruption? This is absurd and inappropriate. I intend to give my statement. I do not intend to have anybody interrupting. I am not going to interrupt your statements. I

think you should have decorum and courtesy and do not act like a bunch of nimrods.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. You just interrupted a woman.

Chairman COMER. And that is five—I gave everyone else 5 minutes.

Mr. MFUME. Can we agree that everyone gets 5 minutes?

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order again. The assertion that I interrupted was absolutely false. That is typical of the gentleman who spoke it. I have got permission to speak from the Chairman. I spoke. I was interrupted yet again by the gentleman who does not choose to go through the Chair and follow proper order. I encourage us, I think if we are going to have any respect at all, we need to have proper decorum.

Chairman COMER. Well said. Well said.

Ms. MACE. I would like to finish.

Chairman COMER. The rules are everyone is going to be recognized for 5 minutes. Anyone that wants to be recognized will be recognized for 5 minutes. Ms. Mace has 4 minutes and 13 seconds left. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. It does not matter who you are, where you come from, or who your father is, or your last name. Yes, I am looking at you, Hunter Biden, as I am speaking to you. You are not above the law at all. The facts in this case are crystal clear. This Committee used and issued a lawful subpoena to Hunter Biden, a critical witness in this Committee's investigation into Biden family corruption. Hunter Biden and his lawyers did not claim privilege of any kind, because clearly, he has none. They did not contest the legitimacy of our reasons for issuing the subpoena, no reasons because they clearly are legitimate, and yet he refused to comply.

Trump's family members, Don Trump, Jr., he did not defy a congressional subpoena. He showed up multiple times for multiple depositions for several hours. In doing so, you know, Hunter Biden broke the law. He did so deliberately. You did so flagrantly. You showed up on the Hill on the Senate side the day of that congressional subpoena to defy it and spit in the face of this Committee. That is what you did. The question the American people are asking us is, what is Hunter Biden so afraid of? Why can't you show up for a congressional deposition? You are here for a political stunt. This is just a PR stunt to you. This is just a game that you are playing with the American people. You are playing with the truth.

Hunter Biden was not afraid to sell access to Joe Biden to the highest bidder when he was in elected office. He was not afraid to trade on the Biden brand, peddle influence, and share those ill-gotten gains with members of his family, including Joe Biden. He was not afraid to compromise the integrity of the presidency and vice presidency by involving Joe Biden's shady business deals with our foreign adversaries. But Hunter Biden, you were too afraid to show up for a deposition, and you still cannot today.

I believe that Hunter Biden should be held completely in contempt. I think he should be hauled off to jail right now because it was not long ago, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, that you also believed in the power of a congressional subpoena. Not long ago at all, you believed in holding those who refuse to comply with a congressional subpoena accountable, and I stood with each

and every one of you. I am the only Member in this room today who has held a Member of my own Party in contempt of Congress for not showing up for a subpoena, and I see nothing but complete hypocrisy on the other side of the aisle. The Ranking Member of this Committee even so eloquently put it: "The lesson is, please tell your children out there in America, if you get a subpoena to go before Congress, go. You have a legal responsibility to do so."

So, the hypocrisy is stunning. What are we to tell our children today? There is nothing the other side can say with a straight face. As the only Member of this Committee to vote to hold a Member of contempt of my own Party, let me be clear: this should not be a partisan issue. If Congress issues a subpoena, you show up, period. This is not a responsibility we take lightly. It brings no joy for us to do this, but the President's son broke the law and must be held accountable in the same way anybody else would. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so. And my last message to you, Hunter Biden, you play stupid games, you win stupid prizes.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentlelady yield for a question? Would the gentlelady yield, will my friend yield from South Carolina?

Ms. MACE. Sure.

Mr. RASKIN. I do want to commend the gentlelady, who was the only Republican who stood up and voted to hold in contempt the Republican Members of the House who blatantly and categorically refused to comply with subpoenas that came from the bipartisan January 6 Committee. I would like to ask my friend, Ms. Mace from South Carolina, whether she is aware of all the case law which says that the Committee has to engage in good faith interaction with the witnesses they have called, and they are supposed to arrive at a solution? And what do you think about the fact that the Chairman on multiple occasions gave this witness the opportunity to come before the full Committee, and he agreed to that?

Ms. MACE. We issued a congressional subpoena, and I know with your constitutional law background, you know exactly what that means, and he should have showed up. And because of your vote and because of your statements, you should be voting to hold this man in contempt of Congress today, right now, if you are going to be consistent on your own policies, in your own words.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is good to see you after a long break. So, I am listening to the gentlelady from South Carolina about the witness being afraid to come in front of the Committee. It is interesting. He is here, does not seem to be too afraid. In fact, for some reason, the Chairman, who on multiple occasions invited the witness to come, on TV, so apparently the Chairman wants to pretend like his statements on television or in interviews do not matter, but it did not happen once. It did not happen twice. It happened multiple times.

The Chairman said the witness can choose whether to come to a deposition or to a public hearing in front of the Committee. The witness accepted the Chairman's invitation. It just so happens the witness is here. If the Committee wants to hear from the witness and the Chairman gave the witness that option, then the only folks

that are afraid to hear from the witness with the American people watching are my friends on the other side of the aisle. I do not know if there is a proper motion, Mr. Chairman, but I will make a motion. Let us vote. Let us take a vote. Who wants to hear from Hunter right now, today? Anyone? Come on. Who wants to hear from Hunter?

No one. So, I am a visual learner, and the visual is clear. Nobody over there wants to hear from the witness. Oh, one. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. Will you yield for a question?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I am not there yet, but I will eventually. So, there is no one, other than one or two, that want to hear from the witness. So, the majority of my colleagues over there, including the Chairman, do not want to hear from the witness with the American people watching. So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to hear from you. Will you acknowledge that you invited the witness on television to choose whether he could come to a public hearing, and do you stand by your words, or do you renege that invitation to the witness?

Chairman COMER. To answer the question, what I have said repeatedly, after the deposition, Mr. Biden can come in front of a public hearing.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to play the video, but that is not what you said on television multiple times, and we have the quotes. We can put them up. You said the witness can choose between a deposition—

Chairman COMER. Listen, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Biden does not make the rules. We make the rules.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, you make the rules, and the rule you made is that he can choose. Those—

Chairman COMER. The rule is—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Those were your words. Reclaiming my time.

Chairman COMER. He was issued two lawful subpoenas.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman. No, you issued those subpoenas after he took you up on your invitation to come. And then you were like, oh, no, no. Oh my God, what did I do? I invited him to come so the American people can hear his side of the story. I put my foot in my mouth. So now I must bury him in the basement where we can decide what we are going to release to the public so that we can continue to tell that story. Mr. Chairman, you have said multiple times that this is not about Hunter. It is about Joe Biden.

And even this morning, on “Mornings with Maria,” she asked another simple question, the question you have been asked multiple times, which is, do you have evidence to impeach the President of the United States. Before you said, “I hope so,” today you said, “I think so,” and the answer is you do not. And you still do not, and so we continue to be here and have these charades.

To my colleagues who talk about lawful subpoenas, I appreciate the gentlelady from South Carolina who voted to hold people in contempt. Listen, I will make this bipartisan. I will vote for the Hunter contempt today. You can get my vote. You can get my vote, but I want you to show the American people that you are serious. Here is the subpoena to Representative Scott Perry, who did not comply. I would like to enter this into the record. Here is the sub-

poena to Mark Meadows, I would like to enter this into the record, who did not comply. Here is the subpoena to Jim Jordan, who did not comply with a lawful subpoena. I would like to enter that into the record. Here is the subpoena to Mo Brooks who did not comply. I would like to enter that into the record. Here is the subpoena to Mr. Biggs who did not comply. I would like to enter that into the record. And here is the subpoena Mr. McCarthy, who did not comply. I would like to enter that into the record.

There is an amendment coming to add some of those names onto the contempt order. You vote to add those names and show the American people that we apply the law equally, not just when it is Democrats, like it is a crime when it is Democrat, but when it is Trump and Republicans, it is just fine. No, show that you are serious and that everyone is not above the law. Vote for that amendment, and I will vote for the Hunter Biden contempt. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia for 5 minutes.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me, Hunter. Apparently, you are afraid of my words.

Ms. MCCLAIN. Whoa. Aww. Aww.

Ms. GREENE. I would like to reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Order.

Ms. MCCLAIN. Wow, that is too bad.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. I think it is clear and obvious for everyone watching this hearing today that Hunter Biden is terrified of strong conservative Republican women because he cannot even face my words as I was about to speak to him. What a coward. And this is also a coward that sat right here in front of Micki Babbitt, Ashli Babbitt's mother, who was murdered on January 6 by Michael Byrd, the Capitol Police officer, and you want to talk about a committee, a political sham.

I totally disagree with you, Ms. Mace. That January 6 Committee was not bipartisan. It was a complete setup to go after President Trump, go after Republicans, go after anyone that believes in free and fair elections, people that believe the Department of Justice should be fair and balanced, not a political weaponized department of the Federal Government that is targeting President Trump, his supporters, people that walked in the Capitol on January 6, and now people that stood outside the Capitol.

There has been no justice for Ashli Babbitt's family. Michael Byrd has never been charged with anything. He was let off, and he was given a promotion and allowed to walk free. And Hunter Biden just walked out. That is an example of not following the law. Hunter Biden thinks he is above the law. Don, Jr., Eric Trump, Ivanka, Trump family members had to come in to Democrat subpoenas and be questioned by Democrats for over 8 hours, each of them. Hunter Biden runs away.

Hunter Biden did not come when we subpoenaed him. He did not follow the law. And then one of our colleagues helped him evade his subpoena by going and reserving a press conference for him, on his behalf, helped him evade the subpoena, helped Hunter Biden

break the law. Let us talk about his own father's words. President Joe Biden said in October 2021 that individuals who defy subpoenas from the January 6 House Select Committee should be prosecuted, and the Justice Department indicted Steve Bannon for doing so in November 2021.

Hunter Biden's father, the President of the United States, said that he should be prosecuted, anyone that defies a subpoena should be prosecuted. Hunter Biden did not show up for his subpoena. Hunter Biden showed up today to make a clown show of himself to show that he is nothing but someone that will not obey the law, that wants to show up when he wants to and sits here with a smug look on his face, and runs away when it is my turn to talk. Not only is he a criminal, but he is a coward, nothing but a coward.

Let us talk about voting for things. We have Members on this Committee that are on record on their own Twitter accounts talking about people blowing off subpoenas on the January 6 Committee that states the rule of law is stirring all over America. That is Representative Jamie Raskin, right here. I will enter this for the record.

Representative Jamie Raskin, "Steve Bannon has been convicted of acting in contempt of Congress. My argument with Rep. Gates is now settled. If subpoenaed, you show up and assert any privilege you think applies to specific questions, but you cannot blow off the proceeding." He blew it off. Walking in today is too late. We have to hold Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress because he is not above the law, and neither is the President of the United States. And this Committee has produced more evidence, more evidence that any Democrat ever dreamed of having against President Trump and his family. While they constantly make up lies and attacks about the Trump family and President Trump, they make them up all day long, it is nothing but a political witch hunt.

This Committee has produced the evidence that Joe Biden has taken payments through his son, Hunter Biden, and all their dozens of fake LLCs. You cannot buy a Biden product, you cannot hire a Biden for a service unless you are a foreign country. And you are asking and paying for political favors and political payouts, and that is exactly what the Biden brand is all about. We will hold Hunter Biden in contempt, and if the Democrats are not the hypocrites that they constantly display that they are, then they will vote for contempt of Congress because they voted for it on every other subpoena that did not go through.

And here is the last thing. You guys had your chance. If you wanted to hold people in contempt of Congress, you could have done it last Congress, but you did not do it. And it would have been a major mistake because you know that it could have been turned exactly back on you. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is really interesting to hear the gentlelady from Georgia speak about Hunter Biden leaving, and she is the person that showed nude photos of Hunter Biden in this very Committee room, showing dick pics in this Committee room of Hunter Biden.

Ms. GREENE. [Inaudible].

Mr. GARCIA. I have my 5 minutes, gentlelady. And so, I think it is really ironic, hypocritical, quite shameful that the person who is complaining about somebody leaving when she is showed nude photos of him to this Committee in this very room.

And you also talk about decorum. You are talking about January 6. You know, Ms. Greene, I was there with you when we went to the January 6 jail and when you are hugging, high-fiving, talking to, and providing so much comfort and joy to the insurrectionists that attacked our Capitol, insurrectionists that attacked our Capitol. You were hugging and giving them all the support—

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has his time.

Chairman COMER. Stop the clock. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia. You have 3 minutes and 50 seconds.

Mr. GARCIA. I want to continue my 5 minutes, and I just want to remind everyone, one, that this is, again, about the Donald Trump revenge show. We are here today, and the Majority is doing this hearing because this is all about Donald Trump and trying to make sure they do everything they can to support him. For weeks, we as Democrats and Republicans and the Chairman demanded a public hearing, and I agree with Mr. Moskowitz, yet, Mr. Chairman, you have denied it.

We want a public hearing. If we need to take a vote or ask unanimous consent, we should hear from Mr. Biden today. That is what the public demands. Democrats are united, we want to see the same thing. And I would like to see a vote to actually have Hunter Biden actually, with unanimous consent, do actually a hearing and address us today if possible.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Biden showed up this morning and was willing to show up weeks ago to appear at a public hearing, which he was led to believe was his option, and today is all about a combination of chutzpah and delusional theory. We just heard some of the delusional theory from the gentlelady from Georgia. But the chutzpah is a bunch of people who defied subpoenas themselves now want to have a contempt citation for the son of the President because they do not have sufficient evidence. In fact, they have no evidence of any kind to pursue the President himself. So, when you cannot go after the principal, try to hurt the people around him, including a wounded member of his own family who has had all too public troubles put before our country. It is mean-spirited, it is cruel, and it is beneath the dignity of this Committee and this body.

If you want to have political differences with the President of United States, our system invites it, but resorting to punitive measures against members of his family because you cannot get at him, I think crosses a boundary. And by the way, I counseled Democrats in the previous Administration to take great care in going after members of President Trump's family because I felt the same dynamic at work.

So, I would urge that we give real serious consideration to the matter at hand, that we show more respect for the President and his family, whoever that President may be at any given time, and that we respect due process, and we hold ourselves to the same

standard we are asking this body to act on today, in terms of a contempt citation. We have let many of our fellow Members off the hook in defying the January 6 subpoenas. I yield to Mr. Raskin.

Mr. GARCIA. Can I have the rest of my time? Just, Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Biden has agreed to address this Committee publicly. I just want to ask unanimous consent to swear in Mr. Biden either today or at a future meeting and have every Member be able to ask 5 minutes of questioning to the witness. So, I would like to officially ask that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Yes, we object to that, not in order.

Mr. GARCIA. How is that not in order?

Chairman COMER. It is just not in order. The time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to remind Members of this Committee, anybody watching, that this is a duly constituted Committee, under the rules of the House of Representatives, duly constituted. You see Republicans on this side and Democrats on that side. The Democrats on that side were selected by their leadership and their process. Same thing for the Republicans on this side.

Why do I mention that? Why do I bring that up? Because this is a stark difference from what is being referenced on the other side of the aisle. This so-called J6 Committee, which was nothing more than a Soviet show trial in America. That is what that was. And so, every single action that they took, subpoenaing people, disparaging people, referring charges of people, were not legitimate. Were not legitimate. So, to compare what is happening today to what happened years ago, it is completely out of context. You need to understand that. This is a game for these folks. Sure, they want to support their guy. They do not care about America. They do not care about what the President is doing to destroy America. They are just locking horns, locking arms to support their guy, and God bless them, they can do that. If you want to vote for people that do that, that is your right.

Now, in my opinion, this Committee is not interested in prosecuting Hunter Biden, not interested in that. Hunter Biden is a sad tale by his own right, by his own admission, by leaving his evidence all around for everybody to see. The other side complains that documents and photographs are shown in this Committee about Hunter Biden. Do not blame the person that showed the documents or the photographs. The person that committed the acts is the person who is responsible for the acts.

And we do take no joy because it is a waste of time to prosecute Hunter Biden, but he created this for himself, along with the rest of his sad tale of his life, unfortunate that it may be. But we, in this Committee, on both sides of the aisle, on behalf of the American people, are charged with finding the facts. And the facts show that President Biden profited from his name, and the person that arranged the deals was Hunter Biden. And so, we would like to delve into that.

Now, Hunter Biden, regardless of his last name, even though he thinks he is special, he thinks he can leave evidence all around and blame it on the Russians when he knows it was him. He can go on TV and say that he thinks he is special because his last name

is Biden and that no one will touch him. Ladies and gentlemen, the great thing about America is, is that we are all special because the law is blind to each one of us, regardless of our station, our economic position, or our political position.

Hunter Biden sadly chose to violate Federal law. That is unfortunate, but we are duty bound to do something about it because without law, we have anarchy, and that is what Hunter Biden would like. By coming here today, he shows that he can be here. He displays that he could show up to a lawfully, legitimately presented subpoena, but he chooses not to, and that is his choice. He can do that. But there are consequences for that, ladies and gentlemen. There are consequences for that, and we are duty bound—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentleman yield? Down here, Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. I will not yield. We are duty bound to pursue the consequences of that so that the American people can trust in the system of justice in the United States of America, which they do not right now. They do not trust it, and nor should they because this side of the aisle has made a mockery of it for the last 3 years and beyond that.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield for—

Mr. PERRY. I will not yield. Mr. Biden is not special. He was given a subpoena. He should have appeared. He chose not to. We have no choice. If we are to uphold our oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, we have no choice except to refer charges and find Hunter Biden in contempt. His choice. That was his choice.

Now we have to make our choice, and conflating the so-called J6 Committee, unduly authorized, not a committee. Not a committee. No jurisdiction, no authority whatsoever under the law of anything. To conflate that with these proceedings today is an abomination. My friends on the other side of the aisle know what they are doing, should be ashamed, should be embarrassed but will not be. Regardless, we must forge on for the sake of this republic. I yield the balance.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Goldman for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel like I am an "Alice in Wonderland" after that. Every American receives the same application of the law, and it does not matter what your last name is. So, I guess that means if your last name is Perry, that subpoenas apply to you as well, lawful subpoenas. Now, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania's argument that the January 6 Committee was not a duly constituted committee, and, in fact, he and many others made that same argument to a number of courts of law. The courts are charged with interpreting our laws and whether a committee is a duly constituted committee and whether a subpoena is a duly constituted subpoena. And even though my friend from Pennsylvania may not like the fact that a neutral judge, multiple judges, in fact, did not agree with him, it still remains the law of the land, not what Mr. Perry says, not how I would interpret the January 6 Committee, but how every single court of law interpreted it and said it was a validly constituted committee, and every single subpoena issued by that committee

was a duly authorized lawful subpoena, no different than the subpoena to Hunter Biden.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No, unfortunately, sir, you did not yield to me, so I will not yield to you.

The fact of the matter is that subpoenas should apply equally, and for my colleagues to actually claim that we on this side of the aisle are hypocritical because we will not vote to hold someone who has made every effort to comply in every way, other than the specific means of providing the evidence, somehow should be held in contempt when three Members of this Committee refused to comply in any way, shape, or form with a court-determined lawful subpoena, is beyond me.

Now, I find it interesting that my friend from Pennsylvania also chastises us for just supporting our guy, and I wonder how he would define “supporting our guy.” Would he define “supporting our guy” as trying to instigate a coup at the Department of Justice to install a lackey and remove the Attorney General and the deputy attorney general, so that he could keep his guy in office, even though he lost? Is that just supporting our guy? Because that is what Mr. Perry did.

The reality is that we are here because, plain and simple, two reasons: retribution for Donald Trump and the fact that the Republicans have no evidence. And you will hear them talk about evidence. You will hear them say, “We have so much evidence, we have so much evidence,” and we are going to get into some of these details as we go forward. But the reality is that you have been moving the goalposts the entire time because you cannot make any connection, notwithstanding all of your false statements, to the President.

So instead, let us subpoena Hunter Biden because what we will expect is that he will not testify or that he will take the Fifth Amendment because he is under criminal indictment. And then we get to say, ah-hah, all of our specious allegations must be true because if they were not, he would come here and testify. Well, he called your bluff, and now you are scrambling, and now you—

Mr. DONALDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDMAN. No, I will not—

Mr. DONALDS. You sure?

Mr. GOLDMAN. [continuing] And now you are scrambling. Now you are desperate, desperate to find anything to divert attention away from your abject lack of evidence connecting President Biden to any business venture of Hunter Biden’s, to any wrongdoing. So, we are going to hold us here on a contempt hearing because you do not want to see him testify in public. You just want to be able to filter his testimony and closed-door testimony as you have been doing this entire Congress.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I will yield to my Ranking Member. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you. The District Court for the District of Columbia, Judge Kelly, obliterated the argument that Mr.—

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the risk of taking the bait, which is all this is, it is laying a little bait. It might be just too attractive for me, so I got to get in on it maybe just a little bit.

I am intrigued by the assertions of my colleagues, who claimed that the Hunter Biden violation of the subpoena scenario is the same as issuing subpoenas to four Members of Congress. I am intrigued by that. I really am. It is interesting. Had the illegitimate J6 group decided to pursue to enforce its dubious subpoena against me, my counsel was prepared to argue that service of that subpoena was insufficient, and so asserted to counsel for the J6 Committee. Had the illegitimate J6 gaggle sought to enforce its subpoenas, my counsel, and I believe the counsel of each Member of Congress who had been subpoenaed, ostensibly subpoenaed, punitively subpoenaed, would also have asserted successfully a privilege under the Constitution of the United States.

Those questions never rose formally because the now defunct J6 Committee, which has no authority anymore because it passed with the closing of the last session of Congress, I think that that cabal surely understood how its tenuous claims were and chose not to try and enforce its questionable subpoenas. And why do I say that? I say it because in reporting to Reuters, the Committee's own Chairman, Bennie Thompson, said this: "There are some questions of whether we have the authority to compel testimony from Republican colleagues." He knew you did not have that authority, but yet you still try to assert it.

Now, what is the distinction? Well, Hunter Biden has no claim to insufficiency of service of process. Why do we know? Because he stood on the lawn of the Senate the same day that he was supposed to be here and asserted publicly, hey, I am supposed to be somewhere else. I am supposed to be giving a deposition, but I will not do it. I will not do it. Second, Hunter Biden has claimed no privilege against testifying before this Committee or the Judiciary Committee pursuant to the subpoena, except for this privilege that he has claimed throughout his life.

And as the LA Times said about Hunter Biden, "Biden is still on the nepotism gravy train." As the Daily Mail reported, "Hunter admits he got \$50,000-a-month job on the board of Ukrainian gas company Burisma because of his family name." And it goes on and on. Again, the LA Times describes Hunter Biden as a "child of privilege." That is the only privilege Hunter Biden has ever asserted. He asserts not that he should be exempt from testifying because there is some constitutional prescription that even the Chairman of this Committee would agree to as Bennie Thompson agreed to on the J6 Committee's issuance of subpoenas to Members of Congress. No, he does not assert that kind of privilege. He asserts only the privilege that he does not need to come and testify before the U.S. Congress, who has issued him subpoena, his attorneys acknowledged that subpoena, and he personally has acknowledged that subpoena, for the simple reason that he is a Biden.

So where are we? Merrick Garland has authorized pursuing Republicans for contempt of Congress. He must also authorize prosecution of Hunter Biden. Failure to do so on the part of the Attorney General will show his contempt for Congress as well, but it will show even greater contempt for the American people who now rec-

ognize the weaponization of Federal Government and the two-tier system promulgated by Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, to former Chairman Thompson's questioning of his own authority to actually issue subpoenas to Members of Congress, Chairman Jordan requested legal analysis and authorities, but Chairman Thompson never responded. That Committee could have pursued contempt if they thought there was valid subpoenas issued and a warranted contempt citation. They chose not to, their authority expired, and ours is not expired. We should issue contempt. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Three names: Jordan, Perry and Biggs. Not a law firm. Three Members of this body who defied a legitimately issued subpoena upheld by courts of law. I think it is really important to remember that when the word "hypocrisy" is thrown around by some of our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The other thing I think that is really important before I yield to the Ranking Member, Mr. Biden—Hunter Biden

-knows that if he appeared in camera and in secret to be deposed, Republicans would cherry pick what he said and leak it. He preferred sunshine. He preferred to come here out in the open and testify before the entire American public, this body, and everyone watching, and take his chances with public testimony that could not be used to his detriment by cherry picking and distortion. That is and ought to be the right of an American citizen. I yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly, Mr. Connolly. I wanted to introduce for the record, Mr. Chairman, United States District Court for the District of Columbia opinion in *RNC v. Nancy Pelosi*, rendered by Judge Tim Kelly, rejecting, obliterating, and demolishing every argument that we heard from Mr. Perry and Mr. Biggs. Their whole argument seems to be that Republicans were entitled to blow off subpoenas of the U.S. Congress that came from the January 6 Committee because they did not like the committee. They did not think it was legitimate. They thought it was not validly authorized. The courts roundly and uniformly rejected those arguments, so now they purport to render the law for themselves. If they do not want to comply with a subpoena, they will not, and yet they would now hold other witnesses, like Hunter Biden, to a standard they will not accept for themselves, and that is a remarkable thing.

I started off this hearing, Mr. Chairman, by saying we believe that everybody should respond in good faith to the subpoenas of U.S. Congress. Now, Mr. Biden asserts that he responded in good faith to what you repeatedly publicly asked him to do, and he has at least got an arguable, colorable claim that that is true. All the case law I have been able to read, Mr. Chairman, suggests that the Committee is supposed to engage in good faith negotiation with witnesses, which is precisely what the January 6 Committee did.

The dates do not always work out. The times do not always work out. Some people want to assert privilege. Some people do not. There are certain questions that are agreed to or not, so there are negotiations, but as I read at the beginning of this hearing—

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman take a question?

Mr. RASKIN. I will soon as I get to that—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Excuse me. It is my time, Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Connolly. So, why has the Committee not engaged in that negotiation with Hunter Biden? I just do not understand that. I mean, he is the guy who appears to be 99 percent willing to do what you even asked him to do in the written subpoena, but he has given 100 percent good faith compliance with what you repeatedly publicly challenged him to do.

So, I do not understand why you will not meet with them and work it out, which is what every court in the land has said. The courts do not want to be involved in all this stuff, especially when you have got a guy like him who is overwhelmingly complying with what you are asking for, unlike all of these colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who, unfortunately, 100 percent defied the subpoenas of the U.S. Congress, which is what they did. And I do not think those people should be able to vote on any subpoena relating to any witness in this Committee until they render cooperation with the January 6 Committee and come forth and tell us what they know.

Now, there is another point that I need to make, and I want to thank Mr. Connolly for his indulgence here. Our good friend, the gentlelady from Georgia, referred to the murder of Ashli Babbitt. Well, the Department of Justice, the United States Attorney, and the U.S. Capitol Police Inspector General all rejected the idea that there was any—

Ms. GREENE. Point of order, Mr. Chairman, or inquiry.

Mr. GOLDMAN. There is no such thing.

Ms. GREENE. There has never been a court hearing.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, we agree—

Ms. GREENE. Michael Byrd was never charged.

Chairman COMER. Reclaiming order here. The time is Mr. Connolly's. I yield back to Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RASKIN. But I will submit for the record a document entitled, "Department of Justice Closes Investigation Into the Death of Ashli Babbitt." United States Capitol Police: "The USCP Completes Internal Investigation into the January 6 Officer-involved Shooting." I think it was a scandal. It was a tragedy that people died because Donald Trump put them at risk, as many of the former insurrectionists, that are now willing to say publicly that he said you have got to go and you have got to fight and fight like hell, or you will not have—

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. Mr. Connolly's time has expired. Mr. Connolly's time has expired. Mr. Connolly's time has expired. Order. Order.

Mr. RASKIN. I was trying to reclaim the time the gentlelady stole from me. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. We stopped the clock. I watched it. I am paying close attention. I do feel compelled to respond to this. We have engaged in good-faith negotiation. We have offered every witness a narrow scope of topics, documents in advance. They can choose the day. Hunter Biden's lawyer has not engaged with the Committee regarding Hunter Biden.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Waltz, our newest Member, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Did you respond to their letters to offer to cooperate, sir? Mr. Chairman, did you respond to the lawyer's offer to cooperate with the Committee and meet with the Committee?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Waltz for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an incredible first hearing with the Committee—

Chairman COMER. Yes. Welcome to the Oversight Committee.

Mr. WALTZ. It was, but, you know, I mean, this was entirely predictable, I think, what we were going to hear and see today. We saw that Hunter came and staged a PR stunt with my friend from Florida, Mr. Moskowitz, that was clearly organized and recognized. But what I am hearing from the Ranking Member and his colleagues that claim that transcripts are subject to "partisan and twisted leaks and distortions" is incredibly rich.

Let us talk about calling the kettle black. First, the country suffered through an entire impeachment proceeding of a President of the United States because of a false dossier in a SCIF, a compartmented facility, where every hearing and every transcript started with this in an unclassified proceeding, then to have it selectively leaked and lied to the American people to the great damage to this Nation, but then bring it to this Committee.

Because I am new, I watched yesterday as Committee Democrats continue to spin false narratives, several of which went out just yesterday as interviews were ongoing with Hunter Biden's art dealer, which is rich in and of itself, that Congressman Goldman on the other side of the aisle went to the press during the interviews and spun a narrative while it was going on. But he conveniently admitted that 70 percent of the art buyers were Biden donors, so we can go down the line and talk false spin.

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is absurd. That is not the fact.

Mr. WALTZ. But the other thing that we are hearing today, well, Member so-and-so, Congressman so-and-so, Congressman Jordan, they did not comply with their subpoenas, but let us have a quick lesson on the Constitution. Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution, the Speech and Debate Clause, essentially protects all of us from abiding by each other's subpoenas. Otherwise, this body would do nothing but subpoena each other. So, I would encourage my colleagues to look up Article I, Section 6, and look at the case law of the Speech and Debate Clause and why my colleagues rightfully did not abide by that subpoena.

But let us talk about precedent for a moment of a President's son abiding by lawful subpoenas of the Congress. Donald Trump, Jr., came before this body. He came before the House Intelligence Committee, he came before the House Judiciary Committee, he came before the Senate Intelligence Committee twice, he came before the so-called Jan. 6 Committee, all behind closed doors, where lawyers can sit down, both sides of the aisle, and have a conversation, go through documents all under oath, which is the precedent for any committee. Don, Jr. came before committees and came before this body 5 times behind closed doors. What is Hunter Biden afraid of? What won't he do?

And, Ranking Member Raskin, you are going to reap what you sow my friend. I mean, you insisted on depositions for those who appeared before the Jan. 6 Committee. When Steve Bannon agreed to testify publicly, you argued, sir, that he should have to sit for a closed-door interview, just like every other witness. “The way we have treated every single witness is the same. They come in behind closed doors. They talk to the Committee there.” You said on an interview in front of CBS in 2022. But now that Republicans are doing the same process, following House rules, doing the investigating, somehow Hunter Biden, because he is a Biden, should be held to a different standard. At the end of the day, we had a government official and the President of the United States, a Vice President, set up 30 shell companies. Why? What product did those companies sell? Nothing.

Vice President Biden was charged with two countries in his portfolio, China and Ukraine. While the Vice President, his son traveled on official business on Air Force Two and received massive monetary contributions afterwards. We have laws in place, colleagues, that prevent foreign powers from influencing government officials. World policies changed as a result of the dinners, the calls, the text messages that we know President Biden engaged in through his son. We have a duty to get to the bottom of it. We will reference this contempt, and we will see if the Attorney General will uphold a fair standard of the law—

Mr. RASKIN. The time is up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTZ [continuing]. And prosecute Hunter Biden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Crockett for 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. All right. So, we love the Constitution today, and we also want to talk about foreign money coming in. Have you all seen the report that was just produced where this Chairman decided that he was going to block this Committee from receiving additional information about you all’s guy, Trump, and all the money that he took? From what we did receive, we know that Trump got almost \$6 million that we can account for, and we know that there is more there. From China specifically, we found almost \$8 million total that he accepted from foreign governments while he was serving as the President of these United States. But we are concerned about the President’s son.

The President’s son, who has not been involved in his Administration.

I just want to run it back, though, to the very beginning because this is something that I just cannot get over. I cannot get over the gentlelady from South Carolina talking about White privilege. It was a spit in the face, at least of mine as a Black woman, for you to talk about what White privilege looks like, especially from that side of the aisle. And let me quote your now ousted Speaker and what he had to say about the Republican Party and you all’s lack of diversity. “When you look at the Democrats, they actually look like America. When I look at my Party, we look like the most restrictive country club in America.” So let me tell you something, you all do not know what white privilege looks like, but I am going to show you a little bit of something.

You see, you want to talk about a two-tiered justice system, and this is the only time that you all have ever referenced it when this country has a history, when it comes to Black and Brown folk, of having two separate sets of rules.

And right now, what you want to do is have two separate sets of rules because Mr. Moskowitz offered you all a fair situation. He said he would vote for Hunter to be held in contempt. Even if you all remove all of the Members of Congress, there are still other people that you all have not decided, that you all have excuses for, but you all do not want to hold them in contempt, but for some reason, it makes sense to hold Hunter Biden in contempt who has tried to comply.

And let me tell you why nobody wants to talk to you all behind closed doors: because you all lie. That is just the bottom line. You have done it thus far in this investigation. You have done it thus far as it relates to this Committee and every single hearing, you all spin, spin, spin. I do not know how you all are still standing right now because you should be quite dizzy from all the spinning that you are constantly doing when it comes to spinning the truth. You talk about free and fair elections, but you back a guy who we know tried to steal the election.

And this is not about what Democrats have to say. Let me remind you, for those of you that do not know, how the justice system works. It is not a matter of the President went in and indicted Trump, but we are talking about grand juries. Grand juries are comprised of American citizens, and the people that have entered pleas of guilty that will be flipping on your leader in a minute. They are Republicans—I do want to point that out—and half of them were Republicans that were handpicked by Donald Trump himself.

So, to be clear, whatever happens to your little leader is going to be because of the actions that he took. So, you can talk all you want to about how January 6 was nonsense, but all of you all were running. At that time, you all were grabbing you all's gas masks, and you all were running to your offices because you did not know that they were coming to kill you. You should have cared that somebody was there to protect you, but instead, you want to play games because you found out that it was your leader that decided that he wanted to propagate an insurrection on our country. So do not tell me that you care about the Constitution because you do not. All you care about is Trump getting reelected. And I will yield the last of my time to my leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Ms. Crockett, for your eloquent and powerful and irrefutable remarks. I would like to just add a couple of points to what you have said. On January 6, Senator Ted Cruz described it as terrorism. They later came to attack him during their revisionist Orwellian, Stalinist attempt to rewrite history. Unfortunately for them, we know that 147 or 48 of our officers were wounded, bloodied, and hospitalized by the rabid mob that beset the Capitol that day.

We know that Kevin McCarthy, one of their deposed leaders over on their side, called Donald Trump from his office to complain about how his people were storming the Capitol and putting people's lives in danger. And Donald Trump said, no, no, those are not

my people, those are Antifa, and McCarthy corrected him and said, no, those are your people, Mr. President, to which Donald Trump said, well, maybe they just care a little bit more about who won the election than you did, Kevin McCarthy. You guys have got to deal with reality here.

By the way, the Speech and Debate Clause stands for the exact opposite principle, who our distinguished new Member just spoke about a moment ago. It says that Members of Congress cannot be questioned anywhere else other than Congress, so you should read the Speech or Debate Clause aloud.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, point of order. Mr. Chairman—

Chairman COMER. Let him finish his sentence there. Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Burchett from Tennessee for 5 minutes.

Ms. GREEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues even will not talk about the justice system, so let us talk about it. November of last year, the Chairman issued a subpoena to Hunter Biden to appear on December 13 for a closed-door deposition. Instead of respecting the rule of law, Hunter Biden chose to give a press conference on the front steps of the Senate. To show such contempt for Congress without fear of repercussions highlights a theme throughout this Administration and Democrat administrations before it. If you are a big-name Democrat, then you are immune to prosecution. Former Attorney General Eric Holder said as much in a memo he wrote regarding collateral consequences.

For those who do not know, the collateral consequence policy allowed prosecutors to consider whether charging a company or individual results in greater societal harm than not charging them. It is why the banks were not held criminally accountable to the fallout of the 2008 financial crisis. It is why Jeffrey Epstein's clients are not behind bars. Is also the mindset of President Biden and his family: too big to jail, not too big to fail, too big to jail.

The two-tiered justice system is a disgrace to our country and the principles it was founded on. I thank the Chairman and the Committee for the hard work they put into hold the Biden Administration accountable, but I doubt our Justice Department has the guts or the wherewithal to do anything about it. And I would like to yield my time to my friend from Florida, Byron Donalds. Actually, let me yield to Ms. Mace. She has not gotten enough quality TV time today, so I will give her a little more time.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, and then I will yield to my colleague from Florida. So, I am going to try to be quick here because I was accused by my colleague on the other side of the aisle about my White privilege. I want to say, No. 1, as the former Ranking Member of the Civil Rights Subcommittee under Chairman Raskin last session, I take great pride as a White female Republican to address the inadequacies in our country. I come from a district where rich and poor is literally Black and White, Black versus White on most days. My largest jail in my district, which is the largest jail in the state of South Carolina, has had 7 or 8 deaths in the last 2 years, and I was there with our Black and African American council members trying to get the right thing done. And I come from a district where Black men had been killed by law enforcement, tased to death in our jails. And I have stood with those Black families be-

cause I know the differences that they see day to day in their life, and I try to do the best that I can.

I come from a district where the first African American, first Black man in the U.S. House of Representatives was Joseph P. Rainey—represented my district back in the 1800s with that. The last Black Member of the U.S. House of Representatives before Reconstruction came from South Carolina, George P. Murray, a Black man, former slave, an entrepreneur who founded the Republican Party in South Carolina. One of the founding members was named Robert Smalls, who commandeered a Confederate ship and gave it to Union soldiers and served his country admirably in the process. In my district was Harriet Tubman, and you can see it in the movie “Harriet,” who rescued more than 700 slaves in one night in Beaufort County, South Carolina.

So, I am very well aware of our rich history and try to recognize it as best as I can in the position that I have, and I resent the fact that you are going to throw that in my face up here. I am one of the few people that you will see on my side of the aisle trying to do the right thing to the right people every single day. And I would like to yield the remaining balance of time to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. This has been a very interesting hearing. Mr. Waltz, welcome to Oversight. Yes, it usually gets like this. Let us be very clear. This is not about Hunter Biden’s White privilege. This is about Hunter Biden’s Democrat privilege because Donald Trump Jr. showed up for five congressional subpoenas. There was never this circus where he was subpoenaed by House Democrats and he showed up on the Senate side or showed up at the White House to answer in some fake, phony, lame press conference, not actually going to the House and doing what he was compelled by a subpoena to do. Hunter Biden did that.

And then he has the unmitigated gall to show up here when we know that we are going through, actually, the legislation for contempt, which by the way, Mr. Chairman, we should actually get to the legislation of contempt. Speechifying is great, but let us do our business, Members. He has the gall to come here, show up, and then when the Democrats are saying, hey, he wants to speak, he leaves. This is a joke. This is a farce. The man has been subpoenaed by Congress.

Oh, and by the way, the January 6 Committee, Mr. Raskin, which you did sit on, by the way, that was not a normally ordered committee of Congress because Nancy Pelosi did not want the Republican Members that then Leader McCarthy put up.

Mr. RASKIN. According to the courts, it was.

Mr. DONALDS. It is my time, sir. Be quiet.

Mr. RASKIN. But would you yield for a correction?

Mr. DONALDS. I will not. I was respectful of your time. I did not say anything. So, ladies and gentlemen, let us move forward with our business. He should be held in contempt. There was a subpoena. He did not answer it. Any other American would be held in contempt by Congress, any other. This is Democrat privilege of the highest order. Let us do our jobs. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Ocasio-Cortez from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to address briefly, quickly, that moment about privilege and all of this that we are seeing here. It was a very beautiful speech by the gentlelady, who, as she mentioned, helped lead the now Majority side's Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Subcommittee. But I think it is so exemplary of the point that she also oversaw the elimination of the Civil Rights Subcommittee on this Committee, which really kind of gives the whole game away.

We show up, we give speeches, we give flowery words, but at the end of the day participate in the structural erosion of the rights and representation of people that are marginalized—women, people of color, people that just need to see their due process and civil liberties protected in this country—but I will move on.

Also, the Republican side had mentioned in their many raisings of the January 6 Committee, that it is not just Hunter Biden, you, me, any individual subject to equal treatment under the law, to be held up to accountability under the law, but it is also these committees and this Committee that is subject to oversight and law. We must comply with the law here as well.

Now, I may be one of the very few people that actually believes in Congress, you know, in this country, but I do, and many of us do here. And we have an obligation to engage in good-faith participation, to execute and comply with a subpoena. The Chairman said in front of the country several times to Hunter Biden, you can show up here in front of the world, in front of the public. Hunter Biden took him up on that offer. He said, I will show up in public. I will show up in public. He showed up here today. He showed up here in the past.

And, Mr. Chairman, I know you do your best with what you have got, but you have got Members here that has submitted falsified evidence to the record, you have Members here that have submitted in mischaracterized closed-door hearings. And people want to say back and forth, at the end of the day, it does not matter what Party it has happened from. You have got Members who have engaged in revenge porn in this Committee. So, it is understandable why Hunter Biden would want to testify in front of the public for the American people to be able to witness that testimony for themselves. You have got Members who have defied subpoenas. You have got Members, who, we are 1 year into the term, asking what the rules are at the beginning of the Committee. The book was given to us on day one, and so what we should do is allow the man to testify.

I believe in the power of the Oversight Committee. Frankly, I believe in it, regardless of whether Republicans or Democrats have the Chair, because I believe that this Committee should have the power of oversight, and we cannot do that on a partisan basis. And so, for that, I implore this Committee to allow Hunter Biden to testify publicly. I implore and I ask for that to happen, and we cannot do that by getting engaged in this back and forth on a defiance of the subpoena. Let him comply. Let him do it today, let him do it tomorrow, but let the man do it. And with that, I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I think you went right to the heart of the issue here. You know, if this ended up

going to court, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it does not. I really hope that this Committee will act in a way to negotiate and achieve a compromise with the witness. But if it goes to the court, it is going to present a novel question. What happens when a Committee, represented by its distinguished Chairman, goes out in public and repeatedly invites and challenges a witness to come before the Committee, and then that witness gives the answer, yes, I will come in. At that point, the Committee pulls a bait and switch and says, well, we actually do not want you to come before the full Committee as was offered repeatedly in public by the Chairman, but instead, we would like you to come to a backroom and do it there in a closed deposition.

Now, undoubtedly, if that had been the original offer, the Committee would stand in a very good place, the way we did with Mr. Biggs and Mr. Perry and Mr. Jordan, because they were told to come in, they were subpoenaed, and they blew off the subpoenas of the Committee, which is why I do not think anybody should be voting on that side, other than Ms. Mace because Ms. Mace is the one who took the position that the rule of law means something, and I take the position, if we give somebody a subpoena, they should come in. But there is a very sticky problem now. What happens when we give them one offer, A, and then switch it over to offer B? That is why I hope you will work it out, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for yielding.

Chairman COMER. And the gentlelady's time has expired. To respond to the gentlelady, he can come in for a hearing after the deposition. The Chair now recognizes Mrs. McClain for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. So, I just want to bring everything back home. This hearing is a contempt of Congress hearing for Hunter Biden. It is not about January 6. It is not about Mr. Perry. It is not about White privilege. It is a contempt of Congress hearing about Hunter Biden. Although I appreciate the diversion tactics, like my colleague from Florida said, let us get back to our business, which is actually the contempt of Congress.

I also want to thank my colleague, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I agree, let him comply, right? Let him comply, and with our Ranking Member: let us follow the rule of law. So, in contrast, let me read the rules of the Committee, real quickly. It is on page 9 of the rulebook, right? And it talks about notices, notices for the taking of depositions shall "specify the date, the time, and the place of examination." Depositions may continue from day to day. Then you go to Section D: "consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall include,"—listen for it, listen for it—"3 calendar days' notice."

So, although I am sure any defendant would like to come in, and say, judge, I want to come in on this day, and the defendant is going to tell the judge and the legal system how the trial is going to run. Unfortunately, that is not how it works. It is really simple. So, I do agree with you, let him comply. Let him comply with the subpoena that we gave him. He chose not to. So, therefore, we are holding Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress. And I would also like to say, you had the opportunity when you all were in charge to do the same with the Members on our side of the aisle. You did

not do that. That is not our fault. That is yours. So, we are here to talk about Hunter Biden.

For everyone watching today and for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I want to be clear, again, what this hearing is really about. Hunter Biden was subpoenaed to answer Congress, right? That is it. Questions. But he violated Federal law by failing to appear before the Committee. You cannot spin that for my colleague on the other side of the aisle. You cannot spin that.

The bottom line is Hunter did not show up, and he committed a crime. You see, we are a land of laws, and we must follow those laws, and that is what we are here to do today. Instead, he was on the grounds to the U.S. Capitol where he made a public statement without taking questions from the media, conveniently. So instead of showing up for his legal obligation, he showed up just steps away from a hearing room to spit in the face of this Congress. And unfortunately, that is Hunter Biden's MO.

We are merely doing our job. What we are doing here today is showing the country that Hunter will not receive special treatment due to his last name, it is very, very simple, and he will be held to the same standard that every other American citizen would be expected to do. Can you imagine if you are average America, and you get a subpoena and you go in and tell the judge, hey, let me tell you, here is how it is going to work, judge. I am not showing up. I am not showing up. I am going to do it my way. I know we have laws, but, ah, do not worry about those laws because—that would never fly, but that is exactly what Hunter Biden is doing.

And if we care about this institution, if we care about democracy, at some point in time we have to hold the law and people who break the law accountable or, like my colleague said, we are going to have anarchy. So simply put, it is not about anything else. We are talking about Hunter Biden and his noncompliance. And you can get up and scream and holler, and rant and rave. And talk about everything but the fact we subpoenaed—Congress, legally—Hunter Biden, and he chose not to show up. Read the rules. He has to follow the law. I know that is a very foreign concept, but you have to do it, and for the Biden family, you, too, have to follow the laws. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Mr. RASKIN. A quick parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. The gentlelady makes an excellent point about the 3-day notice requirement for subpoenas. I do not think that has ever been complied with in this Committee. Will you commit to—

Mrs. MCCLAIN. That is not my issue. I am just reading the laws.

Mr. RASKIN. No, it is my time, Mrs. McClain. Thank you so much. Would you commit to honor the 3-day notice requirement that Mrs. McClain properly invoked?

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Would I comply?

Chairman COMER. I will say this to answer the Ranking Member's questions, then I will recognize Ms. Stansbury. We have complied with the 3-day.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Well, we might have a dispute about it, but you will continue that going forward. You will continue going forward.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Will you comply?

Chairman COMER. We have followed the rules.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. That is my question. Will you comply?

Mr. RASKIN. We do not have the Chair, Mrs. McClain, and you do not have the time.

Chairman COMER. We have followed the rules. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, it is always a wild and interesting adventure here in the Oversight Committee, and this morning certainly does not disappoint.

You know, I want to talk for a few moments about the resolution that has been proposed in the ANS here because that is what we are here to debate this morning, and really the content of that, including the assertions about the investigation that led to the moment that we are at here today. But I am really glad that my colleague mentioned that we are a land of laws and that every citizen should have to comply with them, including Members of this Committee, not to mention, a Chairman, who was subpoenaed during the last Congress and refused to respond.

So, if we are going to apply these laws, then they must apply equally, I would think, to even Members of this Committee, and certainly to the frontrunner in the GOP's Presidential election, which I will get to in a moment. But let us talk a little bit about this ANS and about the background and correct the record a little bit.

First of all, I want to talk about the evidence that was presented to this Committee as part of this investigation: more than 62,000 pages of records from the National Archives on top of 20,000 pages that were already made publicly available; 30,000 pages of private bank records; 2,000 pages of activity reports provided by the Treasury Department; dozens of hours of testimony from special counsel, U.S. attorneys, DOJ officials, FBI, IRS agents, financial advisors, friends, business partners; evidence provided by the Ways and Means Committee; and expert witness testimony by the GOP's own witnesses right here in this Committee in September, who sat right there at that table and said there was not sufficient evidence to support proceeding with an impeachment. In fact, there are numerous members of the GOP currently serving in Congress who do not believe there is sufficient evidence. So, my question is, where are the receipts? You have reviewed thousands of pages of documents, countless hours of testimony, talked to expert witnesses, including your own witnesses, that cannot provide a single iota of evidence of wrongdoing by this President.

But last week, House Democrats released this. We have the receipts. In fact, they are all right here in the Mazars report. And for any of you that have not dug in on this report, I want to talk a little bit about what this report shows because it is actual receipts from foreign governments who spent \$7.8 million at Trump properties during his presidency while they were actively seeking to influence foreign policy and decisions by the Administration.

Mr. DONALDS. Will the gentlelady yield for a question?

Ms. STANSBURY. So, let us talk about some of the receipts that are in here. Malaysia: over a quarter million dollars was spent by representatives of Malaysia while their ex-President was being investigated for a massive corruption scheme and which Trump's ex-

fundraiser was indicted for illegally lobbying on. Saudi Arabia: tens of thousands of dollars spent by the Saudi government and by the Crown Prince and his staff——

Mr. DONALDS. Do you yield to a question?

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Who later gave \$2 billion to Jared Kushner's private firm. Qatar: tens of thousands of dollars spent by Qatar during what was described as a charming offensive and an arms sale to the Government of Qatar by the Trump Administration. Kazakhstan: thousands of dollars spent by the President of Kazakhstan on a controversial visit, which raised questions about human rights violations, business dealings, and a money laundering scheme involving Donald Trump's properties in New York.

So, my question is, if the GOP actually cares about criminal activity, how about they investigate the receipts that we have right here——

Mr. DONALDS. Can I answer that question?

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. And the evidence of influence peddling by Donald Trump, and a man who is currently facing trial in four jurisdictions on 91 counts of criminal activity, who has been twice impeached by this body and is currently trying to run for President again and which much——

Mr. DONALDS. I would love to answer your question.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Of this Committee has already endorsed. This is not factually based. This is a farce. This is a political stunt, and it is designed to help Donald Trump secure the nomination this November.

Mr. DONALDS. Will you yield to a question?

Ms. STANSBURY. So, let us call it what it is, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield my time back to the Chair.

Chairman COMER. Four seconds, 3, 2. All right. Time has expired.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter information for the record.

Chairman COMER. What is the information? State the information.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. I reserve the right to object. The Minority was not provided a copy of the material for the record. In the past she has displayed pornography. Are pornographic photos allowed to be displayed in this Committee room, Mr. Chairman?

Ms. GREENE. It is not pornography.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. You are the expert. I will——

Ms. GREENE. I am not an expert, Mr. Raskin.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I object to the unanimous consent.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Hold on.

Mr. RASKIN. All you need is one objection.

Chairman COMER. We need decorum. I am going to let the lady state, and then if you object still, we will go from there.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, do not we have an opportunity to review the material before it is provided?

Ms. GREENE. I reclaim my time. Mr. Chair, I reclaim my time. I would like to enter for the record an excerpt from a bank state-

ment, a bank statement that is public in regards to Hunter Biden and his bank accounts and his payments—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Mfume has already objected.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chairman, I object to the Styrofoam board. It is not a document.

Chairman COMER. Reclaiming order. Reclaiming order. Reclaiming order.

Ms. GREENE. Clearly, Democrats today do not want the truth to come out.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, this just means that any Member will be able to add to their 5 minutes by putting on a display of the placard.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter for the record a statement from a bank report that shows proof of Hunter Biden's bank account—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Could we get some order here?

Chairman COMER. OK, OK. Let us hold off on this. There are several objections. We are going to talk, staffs between each other, and then we will go from there, but I understand. I think what you are saying is from the laptop?

Ms. GREENE. Someone on this Committee accused me of revenge porn, and I have a right to respond to that, and I would like to introduce into the evidence for the record.

Mr. RASKIN. But within the rules of the Committee, everyone, Mr. Chairman—

Ms. GREENE. This is important evidence for the record, and it pertains to our investigation into Joe Biden and Hunter Biden, and this comes from—

Mr. GOLDMAN. So, do it behind closed doors like you do it—

Chairman COMER. It does not appear to be bad, but you all—

Mr. RASKIN. But, Mr. Chairman, she has got nine placards here. Does she get an additional 5 minutes or 10 minutes?

Ms. GREENE. But I do not understand how any of you, who support the genital mutilation of children and drag queens showing their body parts at parades, are offended—

Chairman COMER. OK. OK. OK. We are going to reclaim order here. We will suspend and let the staff discuss the evidence from the laptop being entered into the record. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes.

Chairman COMER. OK. Hold on. Hold on. We will suspend, so we need to stop for a moment. OK. Hold on. We will do this. You all are going to discuss.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. Reconvened. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, you have to acknowledge that there is a concentrated effort to deflect and distract. And this is not about January 6, and unfortunately for the Democrats, it is not about Donald Trump. This is about Biden family corruption, plain and simple. And what really gets me is from just an individual and to being an American, is the fact that I disagree vehemently with most of our friends across the aisle when it comes to politics. I will submit that most folks that serve in Con-

gress, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, are not corrupt. They are not on the make. They are not trying to enrich themselves. Hunter Biden is. The Biden family was.

And so, to sit here and defend a fellow that does not merit that kind of defense is just interesting, and, quite frankly, I find it sad as well. And I think he is a coward to come in here with this stunt again because, you know, you can define someone that is all about themselves by the way in which they act, and he clearly does that. That is what we are here to discuss.

So, let us talk about the process because we have been told that, hey, he was here. He is ready to testify. Just let him testify. For the American people, to make it very clear and digestible, when you are deposed in Congress, the Majority gets an hour and the Minority gets an hour, and it can go on indefinitely. So, what usually happens is you can get 100 hours of questions in, you can go drill down, you can get into the efficacy of the procedure because you can go in depth, and you can hold whoever is the witness to account.

If we have just public testimony, what happens here is we all get 5 minutes times, roughly, about 60 equals 300. Doing the math without a calculator, that is 5 hours. So, instead of hundreds of hours, you only get 5. And witnesses are very good with their counsel to deflect and distract and answer really slowly, et cetera. That is why this is about procedure: a hundred hours, 200 hours, and then we can come in to public testimony and ask questions about what we have read and make that public.

He was here. He left, unfortunately, because I would have loved to at least ask questions while he is in the room for the first time. I have never laid naked eyes on the man until just now. But I would have loved to have asked certain questions, like why did he feel special that he could evade paying taxes on millions of dollars of income? Why doesn't he pay it back? I know a lot of it is already outside of the statute of limitations, so he cannot be prosecuted for it, but he can certainly still pay it back. That is a moral obligation that any American has. I would like to ask him what he did, his company did, to "earn" \$3.5 million from Yelena Baturina, who is married to a corrupt oligarch who used to be the mayor of Moscow. What did he do to have Kenes Rakishev from Kazakhstan to wire him \$142,300? The very next day he bought a Porsche. What did he do for Mr. Rakishev? What did he do? Did he get a naked bribe of \$5 million by Mykola Zlochevsky, and did he have any experience in the energy sector prior to his father becoming Vice President because Zlochevsky paid him a million dollars a year?

Interestingly enough, the CFO of Burisma, Vadym Pozharsky, had dinner after he paid Hunter Biden millions of dollars, had dinner with his then-sitting Vice President dad at Cafe Milano. Did that happen because it seems like it did. Did Kenes Rakishev, who essentially bought him the Porsche, he also had dinner with his dad. And, yes, coincidentally, Yelena Baturina as well had dinner with his sitting Vice President father at the time, who I would also like to have asked him, having been an entrepreneur, a businessperson myself, why create 30 shell companies if you have a legitimate business? What did your business do? What services did they provide? What goods did they sell? Who pockets seed

money? I have never met anybody in business that pocketed seed money. It is the lifeblood of your venture. Why did you take millions from foreign entities? Who was the big guy? Mr. Hunter Biden, was it your dad?

“Ten percent for the big guy.” When you said in that WhatsApp message that “I am sitting right here with my father,” was your father really there? Will you give up your geolocations on your phone with your dad so we can determine if you guys were actually in the same room at that time? Why did you email your daughter or text her and tell her about, “Well, I wish I did not have to give 50 percent of my salary to dad.”

This all is just questions that, under a deposition when we have hundreds of hours, we could ask this, and I am only one Member of a committee of 60. I am sure my colleagues would have plenty of questions as well. So, this is what it is about. It is about justice, and think about who you are defending here. He is not worthy of your defense. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Donalds [presiding]. The gentleman yields. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will agree with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, that this is a sad day, but perhaps sad for different reasons. This whole process has become such a sham.

The underlying purpose at the beginning of these hearings was that, as was the title of one of the first hearings we had, a hearing on the basis for an impeachment inquiry against President Joseph R. Biden. And at that hearing, the Republicans and the Democrats had an opportunity to bring witnesses forward that would actually provide evidence to the Committee so that we could make a decision to substantiate or to undermine the call for an impeachment. And we sat in this hearing and the Republicans brought their witnesses in and, I have to admit, witnesses that had considerable experience and expertise and impressive resumes. So, this is the big moment. We ask these expert witnesses that the Republicans had brought in, are there any bases or underpinnings that would warrant an impeachment inquiry at this point? And these witnesses had reviewed almost all of the 14,000 documents that have been provided: transaction reports, Treasury reports.

And I will give you the answers. These are the Republican witnesses. This is Jonathan Turley and I think Bruce Dubinsky who were the consultant. One witness said he “did not believe that any of the current evidence would support articles of an impeachment.” That is the Republican witness that you had your moment. You had your moment to bring in the witnesses—

Mr. GOSAR. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. No, I will not yield. I will not yield. The other witness that the Republicans brought forward against President Biden, he said under questioning he had no basis to even suggest that there was corruption, fraud, or any wrongdoing on the part of the President.

Now, we are all familiar with Hunter Biden, his conduct. There have been explanations of his drug addiction that had been widely publicized, something that maybe a few families of Members of this Committee might be familiar with when people go sideways be-

cause they are addicted to drugs. But the very moment to pursue the underlying purpose of these hearings has been completely diverted. There has been no evidence brought forward against the President of the United States.

And as to this witness, coming here today or his reluctance to submit himself to private investigations can be, I think, credibly explained, given the lack of trust that has surrounded these hearings. There have been story after story about leaks coming from those private interviews, blatant misinformation and disinformation that the Chairman and other Members of the Committee have offered to the press, so-called bombshells. That is what it was on Fox TV, bombshells, turned out to be a dud, turned out to be completely false. But under the auspices of this Committee, those Members, including the Chairman, put out these stories in the press because they could not be refuted. They were not subjected to cross-examination. They were not provided for or provided by any credible witness. It was just made up in the minds of the Chairman or those Members. That is why this gentleman wanted to testify in public so someone could not distort his statements and leaked them wrongfully to the press. The Chairman——

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mrs. Luna for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUNA. This contempt proceeding is about upholding the rule of law. You know, with recently what happened with Jeffrey Epstein and the client lists, we can see that many rich and powerful people, to include people in Washington, were held above the law, and that is simply not fair. And interestingly enough, though, one of the victims of Jeffrey Epstein—Virginia Giuffre—actually vindicated Trump. What you will notice is that the media did not want to cover that, but why is that? It is because it will show a double standard that exists within our justice system, and also the media bias against those, especially Republicans and conservatives, that are simply not guilty of what they are accusing us of.

So, I just want to put this in perspective. The reason we are doing this today is because Hunter Biden failed to comply with our subpoena. Hunter Biden—I do not care about his drug addiction. Yes, you are right. Many of us have experienced some of these awful things impacting our family, but that does not mean that Hunter Biden gets a pass or that we should feel any sympathy for him breaking the law.

I want to just point to behind me, U.S. Code 192, Refusal of a Witness to Testify or Produce Papers. It means that you should be, one, subject to a misdemeanor, a fine up to \$1,000, and anywhere from 1 to 12 months in prison. For your average American that does not have the connections that Hunter Biden has, this is what you face.

So, I want to just point out that when my colleague Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez says we must comply with the law, I agree with you. When Ranking Member Raskin pointed out that Donald Trump's allies should be held—and we should not tolerate these contemptuous violations of the rule of law, I agree with that, but then let us use these exact same standards against their own.

Frankly, I think that as of right now, there is a double standard that exists. We have to hold him accountable. He broke the law.

He will be held accountable, and that is exactly why I am supporting this contempt proceeding. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Tlaib for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am going to yield to our Ranking Member. But before I do, after coming back and being in our districts for so long, no one is asking me about this. They cannot pay their bills. There is a lot of cost-of-living struggle all over our districts, and I just wish we would use this Committee to talk about those issues. I mean, even on having the Sadler folks in here and talking about that, the cost of insulin. I mean, Mr. Chair, I would love to work with you in a bipartisan way to talk about those issues that I think, really, there is responsibility all over the place in regards to the fact that so many of our American residents and communities across the country are struggling. With that I yield to our Ranking Member Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Ms. Tlaib, for your tremendous and enduring devotion to your constituents and the public good of all Americans.

Why are we here, colleagues? Well, between January 2017 and January 2021, we suffered the most lawless presidency of our lifetime. It began by Donald Trump saying that he would keep his more than 500 businesses going—that is right—and he would not divest himself of any of those businesses, and he would not adopt a rule in honor of the Emoluments Clause, consistent with the Emoluments Clause, declining to take money from Saudi Arabia, China, United Arab Emirates, and so on. And then he proceeded, as we have learned, to collect at least \$7.8 million from foreign governments, and that is actually a tiny fraction of what he got because that was only for the first 2 years before the Chairman, in his wisdom, decided to tell Mazars to stop complying with a judicial court order. And so that was all we got was 2 years for four businesses out of more than 500, and that was just for 20 countries out of 195 countries on earth.

But the lawlessness lasted up until yesterday when Donald Trump's lawyer got up before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and asserted that President Trump or any other President for that matter, has a right to order assassinations of his political opponents and not be prosecuted for it, unless he is impeached and convicted first, which is completely at odds with the text of the Constitution, the history of the Constitution, but he asserted a right to assassinate other citizens, unless, first, he is impeached or convicted, which means all you got to do is kill your political opponents, and then kill enough of your political opponents in the House and Senate to keep yourself from being impeached or convicted.

My friends, please do not look at your phones and papers right now. This goes to the heart of the Republic. Take a position on it. Even if you are going to support it, take a position on it. Do not stick your heads in the sand. Donald Trump is doing this to our country. He is asserting the right of the President to murder people and not be prosecuted for it. Well, so why are we here? Well, Donald Trump insisted to numerous Republicans and in public and on Twitter and on Truth Social that Joe Biden be impeached. Why? Well, because Donald Trump was impeached twice, the last time

for inciting a violent insurrection against his own Vice President, against the Congress of the United States, to overthrow an election.

And if you do not believe that, you have got to tell me that if Mike Pence had buckled under to weeks and months of pressure, that Donald Trump would have said, oh no, I was just kidding. I am not actually going to seize the presidency. Come on. If you believe that, you are too innocent to be let out of the house by yourself. So anyway, Donald Trump says I do not want to be the only one running for President who has been impeached. Impeach Joe Biden, figure out something. We were here for a year. You guys did not lay a glove on Joe Biden. You do not have a single credible piece of evidence, not one iota showing any crime by Joe Biden. As Mr. Lynch says, even your witnesses came up and said they did not see it at the one hearing that you had on impeachment. So why are we here? Well, we cannot go after Joe Biden. He is clean. Let us go after Hunter Biden. Let us go get him.

And that is why I am so suspicious of where we are today, Mr. Chairman, because I heard you numerous times say, come before the Committee, come and testify before the world, come and tell everybody what happened, and he took you up and he said yes, and I said, finally, we will get to hear from Hunter Biden. We will get to hear answers to all of those questions, Mr. Fallon posed, but then you would not take “yes” for an answer. You said, no, we want to go to a back room and do it there, and then we will leak out appropriate details, which, of course, we have seen, has allowed for radical distortions of people’s testimony before this Committee. You have not released the vast majority of transcribed interviews that had been in the back room, so we can leak out specific details, so that is not right. That is why we have questions about it.

But I am with Ms. Mace. Let us bring them all in. Let us bring in all the Republicans who still have not testified about what they know about what happened on January 6, and let us bring Hunter Biden in, and let us do that all together. I beat for that. And thank you for yielding, Ms. Tlaib, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Langworthy for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Well, we have certainly had enough distractions here today and a political stunt that we saw here at the beginning of this hearing, Hunter Biden strutting in here like a real tough guy while he refused to sit for a deposition that he had been lawfully subpoenaed to do. It must be embarrassing to have to defend all of this. And we certainly have Trump derangement syndrome on display in a big way in this chamber today.

Over the last year, the Oversight Committee has uncovered a plethora of evidence that is directly pointing at the corruption from Joe Biden and his family. This level of corruption is what you would expect to see in a Third World country, not the United States of America. If the volume of evidence was uncovered on any other influential family in the United States, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would no doubt initiate thorough investigations. Now, just imagine, if Hunter was a Republican. The President’s son does not deserve special treatment, period. Holding Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress is the responsible reaction to his

blatant disregard for Federal law and our duty to investigate potential wrongdoings by the President of the United States.

This Committee has analyzed thousands of pages of bank records, leading to the discovery of \$24 million of wire transfers and payments from foreign companies and foreign nationals directly to this Biden family. Through interviews with Biden family closest associates, the Committee discovered that Hunter Biden used his father's name and influence in meetings with foreign nationals over 20 times. Witness testimonies prove that Hunter Biden dined with foreign individuals from countries such as Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan alongside his father, who was the sitting Vice President of United States, and the list of evidence goes on and on.

The President himself has been exposed for lying. Both the White House and Hunter have used every tool at their disposal to obstruct this investigation and to block the gathering of evidence. This blatant corruption must be held to account. It is one of the major duties of this very Committee, and that is why on September 12, 2023, as a result of this significant evidence against the current President, the Speaker of the House asked the Oversight Committee to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not sufficient grounds existed for the impeachment of President Biden.

Hunter Biden's testimony is a critical component of the impeachment inquiry into whether President Biden or his family personally profited from his office as Vice President or his current role as President of United States, and these facts cannot get in the way. We have got to get on with this investigation and end the distractions that we have heard here today. Let us get this contempt provision put forward, and let us move forward with this impeachment inquiry.

Mr. GOSAR. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman yield?
Chairman COMER. Mr. Gosar is asking you.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. I yield my time to Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Langworthy. Note to the Ranking Member, we are cherry picking, and to Mr. Lynch, we are cherry picking because if you go back to those individuals we had as witnesses, they all said there does not exist that information now, but there exists the potential to be there, and the inquiry is different than an impeachment. It is a search for that document. So, I think we have got to be very, very careful on both sides when we are talking about this, that we give the whole picture, not part of the picture, the whole picture to this.

Mr. RASKIN. And what has been found since then?

Mr. GOSAR. Well, once again, there is stuff there, so——

Mr. RASKIN. I am sorry?

Mr. GOSAR. There is stuff there.

Mr. RASKIN. There is stuff there?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. Can you share it with us?

Mr. GOSAR. Because, yes, because you stack up these random corporations, what are you producing? If I am the manufacturer, I would do that because, I mean, I have different businesses accomplishing that. They had nothing to sell. Some paintings? It was ac-

cess to the President. So now whether that reaches to high crimes and misdemeanors, I do not know. I am not an attorney.

But last but not least—I want to make sure we also get to this—is that you did a process and you stated it. The language has been repeated over and over again. You do this massive hunt with attorneys, not people like dentists or others. You do it with attorneys to gather that information, and then they selectively compile it. You guys get questions, we get questions, and we cover the ground more efficiently. That is why this process works. I agree with you. You do the behind the doors, then you come out here for the public. I think there is no difference there. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Good. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Casar for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Florida, held up a poster board saying we should hold Hunter Biden in contempt because of a provision saying, “refusal of a witness to testify,” but that does not apply in that we have a witness that was here and is willing to testify.

Now, I will give everybody credit here. There seems to be disagreement about whether to do the closed-door deposition, but there is an area of agreement, and the area of agreement is to have a public hearing. And so, what I am interested in—I will yield a minute of time over to you, Chairman, or somebody from the other side—we have been here for hours. And I have still yet to figure out why we do not have Mr. Hunter Biden here to answer our questions for whatever period of time we want in front of the Oversight Committee. So, I want to understand. I want to give Mr. Fallon due credit, from the great state of Texas, for saying, well, he wants to make sure we have enough time. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we could agree to whatever amount of time was necessary.

But I am having a lot of trouble understanding why the Republican majority will not take “yes” for an answer and ask questions of Hunter Biden here publicly. I think we would really learn, because all I have been hearing on TV news is, over and over again, that we need to ask Hunter Biden questions. He is saying we can. Why refuse to have this public hearing—that, it sounds like a minority issue?

Chairman COMER. Are you yielding?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, I am happy to yield you 30 seconds.

Chairman COMER. So, we have obtained thousands of pages of bank documents. We have reviewed 170 suspicious activity reports from banks filed against the Bidens, from my banking background, and that is unprecedented to have that many bank violations that allege very serious things from money laundering to tax evasion to bribery, and we have a lot of questions. We want to treat him like any other witness. He does not get to set the rules. We will depose him. And look, we will split time with Democrats. You all get an equal amount of time with Hunter Biden, then we will have a public hearing.

Mr. CASAR. But I guess my question is, if there is disagreement, and it sounds like there is, around the deposition, why not have the public hearing?

Chairman COMER. We will, after the deposition.

Mr. CASAR. I understand, Mr. Chairman, but nobody has explained to me clearly yet, and I think to your own district, to my district, why not call Hunter Biden in tomorrow? Why not ask him in next week? We are ready to—

Mr. DONALDS. Will the gentleman yield? I would love to answer that question.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, would you yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes. So, I would have loved to depose him right here today. We have rules. We have 3 days.

Mr. CASAR. Let us do it in 3 days.

Mr. GOSAR. My whole point is behind closed doors. I would have gone right now. He is here. He has got his legal representation there. Let us play this game, but we have rules that say you have 3 days.

Mr. CASAR. I am not playing a game. One, I am sure we could waive the 3 days. Second, we could have it here in 3 days if there is agreement about if what we are hearing from the Republican side over and over and over again is they have got questions for Hunter Biden, quotes from this hearing that Hunter Biden's testimony is critical.

Chairman COMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. I want to delve into questions I have for Mr. Biden. Why not ask for those? Why not ask for that tomorrow?

Chairman COMER. The deposition tomorrow?

Mr. CASAR. No. We would have him here in public tomorrow in front of everyone.

Chairman COMER. After the deposition.

Mr. CASAR. I understand you are saying after the deposition, but my question for you is just very clearly, why not have the public hearing tomorrow?

Mr. DONALDS. Will the gentleman yield to that question? Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Mr. CASAR. Yes, sir. And, Mr. Donalds, I want to compliment you because I remember our first Oversight Committee here, and you said it would be good to have these real conversations, so I genuinely—

Mr. DONALDS. I am all for this, Mr. Casar. I actually enjoy this part, if we ever get to it. But the reality is, and you have attorneys on your side of the aisle, there is never any proceeding that takes place without a deposition of the witness. The reason why is because if something comes up in the round of questioning, either A, Members of this Committee may not be prepared because they do not have all the information from the witness because the witness was never given an opportunity with his attorneys present to actually give out that level of information. So, you need a deposition process before you bring a witness into open hearing. This happens all the time. This is actually the protocol of the House. And, Mr. Casar, what your side of the aisle is requesting, with all due respect, is a deviation from the historical precedent of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. I will yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you for moving the ball forward with that explanation. That has been the practice sometimes, not all times. The vast majority of witnesses who come before this Committee come without being deposed first. We come and ask for their testimony. But in any event, even for a witness who is being subpoenaed, like Mr. Biden was, we have a completely different situation when the Chairman goes out publicly and says we will give you the choice, A or B, you can have a deposition or you can come in to a hearing, but I challenge you, I invite you, I insist that you come before the Committee, and repeatedly says that. So that is why I think, legally, it is a very complex question, but I do not see why we take this all the way to court. If you guys really want to hear from him, let us have a public hearing and then depose him afterwards. But he is saying he does not want to be misrepresented. Thank you for yielding.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What should be obvious to the American people, I think we need to just say to the American people, is to point out that this kind of food fight, this kind of the circus that we have experienced is the reason why we want to have a deposition. In a deposition, you do not get people distracting the American public with all these other topics, and during a deposition, they do not get to lie to the American people for 5 minutes at a time. They do not get to distract, they do not get to lie. And they do not get to divert from the facts of what is happening.

But what I see happening is what is being telegraphed here is that they are building a case, a political case, really, because that is what this is. It is all politics that that they are entering into for why the Department of Justice—or giving Merrick Garland an excuse—which we all knew that he probably not prosecute these contempt charges because it would be hypocritical if he did so. He would because he prosecuted Steve Bannon, even though Bannon was actually working for the President and was able to raise the Speech and Debate Clause that was mentioned in the Constitution. Merrick Garland still prosecuted him for that.

Here is that what is really frustrating to the American people, and they see right through this. We are now going through a second process over really the same crimes that were committed when Joe Biden was Vice President, and those crimes include the creation of dozens and dozens of limited liability companies, dozens of bank accounts, when people say, where are the facts? Well, I want to ask, what facts are you looking for, because to me, bank records are facts. Suspicious activity reports are facts. Copies of checks are facts. When you juxtapose that with the WhatsApp message, and what is on the Hunter Biden laptop, and the deposition from witnesses like Mr. Archer, when you add to it further depositions, as we are going to hear about soon, the art dealer, when you layer all that together, that is a compelling story. There is a lot of facts.

And you know what? I would hate to be on the other side of the aisle and try to defend this situation, and so I think that the only outcome would be to distract, to try to make this a political process. But it still stands as a fact that when the Democrats were in

charge, they brought in the President's son. They brought him in multiple times, and they brought him in to depositions, and he agreed. This is what should be the takeaway message to the American people. When the Trump family was asked, they came in and they gave depositions.

Once again, Hunter Biden feels that he is privileged. He is privileged, he does not have to pay taxes like everyone else. He is privileged that apparently he can traffic sex workers across the globe and get away with it. He is privileged that he can get away with acting as a foreign advocate and be able to get away with it when other people are prosecuted and sent to jail for the very same thing. The American people see that there are two standards of justice. And when we are trying to go about the people's business in a serious manner, we end up allowing the food fight, which is exactly why he did what he did when he went across the street as far away as he could from this building and had his press conference, and then why he today showed up when the hour was way too late. I yield the remainder of my time.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Brown.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not a lawyer and nor do I try to pretend to play one on TV, but it is plain for all of us to see we are here on behalf of one man, the self-proclaimed dictator on day one. That is twice impeached, four times indicted, insurrection initiator and supporter, election denier, convicted fraudster, and maniacal manipulator from Mar-a-Lago, the one who lost and lost badly.

We are here because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no positive agenda to run on. They have not accomplished one thing in their year in the Majority to improve the lives of the people around this country. We are not here to hold the President in contempt of Congress. We are not even here to hold a member of President Biden's Administration in contempt of Congress. For some reason, the Majority has gathered us here to hold the President's son, his son, who I will remind all of us is not and has not ever been a government official, in contempt of Congress, despite his willingness to come testify publicly before this Committee. So, getting to the truth was never their actual goal.

Instead of working together to solve big problems on behalf of the American people, my Republican colleagues continue to pursue a meritless, groundless, baseless investigation into the President's family. Meanwhile, back in my district, during our recess, I was literally dodging bullets at a funeral of a gun violence victim, and I never felt so powerless and vulnerable because I know that when I got back here, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refused to do anything about it. Yet they continue to make efforts to ban books, rewrite history, make it harder for people that look like me to vote, and to make it harder for women to make their own healthcare decisions. We see nothing on the other side of the aisle but distraction, diversion, deflection, delusion, divisiveness, and dangerous destruction of our ever so delicate democracy.

So, with that, I am tired of the political theater. I want to get to work for the people back home in the 11th congressional District because they, quite frankly, do not care about Hunter Biden.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN. And with that I will yield the balance of my time to my Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Ms. Brown, thank you so much. You know, you started off by saying something pretty profound, which is we are here instead of doing the business of the American people because the Republicans have offered us no positive agenda in their year in office. We know we have wasted countless weeks in them just trying to pick a Speaker, and we have wasted countless weeks with their inertia and their do-nothing policies.

But Ms. Brown, I do not know if you recall, I just do not want people having to take your word for it. I think numerous Republicans have gotten up on the Floor of the House complaining about the fact that they have no agenda. I think our colleague, Chip Roy from Texas, said that the Republicans had not given him one thing, a single thing, I remember him saying, to campaign on. So, I just want to ask you when you are saying that they have no agenda, that is not a partisan point. You are getting that from Republicans, aren't you?

Ms. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. RASKIN. One of our colleagues said that there was Trump derangement syndrome, and, of course, Trump derangement begins with Donald Trump himself. He thinks he has a legal right to assassinate U.S. citizens. He thinks he can grab women by their genitals, although that is not the word that he used. He said that if Joe Biden is reelected President, there will be World War II. He is obviously deranged and disoriented.

But the real Trump derangement syndrome that I see is those people who cannot break from Donald Trump after he has proven himself to be completely and totally unworthy of your support because I am looking at talented, gifted people on the other side of the aisle, the ones who have not left Congress in frustration or because they have broken with Donald Trump and clashed with him. But I am still looking at people who have their wits about them, I think, but you are acting like cult members, like you are sleeping on the basement of a cult listening to tapes all night, and I beg you to get over your Trump derangement syndrome. Thank you very much for yielding, Ms. Brown.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donald from Florida for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of things. First, it was said in this hearing, Mr. Chairman, about you specifically that you repeatedly said you would give Mr. Biden any opportunity, he could choose which one, to come and speak in front of this Committee. He could do by deposition, he could do by open hearing, it was up to him. The truth of the matter, though is, Members, is that the Chairman's words are not binding. Like, no other Member's words of Congress are really not binding. The binding article—

Mr. RASKIN. Point of order. Does the Chairman agree with that? Point of order. Does the Chairman agree—

Mr. DONALDS. Are you going to restore my time? Are you going to restore my time?

Mr. RASKIN. Point of order. This is a point of order.

Mr. DONALDS. OK.

Mr. RASKIN. Does the Chairman agree that the Chairman's words are not binding on the Committee?

Mr. DONALDS. It is not a point of order. It has nothing to do with the order of this hearing. Thank you. Can I go back to 4 minutes and 34 seconds? That is where I was before I was interrupted by Mr. Raskin.

Chairman COMER. Yes. Reset the clock.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you. Thank you. What is binding is the actual written language in the subpoena because a subpoena from this Committee is also signed off on by the Clerk of the House. That is the binding document that matters here. That is what governs. That is No. 1. No. 2, that was said in this hearing. It was said that our witnesses said that there was no basis for an impeachment. But remember, Members on the Democrat side of the aisle, what was said by Mr. Turley at the time was that there was plenty of evidence for the continuation of an impeachment inquiry, and the purpose of that hearing was the relevance basis for an impeachment inquiry.

The House has now voted for an impeachment inquiry. And one of the first things that the House did after the vote of an impeachment inquiry was to subpoena Hunter Biden to appear. Hunter Biden has evaded that subpoena. So flagrantly did he evade it, that he decided to show up at the Senate side to give a press conference, and Eric Swalwell, a Member of the House helped him get that time on the Senate side to give a press conference. That is a flagrant violation of a congressional subpoena.

Secondarily, he has the gall to show up here when we are actually discussing contempt, and he did not stay. He was sitting right over there. He is not here now. He said he wants to talk. He can stay through the whole proceeding. He chose to leave. That is his business, but he was subpoenaed to come here back in December. He chose not to of his own volition. He is in violation of that subpoena, a subpoena that was executed with the signature of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. That is the document that is binding. That is what we work off of.

Mr. Chairman, I actually want to submit for the record an article from *The Hill*, written by Jonathan Turley, and it is titled, "Eric Swalwell and the Politics of Contempt."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you. I am glad something got admitted to the record. Last, a couple of other points. One quick point I want to make, and this is in reference to the Minority's reports about this \$7.8 million. I want the Minority to understand one very important distinction between Presidents Biden and President Trump. President Trump has an international real estate portfolio that he has amassed over decades. I am quite sure if you go back through all of the hotel receipts before he was President of the United States that you had foreign dignitaries staying at Trump hotels all across the world—

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONALDS. I am not going to yield, Mr. Raskin. I am making a point because they are actually very nice hotels. They look good. People like saying there. President Trump was not running the Trump Organization when he was President of the United States.

To my recollection, Eric Trump, the President's son was actually running the Trump Organization when President Trump was President of the United States. So, if he had a portfolio of hotels, and people choose, you know, through *Expedia*, through *Kayak*, through *Hotels.com*, if they choose to go and stay there, how was that the President being in violation of what, the emoluments clause? Is that what you are citing? Stop.

Ladies and gentlemen, America, this is ridiculous. The Biden family has no business. They have never had a business except for politics. And the one thing that the Oversight Committee, in conjunction with the Ways and Means Committee and in conjunction with the Judiciary Committee, has always been able to demonstrate is that they shook down foreign nations for millions—millions—\$26 million at the latest count and growing. Millions. And there was never any business entity involved except public corruption, and a pay for play scheme.

The House Oversight Committee would like to get to the bottom of this under the impeachment inquiry of the House. We have questions for Hunter Biden. We issued a subpoena for him to answer said questions. He ignored a congressional subpoena. As a private citizen—there are many attorneys on the other side of the aisle—if you had one of your clients in your private practice ignore a congressional subpoena as a private citizen, you would advise them not to because they will be held in contempt, and they would actually be punished by the Department of Justice. So, I find that interesting—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentleman yield so I can respond?

Mr. DONALDS. I am not going to yield, Mr. Goldman, because I had a question for you earlier. You did not want to take my question, so I am not going to take yours. Thank you. So, in closing, I will say private citizens, yes, they have a responsibility to answer congressional subpoenas. They do. Hunter Biden had it and he was flagrant. He decided to give a press conference, so we are going to do this business and he should be held in contempt by the full House of Representatives. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Very good. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Norton from Washington, DC. for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I yield my 5 minutes to Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. I would like to thank the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia, and I need to correct the record because of several false statements made about the Foreign Emoluments Clause, Article I, Section 9, Clause 8, although I do appreciate the gentleman from Florida's attempt to at least engage on the matter of substance that was raised so powerfully by Ms. Crockett.

Now, let us start with this. Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 says that neither the President nor any Member of Congress can receive a present and emolument, which means a payment in office or a title from a prince, a king, a foreign government, "emolument" of any kind whatever, of any kind whatever without going to Congress first and obtaining the consent of Congress.

There is no hotel exception, Mr. Donalds, to the Foreign Emoluments Clause. There is no international real estate syndicate exception to the Foreign Emoluments Clause, Mr. Donalds. And also,

I will take you up on your challenge to see whether the Trump Hotel in Washington, the Trump Hotel in Las Vegas, the Trump Hotel on Fifth Avenue, the Trump Hotel U.N. Plaza, four of the more than 500 businesses that we got documentation for, whether they actually had the same level of business coming from Saudi Arabia, the communist bureaucrats of China, who were the leading spenders, you know, if you have read our report, the United Arab Emirates, Indonesia, India, Egypt, and so on. We will make that comparison about what was done before if you get the Chairman to call off the ban on further documents coming from Mazars. So, if you—

Mr. DONALDS. Have you ever stayed at the Trump Hotel, Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. No, and I would never would stay at a Trump Hotel. I have got too much self-respect and concern for hygiene.

Mr. DONALDS. You stay at bad hotels?

Mr. RASKIN. But in any event, Mr. Donalds, you are totally wrong about what the Foreign Emoluments Clause stands for. Abraham Lincoln was given two elephant tusks by the King of Siam during the Civil War, and he liked them very much. He wanted to keep them, but he went to Congress, which is what every other President did before and every President did since right up until Donald Trump, and he asked whether he could keep the tusks, and Congress, though they loved Honest Abe, said, no, you cannot keep them. I mean, John F. Kennedy was offered citizenship by the people of Ireland because they loved him so much, and he refused to take it, saying that even though it did not violate the letter of the Emoluments Clause, it violated the spirit of the Emoluments Clause. And Donald Trump converted the presidency into an instrument for self-enrichment. He raked in millions of dollars from the most corrupt governments on earth, who came in with specific favors that we document in our report that they got from Donald Trump.

I beseech my colleagues, I will read any book, any magazine, any speech you have given that you want me to read, read this report, and come back and tell me if you think Donald Trump did the right thing in converting the White House into a for-profit operation. No other President in American history has come anywhere close.

And you ask why he is so determined to stay in office that he would unleash violence against his own Vice President, the brother of your colleague, of our colleague. Why would he do that? It is because it was a money-making operation, and it was a great business gift for a guy who went bankrupt several times, and yet out of some misguided partisan loyalty, you are going to stick with him. I do not even know why you stick with him. He was a Democrat longer than he was a Republican. He wanted to run for President on the Reform Party. You guys had been taken over by an absolute con man, and now you are acting like members of a religious cult who do not even remember how you got in it in the first place.

We say return the profits, Donald Trump, \$7.8 million. I have got a letter, Mr. Chairman, I am going to share with you telling Donald Trump to return the \$7.8 million. It is a small fraction of what he raked in. We want to know about the other 2 years in office. We want to know about the other businesses, not just those four

that we were able to get information on, and we want to know about every country on earth, not just the 20 autocracies and dictatorships that we found.

This is our government, this is our Constitution, and we are going to stand up for it against Donald Trump and anybody who follows him to the path of oblivion. Abraham Lincoln started your Party as a third Party to replace the Whigs because they would not take a moral stand against slavery, was a pro-freedom, antislavery, pro-union, pro-honesty Party, and your Party has been reduced to a corrupt authoritarian cult of personality. And everybody does whatever Donald Trump tells them to do, which is what we are doing here today with this stupid attempt to hold Hunter Biden in contempt when he has come forward to say he will testify and give you everything you want as the Chairman of the Committee repeatedly offered in public. So, forgive my outrage and indignation, but enough is enough. Let us get back to the business of the people, as Ms. Brown said.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognize Mr. Higgins for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the American people may be surprised to know some of my colleagues across the aisle have not served as long as we have, might be surprised to know that Representative Raskin and I had been building quite a colleague friendship. In my original years of service, prior to J6 especially, we would visit and we would debate constitutional questions, and he honored me by observation of my, what he would sometimes call compelling arguments, contradictory to his own. So it is with sincerity that I say congratulations to my colleague, Mr. Raskin, because you have obviously fully recovered from your cancer treatments. You—

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, my dear friend, and I do love you.

Mr. HIGGINS. You are quite animated, and I believe there is a direct correlation between your testimony against former President Trump and his poll numbers because I am watching a live feed. The more you talk about him, the more his numbers go up. So, I may yield you more time, but I would, honestly, like to ask you, if I could, regarding the deposition, just from a calm—if we could take a step back from the emotion here and the political conflict and this sort of prepared for battle debate we are in here.

Just regarding depositions, we have all been through depositions in one way or another. They are very cold and calculated, and you have your attorney there. And then the bad guys, who are always the other guys, they have their attorneys, and you are either being sued or you are part of a suit, you are either defendant or the plaintiff, and you are in a room for hours, until all the questions have been asked.

So, sincerely, if you were Hunter's attorney or advisor, why would you advise him not to participate in a deposition wherein his own attorney is there, it is private and everything is transcribed, his words cannot be twisted by the fake news. Just tell us, Mr. Raskin, and I yield for your answer.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, kindly, and I should tell you that your feelings are not unrequited. I still have very fond and warm feelings for you. I am sorry that January 6 came between us and I look

forward to a day in our republic when we will be really good friends again. But in a direct answer to your question, if I were his lawyer and I were his advisor, I would never advise him not to come and testify before the Committee, except for one thing, and this is why and I started out this way.

Mr. HIGGINS. Specifically, I am asking about deposition.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. So, about a deposition.

Mr. HIGGINS. Because we want the deposition first, to clarify—

Mr. RASKIN. I would recommend—

Mr. HIGGINS. And then the public testimony.

Mr. RASKIN. Just to answer your question, I would recommend it except that they were publicly given the offer numerous times to come before the whole Committee, and they state a fear on their part, which is not unreasonable, that their words will be distorted. And the transcript of the interview will never be released because the vast majority of the transcribed interviews have not been released. And I would use this as an opportunity to call on the Chairman to—

Mr. HIGGINS. Let me just say that I think that is solid counsel. But that brings us to our next point, my next point, which is that as a free American, which I mean, to a certain extent, we still have some individual rights and freedoms, including to not comply with a subpoena. But so, as a free American, Hunter Biden has a right to not comply with the congressional subpoena. But we have the right to take the next step as a Congress, if we believe the subpoena was righteous and his noncompliance with that subpoena was unrighteous. If we believe that our subpoena was lawful and we have presented probable cause and lawful argument to support that subpoena, then we have not only the right but we have the obligation to consider that he was in contempt of Congress when he took that stand of noncompliance, which is where we are right now.

It does not have to be emotional. The man had the right to not show up, we have the right to hold him in contempt, and that is what is happening. So, by all means, as my colleague just stated, let us move forward with the people's business. The people's business today in this Committee is to move forward with the vote to hold Hunter Biden in contempt. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member wish to be heard before we begin the amendment process?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, I understand there is an amendment at the desk. Oh, Mr. Cloud, I am sorry. I recognize Mr. Cloud from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Well, in the true D.C. meeting maxim of everything has been said, but not everyone said it, since I have not said anything yet, I will go ahead and mention it. But we have heard words about irrefutable evidence being presented, and, you know, I just have to say I do not think that word means what you think it means.

And there is a stark contrast as has been pointed out between how the Democrats have investigated and how we investigated. They are opposed to a closed-door deposition, which they have held a number of times. As a matter of fact, during the impeachment

hearings, I sat in the SCIF, along with others, while they withheld the transcripts that they are worried about. And so oftentimes it seems like they are portraying their motivations on us, and that is just not the case.

I remember sitting, for example, in one of the hearings, and one of the witnesses who worked at the White House was asked did the President talk to you before coming here and said, well, we passed in the hallway and had a conversation. What did he say? Just tell the truth. Ironically, that part did not leak from the Committee hearing, but a number of lies did. And let us also look at how these two investigations got started. One was based on evidence that was false evidence that was paid for by a political opponent of Trump as a candidate and created a whole Russian collusion narrative that we spent millions of government tax dollars on perpetrating this Big Lie that our colleagues on the other side helped promote.

This one began with a laptop that Hunter Biden produced himself and then was backed up with bank documents and then evidence of shell companies all over the place. And then there is talk about the business, the fact that Trump's business has made money from people who stay at the hotels. Is that not shocking? I think every American expected that people in other countries, where some of his hotels are, might have stayed at those hotels. That is not a shocking thing. But the big difference, of course, is that President Trump and his son is not manning the reservation desk, and they are not the ones answering the call and handing it over and saying the Big Guy sitting with me, would you like a room at the hotel? That is not happening. But yet for these shell companies that Hunter Biden has set up in the Biden family, that is exactly what we have seen is been happening.

And I would say that money that comes into the Trump organization does not go directly to him. Now, I am sure there is some return on the investment that the Trump family has made, but it also employs several employees that get money from what comes in. I doubt that these 20 shell companies have nearly the employees of one hotel that a Trump property has, probably not as many employees as you would find working the lobby of one of these hotels. So, this is completely, completely, completely different. They are trying to compare apples and oranges and confuse the American people back home. It is totally not the case.

And getting back to the point of today's hearing. This really is about contempt. And so, what we have seen happen is Hunter Biden has come here now twice, just to not speak to this Committee. So, contempt is defined as a lack of respect or reverence for something, a willful disobedience, or open disrespect for a court judge and legislative body. He flew all the way over here the day he was scheduled for a deposition just to not appear and to kind of thumb his nose here at this body. Today, he showed up, and the Minority is trying to make the case, well, he showed up to speak.

We have been here a couple times. I have been in a couple of committee hearings, not nearly as many of the Members here. Never have I seen a witness show up when they want to show up on any sort of thing to say, hey, I am here to speak on what I want to speak about. That is not how Congress works. That is not how any meeting on the Hill works.

That is ridiculous to think that somebody is going to be able to show up and just mandate the agenda for today's meeting, which is further evidence of why he is holding Congress in contempt. He thinks he is above the law. He thinks it has no weight on him, and understandably so, for the moment, because the DOJ refuses to follow up on anything and has done their best effort to work with the IRS and other agencies to shield and protect the Biden family. This is important, we have to hold them in contempt, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member wish to be heard before we begin the amendment process?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, I understand there is an amendment at the desk.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. For what purpose does Mr. Goldman seek recognition?

Mr. GOLDMAN. My apologies for jumping ahead. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will distribute the amendment to all Members. Does everyone have the amendment?

No. All right, we are going to let the clerk distribute to amendment. I believe it was changed in the last little bit.

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is OK. I would ask that the clerk read the amendment. My apologies, I withdraw.

Chairman COMER. While we are waiting for everyone to review the amendment, I will say we had 3 hours of opening statements, so hopefully we can get through these amendments in time. Just a note, we are working on printing the amendment because we just got it.

[Brief pause.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Mr. Goldman of New York.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment would strike all of the resolve clauses and the report, and it would insert language that details all of the extensive efforts to cooperate that Hunter Biden and his attorney have made in response to this Committee's requests for testimony and information from him.

That began in February when Chairman Comer wrote to request documents and communications related to our investigation of President Biden's involvement in your financial conduct. The following day, his attorney wrote back to Chairman Comer offering to sit down with the staff to discuss the request. Then 7 months later, Chairman Comer goes on television and said he never got a response back from Hunter Biden, which is flat-out false. And that day, Hunter Biden's attorney wrote again to Chairman Comer to say that he did respond, he never heard a response, but that he remains available to have a discussion. So next, without any re-

sponse from the Chairman, you went straight into a subpoena. The subpoena was for testimony, and the witness, Hunter Biden, has put no conditions or limitations on his testimony.

There are no limits on the topics. There are no limits on the length of time. He is happy to do it under oath. He has said he would not assert the Fifth Amendment privilege, even though that is available to him. That is in stark contrast to Devon Archer, their star witness, who so narrowly limited the time and scope of his testimony that we could not ask him anything about any of his own criminal conduct. But the only request that Hunter Biden has made is that he wants to give his testimony in public, not behind a closed-door deposition, where his transcripts would not be released. There is absolutely no certainty or guarantee that there would ever be a public hearing again, and I would bet a lot of money that you will never put him in that witness chair, whether or not he comes in. That is all he wanted, just to speak to the American people.

He has not, unlike your dear leader, filed a lawsuit to prevent third parties from turning over financial information. In fact, you have received tens of thousands of bank records. The problem you have is not Hunter Biden's cooperation. It is that all of those bank records, which would show any connection between Hunter Biden and his father, if there were any, has zero—zero—money going from Hunter Biden to Joe Biden related to any of his business ventures.

So, your problem is that the evidence does not show what you say it does. It is not that he is not cooperating. So, that is why we are here today so that you can change the topic, can claim that there is some kind of obstruction, and, therefore, Hunter Biden really did do all of these terrible things, and Hunter Biden should be impeached. Oh, wait, no, no, it is not Hunter Biden who is being impeached here.

Now, this is far worse because the Chairman, as we have discussed many times, has multiple times offered Hunter Biden to come testify in public. So, if you had wanted a closed-door deposition, I do not understand why you would go on TV, Mr. Chairman, and offer for Hunter Biden to come in and testify publicly, whichever he chooses. So, why no public hearing? Why won't you have a public hearing? The only request.

This is an incredibly cooperative witness. We have all dealt with many witnesses who put a lot of restrictions on their testimony. There is one request, one request of Hunter Biden, which is to speak directly to the American people, not in a closed door to the Republicans who will control the release, the dissemination, and the misinformation from that testimony. Why not? Well, one of your own colleagues went on the House Floor last fall and said that this impeachment investigation was "failure theater." A Republican said that. So, the theory here must be let us avoid the theater part of that and just keep the failure behind closed doors.

Last month, Hunter Biden showed up to the Capitol, on the day that he was subpoenaed, ready to testify in this hearing room, you refused to take his testimony. That very same afternoon, you went on the House Floor to vote for an impeachment resolution on the rationale that you needed to pass a resolution to get more evidence.

You reject evidence in the morning, and then you cry foul about no evidence in the afternoon. He is ready to testify. And this is a dangerous precedent you are setting if every single line in every single subpoena must be adhered to or you are going to hold in contempt. I know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who defied subpoenas outright, would be very afraid if that——

Chairman COMER. The time has expired here.

Mr. GOLDMAN. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. And I will recognize myself, oppose this amendment. This amendment claims that Hunter Biden has cooperated with this Committee's investigation. How has he cooperated with the investigation if he has not abided by congressional subpoena? Abbe Lowell has never discussed scope or logic with us, and we have identified at least two checks directly to Joe Biden, where we traced the money directly through the Biden influence peddling schemes. That is a fact. We have published evidence. This is not like Adam Schiff or the Steele Dossier where you just make stuff up. We have produced bank records and bank records do not lie. So, Mr. Biden mocked our legitimate congressional impeachment inquiry and flew to D.C. to hang out outside of Congress and did not show his face for a deposition. He is not in compliance. He openly defied a congressional subpoena.

Do any other Members wish to speak on this amendment?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. I want to yield back to Mr. Goldman. Before I do, I just want to pose a question to you. When you said that there was documented checks involving the President in an influence scheme, are you referring to the auto loan repayment checks between Joe and Hunter Biden?

Chairman COMER. You mean the Porsche he got from Uzbekistan? Which auto are you——

Mr. RASKIN. I do not know what kind of car, but are those the checks that you are referring to?

Chairman COMER. The checks we are referring to were a check for \$200,000 that came through the influence peddling scheme with AmeriCorps Health and the \$40,000 check that came through the influence peddling scheme with China, where I believe Mr. Bobulinski has stated publicly was a company that Joe Biden was supposed to be 10 percent owner.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I reclaim my time. I think in both cases, I mean, there were a lot of words there, Mr. Chairman, but I think you are referring to the auto loan repayment with Hunter Biden. You are referring to the James Biden repayment. But if you have got documented receipts of foreign governments giving money directly to President Joe Biden, that is an outrageous violation of the Emoluments Clause, like the \$7.8 million that Donald Trump pocketed while he was President, which for some reason, you guys do not care about because you think the Constitution only applies to Democrats and not to Donald Trump because, hey, you know, that is an identifying characteristic of an authoritarian political party.

It has got a charismatic leader whose word is considered above the Constitution, above the rule of law. You refuse to accept the results of democratic elections that do not go your way if you are an

authoritarian party. And then you refuse to disavow, or you embrace political violence as an instrument for obtaining and maintaining political power. So, you guys did not like when President Biden said that your Party under Donald Trump has fallen into semi-fascist ways of operation. If the shoe semi fits, you semi wear it, OK?

Now, I would like to yield back to Mr. Goldman——

Chairman COMER. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. RASKIN. Well, yes. I will take a quick question.

Chairman COMER. OK. I just want to clarify. We have a wire that went directly from CEFC which banks have identified as a state-owned entity from China. That this wire went from CEFC to Hunter Biden, then to Joe Biden, for \$40,000.

Mr. RASKIN. OK.

Chairman COMER. Joe Biden has been directly implicated in the family influence peddling scheme at least two times.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I——

Mr. GOLDMAN. No, you have not. I have not ever seen that.

Chairman COMER. It is the bank memo.

Mr. GOLDMAN. The \$40,000 is for Jim Biden.

Chairman COMER. No, no, the \$200,000 is from Jim Biden. The \$40,000 is from Hunter Biden.

Mr. RASKIN. All right, but please produce the documentation.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I look forward——

Chairman COMER. We have it. We have four bank memoranda.

Mr. RASKIN. Give it to the Members of this Committee and——

Chairman COMER. Four bank memorandums.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Four. There has never been a more substantive investigation——

Mr. RASKIN. I am saving my time. You go ahead, but I am saving my time.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. In the 7 years I have been in Congress.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Let me say this. The Democrats undertook a serious investigation, despite every effort by the Chairman to undermine it. And we determined there were \$7.8 million documented receipts from foreign governments to Donald Trump. You guys do not care about that. That is unfortunate.

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the Ranking Member yield?

Mr. RASKIN. But if you have got document——

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the Ranking Member yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, just a moment. Let me make my point. OK. If you have documented receipts of foreign governments writing checks or giving credit card payments to Joe Biden, show it to us. We have been at this for a year now. We have not seen anything. Then we show you in our more than 100-page report the documented receipts of money going to Donald Trump and you do not care about it. In other words, you do not care about the principle that our government leaders should not be on the take from foreign governments. That is outrageous. Because I will——

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the Ranking Member yield?

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Oppose any government official with any political party who is on the take with money from foreign gov-

ernments, and I hope you would join me in that. And yet we have shown it to you, and yet you guys do not care about it. I mean, that is just unfathomable to me. At least the Trump family has responded to it.

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the Ranking Member yield for a question?

Mr. RASKIN. The Trump's people say, well, he did not take his \$400,000 government salary. You know what? That is the only thing you are allowed to take, is your salary from Americans, not money from corrupt Saudi monarchs who ordered the assassination of journalists, not from Chinese communist bureaucrats crushing the human rights of people in Tibet and the Uyghurs. You are not supposed to be on the take from those governments. That is what our Constitution says.

Then they say, well, we returned the profits. These guys think, well if it is a hotel, they could just keep the money. At least the Trump family understands. Some lawyer told them what the Constitution says. We returned the profits. Well, guess what? They did not give us the accounting of the profits, and that is not what the Constitution says. The Constitution says you cannot take any payments at all from a foreign government without going to the Congress of the United States. It is not that you can keep the profits from foreign governments. Do you guys understand what you are doing here? You are putting that—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Timmons from South Carolina.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues across the aisle missed the point here. The Trump family has preexisting businesses built over decades, hotels all over the world, and President Trump divested himself of control over those businesses to his children and business—arms-linked transactions between foreign governments and between the Trump International Hotel chain. There is actually an arms-linked transaction. They are getting hotel rooms. They are getting food and whatever from these hotels.

So, the difference is this: the Biden family does not produce anything. They do not have anything. They do not have hotels. They do not have services rendered. There are none. Hunter Biden has said that he was on the board of Burisma, and he has no qualifications. They actually cannot document any service rendered by the Biden family, whether it is Jim Biden, whether it is Hunter Biden, so that is the issue. The issue is that the Biden family, all they have is the Big Guy and his policy of favoritism, and that is why we are here. And I just think you are muddying the water, and it is not doing the American people justice. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. PALMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes, I will yield to—

Mr. PALMER. I thank the gentleman. I do want to point out that, to the point that Mr. Timmons was making, that the operation of the Trump Hotel was a legitimate enterprise that was approved by this Committee in 2013, before President Trump was elected to office, but prior to that it was the old Post Office. It was losing \$6 million per year. The turnaround was a plus \$3 million that went to the Federal Government, and as Mr. Timmons pointed out, it

was divested to the family, to the children. It was not run by the President.

Mr. RASKIN. Would you yield for a question on that?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, when you say it was divested, are you claiming that Donald Trump surrendered any ownership interest because he continued to own it. He put it into a trust for his sole benefit. He said the day-to-day management would be turned over to his sons, but he was still the beneficial owner of it, and he stayed involved, as we know, because he kept talking about all the business that was coming in from abroad.

Mr. PALMER. Well, the gentleman's question is legitimate in the context that most elected officials put their assets in trust for their own benefit after they leave office.

Mr. RASKIN. But it was not a blind trust.

Mr. PALMER. He should not be forced to divest himself of the asset, an asset that was approved by this Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. No, but I am afraid—

Mr. PALMER. I am reclaiming the time yielded to me by Mr. Timmons to point out that what is happening right here should concern every American citizen because we refuse to prosecute, to investigate, prosecute corruption. We were constantly pounded about corruption in other countries, but we have got a corruption right here. We form partisan sides on this thing, and we do not do our job.

I have been here 9 years and 7 days and gone through multiple hearings in the Oversight Committee dealing with corruption, and it turns into a partisan battle when we ought to be trying to make sure that we restore the American people's confidence in this government. What Hunter Biden should have done, he should have presented himself and answered to the subpoena. I am not trying to take sides in this. I want the evidence to speak for itself, and it will never speak for itself if we do not have people come before the Committee as they are required to do. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield for a question? Would you yield for one final question?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, kindly. And thank you for the spirit and the substance of your remarks, which I think significantly uplift the tone of the conversation.

You would agree with me that the Emoluments Clause applies to government officials, and presumably, you would agree with me that Hunter Biden is not and has never been a government official. So, this is about a relative of the President, right? So, we have Donald Trump, who is collecting \$7.8 million, at least—it is probably 4 or 5 times that much and that is just during the presidency, and he was President—

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. RASKIN. And he was President—

Chairman COMER. It is Mr. Timmons' time.

Mr. TIMMONS. Ranking Member, do you have any evidence that Donald Trump received any of this money you are alleging that was received by the Trump Hotel organization?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, he bragged about it, and, in fact, he returned what he called the profits to the government, which gave the game away.

Mr. TIMMONS. So, \$8 million in revenue of which you do not know what the costs were associated with that, and you do not have any evidence that the President actually received any of this money. By the way—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, we have got all the evidence. Have you read the report yet, Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. What is the amount of money that you allege he has received?

Mr. RASKIN. Seven-point-eight million dollars, and it is a tiny fraction.

Mr. TIMMONS. It is just not true. That is just factually inaccurate.

Mr. RASKIN. You read our report?

Mr. TIMMONS. That is revenue. It is not—

Mr. RASKIN. I beseech you to read the report. I will read any book you want me to read, any poem, any ghost story whatever. Read the report. Please, read the report.

Ms. STANSBURY. Will the gentleman yield, please?

Mr. TIMMONS. My time has expired, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired. Before I recognize the next Member, since Mr. Raskin's into reading, I would like to submit to the record the last bank memorandum, the bank memorandum that details the Chinese wire that went to Hunter Biden, then to Joe Biden, it is in the bank memorandum. This is substantive memorandum. This is the fourth memorandum. If you need the other three, we will resend them to you.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, can I introduce any for the record, too, before we—

Chairman COMER. Yes, but without objection, we entered in the fourth bank memorandum into the record. Now you have something, Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. This comes from *Newsweek*. This is, "Republican Congressman Andy Biggs Warns His Party Has 'Nothing to Campaign On'."

Chairman COMER. All right. Without objection so ordered.

Mr. PERRY. I object. It has nothing to do with subject at hand.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, it was very much discussed by the Members today.

Mr. PERRY. I still object.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Could I call for a vote on that, then, Mr. Chairman? Yes?

Chairman COMER. Yes. I mean—

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Thank you. Let us get our Members to vote.

Chairman COMER. All those in favor of entering into the record a news story, say aye.

All those opposed, no.

Mr. RASKIN. A recorded vote, Mr. Chairman. Recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote called. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed. We have votes coming up on the House Floor, so.

All right. OK. We have votes on the House Floor. Have they been called?

Votes on the House Floor are going to be called in 30 minutes. We will recess until the last vote has been recorded, then we will reconvene and take up the amendments and the votes.

So, without objection, the Committee is now in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come to order. The first order of business is a vote on Ranking Member Raskin's motion to insert a document in the record.

All those in favor, say aye.

If you vote aye, you support Raskin's motion. If you vote nay, you oppose.

All those in favor, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. The motion fails.

Mr. RASKIN. I would like to ask for a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will call the roll. So, a "yes" vote means you support Raskin's motion to insert a document in the record. "No" means you oppose it.

Clerk, call the report.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Cloud?

Mr. CLOUD. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.

Mr. LaTurner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.
Mr. Burchett?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. McCLAIN. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
Mrs. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Porter?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Bush?
[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
 Ms. Lee?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes yes.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib?
 Ms. TLAIB. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes yes.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. I vote no.
 How is Mr. Fallon recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon is not recorded.
 Mr. FALLON. Nay.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Is Mr. Sessions recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Sessions is not recorded.
 Mr. SESSIONS. Sessions votes no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report the tally?
 Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Chairman COMER. OK. How is Ms. Porter recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter is not recorded.
 Ms. PORTER. Ms. Porter votes aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. LaTurner recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is not recorded.
 Mr. LATURNER. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the tally?
 How is Ms. Norton recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Norton is not recorded.
 Chairman COMER. Ms. Norton votes yes, I assume? Yes. Ms. Norton votes yes.
 How is Mr. Burchett recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.

Mr. Burchett is not recorded.

Mr. BURCHETT. I will be a no.

The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.

Chairman COMER. And how is Mrs. Luna recorded?

The CLERK. Mrs. Luna is not recorded.

Mrs. LUNA. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.

Chairman COMER. And is Mr. Moskowitz recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz is not recorded.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes yes.

Chairman COMER. OK. Will the clerk please report the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 10, the nays are 19.

Chairman COMER. OK. Motion fails.

Now the question is on the amendment, offered by Mr. Goldman.

Does anyone else seek recognition?

Ms. GREENE. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene.

[Chart]

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the importance of Hunter Biden obeying his subpoena and some of the evidence that we had questions about today. When we had arranged with Hunter Biden and his attorneys for him to come in, then he evaded his subpoena, and there is serious evidence that needs to be discussed. That has to do with many of the bank reports that we had read in the Treasury outlining very serious crimes that Hunter Biden had committed or has allegedly committed, and then we have evidence of that: crimes of Mann Act violation, human trafficking. These were in the bank reports, and the American people deserve to know about it.

Here is another excerpt from a bank report—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, point of order. Point of order.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Talking about a victim in California.

Chairman COMER. Hold on. One moment, Ms. Greene. State your point, Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. What is the gentlelady just showing to the cameras?

Chairman COMER. This is her 5 minutes on your amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, if it is the suspicious activity reports, there was an agreement with the Treasury Department that the Committee would not disclose the information.

Chairman COMER. It is my understanding what she is showing has already been disclosed in the public long before we started this investigation.

Mr. GOLDMAN. So, this is in the public domain?

Ms. GREENE. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is that your representation?

Mr. RASKIN. Is it a verbal representation it is in the public domain?

Ms. GREENE. This is in the public domain. I reclaim my time. Victim 1 is a California resident, currently employed with FSS

Management between June 2018 and October 2021. Victim 1, Hunter Biden's victim, was employed by Owasco PC, as evidenced by her receipt of biweekly payroll remittances from Owasco PC. However, during the same period of time, Victim 1 also received large round dollar wires from Owasco PC, which reference new hire K Wage 10K golf member. Victim 1 received five wires totaling \$44,508 in a 4-month period between June 12, 2018 and October 2, 2018. These are reports that are calling so-called employees of Hunter Biden and his law firm, victims.

And here is evidence of Hunter Biden violating the Mann Act. This is trafficking women across state lines for prostitution. This is an airplane ticket, and it was purchased by Hunter Biden for this victim where she flew from Los Angeles to Washington D.C. and then the next day flew back to Los Angeles. She flew in from Los Angeles on June 14, 2018 and was flown back to Los Angeles the following day. And this is pictures that Hunter Biden had produced and uploaded to porn websites, and it is marked out—

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, point of parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. GREENE. These are marked out showing proof of Mann Act violations. Democrats should not be offended by pictures that are blacked out—

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, have I been recognized?

Ms. GREENE. They should be offended by whole human trafficking.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. All right. State your point.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, kindly, Mr. Chairman. On July 26, I sent you a letter about the last time this happened when the gentlelady introduced before this Committee, without any notice to anyone, nude photos, pornographic images that were completely irrelevant to the purpose of the hearing itself. And my question to you is, are Members allowed to simply put up sensationalistic, voyeuristic, pornographic images if they are not relevant to the actual object of the legislative proceeding? I want a parliamentary ruling on that.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Raskin, that is probably part of the questioning for Mr. Biden. Violations of the Mann Act. Ms. Greene has lead on that issue.

Mr. RASKIN. No, no. This is a question of the rules of the Committee.

Chairman COMER. These pictures have already been entered into the record.

Mr. RASKIN. So, in other words, you have accepted the idea that Members can introduce irrelevant, sexually based, voyeuristic—

Chairman COMER. How is this irrelevant?

Mr. GOLDMAN. How does it relate to Joe Biden?

Mr. RASKIN. How does it relate to—

Mr. GOLDMAN. We are not doing a criminal investigation of Hunter Biden.

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Point of order.

Chairman COMER. We have had several people testify in the FBI, DOJ, IRS that they were told to stand down investigating various crimes of the Biden family, did Joe Biden tell them to stand by?

Who told the IRS, the FBI, and everyone else to stand down? This is what we are investigating.

Mr. BIGGS. No, no.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. GREENE. I believe it is my time.

Mr. RASKIN. No.

Ms. GREENE. I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. RASKIN. No, I have been recognized. I object to the use of this exhibit, Mr. Chairman. This is not a criminal investigation of the Mann Act or prostitution or anything else. It is completely irrelevant to a subpoena, the validity of that subpoena, and whether or not there has been compliance with that subpoena. It is totally extraneous, immaterial, and irrelevant, and someone should explain that to Ms. Greene if she does not understand.

Mr. BIGGS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. And let the Chair rule. You had a point of order. This is evidence. You objected. We got that evidence that Hunter is a material witness in this investigation.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, does that mean you can put up pornographic pictures of other people that Hunter Biden has met in his life? I mean, come on. Like, how far does that go? It is not relevant to your motion.

Chairman COMER. Well, you can ask him that in the deposition.

Mr. RASKIN. It is not relevant. I mean, no, honestly, Mr. Chairman. It is not relevant to your motion of whether or not he violated that subpoena. How do those naked pictures of—

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Ms. GREENE. We talked about a lot of things today that were not relevant—

Mr. RASKIN. This is not the “Jerry Springer” show. This is the U.S. House of Representatives.

Chairman COMER. And let me say this. This is not pornography. It is appropriately censored evidence in an ongoing investigation.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Chairman COMER. OK. It is appropriately censored evidence in an ongoing investigation. Mr. Biggs—

Mr. RASKIN. I just want to say, pursuant to Clause 6 of Rule 17, I object to the use of this exhibit as irrelevant, extraneous, sensationalistic, voyeuristic, and totally antithetical to the legislative purposes of this Committee and this House. This is not the “Jerry Springer” show. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs for a point of order.

Mr. BIGGS. Thanks.

Chairman COMER. Your clock stopped, Ms. Greene.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. My point of order is—

Mr. RASKIN. And I appeal the ruling of the Chair, if that was a ruling, Mr. Chairman. Did you rule on it? Because I appeal your ruling.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I was recognized for my point of order.

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. BIGGS. And I get it he wants to have an appeal.

Mr. RASKIN. Chairman?

Mr. BIGGS. I am trying to keep this in order as much as we can. Mr. Chairman, my question is to you, is now the objection based on relevance going to be encountered here and constrain what can be presented in this Committee? And the reason I ask that is because, there is virtually nothing—a comment I made in the press about that, and it was totally tangential to this that they just tried to get in. All of that becomes irrelevant. If that is the case, then the entire Democrat testimony that we have heard today should be stricken as being irrelevant.

Chairman COMER. No, I think you are——

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Irrelevant and pornographic.

Chairman COMER. We are going to have a ruling, Mr. Biggs. So, Ms. Greene is attempting to enter this into the record, unanimous consent, Mr. Raskin has objected, and we are going to vote on it just like we voted on the last amendment.

Yes. The ruling is the point of order will not be recognized, and Ms. Greene is in order. If you want to object——

Mr. RASKIN. Well, yes, I object. And, Mr. Chairman, you have the authority to bring to the full House, under Rule 17, whether or not pornographic material should be entered without a clear shown relevance, and I would ask you to bring that to the Floor of the House. Let the Members of the House decide whether that is the new standard, whether Congresswoman Marjorie Taylor Greene's——

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, may I have my——

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Standard is going to be the standard for the whole House.

Chairman COMER. Decorum is within discretion of the Chair. We overruled your objection.

Mr. RASKIN. OK, and I appeal that.

Chairman COMER. You appeal the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I do. I would like to——

Chairman COMER. We are going to vote on that.

Mr. RASKIN. We are going to vote on the pornography.

Ms. GREENE. May I finish?

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Mr. Gosar, you are recognized.

Mr. GOSAR. I move to table the motion.

Chairman COMER. OK. Motion to table the motion of Mr. Raskin. This motion is not debatable. As many as are in favor of tabling, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it, and the motion to table is agreed to.

The Committee will now resume——

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would move for a recorded vote. I mean, if that were a book, she would censor it, but she wants to advertise it through the House of Representatives.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. A recorded vote is ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. If we are going by courtroom, speaking objections do not work, chief.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will call the roll. The clerk will call the roll. If you vote yes, you table the motion.

So, Clerk, call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.

Mr. Cloud?

Mr. CLOUD. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes aye.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.

Ms. Greene?

Ms. GREENE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.

Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. McCLAIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.
Mrs. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes aye.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes no.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
Mr. Mfume?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes no.
Mr. Gomez?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.

Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.

Mr. Casar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Lee?

Ms. LEE. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.

Mr. CASAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes no.

Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes nay.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.

Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chairman votes yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the nays are 15. The ayes are 21.

Chairman COMER. The yeas have it, and the motion to table is agreed to.

The Committee will now resume consideration of the Goldman Amendment. Ms. Greene has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And again, this information is extremely important because Hunter Biden refused to obey his subpoena, and we are holding him in contempt of Congress for doing so. This is important evidence of human trafficking, Mann Act violations, that we had questions for the President's son about, and there is evidence. I would like to show the evidence of payments. These are payments made from Hunter Biden and his law firm to so-called assistants. These were not assistants. These are prostitutes that he was trafficking, and I think these victims are important. And just because our Democrat colleagues do not like the evidence does not mean that it is not relevant, and I am especially offended by the women on this Committee that do not care about these women's rights. They are victims of Hunter Biden.

Here is another excerpt from bank reports talking about victims. These are banks, and these banks are identifying these women as victims, Victim 2, talking about Victim 2, Victim 1. Each appear to be in the adult entertainment industry and are receiving payments from Hunter and Owasco PC. It is unclear what relationship Hunter or Owasco PC have with these individuals, and based on public media, it appears possible the payments may be associated to prostitution or adult entertainment services. Victim 2 is a New York

resident and employed as freelance. Per internet research, she is a social media influencer and adult entertainer. She received six Quickpays for \$6,250 from Hunter between 3/29/2018 to 11/20/2018. This is clear evidence, Mr. Chairman. These are important questions we have for the President's son—

Ms. CROCKETT. Time.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Pertaining to Mann Act violations.

Ms. CROCKETT. Time.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, just a point of order. I did not want to interrupt the good lady, but two points here. One is the Majority has purported to be in possession of the laptop, and you are supposed to share all evidence with us. We have been asking for a year. Will you make the laptop available to the Democrats so we can look at it? The guy who originally apparently leaked it, he said he cannot vouch for anything they are talking about because he does not understand the chain of custody. We do not know who made those pictures. We do not know who made those statements. If it is coming from the laptop, we don't know where it is coming from. So please, could you please share with us what you have got?

Mrs. LUNA. If I can interject. I can give you a copy of it. Marco Polo has the actual entire publication. We can get every single Democrat Member a copy of that.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I want to get at least the copy that the Majority is using. I do not even know what Marco Polo is.

Mrs. LUNA. I promise. Like, I am not trying to be rude. I will get you a copy.

Chairman COMER. But you mentioned you wanted to read some stuff. That would probably be something good to read, the Marco Polo report.

Mr. RASKIN. But what about your copy because, you know, you have an obligation under the rules to share with us any evidence you claim to have. So as far as we know, all of that stuff is completely confected. It is just made up.

Chairman COMER. With all due respect, Mr. Raskin, you spent a lot of time investigating the former President and you have not spent any time on this. The American people are keeping up with this investigation.

Mr. RASKIN. We want to investigate.

Chairman COMER. But you all are three or four steps behind the investigation.

Mr. RASKIN. Give us the evidence.

Chairman COMER. So, Ms. Greene's time has expired. Does anyone else wish to speak on the Goldman Amendment?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, again, just to reiterate the point but rather than my words or my opinion, I think I am going to quote Senator Ted Cruz who the Chairman appeared on his podcast, and, in fact, just to remind the Chairman of Ted's own advice to the Chairman. I made a board for you, Mr. Chairman. You were on the show with Ted Cruz in which Ted Cruz said to you, "I am going to give you some unsolicited advice." Now, by the way, Ted Cruz, right, clerked at the Supreme Court. He

knows the Constitution pretty well. You guys know who Ted Cruz is, right? He has run for President a couple times. So, Ted Cruz said to you, Mr. Chairman, you should have Hunter Biden in a public hearing. He actually said his advice to you is just have him in a public hearing.

And, again, I go back to what is the Majority so concerned, or to use some of the words of my colleagues, afraid, to have Hunter Biden sit at this desk? Mr. Chairman, you control the rules. You could give everybody 10 minutes. You could give everybody 15 minutes. You could give everybody 20 minutes. You could give your side as much time. We could go on for days here, quite frankly, because, again, you control the rules, as you just showed.

But the one difference that you guys object to, is you object to the cameras because you do not want the American people to hear the answers. No. You want to take the transcript and release it 6 months after you have gone out and lied about what has happened, and so, again, because the gentlelady from Georgia, I know, is such an advocate for women's rights, as she mentioned, and is so concerned about grooming, and apparently we do not have any standards here anymore.

[Chart]

Again, I just want to remind my colleagues because I do not want them to forget about hypocrisy, OK? I do not want them to forget about hypocrisy. But Donald Trump was asked about Jeffrey Epstein, and when he was asked, he said, you know, Jeffrey likes them young. Well, how did the President know that? How did he know that Jeffrey Epstein likes them young? Perhaps some people are saying he was there, since you are so concerned, right? But again, again, I bring this up not to make jest. I bring it up—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I thought we were not going to interrupt.

Chairman COMER. We are going to stop the clock. We did this with Ms. Greene.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK.

Chairman COMER. State your point.

Mr. BIGGS. I am just curious about the impugning of the former President's character—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I do not have to do that. He does that himself.

Mr. BIGGS. Have we basically thrown that rule out? I am just curious. Are we going to follow that rule?

Mr. RASKIN. Would you accept a pornographic photo?

Mrs. LUNA. Of Bill Clinton?

Chairman COMER. Yes. We suspended the rule to the current President, but we did not suspend it to the former President.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. By the way, please, so you are making the point that we can disparage Joe Biden but not Donald Trump. Please make that point to the American people. Please. Bill Clinton is not running for office.

Mr. BIGGS. That is my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I will wrap it up.

Chairman COMER. We suspended the rule on disparaging the current President because this is a contempt proceeding with a Biden, so he is part of the investigation.

Mr. BIGGS. But the rule remains in place for all prior Presidents, including——

Chairman COMER. I would say that, but in all honesty, they have broken the rule many times today.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, it does not apply to the prior Presidents.

Chairman COMER. It does not apply to former. All right.

Mr. BIGGS. OK. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Listen, I will not talk about the photo and the 11 of them and the fact that he was on the plane and on the island anymore. What I will point out is the hypocrisy of today. The hypocrisy of today is you guys break the rules by not complying with subpoenas in the last Congress, and now you are shocked. You cannot believe, after you broke all of that, that now it does not work.

You come up here and talk about Hunter Biden's behavior, and you are so disgusted, but the guy that you all kneel to, OK, associates himself with a pedophile. But remember, I get it. I——

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, that should be stricken.

Mr. BIGGS. I ask his words be taken down.

Mr. RASKIN. It is a statement of a fact in his time.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. It is a fact.

Mr. BIGGS. I ask that his words be taken down.

Chairman COMER. OK. There is a motion to strike the words.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. On what grounds? On what grounds?

Mr. BIGGS. To say that we associate with pedophiles.

Mr. RASKIN. No, no. He was referring to Donald Trump.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, no. I said Donald Trump associates.

Mr. HIGGINS. The man just said that we all kneel. I kneel to Christ. I stand for the flag. And if you are concerned about pornography being shown in public——

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I will change my word to "support."

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Ranking Member, you might look to the library books that your people support.

Mr. RASKIN. No. OK. So, you are referring to the "kneel down," Donald Trump, said that someone tried——

Mr. CLOUD. I move for his words to be taken down. It is a motion.

Mr. RASKIN. And I think he withdrew that.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I withdraw my——

Chairman COMER. He withdrew it. He withdrew. That will be taken from the record.

All right. Everybody good? That is going to be taken from the record.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. I withdraw the "kneel down." I will use the word "very much support." We OK with that? No snowflakes offended? OK. Wonderful.

Anyway, back to the point, Mr. Chairman, is that I just think the American people are tired of the hypocrisy, right? They are just tired of it because what they have recognized is when Donald Trump does something, it is just fine, but when someone else does it, it is a crime, time and time again. You think the Chinese stayed

at his hotel because they did not have another choice? You think he wanted to have the G7 at Doral because Doral is the best property in America? Come on, you guys are smarter than this. You know he was trying to make himself rich. But when Donald Trump does it, when Donald Trump does it, when Donald Trump does it, it is just fine, but when a private citizen you claim does it, it is a crime. You guys do not have any credibility. You might have credibility on the “Charlie Kirk Show,” but you do not have any credibility with the American people anymore. You just do not. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask for the last word to be stricken, and I would like to yield to Representative Timmons.

Chairman COMER. OK.

Mr. TIMMONS. I thank my friend. I want to correct the record. It seems this entire hearing, we are chasing all of these logical arguments that really do not have any merit. And earlier, before we recessed, we were discussing the Ranking Member’s \$7.8 million in foreign payments from at least 20 countries during his presidency, and I knew the answer. I knew that that was revenue, and it was not actually profits. Hold on. I will let you ask questions at the end of this.

And you said did I read the report, and so I did. And in the report, it actually specifically says these included payments from foreign governments and foreign government-owned or controlled entities to properties owned by Donald Trump, including Trump International Hotel in D.C., Vegas, Fifth Avenue, and—this is my favorite—Trump World Tower at 845 United Nations Plaza in New York. So, let us just use that one alone because if you go down to Footnote 23, it actually clarifies where this money came from to include the amount of money. And so, what you all did is you took a building that was built in 1999 and completed in 2001, and it is a hundred yards from United Nations. So, these foreign countries owned multimillion, \$10 million, \$20 million condos in one of the nicer buildings in New York.

And I was just kind of shocked because I knew that you were using revenue and you were not using actual profit that the President or the Trump organization made. You actually used HOA payments. Do you know how duplicitous it is for you to use HOA payments on a \$20 million condo in New York? Like, it is outrageous.

No, no, no, I am going to go through. We are going to go through all of them because you list them. You list them. And I see Saudi Arabia, \$615,422, Trump World Tower, and you go and you look, there is nothing there that is under \$10 million, \$12 million. So, you are taking a \$12 million property that was owned since 2001, and you are saying that this is somehow similar to Hunter Biden running all over the world and selling the “Big Guy’s” influence. These are completely different things. And the fact that you even created this report and you are using it to shield us pursuing justice to make sure that this President is not compromised because his son has sold secrets to China, to Ukraine, is so disingenuous, it is so duplicitous. It is not even misrepresentation. It is a lie.

I am happy to hear this from you because, again, you told me to go read it. I read it. That is what it says. I can read you in Footnote 23 where it says this report uses common charges or rent payments. All of these properties were owned prior to 2018. They did not go out and purchase them because of the President. They were there for decades before this happened. That is the point. That is the difference.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Do not let the facts get in the way of a good story.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMMONS. Absolutely.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, my dear friend, for engaging in substance and not ad hominem attack. I very much appreciate that. Having said that, first of all, you said that there are lies in here. Can you find one factual inaccuracy? There is not one.

Mr. TIMMONS. For you to tell the American—

Mr. RASKIN. You are quoting us.

Mr. TIMMONS. Reclaim my time. For you—

Mr. RASKIN. Let me make this point. Let me make this point which is that China gave \$5.5 million—

Chairman COMER. It is Mr. Timmons' time. It is Mr. Timmons' time.

Mr. TIMMONS. For you to tell the American people that \$7.8 million went to President Trump is an outright lie. It is a fabrication—hold on—and I will tell you exactly why, because you are using businesses that existed decades prior to when he became President.

Mr. RASKIN. And you are saying all of them?

Mr. TIMMONS. Hold on. And you are using HOA fees for multi-million dollar properties that have been around since 2001, and, again, even the fees that they pay for hotel rooms, that is a fee for a product for a service. There is no service with Hunter Biden other than influence of the Vice President or the President of the United States. And that is why we are here because he will not answer questions in the exact manner that you have required for last Congress and the Congress before that.

I mean, it is difficult to chase all of your logical fallacies surrounding this, but at the end of the day, he is going to do exactly what Don Jr. did. He is going to do exactly what you required of every other Member, except every other person you have subpoenaed, except for Members of Congress who actually do have immunity, which you are pretending like you do not know what that means. We need to get to the bottom of this. The American people demand it, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Excellent. Does any other Member wish to speak? You wish to speak on the amendment?

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just quickly, before I speak on the amendment, I do want to address the assertions that were just made about this report and the receipts that have been provided about the funding that came into various prop-

erties and businesses owned by Donald Trump while he was President.

To address the inaccuracy put forward by Mr. Timmons, if you go to the source material, which is the actual receipts from Trump International Hotel, other hotels in New York, yes, there are condo fees. There are a number of different businesses, but it is very clear that there was influence peddling going on. So, for example, there are receipts—

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. STANSBURY. No. There are receipts that show the Malaysian Government, between September 10 and 13, was spending \$10,000 a night—butler service, personal trainers, lavish meals—at the same time that they were meeting with Donald Trump, and the media reports from the time say that they discussed their stay at Trump's hotel in the Oval Office. So, this is just not true.

And another one, UAE. During a military delegation visit in March 2018, they were negotiating an arms package with the White House at the time. They dropped \$85,000 at Trump Hotel and were discussing their stay at the hotel while they were negotiating the arms package. The Saudi crown prince and his staff dropped tens of thousands of dollars in Trump's hotel while Trump was in office. They were not only negotiating an arms deal, they were seeking the Iranian deal or the Iranian agreements under the previous administration to be overturned. And we know that months after Trump and Kushner left the Oval Office, the MBS committed \$2 billion to Kushner against the advice of his own investment advisors. And we know that in Kazakhstan, we had the Kazakh President who came and stayed, again, in Trump's New York and D.C. properties while there was these very nefarious activities going on.

So, I would encourage our colleagues to actually look at the receipts and then go look at the dates and what was actually happening in the media. It is very clear that whether or not Trump encouraged them to stay in his hotels or properties, or these foreign governments stayed in them and then told Trump and his son-in-law, they were seeking influence by staying at his property and, thus, were trying to bribe him, which is a violation of the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution.

So, let us move back to the amendment here just for a moment. I do want to just establish a little bit of a timeline, and, Mr. Chairman, if it is OK, I would like to just ask some clarifying questions on the timeline. It is my understanding that in February of last year, that you transmitted a letter to Biden's attorneys seeking documents and communications from the investigation. Is that correct? I will go ahead and answer on your behalf because we have the records for that, if it is not immediately at your hands.

Our understanding from the witness is that the Chairman and his staff never responded to that request. In fact, they did not hear another thing until 7 months later when in September, Mr. Comer, you appeared on a TV news station on Newsmax and said, "Hunter Biden is more than welcome to come in front of the Committee if he wants to clear his good name. If he wants to come and say, you know, that these were not his dealings, then he could come and clear his name." And so literally, the next day on September 13,

Biden's attorney responded and wrote you back and said you never responded to our offer. I will come in. I will come do a public testimony.

A couple months later, after the impeachment hearing that just completely fell apart, Chairman, you went on the "Benny Show," and you extended another offer to Hunter Biden to come testify in front of the American people under oath. And yet again, when Biden's attorney transmitted a letter offering to do so, instead you issued a subpoena to do a closed-door deposition. It is just very odd, right? Like, here we are. There has been a lot of yelling today. I think we are all getting real tired of all of this, but the reality is, is that Hunter Biden has, even today, showed up in front of the Committee ready to testify under oath. So, you know, like, let us be real. And I think the reality is, is that of all of these tens of thousands of documents that have been provided to the Majority in their investigation, none of them have actually shown any wrongdoing by the President. And so, it is easier to create a smoke screen to keep this narrative in the media and to peddle in disinformation—

Chairman COMER. The time has expired, and there are so many inaccuracies with your statement, we do not have time to address them all. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, we should be voting down this amendment. It is not needed. What is clear is that the only document that matters is the fact that there was a subpoena issued by this Committee signed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. That is the only thing that governs subpoenas before anybody coming to this Committee. It does not matter if any Member of this Committee did an interview any place, whether it is the Chairman or any other Member. That is irrelevant.

The only thing that matters is a signed subpoena by the Chairman of this Committee and the Clerk of the House. The semantics about what Hunter Biden thought he could do or what Abbe Lowell, his attorney, tried to get him to be able to posture or get out of it is meaningless. And the Democrats know this is meaningless. This is a subterfuge because their guy bucked a subpoena against the law, period, full stop. Members, vote down this amendment. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The question is on the amendment, on the Goldman Amendment. All those in favor.

Mr. GOLDMAN. We have another.

Chairman COMER. What is that?

Mr. GOLDMAN. We have another.

Mr. RASKIN. Ms. Norton—

Ms. NORTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman—

Mr. RASKIN. From New York.

Ms. NORTON. From New York.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. I appreciate my distinguished colleague from D.C. I want to just take this opportunity to address some of the Chairman's evidentiary allegations that you made earlier today.

First, I would just note that we keep hearing this over and over and over again, that Donald Trump had a business, Donald Trump had real estate, Donald Trump sold widgets or whatever it is. Obvi-

ously, there are many different ways of investing or spending money or getting paid for services or for simply putting capital into another company. So, I do not know what these investments were that Hunter Biden and Devon Archer and these other folks were involved in. Devon Archer testified that it was private equity. That is a legitimate form of business to invest capital in other companies.

Mr. DONALDS. Don't you believe we should get that question under oath?

Mr. GOLDMAN. You got it under oath from Devon Archer, sir. In any event, let us go back to, I think the Fourth Bank Memorandum is what you pointed me to earlier today, because you alleged, Mr. Chairman, that there is money that went directly from CEFC, a Chinese company, to Hunter Biden, then to Joe Biden in \$40,000?

Chairman COMER. Through the shells, yes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Oh, through the shells. Through the shells. You did not say that. That you did not say. So, I went back—

Chairman COMER. You have had a hard time understanding what a shell company is, but anyway go ahead.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, you would know, wouldn't you?

Chairman COMER. Oh yes. I try.

Mr. GOLDMAN. So, here we are looking at this fourth amendment. Well, I will show this chart first because it shows how clear it is.

[Chart]

Mr. GOLDMAN. You have got a Chinese company going to Biden-China joint venture, going to a Hunter Biden individual entity, going to James and Sarah Biden entity, going to James and Sarah Biden personal bank account, going to Joe Biden. So that, I guess, is what is directly money from China to Joe Biden. It just had to go from a Chinese company to a joint venture that Hunter Biden entered into with another Chinese company.

Chairman COMER. Would you yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I just want to finish going through what you told me to go through, and then I am happy to yield.

Chairman COMER. OK.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Then it went to Hunter Biden's personal company that he generally used for a variety of his business ventures. Then it went to another entity for James and Sarah Biden. Then it went to James and Sarah Biden. Then Jim Biden, almost a month later, sent a \$40,000 check to his brother, the President, which said it was for a loan repayment, and the same bank records where you got this from showed that a loan went from Joe Biden to Jim Biden. So, this is the kind of duplicity that we are talking about.

You want to say there is evidence connecting Joe Biden to Hunter Biden's business ventures, and you make a false and inflammatory allegation that money went from China to Hunter to Joe when, in reality, it is 4 pages, it is 21 bullet points of information to get from A to B to C to D to E to F. There is no possible way that you could ever show that Jim Biden knows—

Chairman COMER. He—

Mr. GOLDMAN. This is my time, Mr. Chairman. There is no possible way you could ever prove under any circumstances that Jim Biden knew where that money came from. And you certainly cannot show with any evidence at all that Joe Biden would know that

on month before, six different transactions earlier, somehow this money came from a Chinese investment that Hunter Biden had. You are desperate. You are misrepresenting the facts. There is no evidence. There is no evidence of Joe Biden's involvement in Hunter Biden's business interests. There is no evidence of Joe Biden's involvement in any Mann Act or prostitution stuff.

Hunter Biden should be investigated by the Department of Justice, and he has been for 5 years. He is a private citizen. This is what you call an impeachment investigation to the President of the United States based on complete fiction and smoke and mirrors. There is not a piece of evidence that links anything that Hunter Biden did to Joe Biden, and this is a complete sham.

Chairman COMER. Your time has expired, and those accounts that they went through were depleted. It was not hard to trace the money when there is not any money in the account and it passes through—

Mr. GOLDMAN. He does not have bank—

Chairman COMER. No, no. You have the bank records, too. You all get every bit of evidence we have.

Mr. GOLDMAN. No one who receives the money has the—

Chairman COMER. The accounts were depleted. Order. Order.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mrs. Luna is recognized.

Mrs. LUNA. Can I say something?

Chairman COMER. Yes. You have—

Mrs. LUNA. No one is above the law. Even if you think that he is innocent, he cannot defy a congressional subpoena. That is what this is about. People here, I am sure on that side too, have family members that have gone to jail for probably less offenses, so why is he given the special privilege? We have no authority if you have the President's son who is sitting there doing illegal things. I mean, I know it probably does not make you feel good to defend the guy, but, like, for goodness' sake, he has denied. He should be held accountable. At least bring him in and admit that.

Mr. GOLDMAN. He should be held accountable by the Department of Justice where he is being held accountable.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes. Wait, wait, wait, wait. He should be held accountable by the Department of Justice, but that is what we are voting to do, is to send that to investigation because he denied and defied a congressional subpoena.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. LUNA. Wait, let me finish. If the DOJ does not uphold that, though, we have a serious problem in this country that this man is held above the law, and that is why we are arguing here today. We are trying to send it to the DOJ, but you are arguing against that. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. Would you agree that Members of Congress who outright defy subpoenas should also be held to the same standard?

Mrs. LUNA. I believe that certain Members are protected under the Speech and Debate Clause. Some people here can probably school me on that, but aside from that, this is a serious investigation. There has been a lot of personal attack in this entire correspondence that we have had in the last, I do not know, couple

hours that we have been here. But what I will say is that Hunter Biden is not above the law. We want to send him to the DOJ and we want to trust the DOJ to do their job. But right now, the American people have a serious distrust factor with the DOJ and for good reason. So, we would like to pass this, send it to the DOJ, and let us see if they will do what they promise the American people they would do. I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. Very good.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Ms. Tlaib? Yes.

Ms. TLAIB. Yes. Thank you so much. I would like to yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Ms. Tlaib, thank you very much. I wanted to pursue the very interesting conversation that we began about the Foreign Emoluments Clause. And again, I am just delighted that after 7 years, several Republicans now are actually taking an active interest in the Foreign Emoluments Clause as a part of their investigation into the potential impeachment of Joe Biden, which we have been working on for a year.

Let us start with this. When Donald Trump took office, he refused to divest himself of any of his more than 500 businesses, and he refused to put any of his more than 500 businesses in a blind trust. He said he would continue to be the owner of those businesses, but he would transfer some of the day-to-day management to his sons. If anybody wants to contradict me on that, I will stand to be corrected, but that was what Donald Trump said when he was told by George W. Bush's ethics advisor that he was putting himself in extremely dangerous territory unless he stated that he was going to refuse to accept any money in the future from foreign governments. He ignored and defied the advice of all the ethics advisors for Republican administrations, for Democratic administrations.

I want you to recognize the radically unprecedented nature of what he did at that point, and he set himself up for the trouble he got into. Now—

Mr. TIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I will. As soon as I make these points, I will come right to you.

No. 2, my good friend makes it sound like Donald Trump was totally innocent. Well, he was a businessman, and he did not know any of this was going to happen with these foreign governments. Really? Read the report in detail, my friend. For example, go to page 69. Here is a quote from Donald Trump as he was campaigning: "I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. Saudi Arabia, I get along great with all of them. They buy apartments from me. They spent \$40 million, \$50 million. Am I supposed to dislike them? I like them very much." We can find quotes just like that about the Chinese Government. This is your guy.

Now, the governments knew exactly what they were buying at the exact same time. For example, take ICBC, and, by the way, the vast majority of businesses were not paying before as tenants. That is not right. They were patronizing the hotels in Washington and New York. They were going to the golf clubs and so on. A handful of them were preexisting tenants. That in itself is unconstitutional

and illegal. You want to be President of the United States? Then you get out of that. You divest, which is what other Presidents have done. Look at what Kennedy said. Look what Obama did. Look what Abraham Lincoln did. Every President before Trump scrupulously followed the Foreign Emoluments Clause.

Go to page 10. There is a corrupt Chinese-owned bank called ICBC, one of Trump's tenants, and the Department of Justice recommended sanctions against them for funneling money and services to North Korea. And Donald Trump reversed them because, as he was saying, he collected money from some of these people, like Saudi Arabia. He knew who he was collecting money from. Of course, Donald Trump knew that. He is a businessman.

Is there anybody that would dare to challenge that idea? Here is the former Republican Chairman, Ed Royce, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who called on Trump to apply maximum financial and diplomatic pressure by targeting Chinese banks that do business with North Korea, like ICBC, and Donald Trump let them off scot-free, just like he did with Saudi Arabia after the homicidal crown prince ordered the assassination of Jamal Khashoggi. They covered up for him. He said, we saved his "blank." We saved his "blank," and he owes us now, and, of course, as soon as the Administration ended, his son-in-law created a business and brought back—what do you know—\$2 billion from Saudi Arabia, even though the Sovereign Wealth National Investment Fund said it was a terrible idea, overruled by the crown prince whose "blank" was saved by Donald Trump.

So, our founders would be offended that we even have to get into the specifics of what was done because they said categorically, nobody can take a dollar from a foreign government. Do you understand that? No payment "of any kind whatever." So, we do not have to have this ridiculous, humiliating debate about how far one of our Presidents debased himself to line his own pockets.

Mr. GOSAR. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Sure. I would love to yield.

Mr. GOSAR. So, my thought process here is I understand that the President lost money during his tenure.

Mr. RASKIN. Really?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, he went bankrupt 5 times. It does not surprise me if that is true, but I doubt it because I think they made more money that year than they had in the several prior years before he became President.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, he dropped out of the top 100, so I—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, yes, because they started finally checking the records. You know that your guy cooked the books a little bit, but in any event, Donald Trump—

Mrs. LUNA. Cooks the books with the rules that the Congress, pre-dated, made the rules for—

Chairman COMER. All right. All right. All right.

Mr. RASKIN. He has just been punished by the state of New York. Chairman COMER. Are we ready to vote on the amendment?

Are we ready to vote on the amendment? All right.

All those in favor of the Goldman Amendment, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. RASKIN. Recorded vote, please.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

All right. Now, I understand, Mr. Raskin, you have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. RASKIN. I do.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will distribute the amendment to all Members.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. Does everyone have the Raskin Amendment? Does everyone have it? OK. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Mr. Raskin of Maryland.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly, Mr. Chairman. Since we have not read the amendment, I am just going to work through the basic terms of it. "Resolved, that the initial deadline for Hunter Biden to comply with the subpoena issued on November 8 was December 13, 2023;

"Resolved, that current Members of Congress and three Members of this Committee have refused to comply with subpoenas duly issued under the authority of the U.S. House of Representatives, including Mr. Biggs of Arizona, Mr. Jordan of Ohio, and Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania;

"Resolved, that the aforementioned Members of Congress have firsthand knowledge and information related to the January 6, 2021 attack on the Capitol and on this body and on the Vice President of United States, that is of critical importance for the American people and the work of this Committee;

"That the deadline for Hunter Biden to comply with the November 8 subpoena be changed to the date upon which the aforementioned Members of Congress supply their knowledge and information to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability."

In other words, Hunter Biden has until the date upon which our own Members comply with the subpoenas that were issued in the last Congress that have still not been supplied, and that "the aforementioned Members of Congress shall be ineligible to vote on matters pertaining to contempt of Congress considered by this Committee until the date upon which the aforementioned Members of Congress supply this knowledge and information to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability." In other words, you should not be standing in judgment on contempt of other people who allegedly have violated their subpoenas when you have violated a subpoena

and have not complied with the orders of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I would also like to raise a problem that struck me as I was looking through the paperwork on this, Mr. Chairman, which is that the subpoena that was sent to Mr. Biden, which came around a week before or a couple of months before it was issued on November 8, 2023, was issued before the House of Representatives had voted on impeachment. I remember there were numerous Republican Members who were very hesitant about voting for it because of the testimony of the Majority's own witnesses who said there was nothing closely approximating a quantum of evidence that would justify impeachment. And so, there had been no vote on it, you will recall.

Mr. GOSAR. A point of order.

Mr. RASKIN. And on November 8, the subpoena was issued. The subpoena date for appearance was on December—

Chairman COMER. If I could—

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Gosar has a point of order to explain.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, we are not talking about impeachment. We are talking about impeachment inquiry. We need to be very considerate about that.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, exactly right, and that goes right to the point of this question I have. Thank you, Mr. Gosar. The subpoena was issued on November 8 for a subpoena date of appearance on December 13. And that was the same date when, you will recall, we were called to the House, and then there was a vote on impeachment. So, the underlying subpoena here is at least arguably invalid for the purposes of holding him in contempt of not complying with the subpoena related to impeachment, and I wonder if we could clear that up.

But at any event, I would press the amendment. Certainly, those Members who have outstanding subpoenas from the U.S. House of Representatives who blew off the subpoenas should turn over what they know about the violent attack on the U.S. Capitol, the worst domestic political violence designed to overthrow an election in American history at the Capitol, and they should turn that over. And at that point, then—yes, I will yield, 1 second—and then Mr. Biden should also be forced to comply at that point. In the meantime, those Members really should not be voting on contempt motions related to other witnesses. And somebody had a question.

Mr. BIGGS. I did. You yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Are you sure that everybody up there actually received a subpoena? I mean, your board says certain people received a subpoena, and, in my experience, some of those people up there did not receive a subpoena and so notified counsel for your bogus J6 Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, first of all, every court in the land has rejected the claim there was anything bogus about it. As you know, the courts rejected the idea that it was somehow—

Mr. BIGGS. Was it heard before every court of the land?

Mr. RASKIN. Every court that heard it. Do you have any authority on your side for that outrageous proposition? I know you would

like to believe it, but your fantasies are not the law of the United States.

Mr. BIGGS. I have great fantasies.

Mr. RASKIN. I am certain you do. You and Ms. Greene might want to discuss them together, OK?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, but you have not answered the question. You do not know if those people actually even received the subpoena and you have put it on the board, and you are going forward and trying to hold people in contempt.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time. I served for more than a year on the bipartisan January Select Committee to investigate the attack, and you might not like Liz Cheney anymore, who was head of your conference, but it was bipartisan, my friends. And so was Adam Kinzinger, who served this country well, so, but in any event, nobody ever claimed that they had not gotten the subpoena. And—

Mr. BIGGS. Go back and check the record, sir.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, if that is the argument, have them come forward and explain that. I would like them to testify under oath that they never received it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we immediately dispense with the amendment for lack of germaneness.

Chairman COMER. OK. I am prepared to rule the amendment is not germane to the bill. Therefore, the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair. It is clearly germane. It goes right to the heart of what we are doing here today.

Chairman COMER. OK. The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair is not debatable.

All those in favor of tabling the appeal—

Mr. GOSAR. Wait. Wait.

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. I move to table.

Chairman COMER. All right. OK. Mr. Gosar's motion is not debatable.

All those in favor of tabling the appeal of the Chair signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair is tabled.

The Committee will now resume consideration of any further amendments before this body.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is Garcia Number 3.

Chairman COMER. OK. Who said that?

VOICE. Mr. Garcia.

Chairman COMER. OK. Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. For the Amendment Number 3.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Mr. Garcia of California.

Chairman COMER. OK. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

Mr. Garcia is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know obviously what we are seeing today has been quite insane. We have seen pornographic images. We have talked about White privilege, but what we have not seen is any sort of evidence linking President Biden to any sort of wrongdoing. There has been absolutely zero evidence discussed today, and as we know, all the demands for a public hearing with Hunter have gone unanswered, even today when we asked for that vote.

But what we do have is plenty of evidence that we have uncovered in this Committee and that have been against the Constitution with our investigation of foreign government payments to President Trump through his businesses. And what do we have as Democrats, we have receipts, proof, a timeline, screenshots. We have everything we need to prove conclusively that foreign governments were funneling money through Trump properties and into Donald Trump's pockets, all in violation of the Constitution. Now, we do not have access to all of Trump's properties, and he has hundreds, by the way, of properties and business interests, and we do not have access because our Chairman actually chose to end that investigation, but my amendment will fix that by demanding a full accounting of Trump's businesses.

Now we know that we can already prove about almost \$8 million of foreign payments, illegal payments, against the Constitution back to the Trump Organization, and that is just a tip of the iceberg because we do not have access to the other hundreds of businesses and properties. That \$8 million of receipts and payments that we have is only from a total of four properties of the hundreds of businesses of Donald Trump and his family. No family in history has ever benefited more than the Trumps and the Kushners.

And actually, I want to talk about Jared over here, especially his son-in-law. His son-in-law was brought in to run Middle East Policy at the start of the Trump White House, by the way, having zero experience in doing that work and against the objections of the Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson. Trump and Kushner, of course, made their first state visit to Saudi Arabia, overruling the State Department, this is the same time, by the way, that Jared was actually putting together a \$110 billion arms deal for the Saudis.

But what was happening during that time? The Saudis were paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in room stays and foreign gifts that were illegal under the Constitution back into the Trump Organization. Over and over through hotels and properties, these shady investments by the President, his sons, and his son-in-law, who was an employee of the White House, all worked to enrich the Trump family and Donald Trump himself.

And the insane part is that just months after leaving the White House, Jared Kushner received a \$2 billion, with a “B,” investment from the Saudis to manage and be paid directly as well out of that fund that the Saudi Government organized. I want to just mention also that our Chairman also said that this “crossed the line of ethics.” So why have we not investigated the Trump crime family and the current and ongoing abuse by Jared Kushner as a government official? And I remind folks, Hunter actually never worked for the government. He was a private citizen.

That is why I want to offer my amendment which lays out the details of not just the \$8 million in illegal unconstitutional foreign payments but also demands Donald Trump to pay back the taxpayers. It demands a full accounting of all of his properties, and it subpoenas the Kushner businesses so we can understand the complete grift not just from Saudi Arabia, but the 20 other foreign governments which we have records for and the governments that we do not have records for, like places like Russia, which we know there was a series of investments made there as well. And so, with that, I urge support for this amendment.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to dispense with the amendment immediately. It is not germane.

Chairman COMER. I am prepared to rule. The amendment is not germane to the bill. Therefore, the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair. It is clearly germane and relevant.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, I move to table the motion.

Chairman COMER. OK. The motion to table Mr. Raskin’s appeal is not debatable.

All those in favor of tabling the appeal of the Chair signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed say no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair is tabled. The Committee will now resume consideration.

Are there any other amendments?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost. Will the clerk please report?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Mr. Frost of Florida.

Chairman COMER. OK. The clerk will distribute the amendment to all Members. We are waiting on copies of the amendment.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. OK. The clerk, have you designated the amendment? You have?

The CLERK. Yes, sir.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. Frost is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am offering an amendment to this misguided resolution that would essentially work to take out the lies and the smoke and mirrors and insert the truth of the matter before us. And the fact of the matter is that Chairman Comer has a history of selective treatment of the facts presented to him that would really make any witness concerned about any kind of closed-door procedure or deposition.

My amendment outlines how last month, Chairman Comer tried to push this fake impeachment by selectively—selectively—talking about a truck that President Biden initially made payments on while he was still a private citizen that his son, Hunter Biden, later paid him back for. The month before, Chairman Comer selectively released just one page of a 4-page email chain to falsely claim that regulators were concerned that Hunter Biden was money laundering, when that was not true. What the Chairman selectively forgot to share is that the other three pages of the email directly contradicted his claims. Regulators explicitly stated that the transactions were reasonably and consistent with the business profile and that “the entity was transparent.”

And it does not stop there. My amendment outlines how the Chairman has misrepresented the mountain of bank records that show no wrongdoing, the fact that Chairman Comer has only released 2 of the 17—2 of the 17—witness transcripts so far. We want him to release the transcripts. And we also know the Chairman has interviewed some of Hunter Biden’s associates and no dirt could be found, and because of that they wanted to bury the truth, but the truth is out because the truth is that this has been a complete waste of time. Republican claims all throughout this case barely hold up to the slightest bit of scrutiny, and it is not just me saying that. We have heard it on Fox News. We have heard it from *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Post*, CNN, and others who have been investigating the Chairman’s false claims of evidence against President Biden.

And once again, it has been said time and time again, Hunter Biden took us up on the offer of sitting in that chair in this Committee and publicly answering questions, so that way the public can see it, and so that way he does not have his words misrepresented in a closed-door deposition, and what this works to do is give the entire story.

If you are going to vote to hold him in contempt, at least—at least—vote yes on this amendment so we can include the full story in this piece of legislation. It is the fear of the truth that has stopped the Chairman from accepting Hunter Biden’s offer to testify publicly, and my amendment essentially lays it all out on the table. I urge adoption of my amendment, and then let us move on and do the real work of the American people, especially in these difficult times. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to—

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donald.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, my inquiry is this, that considering we are going to be going into these amendments, where the context of the matter at hand has been debated since 10 a.m. this morning,

I would move, Mr. Chairman, that further debate on amendments will be considered under 20 minutes of structured debate in total, 10 minutes for each side of Majority and Minority on the Committee, to fully debate the merits of each amendment going forward, Mr. Chairman. That is my question for the parliamentarian.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I would move to accept that and move by unanimous consent that we accept that.

Chairman COMER. OK. Without objection, so ordered. Ten-minute debate on each side. Does any Member wish to debate further?

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. OK. Ms. Porter.

Ms. PORTER. I am glad that my colleague from the other side has moved to limit debate because this hearing, to put it bluntly, has sucked. There is one thing that Republicans and Democrats seem to have in common today, which is that we are willing to be players in the game, both sides at times using this hearing to take shots at our favorite political nemeses. And I see some Members practically patting themselves on the back when they get a good insult or counterpoint in. But this is not a game. Oversight is not a game.

Under this Republican Majority we have wasted month after month, censuring, expelling, holding people in contempt and almost impeaching, and for what? Republicans have passed nothing of substance in the House. What our Oversight Committee should be doing, instead of spending now dozens of hours arguing about Hunter Biden, is real oversight of issues that affect all Americans, like corporate price gouging, unconstitutional government surveillance, and waste at the Pentagon. The fact that Members think that real Americans outside of this partisan environment and Capitol Hill care about this is everything that is wrong with Washington, so that Americans who love this country and just want a better future do not have to listen to hours of frustrating attacks and procedural debates in a partisan game.

Let me sum it up. One, there is zero evidence of President Biden doing anything wrong, including in connection with his son, no evidence of an impeachable offense. Not a little, not something, none. Two, Hunter Biden has offered to testify in public in front of this Committee. If Republicans only want his secret, private testimony, that is, as the kids say these days, sus. If my Republican colleagues are truly in this to get answers, and I hope they are, stop wasting all our time and holding Hunter Biden in contempt on a deposition and ask him your questions. He will be here under oath, and the American people can watch. What is more transparent than that? What is better accountability than letting the American people hear Hunter Biden's answers? That is real accountability, not political gamesmanship behind closed doors.

This is a game where nobody wins and everybody loses. It is Washington at its worst, and I will tell it like it is without pointing the finger at either Party. This sucks. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any further Member wish to debate on the Frost amendment?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. I appreciate the gentlelady's remarks, but I do want to point out that one of the reasons it is necessary for Hunter Biden to appear to give a deposition is that he is a material witness in an ongoing investigation of potential corruption at a very high level. I think, to your point, that this has devolved into partisan politics. We have an obligation as Members of this Committee, a very solemn responsibility, to pursue evidence and investigate charges legitimately and not let it become what it has become today, and I do not think we are getting there.

I do think that Hunter Biden has a responsibility to respond to the subpoena, through his legal counsel if he so chooses, in a responsible way. What he did in showing up outside the steps of the Senate is contemptible. He should not have done that. But we need to investigate this. We need to follow the evidence, and he needs to appear as a material witness to an ongoing investigation. If he comes in to testify before this Committee, there are other issues related to his activities that I think would be germane. But I really believe at this point we need to move forward to this, and, frankly, I think Hunter Biden should have responded to the subpoena either himself or through his legal counsel. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I appreciate the gentleman's solemn points and pleas, but the reason why the folks on this side of the aisle have a hard time digesting that is because your curiosity on what violates the law only applies when it is politically convenient to talk about Hunter Biden, when it is pennies compared to \$2 billion from a foreign government.

And I am not saying that Jared Kushner violated the law, but what I am saying is that was probably negotiated before he left: a \$2 billion deal, you announce it months after you leave, probably negotiated before. He had never run a hedge fund before. We talk about Hunter Biden having no experience. He never had run a hedge fund before. He was put in charge of Middle East. The \$2 billion is from the Middle East. He had no experience in the Middle East, but there is no curiosity because it is Jared and because he is Trump's son-in-law.

And so, coming to us and pleading with us about Hunter would not sound so hypocritical if there was one of you, just one of you, that would look into the camera and speak into the microphone and say, you know what? That smells pretty bad. We should look into that as well. And I think, quite frankly, the American people would believe you more about your inquiry and about Hunter if they saw your curiosity into the Biden family with the same curiosity into the Trump family. And so that is why we are where we are. It is why the American people have no faith in this institution, and it is also why, quite frankly, you know, many Members of your own Party have gone in front of the camera and admitted the 118th Congress has done nothing.

And so, we are here. We would like to do oversight and apply the law and the rules universally. But when we talk about Trump or Jared Kushner, you all look down just to make sure Donald Trump does not see you on camera. You cannot even, like, look up and be interested that a foreign government, months after someone who

actually worked in the White House—Hunter Biden never worked in the White House—months after someone who worked in the White House and was in charge of that very region got \$2 billion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PALMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Sure. Yes, I would. I would.

Mr. PALMER. With great respect, your allegations have absolutely nothing to do with what this Committee is investigating. And—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. You are not curious about it, though?

Mr. PALMER. Well, it has absolutely nothing to do with anything that we are investigating, and it is just—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. But don't we get to decide. There are questions—

Chairman COMER. Order. Order. You are going back and forth—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. Sorry.

Mr. PALMER. And I do not want to use up the time, but I made my point. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I just want to respond to my friend from Florida, the gentlelady from California. I think this, unfortunately, does devolve into a partisan exercise, and I just listened with interest at what you say kind of, I am not going to use "galls." Folks on the other side of the aisle, it bothers you, and I respect that.

So, I want to let you know what galls or troubles us on this side of the aisle based on all of the claims that you have made, because many of us, I was one of them, sat in a SCIF week after week, day after day for an impeachment. One of the Members of this Committee, now, as a staff member, then a staff attorney, then knew there were lies being told to compel the impeachment, to back up the impeachment, to reinforce the impeachment. Lies. Abject, straight-up lies. Not to mention the fact that for years, the other side of the aisle pursued the then duly elected President of the United States based on pure hyperbole about some Russian hoax that has now turned into, you know, it is the same old story from the 1930's in Germany and the 1940's. If you tell a lie enough times, it becomes the truth.

We sat and watched you dismantle the country and the presidency and any agenda that the American people have voted for based on that. And to date, to this minute, to this moment, I do not think one of you have ever, to use your phraseology, the kind gentleman from Florida, stood in front of a camera and said, you know, that was pretty bad. Holy smokes, I cannot believe we did that. And now with the benefit of hindsight, we look back, and I look back and I say, how could we have ever done that? How did we ever mislead the American people? How could we have lied? How can we make up for that? How can we recover the lost time? How can we recover the lost reputations? No interest whatsoever. None whatsoever.

And again, this is not about looking back at the past. This is a markup. This is not a hearing. This markup is strictly and specifically about the actions chosen by Hunter Biden. I said before and I will say it again, I do not think this Committee has any interest

in prosecuting or pursuing Hunter Biden. He did this to himself. He made this choice. We all make decisions and there are consequences to the decisions. He did that. Our duty is to say, is this a breach in the law? Is it a breach, yes or no? Clearly, he can come to Congress. He sat in this very room today. He was on the grounds the day that he was supposed to appear, so clearly he can come. He has chosen not to.

Look, Secretary Clinton got away with it, right? She was allowed to be deposed, not under oath, and her deposition on a Saturday—you know what—a holiday weekend. She got to do that. That galls the rest of America who says when the FBI or the local magistrate or some law enforcement agency comes knocking on my door and says you are going to appear, you have been served. Well, see here, I think I will set the terms of how and where I will appear. I will just do that. Me, Citizen X.

You know who gets to do that? Apparently, Hunter Biden, who thinks he is above the law, who thinks he is special, who, he and with the rest of his family, and, with all due respect, this Administration shows contempt for the law, contempt for the American people, contempt for the Constitution, and contempt for the citizens of this country. Contempt, and that is what this markup is about. And if you want to know what galls us is, you are not interested. You are not the least curious about all of that. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I respond since my friend from Pennsylvania directly addressed me? And I am happy to have this conversation to compare the 2019 impeachment investigation. Why are you leaving, Mr. Perry? I am happy to have a conversation.

Mr. PERRY. I have got a meeting.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Because what you saw in that investigation was 17 fact witnesses who came in and testified under oath, and then 12 of them appeared in a public hearing. There was not a single thing that any Democratic Member of Congress said that was not supported by neutral Trump Administration fact witnesses and what their testimony and their documents said.

Contrast that with what we have here. We have not had a single public hearing with a single fact witness, not one. The only public hearing we had was a complete debacle where the Republicans' own witnesses said that there is nothing approximating an impeachable offense here, so we are done. We are not having anything out in the public, and you have not even released the transcripts of all of the depositions.

When we had our first impeachment hearing with the constitutional law professors—and I would note, I at least admire your fellow colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee, which, I also said they did not even bother to bring in any constitutional law or impeachment experts in their first impeachment hearing today. At least they learned from the debacle that was yours. But at that hearing, we moved to have your own fact witnesses come here and testify in public as part of the impeachment inquiry, and you voted it down. You voted it down.

So, if you want to compare 2019, that is fine, let us do it because every single fact that was in a 300-page report was not spoken by

counsel, me, by Adam Schiff, the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee, by any Member of the Democratic Party. It was testimony from witnesses who had knowledge, who actually had expertise and experience and factual information about the topic at hand. We do not have that here.

And when we have a witness who is willing to come and sit here and give you the evidence that you claim you want to have, you say no. You say no. You understand the accommodation process and how that works in Congress. That means that Congress issues a subpoena and the receiving Party works with Congress to accommodate the interest of both parties so that Congress can get what it needs and the interest of the witness can also be served. Hunter Biden's attorney has done that. He has agreed to every single thing in your subpoena, every single thing, under oath, any questions you want, any topic you want, any date you want. He will not raise privileges available to him under the Fifth Amendment. He will answer your questions. The one accommodation he wants is to do it in public in front of the American people, and you are too afraid to let him do that. And I will yield the remainder of the time to Mr. Raskin.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Raskin is going to have a minute and 3 seconds. The Chair is going to recognize Mr. Gosar. I just have to throw away, and you must have been absent when the IRS whistleblowers testified with respect to the number of crimes and evidence that the IRS had on the person who were voting to hold in contempt today. You remember that hearing? The Chair recognize Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOLDMAN. He was being prosecuted by the Department for Justice because—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognized Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. I will tell you, the gentleman from New York has got some facts wrong. You know, when we were talking to these witnesses, Jonathan Turley, they said they rose to the occasion of impeachment, but they said there was a suspicion. And that is what the impeachment inquiry is all about, to go get that information, if there is. They all said that there was a suspicion based on these shell corporations, so they did say that. They did not say what you just said. You mischaracterized that. So, you know, from that standpoint, we have to be very, very careful with how we are cherry picking this information. Maybe we do it, but you do it, too, and you did it right there because they did not have—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOSAR. I will give you—

Mr. GOLDMAN. A quick question. I said that the witness testified that there was insufficient evidence to impeach Joe Biden.

Chairman COMER. It was an impeachment inquiry hearing. He said there was more than enough evidence to proceed with the impeachment inquiry. That is what we are doing. Let us be clear about what we are doing here.

Mr. GOLDMAN. But did he also say that there was insufficient evidence—

Chairman COMER. It is Mr. Gosar's time.

VOICE. [continuing] Sufficient evidence.

Mr. GOLDMAN. He said both. He said both.

VOICE. [continuing] Oversight.

Mr. GOSAR. You know, and when you are comparing apples to apples on the two impeachments of Mr. Trump, you did not even go through an impeachment inquiry. You did not vote on the Floor on one of those. So, if you are talking about apples and apples, we are not even close to that. You know, the one thing I thought was the Lady Justice is blindfolded. She has got the scales. You put the information in there, and she is going to give you a result. She is blindfolded. She does not see who that is. You know, Trey Gowdy made that comment.

We are missing the point here, is that the information that we got is factual based. There is information there that is suspicious. Why would you stack all these shell companies up? You got the IRS folks who said this, the whistleblowers, they have been exonerated. I got to tell you, they are not liars. They are not liars. They need to do one thing. They are good at auditing. So, I think what we can do is we can get back to the order of business; that is, Hunter Biden violated the context of the subpoena. You know, he is not above the rule of law, so we ought to be just continuing that vote. I yield.

Chairman COMER. Now, Mr. Raskin has a minute and 3 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. First, to my friend, Mr. Gosar, we did not launch an impeachment inquiry for the second impeachment because Donald Trump tried to overthrow the Constitution on January 6, 2 weeks before he left office, and we were the targets of that impeachable offense. We all saw it, we were the witnesses, and we were the ones to vote on it. And we did not quite have time for all of those niceties, but all of us knew exactly what happened.

Second, I am sorry that Mr. Perry, you know, left the room at Josh Hawley speed when Mr. Goldman began to speak there because he made two really important points. One was he said that if you get a subpoena, you comply with the subpoena, you answer it. Yes, I would like to tell him, Mr. Perry, you complied with your subpoena, but no, he decided to irrigate the law to himself and to claim that the January 6 Committee was invalid, it was illegal, it was unconstitutional, all claims that were rejected by Federal courts. They do not have a single case authority for that at all, and yet, he is going to now lecture other people about complying with subpoena? I mean, he should, I think, delegate some of his time to some other Members to speak on that. It is a little uncomfortable there. And then finally—

Mr. GOSAR. The gentleman—

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. I will yield, yes, go ahead.

Mr. GOSAR [continuing]. Will allude to good process, builds good policy, builds good politics, would you agree?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I totally agree.

Mr. GOSAR. You do not skip, and the severity of impeachment, you never skip that process. But you did.

Mr. RASKIN. Donald Trump was already arguing that he could not be tried because it was too late at that point. He was already arguing.

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. Your 10 minutes has expired. Mr. Fallon, I think we have a minute and a half.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know what? This has devolved into is deny, deny, deny, counter-accuse. It is an old adage, and it is unfortunate because, and again, and we have been talking about this now, 5, 6, 10 times. The difference between a deposition is hundreds of hours can be expended and you could really drill down and you can have accountability. You can get an in-depth interview. And then at that point, after we have all read that, we can come here, and each of us can get our 5 minutes. This is a very big difference, and it is a distinction that needs to be, again, reiterated and refuting some of the Democratic arguments.

And then I read this actual amendment and I see this Footnote Number 17, this amendment where the author says, "Chairman Comer has also dishonestly and repeatedly suggested that the then Vice President Biden had the prosecutor of Ukraine fired as part of a bribery scheme." Where is the proof? And then you read the footnotes and there are opinion pieces. The fact is that according to the FBI, the informant, the human source, was very reliable. They paid him over \$100,000, and they have been working with him for almost 10 years. Did Viktor Shokin, the prosecutor, get fired? Yes. Who was advocating for that? Joe Biden was advocating for that.

Mykola Zlochevsky, the corrupt oligarch who was the CEO of Burisma, paid his son millions of dollars. And Viktor Shokin, the prosecutor, had seized land, a few homes and a Rolls Royce from Zlochevsky, so he was apparently doing his job. But even when he was fired, the President of Ukraine on the call to Joe Biden said we thought he was doing a good job, but you wanted him fired, so he is gone. Biden bragged about that. These are all facts. So, I am going to vote against the amendment because the amendment is factually incorrect, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired for both sides.

The question is on the Frost Amendment.

All those in favor of the Frost Amendment, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to—

Mr. RASKIN. Recorded vote, please.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I—

Chairman COMER. Does any Member wish to be recognized? Ms. Stansbury, is that—

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will distribute the amendment to all Members.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the Stansbury Amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Ms. Stansbury of New Mexico.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

The gentlelady from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the opportunity to offer what I hope is a pretty straightforward amendment.

We have heard a lot today. There has been a lot of high emotion and intensity and yelling, but this is really about getting the facts correct in the resolution itself. So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment actually corrects the ANS, which replaced the original resolution text to correct the record in this resolution in the section that begins on page 5 of your resolution and goes to page 7 on the background on the investigation.

And with all due respect to my colleagues who were yelling a few moments ago about this only having to do with Hunter Biden, it is very clear this is a political act, and you do not really need to dig much further than actually read the resolution itself because what the resolution does is make conclusions that are not based in evidence, which are not factual. And, Mr. Chairman, I am going to be honest, I am a former Senate staffer. I am embarrassed. I mean, we cannot send this to the Floor. It is not factual. It is filled with all kinds of misinformation.

So, what my amendment would do is clarify the actual evidentiary background that was conducted as part of this investigation. Which I would like to note, it did not just begin, though there was a vote on the Floor a few weeks ago. This actually began last year, at the beginning of last year, and I will get back to that here in a moment. But over the course of this investigation, 82,000 pages of records have been reviewed from the National Archives. There have been 30,000 pages of bank records reviewed; 2,000 pages of Treasury records; dozens of hours of testimony from special counsel, U.S. attorneys, DOJ officials, FBI, IRS agents, financial advisors, business partners. Ways and Means provided evidence. We had expert witnesses come and testify under oath live in front of the Committee, including during the impeachment hearing in September, and other witnesses who have been called in for depositions and recorded interviews.

And so there has been a massive body of evidence actually brought before this Committee. And, in fact, in the September impeachment hearing, as has been said many times here today, the witnesses that were called here, including the GOP's own expert witnesses, concluded that there was not sufficient evidence to proceed with an impeachment. Now, I understand that there is a rhetorical argument here being made about an impeachment investigation, but Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, that is not actually what your resolution says. Your resolution makes declarative statements about the President. It makes statements about his involvement in his son's activities, which are just factually untrue. We do not have any evidence. There is no material evidence that has been provided before this Committee.

So, what my amendment does is it corrects the record about what evidence has come before the Committee so that if you are

going to send this to the Floor next week for a vote, which we understand that you are, it is actually factual. I mean, that is what we are here to do, right?

The other kind of comments I would like to add here is, you know, Mr. Chairman, you said yourself just a few moments ago, we cannot just make stuff up. We are the Oversight Committee, so we want to make sure that the evidence that we are telling the American people about is clear and factual, and what we are telling the American people about what is happening not only publicly in this domain, but also within the Committee's investigation, is factual.

And you know, I had the opportunity yesterday to sit in one of the taped interviews with one of the witnesses who has been called before this Committee. I have to say, Mr. Chairman, I was really shocked. You know, we sat there. The witness answered the questions of the Majority, and, man, those Members who were sitting in that room, they ran downstairs as soon as they heard the first few minutes of testimony, and then they went directly to the press gaggle and shared a complete misrepresentation of what happened in that room. And that is why Mr. Biden is trying to appear under oath publicly in front of the American people because time and again, and I saw it with my very own eyes yesterday, we have Members who are participating in this inquiry who are misrepresenting the facts. So, let us get the facts correct inside of this resolution.

Now, finally, I want to just point out that this impeachment inquiry actually precedes even, like, some of the conspiracy theories that are even being put forward here today. We heard, you know, back in the summer that two Members of this Committee had competing impeachment resolutions on the Floor, one of which had nothing to do with the evidence that the Committee is trying to bring in on this matter. And they had gotten in a vocal fight on the Floor of the House because they were, you know, so ravenous to prove to Donald Trump that they were his supporters and going to help impeach Joe Biden. So, let us not play games. This is a political activity, but if you are going to engage in a political activity, let us make sure it is factual. With that, I yield back.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that this motion be immediately dispensed with and tabled. It is not germane to the markup.

Mr. RASKIN. Parliamentary inquiry. Can you explain what is not germane about it?

Chairman COMER. Well, I have not ruled, but I am going to rule it is not germane. It violates the fundamental purpose of the report.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, in other words, it addresses the fundamental purpose of the report.

Chairman COMER. No. It violates the fundamental purpose of the report. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I would like to appeal the ruling.

Chairman COMER. All right. The——

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, point of order, please?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Could you please clarify what you mean by the report because my understanding is the ANS is a resolution to hold Mr. Biden in contempt, but this amendment is to correct the resolution so that there is a factual accounting of the errors of the—

Chairman COMER. There is a factual accounting. We have been very transparent. This has been a very transparent, substantive investigation.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I encourage the American people to read the—

Chairman COMER. No, I think the American people are keeping up with this. We will see.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Pages that are in this resolution, not report. I also encourage the Chairman to use the correct terminology when engaging in parliamentary procedure.

Mr. GOSAR. Chairman, I seek recognition.

Chairman COMER. I am sorry? Yes, Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, I seek recognition. Move to table to motion.

Chairman COMER. OK. The motion by Mr. Gosar to table is not debatable.

All those in favor of tabling the appeal of the Chair may signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair is tabled.

The Committee will now resume consideration of any other amendments.

Are there any other amendments? Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will distribute the amendment.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk designate the Crockett Amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute as offered by Ms. Crockett of Texas.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Crockett is recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am introducing this amendment to emphasize the importance of telling the truth. Chairman Comer has given us alternative facts about the testimony of Mr. Devon Archer provided to this Committee, the Democrats and Republicans, but behind closed doors. Again, it is commonsense not to trust my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when it comes to stating the facts because they are the same ones that gave us alternative facts about the election, they gave us alternative facts about January 6, and thus far, they have given us alternative facts, at least to the American people, about their motivation for this impeachment inquiry. So, I do have a few receipts that I would like to go through.

On December 6, 2023, Chairman Comer tweeted out that President Biden emailed with his son's business associates, but let me be clear. When consulting the transcript, it was determined that those were alternative facts. The actual facts found in Mr. Archer's transcribed interviews show that President Biden was not involved in his son's business activities, and that during his more than a decade-long business relationship with Hunter Biden, Archer never witnessed President Biden have any involvement in his son's business dealings or take any official actions to benefit Hunter Biden or his businesses. And Archer never witnessed Hunter Biden discuss the substance of his business with his father or ask his father to take any official actions.

Again, in August 2023, Chair Comer stated in an interview to Newsmax that Mr. Archer "admitted that the Burisma executives were squeezing Hunter Biden to try to do everything he could to get the Prosecutor Shokin fired" because they were going after their corrupt energy company, and lo and behold, a few days later, Joe Biden actually did that. After consulting the transcript yet again, it was determined another alternative fact. The actual facts are that Mr. Archer specifically spoke about Ukraine and Hunter Biden's role with Burisma, the Ukrainian energy company on whose board they both served, and repeatedly stated Hunter Biden never discussed Burisma with his father and never asked his father to take an official action to benefit him or Burisma. Mr. Archer further stated that he had no reason to believe Vice President Biden's call for Shokin's removal was driven by anything other than the U.S. Government's anti-corruption policy in Ukraine.

Chairman Comer again tweeted—he loves his Twitter—on December 6 that President Biden was on speaker-phone with the Biden family business associates over 20 times. We consulted the transcript, and it was determined, again, another alternative fact. Mr. Archer's transcribed interview actually states that while Hunter Biden spoke frequently with his father, sometimes when Hunter Biden was with other people, Mr. Archer stated he never witnessed any discussion of substantive business during these calls. Again, Chair Comer's association with reality about information brought forth by witnesses he demanded come in, well, Chair Comer, we spun it again about Mr. Archer's statements when it came down to President Biden.

When we consult the transcript over and over and over, it has been determined that the facts that have been laid out by the Members of this Committee on the Republican side have been alternative facts. When Mr. Archer was directly asked during the transcribed interview, if President Biden was the brand, Mr. Archer clarified that D.C. was the brand, and that he and Hunter Biden helped to assemble a team of attorneys, lobbyists, and public officials, public affairs professionals to handle Burisma's government relations, and President Biden was not part of the D.C. team.

It is no wonder that Hunter Biden wanted to come before everyone in public because, Mr. Chairman, it is vital that we continually have to set the record straight and make sure that alternative facts are not what is being handed out to the American people, but instead the facts, the real facts, reality. I would also like to—

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentlelady—

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes?

Mr. RASKIN. Just for a quick question, Ms. Crockett, and I thank you for that illuminating intervention because I am starting to wonder if the Russian hoax should apply to the lie about Burisma, which sits at the very heart of this investigation. That is the real hoax, isn't it? In fact, Lev Parnas, who helped make it up, has been out there begging Chairman Comer and the Republicans to end this wild goose chase and to have him come testify about how they tried to concoct the lie in the first place, and yet, that is a witness that they do not want to hear from. Thank you. I yield back to you, Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. They do not want to hear that. And if we care about making sure that the American people know that we have transparency and truth on this Committee, then I would implore this Committee to release the transcripts publicly instead of tweeting out alternative facts about what has been testified to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. As previously approved, each side has 10 minutes debate. Well, the Chair now recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move—make a motion that we table this amendment. It is dilatory and not germane to the mark-up.

Mr. RASKIN. But, Mr. Chairman, didn't we already agree, I think to have 10 minutes on each side? I am not sure Mr. Palmer was aware of that agreement.

Chairman COMER. OK. We already agreed to have 10 minutes debate. I am sorry. I did not make that clear.

Mr. PALMER. I withdraw that motion.

Chairman COMER. Does anyone wish to speak? Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. I think this amendment is very important because it goes to the heart of the dispute that the Chairman and the witness seem to be having, which is where would his testimony take place. The Chairman is insisting that it would be done in a closed-door deposition, whereas the witness is insisting to take up the Chairman's original offer to do this in a public hearing. And one of the reasons that the witness continues to push for a public hearing is the Devon Archer closed-door transcribed interview. That is one of only two transcripts of, I believe, at least 18 transcribed interviews or depositions that this Republican Majority has released. But it gives us really, really good insight into exactly what the Chairman and the Majority would plan to do with Hunter Biden's closed-door testimony.

Let us take for example, just, I think, earlier this weekend, Chairman Jordan of the Judiciary Committee, also a Member of this Committee, said on television that the most powerful evidence of President Biden's wrongdoing is the testimony of Devon Archer. So, I wondered, I wonder what is that testimony that is so powerful? Was it the testimony of Devon Archer when he said that President Biden was never involved in any of Hunter's business ventures, or was it the testimony that President Biden never received any money from Hunter's business interest? And remember, Devon Archer testified he was Hunter Biden's primary business partner. He was on the board of Burisma with Hunter Biden, so he had firsthand knowledge of all of Hunter Biden's business deals.

Now, maybe if it was not those. It was the fact that President Biden, according to Devon Archer, never received any bribes from the Ukrainian Government. In fact, maybe it was even that he said that President Biden never discussed business with Hunter Biden or Hunter's business associates. It must be that he was focusing on the times when President Biden met or spoke to Hunter Biden's business associates. That clearly has to be what the Chairman was talking about. So it must be that when you look at the transcript, what he was referring to is when Devon Archer repeatedly said that they never discussed business, that they only talked about "niceties," including, and this is according to Devon Archer's testimony, "how the weather was" and that none of the discussions ever related to business. So, the best evidence that these Republicans want to put forward is testimony that completely absolves President Biden from any involvement, association, benefit from, or other interactions with Hunter Biden's business interests.

Now, Chairman Comer, you were asked a few weeks ago on CNN what you thought the best evidence was of wrongdoing by President Biden, and you said that the allegations of the bribe from the Burisma founder. Should we call it, I guess the Burisma hoax now because unlike with Russia's interference in the 2016 election, which Special Counsel Mueller unequivocally determined was known to the Trump campaign, was welcomed by the Trump campaign and was used by the Trump campaign, in this case, Vice President Biden's urging Ukraine to fire the prosecutor general of Ukraine, which was consistent with the official U.S. policy—it was consistent with the European Union policy, it was consistent with a bipartisan Senate delegation who urged it as well—was actually bad for Burisma, and, therefore, it was bad for Hunter Biden. And who should we look to to determine whether that is the case? How about Devon Archer, the star witness, who was also on the board of Burisma?

No, Devon Archer said that it was his understanding that Burisma had Shokin, the prosecutor general, under control and that getting rid of him would have been bad for Burisma. And, of course, it was bad for Burisma because as soon as Shokin was gone, after he had allowed a British case to lapse, the next prosecutor general came in and did start investigating the founder of Burisma, so it turned out to be exactly correct. This is why Hunter Biden wants to testify in public is because if you had not released that transcript and we had just relied on the false representations of the Majority Members of this Committee about what Devon Archer said, we would never have known that Devon Archer actually absolves Joe Biden of any involvement of any wrongdoing related to Hunter Biden's business interests, and the public would not know that this entire investigation is a complete sham. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Minority will have 4 minutes. The Majority has 10 minutes. I will go first.

I must oppose this amendment, but I have to state something. I want everyone to understand this. I want everyone to understand this. A lot has been said about people on this Committee running to the press during a deposition or during an interview. During the two main interviews of this impeachment inquiry investigation, the

Devon Archer interview and the George Burgess interview, the very first person, the very first person on this Committee, to run to the reporters was none other than Dan Goldman. That is a fact. Does anyone want to dispute that right now? The very first person.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I would like you to identify one thing that I said that was not consistent with the transcript.

Chairman COMER. You are talking about—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Check the transcripts.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Running to the press and leaking.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I wanted to release the Burgess transcript.

Chairman COMER. You said Hunter Biden did not want to come because of the leaks. You are the leaker. You are the leaker, Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. You do your check.

Chairman COMER. You have 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I say the truth. You gave false information.

Chairman COMER. This is not the time. You are out of order. You are out of order. I let you sit there and regurgitate your baloney for 6 minutes.

I oppose this amendment. This amendment strikes the entire section about why Hunter Biden's testimony is necessary for the Committee's legitimate oversight investigation. The amendment discusses a single deposition with Devon Archer and gets rid of all other relevant information as to why his deposition is important. The amendment distorts the reality of how the Committee has handled this investigation.

Devon Archer has stated publicly that claims made by the Democrats in this amendment are categorically false. Specifically, Devon Archer stated that Democrats' claims that President Biden was not involved in Hunter's businesses in any way was false. Devon Archer said that is categorically false. He said Joe Biden, "was aware of Hunter's business. He met with Hunter's business partners."

I recommend that all Members of this Committee oppose this misguided amendment, and I ask to submit to the record Devon Archer's interview where he says one Democratic claim about the Biden business is categorically false, and that was what I just mentioned with respect to Joe's involvement and knowledge in his businesses.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Now, the Minority Party has 4 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just very quickly want to clarify that when I mentioned that the Majority had run to the press and misrepresented what happened in that interview yesterday, the point was that they misrepresented what happened in the interview. And I know that for a fact because somebody shared with me the text message that the Republican staff sent around all the Members, and I also heard directly from the press what was said. So, that is what we are talking about here is misrepresentation of the facts. And with that, I yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. And I am fascinated by this exchange because most committees I have been on, when the transcripts are released, it serves the vital function of transparency,

but it also keeps people from misrepresenting and distorting the facts in advance. But if you withhold all but two transcribed interviews—I think there is something like 16 or 17 that have not been released by the Majority—then that does become an incentive to misrepresent and distort.

I do not blame Mr. Goldman if he rounded the press to try to get out the true story before others go out and tell a lie about what is taking place if we are not going to turn the transcripts over. And I wonder whether you, Mr. Chairman, could commit to turn over all of the transcribed interviews in the—

Mr. HIGGINS. Will the gentleman yield for question?

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Committee and to the Congress and to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. HIGGINS. Ranking Member—

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, by all means.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Yield for a question?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Will the Ranking Member presume that his Republican colleagues intend to lie about transcripts?

Mr. RASKIN. But I—

Mr. HIGGINS. You seem to have that presumption.

Mr. RASKIN. No. Well, what I will presume is based on the fact that there have been multiple distortions and misrepresentations in the past, and the vast majority of the transcribed interviews have not been released. Someone give me the exact numbers, but I believe only 2 transcribed interviews out of 17 or 18 have been released. I have never seen that before, and I am baffled by it. I do not understand.

Mr. HIGGINS. And the Ranking Member's esteemed background and knowledge of judicial affairs, when there was ongoing investigations and multiple witnesses and complex cases, isn't it common for full transcripts to not be released—

Mr. RASKIN. No, it is not.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Within the parameters—

Mr. RASKIN. No, I do not think so.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Or investigation?

Mr. RASKIN. But anyway, we are talking about some that took place 6 months ago, 8 months ago, but somebody is going to give me a list of how many we are talking about here. There are 17 total. Only two transcribed interviews have been released. So, then it does become a race to get out to say, you know, what you think happened. Why don't we just give the people the transcribed interviews? We talk about transparency and accountability. That is the dominant theme of this Committee. Isn't that something we can agree to?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the Ranking Member yield for 1 minute?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have a question for the Ranking Member. If it is generally the practice of an investigator to withhold all of the transcripts during the investigative phase, would that normally also include releasing two of them?

Mr. RASKIN. Well, that strikes me as odd. That does look like, you know, the famed cherry-picking. It is as if to say, well, two of these interviews helped us, 15 or 16 of them do not help us, so we

are going to bury them someplace, so that is odd. But I want to presume the best of my colleagues, Mr. Higgins, and that is why I am asking the Chairman to explain what is the practice here.

Chairman COMER. Well, you complained that we do not release transcripts. You complained because we do release transcripts. Honestly, we released those two transcripts because you had misrepresented so much what Devon Archer said. That is probably one reason he went on Tucker Carlson show to call you out for misrepresenting what he said in the transcribed interview, but you let them get leaked.

Mr. RASKIN. So, you are able to get them ready. You are able to get them ready, in other words, and you thought that it was important—

Chairman COMER. We have other witnesses to interview. You know how it works, Mr. Raskin. You know, you are playing like you do not know how this works. You are playing and trying to act like you have never done an investigation before when you have led both impeachments in the January 6—

Mr. RASKIN. I did not lead the first impeachment, but—

Chairman COMER. I would not want to admit to leading that first impeachment either.

Mr. RASKIN. I would have 10 nicknames from President Trump by now if I, like, led that one, but—

Chairman COMER. I think your all's time is pretty much expired. Does anyone on our side have anything to add? I do not see anything. Who is that, Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes. You know, we talk about facts. It was not U.S. policy to do what Biden did in Ukraine. The Obama Administration actually said that Ukraine had complied with the law, and that the loan should go through—yes, they did—and then the Vice President changes it on an audible over there. So, the other thing I want to point out is, is if the President did not know anything about Hunter Biden's businesses, how do you explain the 14, 15, 16—I cannot remember now how many times his partner actually went to the White House. How do you explain that? How do you explain this guy Devon Archer shows up at the White House? Who are you? Normally, the person is going to say, well, I am Hunter Biden's business partner. That is typically what the average person would say, but how come he did not know anything about that?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Gosar, for the six people in America who are still watching our hearing, could you just explicate what you think the Presidential crime is?

Mr. GOSAR. I am just saying, right now, we are just talking about the facts. The facts here are misplayed. I mean, you complain about us. I am going to complain about you, because I am stating the facts.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentleman yield for 1 second?

Mr. GOSAR. I will give you a second.

Chairman COMER. It is Mr. Gosar's time.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am not going to ask you to take my representation for it. I would ask you to go read the transcripts of the State Department witnesses in the first impeachment who were in the Ukraine embassy and in the State Department, and were the ones

who created and made the official U.S. policy, who all testified that Vice President Biden was acting consistent with official U.S. policy.

Mr. GOSAR. OK. Well, that is not what we received. And when you start looking at this, you know, the courts, you know, the Ranking Member always goes to the courts. You know, you had a judge that basically said this honeypot of a deal for Hunter was no good, and no one was going to get that. How do you explain the slow walking? You led the Justice Department on the IRS claims, and how many people get a chance to do that?

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield? That is a great point, and when the courts ruled against Hunter Biden, I do not think you heard a single complaint from anybody on our side of the aisle. We said let the justice system proceed, but when the court said that the January 6 Committee was validly and constantly composed, we still have people today who violated their subpoenas who are whining about how the committee is illegal. I mean, come on. I mean, how do you feel about that one?

Chairman COMER. Could I ask you a question?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Just out of curiosity, why did you all not hold them in contempt?

Mr. RASKIN. Hold who in contempt?

Chairman COMER. The people that did not—

Mr. RASKIN. Oh, we did not have time at that point. I mean, we got up to the very end of the Congress.

Chairman COMER. I was just wondering.

Mr. RASKIN. But if you want to work on it now, let us do it now.

Chairman COMER. No.

Mr. RASKIN. I am totally with you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. No, I was just curious as to why you did not. All right.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, let us make it bipartisan.

Ms. STANSBURY. I would like to—

Chairman COMER. Everybody good? We square?

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Motion that we hold anyone who has violated—

Chairman COMER. Well, I was just wondering. I mean, that is a tool that Congress has. You have been on TV several times saying that people should honor congressional subpoenas.

Mr. RASKIN. And I believe—

Chairman COMER. But then you do not hold them in contempt.

Mr. RASKIN. Whether it is Steve Bannon, Dan Scavino, Jim Jordan, or Hunter Biden, if somebody—

Chairman COMER. But you did hold—

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. If somebody—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. The other two.

Mr. RASKIN. I am sorry?

Chairman COMER. You did hold two of those in contempt.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, Steve Bannon has been convicted by a court. He has been convicted in court.

Chairman COMER. Department of Justice—

Mr. RASKIN. And still, I do not think you get a single person on your side of the aisle, other than Ms. Mace, to utter a word about people who violated subpoenas in the last Congress. I mean, that

is extraordinary. And of all that I have been thinking about Hunter Biden is he accepted what was your original offer. You did not like that offer anymore. You put out—

Chairman COMER. Let me say this. And then, your time has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Chairman COMER. And we are going to get to the vote. Hunter Biden is more than welcome to come for a hearing after the deposition.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. You did not say that before, but that is cool. You have changed—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, hold up. Will you—

Chairman COMER. Now, the time is expired.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Guarantee that there will be a public—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman, you have talked and talked and talked.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will you guarantee that there will be a public hearing if he were to come in?

Chairman COMER. After the deposition, I guarantee.

Mr. GOLDMAN. You say right now—

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. We will have a public hearing—

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. With Hunter Biden.

Chairman COMER. Absolutely. We have said that.

Ms. GREENE. He already said—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes, I know. We heard a lot about public hearings that have not happened.

Chairman COMER. OK. The question on the amendment—I do not even remember who offered the amendment—Ms. Crockett.

The question is on the Crockett Amendment.

All those in favor of the Crockett Amendment, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. RASKIN. Recorded vote on that, please.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. We will plan to reconvene in 15 minutes, to get everyone together.

The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come to order.

The Committee will now resume consideration of the report's amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Goldman from New York. The clerk will call the roll on the Goldman Amendment.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?
[No response.]
Mr. Gosar?
Mr. GOSAR. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.
Ms. Foxx?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.
Mr. Cloud?
Mr. CLOUD. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes no.
Mr. Palmer?
Mr. PALMER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.
Mr. Sessions?
Mr. SESSIONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.
Mr. Fallon?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
Ms. Boebert?

[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.
Mrs. Luna?
Mrs. LUNA. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.
Mr. Langworthy?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Mfume?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
Ms. Bush?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes yes.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.

Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. LEE. Yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.

Mr. Casar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Ms. Tlaib?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk call the roll?

How is Mr. Casar recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Casar is not recorded.

Mr. CASAR. Votes yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Fallon recorded?

Mr. FALLON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon was not yet recorded.

Mr. FALLON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Langworthy recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy is not yet recorded.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

Chairman COMER. How is Ms. Tlaib recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib is not yet recorded.

Ms. TLAIB. Yes.

Chairman COMER. She voted yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes yes.

Chairman COMER. The clerk report?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 18. The nays are 22.

Chairman COMER. OK. The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

The question now is on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of substitute, offered by Mr. Frost. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.
Ms. Foxx?
Ms. FOXX. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.
Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.
Mr. Cloud?
Mr. CLOUD. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes no.
Mr. Palmer?
Mr. PALMER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.
Mr. Sessions?
Mr. SESSIONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.
Mr. Fallon?
Mr. FALLON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.
Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.
Mr. Burchett?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
Ms. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.

Mrs. Luna?
Mrs. LUNA. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Fumee?
Mr. MFUMEE. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fumee votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
Ms. Bush?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes yes.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
Mr. Casar?
Mr. CASAR. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.
Mr. Goldman?
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.
Mr. Moskowitz?
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.
Ms. Tlaib?
Ms. TLAIB. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes yes.
Mr. Chairman?
Chairman COMER. No, and how is Mr. Burchett recorded?
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no. Mr. Burchett is not yet recorded.
Mr. BURCHETT. How did Gosar vote?
Mr. GOSAR. No.
Mr. BURCHETT. Then I will be a no.
Chairman COMER. Mr. Burchett votes no. How is Mr. Turner recorded?
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no. Mr. Turner is not yet recorded.
Mr. TURNER. Mr. Turner votes no.
The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.
Chairman COMER. Will the clerk tally?
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the nays are 24. The ayes are 20.
Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.
The question is now on the previously postponed amendment in the nature of substitute, oh, on the Crockett Amendment. The clerk will call the roll on the Crockett amendment.
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?
Mr. TUNER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.
Mr. Gosar?
Mr. GOSAR. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.
Ms. Foxx?
Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes no.
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.
Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.
Mr. Cloud?
Mr. CLOUD. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes no.
Mr. Palmer?
Mr. PALMER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.
Mr. Sessions?
Mr. SESSIONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. No.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.
Mr. Fallon?
Mr. FALLON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.
Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
Ms. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.
Mrs. Luna?
Mrs. LUNA. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Fumee?
Mr. MFUMEE. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fumee votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
Ms. Bush?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes yes.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
Mr. Frost?
Mr. FROST. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes yes.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
Mr. Casar?

Mr. CASAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.

Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. Yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes yes.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Member wish to vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the clerk report the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 24.

Chairman COMER. The nays have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the contempt report.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, signify by saying nay.

[Chorus of nays]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to the report is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting the report. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes yes.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.

Mr. Cloud?

Mr. CLOUD. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes yes.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.
Mr. Sessions?
Mr. SESSIONS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes yes.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes yes.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes yes.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes yes.
Mr. Fallon?
Mr. FALLON. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes yes.
Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.
Ms. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Waltz?
Mr. WALTZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Waltz votes aye.

Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
Mr. Fumef?
Mr. MFUME. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Fumef votes no.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes no.
Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. No, ma'am.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
Mr. Frost?
Mr. FROST. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
Mr. Casar?
Mr. CASAR. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.
Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes nay.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes nay.

Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, and how is Chairman Jordan recorded?

The CLERK. The Chairman votes yes. Mr. Jordan is not recorded.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes.

Chairman COMER. Any other Member wish to be recorded?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the ayes are 25. The nays are 21.

Chairman COMER. Pursuant to this vote, the Committee hereby adopts this report recommending that the House of Representatives find Robert Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by this Committee.

We will move the report to the full House.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, Committee Members shall have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee supplemental, additional Minority and dissenting views within 2 days.

Without objection, so ordered.

Additionally, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the report ordered reported today, subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

If there is no further business before the Committee, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 5:41, p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

