

119th Congress }
1st Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

FULL COMMITTEE
ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

FOR THE
COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JANUARY 14, 2025

Serial No. CP:119-1

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

58-536 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia, <i>Ranking</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	<i>Minority Member</i>
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	Columbia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	ROBERT GARCIA, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	GREG CASAR, Texas
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	DAVE MIN, California
ELI CRANE, Arizona	<i>Vacancy</i>
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	<i>Vacancy</i>
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

RYAN GIACHETTI, Deputy General Counsel and Parliamentarian
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JAMIE SMITH, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

Hearing held on January 14, 2025	Page 1
--	-----------

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

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

- * Amendment No. 1; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- * Amendment No. 2; submitted by Rep. Mfume.
- * Amendment No. 3; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Amendment No. 4; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * Amendment No. 5; submitted by Rep. Crockett.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Tuesday, January 14, 2025

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

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:04 p.m., in room HVC-210, Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Cloud, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, Fallon, Donalds, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, Boebert, Langworthy, Burlison, Crane, Jack, McGuire, Gill, Connolly, Norton, Lynch, Krishnamoorthi, Mfume, Brown, Stansbury, Garcia, Frost, Lee, Casar, Crockett, Randall, Subramanyam, Ansari, Bell, Simon, and Min.

Chairman COMER. The Committee will please come to order.

A quorum is present. The Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

Without objection, 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 Committee will continue to use the electronic system for recorded votes on amendments and passage of the bills before the Committee. Of course, should any technical issues arise, which I do not anticipate, we will immediately transition to traditional roll call votes. Any procedural or motion-related votes during today's markup will be dispensed with by a traditional roll call vote.

I want to welcome everyone to the organizational meeting of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. This Congress, the Committee will continue its important work: safeguarding taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement; ensuring the Federal bureaucracy is transparent and accountable to the American people; and making sure the Federal Government is working efficiently for the American people.

Before we begin our meeting to adopt the Committee Rules for the 119th Congress, I would like to welcome all our new and returning Members to the Committee. I look forward to working with each Member on both sides of the aisle of this Committee during this Congress.

The new Members on the Republican side are Eli Crane from Arizona, Brian Jack from Georgia, John McGuire of Virginia, and

Brandon Gill of Texas. I want to welcome you all. We are glad you are here, and we look forward to working with you to protect American taxpayer dollars.

I would also like to congratulate Ranking Member Gerry Connolly on his appointment to serve as the Ranking Member this Congress.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. A significant upgrade, I might add. We are really happy to have you here. I look forward to working with you on several issues. And we have a great track record, I think you would say, of working together on legislation. I have said to many people that you are a Member of great substance, great character, someone that I believe wants to govern and wants to pass good government legislation. So, I look forward to working with you.

With that, I want to yield to the Ranking Member to introduce his new Members.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair for his kind remarks. Though I will note, he did support my opponent when I ran for this job.

Chairman COMER. I think my endorsement was more damaging than Liz Cheney's endorsement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I used it to a fare-thee-well, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join you in welcoming our returning and our incredible new Members to the Committee on both sides of the aisle and look forward to trying to work closely with you in this next Congress.

This Committee has the most important mandate in the House of Representatives, from my point of view, to ensure a transparent government that is fully accountable to the American people. We take seriously this duty and are committed to promoting a government and economy and a shared national purpose that work for all of the American people.

Our Nation is facing deep political division. Trust in government is low. The economy is not delivering for all hardworking people who should be able to afford a home and provide for their families. And the American social compact of shared belief in fairness, opportunity, and mutual responsibility has frayed, leaving too many feeling left behind and disconnected. We have an opportunity to work together to prove to the public that this government serves them first and foremost and that the cards are not stacked against them.

As the Committee organized at the start of the 117th Congress, Chairman Comer, you acknowledged that the Chair of the Committee is historically reluctant to send serious inquiries to an executive branch comprised of the same party. Following that mold would do a great disservice to the American people who demand that their tax dollars be spent wisely and effectively, unquote. Mr. Chairman, I urge you to approach the incoming Administration with the same rigorous approach to that accountability you discussed back then.

Throughout my time on this Committee, I have been a staunch advocate for improving the Federal Government to ensure that it responds to the needs of our constituents. Whether through improved and expanded use of modern technologies, the reduction of waste and fraud, more efficient acquisition processes, and so much

more, we can create a more responsive and accessible government and find political common ground.

But a responsive government is never enough. We have much work to do to ensure that the Federal Government is also accountable. To do this we must make clear that the entire Federal Government—from the President on down—is subject to the rule of law. We must acknowledge where we have not met that standard and work together to restore the basic guardrails envisioned by the Founders of our republic. And we must continue to advance the rights and liberties of the American people, because a truly effective and responsive democratic government must always protect individual rights.

It would be easy to say reform is too hard, things are too broken, change is too slow, why not just give up and scrap what does not work. This Committee does not have that luxury. Again, the American people are depending on us to deliver on our promises for a government, an economy, and a shared national purpose that works for them. I do not believe any of us would be here today if we did not think that we could accomplish the hard work of this Committee as it has before it.

I hope the Committee can work together to set aside partisan politics to deliver fact-based, reasoned results for the public we serve. And I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consult early and often on letters, hearings, witnesses, subpoenas, and legislation. We may not—and we know we will not—always agree, but we must endeavor to always remain respectful and reasonable, and I hope that will be the new standard of this Committee on both sides of the aisle.

As the subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member, it has always been my goal to encourage a respectful exchange of ideas, vigorous but respectful. And I will continue to promote that approach and that level of civility as the Ranking Member of this full Committee. I ask my colleagues to approach all of our work in the same way.

Now, onto business. The task of our meeting today is to establish rules for this Committee for the 119th Congress. These rules will serve as the architecture for the Committee to operate over the next 2 years. I believe that is why it is critical these rules not only empower the Committee to act effectively and efficiently but to protect minority rights. To further those goals, Committee Democrats will offer a handful of what I think are reasonable, commonsense amendments for consideration.

Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. You and I have already spoken a couple of times, and I appreciate the commitment you have made to work together as much as possible. Again, I welcome everyone to the Committee and look forward to our deliberation.

Chairman COMER. I want to thank the Ranking Member, and, again, I look forward to working with you. And I think there are a lot of areas where we can find common ground. Even in the last Congress, we found common ground on many issues related to cybersecurity, information technology, as well as our three PBM hearings and investigations, so I look forward to this Congress.

Before we move to consideration of the Committee Rules, I want to mention a few things. The Rules package before you is substan-

tially the same as last Congress with only a few changes, and I want to just mention those changes.

First, I want to highlight Rule 6, which outlines our new subcommittees and their jurisdictions. Through these subcommittees we will once again focus on the priorities of the American people. Second, we are including language in Rule 5 to accommodate the electronic voting that this Committee adopted last Congress, and I do not think anyone complained about that. It reduced the time of our mark-ups at least an hour. Last, Rule 15(j) contains changes regarding the transcription of witness testimony.

I was going to allow—I would like—before we get into the Committee hearing, I was going to yield back to Representative Connolly to see if he wanted to introduce your new Members. Do you have that?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I do.

Chairman COMER. And while he is looking that up, I want to welcome the new Democrats to the most high-profile committee in Congress. You all hit the ground running.

So, Representative Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So, let us see, we have new Members: Emily Randall; Suhas Subramanyam from my corner of the world in Virginia—welcome, Suhas—Yassamin Ansari from Arizona; Wesley Bell from Missouri; Lateefah Simon from California; and Dave Min from California. Welcome.

Chairman COMER. Welcome.

We will begin the debate on any amendments to Committee Rules. Does any Member seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Ranking Member Connolly.

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

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

Does everyone have a copy of the amendment?

The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress is offered by Mr. Connolly of Virginia.

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

I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman, the Ranking Member, is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Committee's proposed Rules are silent on whether or not the Chair consults with the Ranking Member and provides a draft copy of a proposed subpoena in advance of the one being issued. This amendment would simply require that at least 24 hours in advance of authorizing and issuing the subpoena the Chair would consult with the Ranking Member and provide a draft copy of the proposed subpoena. This is similar to the rule adopted by the Judiciary Committee.

During the 118th Congress, the Ranking Member was not consulted or notified of a single subpoena out of more than 50 that were issued. The practice followed last Congress was a significant

departure from the precedent set by former Democratic Chairman Cummings and Chairwoman Maloney in the 116th and 117th Congresses. Both Democratic Chairs consistently provided the Ranking Member with 48 hours' notice and a copy of the subpoena before it was issued.

My amendment is also similar in nature to the one that you, Mr. Chairman, offered at the organizational meeting at the start of the 117th under a Democratic Majority at that time. At that time, you said, and I quote, the subpoena is a powerful tool and that notice and consultation are commonsense measures that the Majority should afford the Minority to the fullest extent possible. I strongly agree with those sentiments that you expressed in the 117th Congress.

I would also be remiss if I did not give proper recognition to the source of the amendment that I propose. My amendment is modeled off language that Chairman Jim Jordan of the House Judiciary Committee has included in his committee rules for this Congress on the Judiciary Committee. Returning to a practice of proper notice on the issuance of subpoenas would lend further credibility to the reputation of this Committee and take away from the harmful practice of issuing secret subpoenas.

In the spirit of cooperation and collegiality, I think we should return to this Committee's prior precedent. We cannot allow the Oversight Committee's Rules and practices to become a race to the bottom. The Democratic Members of the Committee and the American public I think both deserve better. I urge Members to support this simple, commonsense amendment, which has been adopted under the Judiciary Committee, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Ranking Member yields back. I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes.

And I must say, I am sympathetic to that request. Many of you will remember, I was a Ranking Member for 2 years with the Democratic Majority and I did offer the exact same amendment that the Ranking Member just presented today. And I just so happen to have a roll call from the 117th Congress, and lo and behold, Mr. Connolly voted against the amendment that he offered today.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, might I just point out, actually, it was not the same amendment. Your language would have required a vote. We are not doing that today.

Chairman COMER. Well, at any rate, as we discussed, we are going to communicate. I think we are going to have a very good working relationship, like Chairman Cummings and Mark Meadows and Jim Jordan had, I feel like.

As we have discussed, a congressional subpoena is a powerful tool, which should be used only in appropriate circumstances. I have vowed to use this power responsibly and only when necessary. Document subpoenas must be issued after I have exhausted reasonable efforts to obtain voluntary compliance with requests for information critical to this Committee's work. It will be very clear to Committee Members and to the Ranking Member when I need to issue a subpoena to ensure that the Committee has the information it needs to conduct oversight investigations and hold wrongdoers accountable.

Similar amendments were proposed by past Congress, and we mentioned that, and unfortunately, when—the last time the Democrats were in the Majority and the Republicans had the same request, as I noted earlier, the Democrats voted that amendment down. I do not see any reason why the rules should change now.

But to be clear, I am not opposed to providing reasonable notices of subpoenas as a matter of practice, and will continue to work with the Ranking Member to ensure the Minority is appropriately informed. And I must say that in the last 3 weeks, or however long it has been since Representative Connolly was elected to be Ranking Member, I think the dialog with our staffs, the Majority staff and Minority staff, has been excellent. It has been significantly better than it has been in the past, and I think we have a very bright future to work together.

But on this amendment, Mr. Ranking Member, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Do any Members wish to seek recognition? Any other Members?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. As I recall it, your amendment required a vote on the subpoena. And Mr. Connolly's amendment is *de minimis* here, and that is just you need to—not only is it waivable if circumstances in your determination require it, but also this is mere notice. There is no vote that the Minority is claiming here. I think it is a really *de minimis* obligation on the part of the Chair just to let Mr. Connolly know of a subpoena being issued.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I would yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend. And he is correct. The substantial difference between the roll call vote, my friend, the Chairman, cited and what we are discussing here today is quite substantial. It would have required a vote, a vote to approve a subpoena. We are not seeking that, because our hope is that someday the worm turns and we are not going to necessarily give away the power of subpoena when we are in the Majority, and we do not expect this Majority to do it either.

However, what we are asking for is a reasonable standard of consultation, advance consultation, so we are not surprised or reading about a subpoena that may be very consequential and very controversial, or not. You know, we believe that in the work of the Committee, as was the tradition, I can—my predecessor Tom Davis, who is coming to testify tomorrow in a hearing before this Committee, and then-Chairman of this Committee, Henry Waxman, actually had a *modus operandi* where they agreed before they issued a subpoena.

We are simply asking for advance notice and consultation, no restriction on the ability of the Chairman to issue the subpoena. I think that is a fairly reasonable standard. And I thank my friend from Massachusetts for clarifying, and I yield back to him.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Just very briefly, and, again, Mr. Connolly's amendment allows that the Chair may waive this requirement in the event of an emergency that does not reasonably allow for advance notice. So,

I think it bends over backward trying to respect the prerogative of the Chair.

And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

And I might add that—just to correct—the amendment that we offered did not require a vote unless the Ranking Member objected to the subpoena. I think that is the way the language was. Is that correct, Mr. Connolly?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I think that is right.

Chairman COMER. So, I just wanted to correct that. And, again, I can tell you, we will work with the Ranking Member and our staffs will be in constant communication on these subpoenas. Honestly—and I have said this to the press, so this is not any groundbreaking news—we had issues with—you know, whenever we issue a subpoena—for the freshmen—whenever a subpoena is issued, the Minority gets a copy when the subpoena is issued. Whenever subpoena documents come in, both sides get the documents at the same time.

And there were lots of issues with—you know, sometimes we would have preferred some of the subpoenas didn't make the press, but they were leaked to the press. And, you know, we never know who the leakers were. I had a strong, sneaky suspicion that the leaker was the former occupant of the chair to my right, but I do not have any evidence of that.

So, at the end of the day, I do think that we will work together. I give you my pledge to work with you on the subpoenas, but, again, I oppose this legislation, just like the Members who were here the last time, and there were at least five that voted against my amendment 4 years ago when we offered that.

So, do any other Members seek recognition on the Connolly amendment?

OK. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Ranking Member, Mr. Connolly, from Virginia.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[Chorus of noes.]

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a recorded vote.

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

And just so the freshmen know, we will vote electronically. After all the amendments are debated, we will vote electronically and it will be real, real quick.

So, do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume from Maryland.

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

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

Do all Members have a copy of the Mfume amendment?

The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress is offered by Mr. Mfume 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. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

This amendment, I believe, strongly helps the Oversight Committee maintain the order, reasonableness, and intellectual honesty for which we have been known for many, many years as a Committee for, both in the Congress and, more broadly, in the minds of many of the American people.

Specifically, my amendment would preserve the jurisdictional authority of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Federal Workforce in the current Congress from what it was in the previous Congress by merging the Government Operations Subcommittee and the newly fashioned Delivering on Government Efficiency Subcommittee in the 119th Congress.

An as an initial matter, Mr. Chairman, I call our attention to the fact that this Committee operated in the 118th Congress also with five subcommittees, yet the proposed Rules before us today would expand that number to seven subcommittees. In an age where government efficiency is the mantra, it appears that we are doing exactly what we say the Federal Government should not do: growing in size and creating unnecessary, overlapping bureaucracy.

As a point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, I served as Ranking Member on the Government Operations and Federal Workforce Subcommittee in the previous Congress. And thanks to a very healthy working relationship with subcommittee Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sessions, we were together able to repeatedly go after the bad guys, the swindlers, the fraudsters, and the crooks, and in the process analyze many of the underlying causes for improper payments in Federal Government programs that were draining American citizens of hundreds of millions of dollars and depriving many of our poor citizens from some of the basic things they need, because oftentimes the money had been taken out, swindled, and stolen.

Likewise, we were able to address backlogs and delays at Federal agencies, including within the Department of Defense. And we have had a working—healthy working relationship with a number of inspector generals who were part and parcel of the work of that committee and very much responsible for not only finding the bad guys but also moving toward conviction of many of them.

So, forgive me if I find it not genuine to pretend that the pursuit of government efficiency is new. We have been doing that, and we have been doing it year after year. Likewise, forgive me if I find it not genuine also to divest the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Federal Workforce of all of its jurisdictional rights. And when I say all, I mean some of the most important ones, particularly the oversight of Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I believe each one of us know that on both sides of the aisle, in our heart of hearts, Amer-

ican campaigns and American elections are in peril because of money. I would offer also that our government is in peril because of money, but money going the wrong way, from where it is supposed to go to people who have devised all sorts of schemes to get around that and who are making fortunes off of money intended to help the American public.

So, I just believe that this situation we have really calls for the merger of these committees, not the separation of them, and as I said before, not the growth from five into seven. So, I would urge Members of the Committee to consider that, consider the work that we have been doing in that subcommittee, to consider the fact that these two committees should have joint oversight and be combined, and I would urge its passage, and yield back, without objection, Mr. Chair, to you and to the Ranking Member for any additional or concluding remarks.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. The gentleman yields back.

I will recognize myself for 5 minutes. And I agree with what you said, Mr. Mfume, the great work that Chairman Sessions and you did on the Government Ops Committee. There is not two finer Members of this Committee than you two.

We are going to be very busy this Congress, and I think that the difference in this Congress and last Congress is that—I hope—we have an administration that is more forthcoming, that is more transparent, that is more willing to provide us documents, receipts, and any type of information we need to do our job to make government more efficient. And if that is the case, we are going to be using a lot of subcommittees to do a lot of work.

We believe that if you look at the current level of bureaucracy, the current level of spending, the current level of—the lack of efficiency from what we are going to be talking about tomorrow in our hearing, government employees not coming to work, I think that, you know, we have got a lot of work to do. The Government Operations Subcommittee will still be the top subcommittee on this Committee, but we are going to have two additional subcommittees as well, because we believe there is going to be a huge portfolio of oversight for us to conduct this session, and we want to have as many Members of this Committee participating and working to try to achieve our goal of making government more efficient.

And you mentioned something that I think this Committee did great work—Chairman Sessions and your work—improper payments. We want to really focus on that, and hopefully we can come up with some solutions and get some clawbacks on these improper payments. So, I am confident the Government Operations Subcommittee is going to be busier than ever with Chairman Sessions, and we will have two additional subcommittees that will have a full platter as well.

With that, I will conclude my remarks. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I enthusiastically support the amendment offered by Mr. Mfume of Maryland. I believe that in this reorganization, the Rules, we are considering today, we are gutting the primary jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee and devolving a lot of it to this new subcommittee. To me, the logic is why not

merge the two, as Mr. Mfume is proposing, and get on with the business of that transparency you talk about.

I share a hope the Chairman is right that we are going to be ushering in a world of accountability and transparency with the second Trump Administration. However, early signs are not encouraging. The world's richest man donated \$277 million, a quarter of \$1 billion, to President-elect Trump and congressional Republicans just last year. In return, he is getting, among other things I am sure, his own entity to gut the Federal Government of its ability to work for the people who need it.

What could go wrong—remember, he talked about cutting \$2 trillion. What could go wrong with handing the reigns of the Federal Government to a billionaire oligarch who sees no use for government, except for his own purposes, in the first place? He does not rely, and nor do his cronies, on Social Security checks when they retire, and they have no problem cutting Social Security as a result. They do not have to worry about a spouse losing his or her job or the family needing to go on food stamps so they can take nutritional support from a Federal Government that is so important to them. They do not know, those oligarchs, what the anxiety is of a family farmer who has a drought or a hailstorm. Cutting crop insurance is no skin off their backs.

I think holding people accountable is an absolutely noteworthy goal. I think we could start with the DOGE process and Mr. Ramaswamy and Mr. Elon Musk.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would also like to commend Chairman Sessions for the good work that he has done on Government Ops. I think that has been great. However, our current state of affairs, as we are \$36 trillion in debt, Congress cannot have enough committees on oversight to look at cutting the ridiculous amount of spending, waste, fraud, and abuse from the Federal Government. So, I am very grateful for the opportunity to Chair the Subcommittee on DOGE.

Also, I do not think that we should be shaming people for success in this country, as we are hearing from the Ranking Member today. You know, success is something every single American strives for, and we want to do everything we can to make sure that Americans can be successful. And in doing so, cutting the ridiculous amount of spending that has carried on for decades here in Washington, DC. is one of the most important steps that we can take as Members of Congress in ensuring that the American people are successful. In doing that, we can get them and hopefully dig them out of this grave of debt, which is \$36 trillion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Do any other Members—

Mr. Frost, from Florida.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, I just want to point out, you know, we just heard someone say that we cannot have enough committees to look into government efficiency. But if you know anything about efficiency,

you can have too many committees doing the same exact thing. It is almost as inefficient as having two co-directors of a fake department of government efficiency.

And so, if we want to be serious about this, which I am very skeptical that folks are, I agree with this amendment on combining these subcommittees that would essentially do the same thing, help us consolidate government resources and spend less, which is supposedly what you care about. And so, I am in support of this amendment. And I also would yield some time—if he wants—to my friend Dave Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Yep, you are recognized.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleague from Maryland. I want to thank him for bringing this amendment forward.

Look, we all know that DOGE was started as the original meme coin, and this particular subcommittee that is being proposed feels a lot like a meme subcommittee. We are a serious body. I am honored to be here, but I think we have to take the business of oversight and accountability seriously. I think political stunts, which is what this looks like, are really not appropriate. So, I will yield back the remainder of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, I oppose this amendment. It is dripping with TDS, dripping with TDS. This is the crap that goes on from the other side. The fact that you would say, oh my gosh, we are going to talk about Donald Trump and hassle him, I mean, that—you want—you talk about cooperation, oh, lovey-dovey, let us unify, and then you just spit all over a fairly rational move, which is to divide a subcommittee up to actually go after specific items while the other one is going after broader items. And Chairman Sessions did a great job. \$1.7 trillion of improper payments over 3 years. Hmm, wonder where that came from? From the same guys who were criticizing wanting to look at DOGE more specifically.

Mr. Chairman, this is what you get. They want you to feel good and join their hand in hand and walk along with them while they want you close enough so they can stab you in the back. I am an absolute no on this. I wish—I wish that I felt there was some sincerity to work together, but there is none.

Mr. MFUME. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIGGS. It is perfectly clear in the comments of the Ranking Member that we just heard.

And I will yield to the Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace—oh, Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, obviously, if the stated purpose of the DOGE Subcommittee is to promote government efficiency, wouldn't we also want government efficiency here in Congress? I think that is what Mr. Mfume is trying to achieve with this amendment.

And with that, I yield the remainder of my time to him to explain.

Mr. MFUME. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Unless I have a different set of ears, to the gentleman who raised this very strong objection, I do not think I ever mentioned the word "Donald Trump" or "Elon Musk" or anything else. So, I am not over here playing games. I am too old to be playing games. And I think as long as we try to conduct ourselves with some sense of dignity without being so upset that you point to the person who made the amendment with accusations that are untrue, that is not playing fair.

Mr. BIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. After I make my point, yes, I will be more than happy to yield.

I am just saying, if we are going to have a bipartisan relationship here, which is what Mr. Sessions and I had, as we Chaired and co-Chaired that committee, and came up with all of those savings in dollars, it was because we took time to recognize the dignity of both sides and the right to disagree in a very agreeable sort of way. So, when you make those accusations about me, sir, go back and look at what I said in the introduction of this amendment, and you will see that you are clearly off mark.

And I will yield.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you. Yes, you and Mr. Sessions worked together. I did not make comments to you. I specifically mentioned the Ranking Member.

I will yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think we should be taking the advice from a group of people who cannot define what a woman is. You certainly cannot define what government efficiency is. So, let us just start right there, Mr. Chairman. I support the subcommittee, the creation of the Subcommittee on DOGE. I wildly support Marjorie Taylor Greene as the subcommittee Chairwoman.

And, again, to the party who says we do not like or support women, well, guess what, we have two women on this Committee who are subcommittee Chairwomen who carry gavels, and we are working for the President of the United States, the President who made the first female Chief of Staff ever in the history of the United States.

And I also want to correct the record of the Ranking Member earlier. There is no Republican up here who has cut Social Security. That is a lie. That is a lie being promulgated by the left, aided and abetted by the mainstream media, and all those liars out there on social media on the left saying that, is not true.

And when we want to talk about oligarchy, we had Joe Biden, we had Nancy Pelosi, we had Chuck Schumer controlling everything on the Hill and the Capitol for years. And guess what? They have all delivered. They delivered the worst economy in history for Donald Trump. They have delivered more terrorists coming across the southern border than any administration in history.

And so, this subcommittee is greatly needed, Mr. Chairman. I hope that we all support it unanimously.

Ms. Greene, you are going to do a great job as subcommittee Chairwoman. I would love to be waived on anytime you let me, because it is time that we stop wasting American taxpayers. It is time that we stop—we stop wasting time up here on the Hill, we stop wasting time here in Congress talking about BS.

And someone brought up dignity earlier. I would love to see dignity and respect for women up here on the Hill, which is why we should ban men from women's spaces, which is why we should ban men from the locker rooms, from women's locker rooms, which is why we should ban men from women's dressing rooms. I am done with this. We have got to get back to common sense. We have got to get back to fighting and working hard for the American people, and we have got to do it together.

So, you guys can talk all you want on the left side of the aisle. You are not going to be successful because there was a mandate in November, the most historic mandate by Donald John Trump, and the American people want us to get our stuff together—notice how I am not cursing today. They want us to get our stuff together and work for the American people. And that starts now. That can start with the DOGE Subcommittee. That can start with every committee on the Hill today if we put in the effort and the work to do it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. I am so glad that we could finally end that nice little propaganda commercial break. Listen, I do not know what Ms. Mace was talking about. I thought we were talking about government efficiency. And the last time that I checked—last time that I checked, this Committee in the 118th, just like in the 119th, has been governed by the Republicans.

Chairman, is it not true that you were the Chairman in the 118th? You were? OK.

So, the Republicans have controlled this Committee. So, my question is, why is it that you need to create an entirely new subcommittee when you literally could go through and do whatever work it is that you are talking about handing over to the gentlelady, who has never seemingly brought up anything about efficiency? The only thing I recall from the 118th was her spending a lot of time on somebody's junk in this Committee.

So, let me be clear. You all had a chance. You chose not to use it. So, why should the American people be convinced that now all of a sudden, because you create a new committee that has been promulgated by a real oligarch—you are talking about Chuck Schumer and Nancy Pelosi. They were actually duly elected, not somebody sitting there buying Twitter and just happens to be the most—the richest person in the world telling you all what to do.

Let me tell you something. You all need to find some people that actually care about their constituents. And honestly, whenever you all are ready to work, we on this side of the aisle have always been ready to do what is right by the American people. Instead, what you continue to do is go after the most vulnerable in our country.

The fact that you just sat up there and somehow figured out how to tie trans folk to your argument makes no sense to me. But let

me tell you something. Trans people ain't going nowhere. Just like when the racists wanted to make sure that Black people somehow were going to be dismissed in this country, we ain't left either.

And I will yield.

Mr. FROST. Would you yield back?

Ms. CROCKETT. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FROST. You know, I just want to say one thing. And I hope everyone is listening, because there is something one of our colleagues just said that I actually think is true. There was a lot of lies, but there is something I think is true, and it is when they said that they work for Donald Trump.

Last Congress, no Democrat on this Committee worked for Joe Biden. We work for our constituents and we worked with Joe Biden. That right there shows why this Committee—and this subcommittee that is being proposed—it has nothing to do with your constituents, nothing to do with government efficiency. It has to do with your boss, not the people who elected you, but Donald Trump, and then his boss, Elon Musk.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Then next is Mr. Cloud. But before I recognize—OK. Mr. Gosar will be next.

Before I recognize Mr. Gosar, I just want to make the point, the number of Oversight Committee staffers is the same regardless of how many subcommittees there are. The budget for the Oversight Committee is the same regardless of how many subcommittees there are, so it does not add to any cost. We are just trying to do more work to get more—to help make government more efficient.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Gosar from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes. To the Ranking Member, on the subcommittee, from Illinois, I think you have a lot of merit to this, because the problems are so great they are from both sides. The spending has got to stop. There is no way we can continue on this trajectory. So, I think if this subcommittee has one mission, one mission only, I think it is important for us all to call into question. I think that they ought to be that specific, because that is how big the problem is, folks.

We have spent \$12 trillion since Bill Clinton was in office on emergencies that we do not have a single receipt for, folks. That is not a Republican problem. That is not a Democratic problem. It is an us problem. So, I would hope that we would keep this Committee just to do that, and I hope they come up with the greatest cuts, because I have got to tell you, we have got to get to some solvency here.

Folks, our biggest debt is our biggest problem. We have got to start finding some efficiencies. And so, I commend the Chairman for putting this Committee together, and I want to see some results. I really want to see some results, because we cannot continue as a country of our stature with this kind of debt.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Any other Members seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Mr. Cloud, and then Mr. Fallon is next.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There has been talk about the danger of a duplicity in having two committees working on reigning in Federal spending. And I assure you, the danger of duplicity is not in too many Members in Congress working on finding savings for the American people. That is almost a comical thinking. The danger of duplicity lies squarely in the bureaucracy that has way outgrown its authority, way outgrown its mandate, has become a bastion of waste, fraud, abuse, error, and a heavy burden on the American people.

And as far as Congress goes, we have gotten by for far too long somehow justifying our worth on how much money we send things versus whether or not those programs and those initiatives are actually accomplishing the purpose they were sent to be funded with and what the American people want. And the American people have spoken very clearly on this. It is not like the DOGE effort and those ideas were somehow a secret thing that was hidden in the campaign season. It is something President Trump talked about. It is something many Members here talked about, and it is something the American people decided overwhelmingly that they wanted to see leading this next season in our country's life.

And so, this is something we should do, it is something that the American people have asked us to do, and frankly, something that should be bipartisan. The waste, fraud, and abuse that have grown over time is an issue.

Right now, we are—one of the national security existential threats against our country is our fiscal responsibility. Right now, with what is happening with interest rates, we are looking at spending another \$50 billion just in interest costs next year. That helps no one, whatever side of the aisle you are on or whatever you want to accomplish. And so, we have got to bring our fiscal house in order, we have got to put this country back on fiscal footing, and we have got to turn a good—return a good ROI to the American people. These are all the objectives of the DOGE initiative.

I applaud the Chairman in setting up this Committee and look forward to the work—and the great work that will be done on it. And thank you, Chairman.

I yield back to the Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Any other Members seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, we had somebody on the other side of the aisle condemn propaganda, and then you hear people go on to say that they did not work for Joe Biden, they worked with Joe Biden. Yet they held Joe Biden's water for all those 2 years. And many people on the other side of the aisle protected his son when he certainly did not deserve any protection whatsoever. And he was actually convicted and committed felonies that he was convicted of—real felonies, not fairytale, made-up lawfare felonies.

So, we work for the American people. We were accused just now of not working or caring for the American people either. Well, the American people, in November, 5 million more of them voted for Republican candidates for Congress than they did Democrats. That is a clear mandate that the American people do not agree with that sentiment whatsoever.

And then you talk about DOGE. You know, my colleague just said, Mr. Cloud, \$800 billion-plus has been burned and wasted on paying interest on the debt itself. This is an existential threat to our country. Democrats and Republicans should be joining hands on DOGE and not criticizing with viciousness a committee that has never even met yet.

How dare you, Marjorie Taylor Greene. What are you doing? You are doing a horrible job not even having done your job yet because we did not give you a chance to. So, how about being fair arbiters and saying, you know what, maybe this Committee could work, and maybe you can save your criticism for when they actually meet and see how they do and how they perform. That is like saying someone is a terrible hitter before they have ever gotten to the plate.

And, then, I guess, we are going to hear for the next 2 years about Elon Musk. Every time you hear his name, "hateful oligarch." You can just mark it down now how many times we are going to hear it. The over/under is about, I would say, 9,000.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members seek recognition?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Mfume.

All those in favor, 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—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Yes. I request a recorded vote.

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

And I must admit, I just got a message that the tremendous 1980's technology in this committee room does not work, and we are going to have to do that all by voice vote instead of the electronic, but we will suffer through it.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MFUME. Just a quick point of personal privilege—

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Mr. MFUME [continuing]. For clarification and for the record so that we are not lost on this and the record reflects, that this amendment was not getting rid of any committee. It was combining two committees so that they would have joint jurisdiction over finding ways to eliminate the debt and to eliminate the problems that we have seen. So, let us keep it for what it is, not for what people think it is. That is why I want to get back again to the way that it was read into the record deliberately, as an effort to combine, not to do away with.

I yield back, and I thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

For what purpose do you seek recognition, Ms. Stansbury?

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the amendment—or the clerk distribute the amendment.

Everyone have the amendment, the Stansbury amendment?

OK. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress is offered by Ms. Stansbury of New Mexico.

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

I reserve a point of order.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good afternoon, everyone.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member.

To my colleagues, to those of you who are new to the Oversight Committee, welcome to the 119th Congress. The fun has already begun.

Today's meeting is ostensibly to discuss and to approve the rules for the Oversight Committee, a simple procedural meeting. The Rules are printed, we discuss them, there is some new subcommittees being created. And so, the purpose of the amendment, which I am offering here today, is very clear and very straightforward. It is for the purpose of preventing this Committee, its subcommittee, its staff, its resources, and its members from being used by those with a financial interest or a conflict of interest in front of the Federal Government for being used for their own means.

And, in particular, I think many Americans are extremely concerned that the new DOGE effort is being led by somebody with billions of dollars of financial interests in front of the Federal Government. We know, because of reporting that came out yesterday in the *New York Times*, that already this DOGE effort which is being led, of course, co-led by Mr. Musk, who is the richest man in the world, as has been stated here today, is literally already running this effort out of his private company headquarters here in Washington, DC. at SpaceX, which has billions of dollars in front of the Federal Government in Federal contracts.

This is a clear financial conflict of interest that is governed and regulated on the executive branch, and so this amendment would ensure that this Committee as a Federal resource would not be used to advance the financial interests of Mr. Musk or anyone else who might appear either before the DOGE Subcommittee or any other of our subcommittees or committees.

So, I am just going to read you the amendment. It is very clear. It is very straightforward. "No person with a personal financial interest impacted by the decisions of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof, including the newly created Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency, shall advise the Committee or its Members in a paid or unpaid capacity or otherwise interact with the Committee or subcommittee on any matter that would benefit that person financially or constitute a conflict of interest."

And that, Mr. Chairman, is the amendment, and I will stand for questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If I could make a question to my friend. You talk about potential conflict with Elon Musk. Is it true that his company SpaceX holds about \$20 billion of contracts with NASA?

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, I am not personally aware of what the total dollar amount is, but it is my understanding that indeed it is tens of billions of dollars, not only through SpaceX, but we also know that significant other financial interests, whether it is regulation of our communications networks, as well as other transportation—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, might I further pursue that?

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. He has a competitor in Boeing, the Starliner, and he has actually said, “The world does not need another capsule,” suggesting that he would like to maybe eliminate competition. Is it possible that could be a conflict of interest—

Ms. STANSBURY. Absolutely.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Given his position?

Ms. STANSBURY. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNOLLY. On the regulatory front, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has opened five investigations into Tesla. Having Elon Musk as the head of this DOGE enterprise could lead to perhaps the suppression of those kinds of investigations, I am speculating. There is no evidence he has done that. But isn't that a risk, conflictually?

Ms. STANSBURY. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So, I support the gentlelady's amendment. I believe that there is ample evidence of conflicts all over the place, especially with respect to Elon Musk. And I think we need to protect ourselves from it.

I yield back to my friend from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

I will recognize myself for a few minutes. I am glad the Democrats are—or at least the gentlelady from New Mexico—we will see how this vote turns out, but the continuing—she is continuing the Biden regime of censoring speech by limiting who can interact with the Committee.

I stand ready to work with anyone who wants to make government better. I do not care if they are Republican, Democrat, rich, poor, urban, rural. We have got—as my friend and colleague, Mr. Gosar, mentioned, we have a crisis of debt in our country. And I do not know of another committee in the House of Representatives that is as serious and focused on reducing wasteful spending as this Committee. That is what this Committee was created to do. I hope that we can do that, and I hope that we can do that in a bipartisan manner. But I oppose—

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, would you—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. The lady's amendment. It is unnecessary. It undermines Americans' constitutional rights to petition the government. So, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Stansbury amendment.

Any other Members seek recognition?

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, do you yield?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, I am yield—

Chairman COMER. Actually, I am supposed to recognize the Democrats next. I am sorry. Who is—who wants to be recognized on this?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Do you want more time?

Chairman COMER. We rotate—for the freshmen, we go back and forth. I was the last speaker, so now we will say—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am in support of the amendment. And I would yield the balance of my time to the maker of the amendment.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify. This is perfectly in accordance with the existing requirements within the executive branch of government. It is required under the executive branch that you provide financial disclosures, that if you have a clear financial conflict of interest with business in front of the Federal Government and you have business in front of an agency that you are advising on. One, it is required that it be done in the public domain. It is obvious that you have to recuse yourself from any financial interest or government advising that have to do with that. And so, this would put those same requirements on the legislative process.

There are many, many Americans who can advise the Federal Government, thousands of Americans who work in the Federal Government and in the private sector on government efficiency. There is absolutely no reason why a billionaire who bought his way into Donald Trump's inner circle with a quarter billion dollars in campaign donations should be the person that is allowed to run a different branch of government's efforts, alongside our colleagues across the aisle, who literally has tens of billions of dollars in front of the Federal Government and could benefit from the efforts that come before this Committee.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Now Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. You know, I find this very interesting. You know, we have got a conflict of interest everywhere. You know, you look at the wealth of some individuals—and I am not picking out one side or another—you know, whether it be people working for us, people who are on this Committee, all the way across the board have a financial interest. So, are we even capable of doing this?

Now, let me also tell you a little bit about Mr. Musk. What would have happened to those folks in North Carolina, in Georgia, in Florida that were taken back by the hurricanes? He volunteered Starlink. So, we also have to have an ability to have innovators, because the last thing I have seen in this body of work is that we are poor innovators. We do not think outside the box. We go over and over the same things, over and over again expecting the same—a different result. That is insanity, folks.

I hope that he picks on—and I am not on the Committee, but I hope that he picks on his own platform that we saw he admitted to being censored by this previous administration, the Biden Administration, forced to do that. So, let us not talk about, you know,

high and mighty about being one side or another. How about what we do is allow this man to do this and then take a look.

Now, I know that the Ranking Member brought up Boeing. Well, I think we look at Mr. Musk because he has actually taken something that has actually gone further than anything Boeing has done. Boeing has been part of that problem. So, we need to think outside the box here.

I agree, the gentlelady has got a point here, but this amendment is poorly written, and I would vote no against it.

And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

They have called votes. We are going to go another 5 or 6 minutes, as long as we can, and then we will recess to go vote.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Mr. Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So, when I started my career, I prosecuted securities fraud at the SEC. I later went on to become a law professor at UC Irvine, where I specialized in corporate governance issues.

And I would just note that this type of rule, essentially a rule of recusal, is not seen by anyone as unconstitutional. So, I gently dispute that claim. This is a very prevalent rule that we see across a wide variety of areas.

And the principle is very simple: When someone in the government has a financial conflict of interest, they should remove themselves from being a decision-maker. It is not rocket science. It reflects basic ethics.

And I would just say that I am a little bit disappointed by this debate, because I asked specifically to be on this Committee because it is the committee responsible for oversight, for ensuring accountability, transparency, ethics in our government. And that is important at a time when Americans around this country overwhelmingly believe that our government, and particularly this body, Congress, is fundamentally corrupt and self-dealing.

Now, there is a saying that the ancient Romans used to say, "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*", "Who watches the watchmen?" And as the committee responsible for overseeing ethics, for overseeing accountability, that question is very, very important. Who watches the watchmen?

This is a rule of commonsense that ensures that the watchmen are not engaged in self-dealing, that we are not engaged in a pay-to-play, restoring trust in this institution.

So, I thank the author for bringing this forward, and I am going to vote "aye" on this.

Ms. STANSBURY. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIN. Oh. Yes, I yield back—or——

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you. And thank you so much, Representative Min. We are so grateful to have you and your expertise here on the Committee.

You know, I do find it just a little surprising, shocking—although certainly nothing should be shocking to us anymore on the Oversight Committee, for those who are watchers of this Committee. But if you read the amendment, it is very clear it is just intended to keep anyone, any person—just read it; it is in front of you, the

text is in front of you—who has a financial interest in front of the Committee from financially benefiting from their work and interaction with the Committee. And the fact that our colleagues are, like, fighting back against that?

This is just basic ethical behavior. That is what the rules of the Committee are for, is to make sure that we govern ourselves in a way that is ethical and in alignment with the public trust that the American people put on us.

That is what this amendment is about. It is good government. It is about ethics, and it is about making sure that things are being done aboveboard.

Mr. CLOUD. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. CROCKETT. No. May I—

Ms. STANSBURY. I will yield back to the—

Ms. CROCKETT. OK.

Ms. STANSBURY. Oh, I will yield to the gentlelady—

Chairman COMER. I think you yielded back. I thought you yielded back.

Ms. STANSBURY. He yielded to me, so—

Chairman COMER. All right. All right.

Ms. Crockett, I will recognize you, but we have called votes, so—the Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. I will be very quick.

You know what? The fact—I associate myself with the remarks that have already been made, especially by the gentleman from California. This is what is wrong with government.

And the idea that we are debating whether or not—just to be clear—and I know that Mr. Gosar, you know, pointed out the fact that he felt as if Mr. Musk has something to contribute—this amendment does not disallow someone from being able to contribute.

But it would say that it may be a problem if you are receiving hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal Government while at the same time arguing that we need to cut trillions of dollars from our debt.

It may say, “You know what? You need to divest”—something that Democrats have actually been pushing for a while, as we did believe that the now-incoming President violated the Emoluments Clause and that there were conflicts there.

Honestly, this is literally about the American people looking at us and knowing that you have no other interest except for to do what is right by this country. And I do not understand what could be more patriotic than deciding that you truly want to make sure that people do not have to trust what you say but they can believe what you do because they know that you have no other interest.

That is all that it is. It is the basic ethics that we are missing from this Supreme Court that has the lowest ratings that it has ever had because the American people feel as if they are constantly conflicted.

Again, as someone who is licensed to practice law in multiple states, one of the things that we have to do is pass a separate ethics test. Because this should be about ethics.

Why is it that only one side of the aisle seems to care about truth, honor, and—

Chairman COMER. Oh, my—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Honestly, what I would consider to be the most patriotic thing that we could do, which is being—

Chairman COMER. The yielded time has been expired.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. There were 2 minutes left when Ms. Stansbury—

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Yielded. The time has expired.

Before—let me say—I am going to recognize—Mr. Palmer will be the last speaker, and then we are going to recess until 5 minutes after the last vote. After the last vote, we will all come back in here. And I am, again, talking to the freshmen.

So, I will recognize—Ms. Mace, did you recognize—for a motion or parliamentary inquiry or—

Ms. MACE. No. I wanted to say a word.

Chairman COMER. OK. OK. We will get you when we come back.

The last speaker before we recess, Mr. Palmer from Alabama.

And then, remember, come back 5 minutes after the last vote.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am very troubled by the amendment. I think I understand the intent of the gentlelady in bringing it, but this violates—in my opinion, it violates the Constitution's right to redress grievances before the government, because it does not say—it says, "no person" could be interpreted as "any person."

And because somebody might have a government contract, might be working for a company that is involved with government work, that does not deny them the right to participate in their government. We are a participatory Republic.

And I am really—I know what this is about. This is an effort to undermine what the incoming administration is trying to do to get our debt under control, get our spending under control, and it is a direct shot at Mr. Musk, whom they feel like played a disproportionate role in the success of President-elect Trump. But we should not be doing things like this.

We should respect the constitutional right of every U.S. citizen to participate in the governance of the country, either through elections or through the opportunity to advise on issues of critical importance to our country.

So, in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I would encourage the gentlelady to withdraw the amendment, but I know that is probably not likely, so I am going to oppose the—

Ms. STANSBURY. Does the—

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. Amendment.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Gentleman yield just briefly for a minute?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired—or the gentleman yields back, rather.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess until 5 minutes after the last vote. The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come back to order. The Committee will come back to order.

I understand there are a few people en route, but we are going to start back with discussion.

And it is now the Minority side, and I believe I was informed that Ms. Crockett sought recognition for 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this time, I would yield the remainder of my time to the gentlelady from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, Madam Crockett, this is a commonsense, good-government amendment. The entire purpose of this amendment is to bring standard ethics language into the Committee process to make sure that anybody—anybody—who is interacting with this Committee does not use it or its resources for personal profit. It is basic ethics language.

It does not infringe on speech. It does not prevent someone from appearing or advising the Committee on general issues or classes of issues which are permissible under the rules and the ethics of the House of Representatives. But it would prevent someone from using the Committee and Federal resources for personal financial gain.

And I want to read the text in the amendment that is really clear about this. It says that folks shall not advise the Committee or its Members in a paid or unpaid capacity or otherwise interact with the Committee or subcommittee on any matter that would benefit the person financially or constitute a conflict of interest.

This is not a violation of the Constitution or of free speech. Using Federal resources to benefit your own financial interest is not protected speech, unless—I was trying to figure out while we were on break what my colleagues are referring to. Maybe they are referring to the Citizens United case. Maybe they are referring to protecting the speech of campaign donations. Maybe they are referring to protecting the quarter-billion dollars in donations that Elon Musk made to Donald Trump and his campaign and that has given him access not only to the inner circle of Donald Trump's Administration but it is going to land him an office in the White House and pretty much unfettered access to this Committee and its resources.

So, this amendment is designed to make sure he can come here, he can come testify, he can talk about issues that are general issues, but he cannot use this Committee as a personal piggybank to put forward an agenda that would personally profit him or others against the public interest.

That is what this amendment is about. That is what we are trying to do, is to make sure that people do not use this Committee for personal and private gains.

Now, I am dismayed that in the first organizing committee of this Congress, we cannot even agree on the most basic ethical standards for how this Committee is going to conduct itself, language that appears in almost every single government agency—Federal, state, local, tribal—also in the private sector.

This is about protecting the public interest. This is about making sure that the goals that are supposedly laid out in this rule change that creates these two new subcommittees is really about achieving government efficiency and improvements. And it is about making sure that billionaires who buy their way into the inner circle of

Donald Trump do not use this Committee and its resources for their own financial gain.

And, with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is a lot of outrage today about my new Subcommittee on DOGE. I want to say, I am honored. Thank you.

You see, all the talk about billionaires—let us talk about George Soros, who has donated hundreds of billions of dollars to Democrats, Democrat PACs, Democrat interests that ripped open our border, invaded our country, have had all types of policies that have directly impacted Americans in the worst ways possible.

You know, Elon Musk used to be a Democrat. And I think the problem here is, is you guys are really jealous. And let us be brutally honest: It is your policies that have run off Democrats. You have run off your own donors. And you ran off the voters in this last election because of the absolute failures that you did to this country.

So, let us be really clear in what you are trying to do. You are attacking Elon Musk because you are really jealous. You are. You are just really jealous.

And Elon Musk, I want to remind you guys, while California is on fire, he is directing his resources there, with Tesla trucks and Starlinks, to help people and victims that are being impacted right now by the failures of the Democrat leaders in California.

No, it is not climate change that is burning down California. It is a failure of how to handle and prevent these types of problems. No water in the fire hydrants. No water in the water reservoirs. Not cleaning up the forest floors.

So, let us be very clear about Democrat policies, Democrat decisions that have run off so many people. And let us talk about, what you are trying to do is just attack someone that used to actually support your party and supports your party no more.

But let us really talk about this amendment. And it is not an attack on Elon Musk, specifically, as it is an attack on Elon Musk and every single taxpayer—every single taxpayer in this country.

It says, “no person with a personal financial interest impacted by the decisions of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof, including the newly created Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency, shall advise the Committee or its Members in a paid or unpaid capacity.”

Think about that. So, you do not want taxpayers to have any say in what this subcommittee holds hearings on, talks about; talks about things that need to be funded or unfunded; departments that need to be shut down; union employees of the Federal Government that need to be fired; unions that need to be busted up; waste, fraud, and abuse?

If this amendment were to pass, this amendment would directly violate the freedom of speech of taxpayers, of Americans, because this amendment says that no one can have any say to Committee Members or on the Subcommittee of Government Efficiency. That is what this amendment says.

And our job and our role is to serve the taxpayers, to serve the American people, to protect their freedom of speech, to uphold their interests, to protect how their taxpayer dollars are used. And so, this is why this Committee cannot even—we cannot consider having an amendment like this in our Rules, because we would be violating exactly what we are here to do. It is a complete waste of time.

And, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

I just have to—first, that was—that was a lot.

And, first, I think the people of California and the West absolutely deserve an apology for politicizing fires that are actually killing people right now and where people are losing their homes. And the idea that somehow you want to politicize those and say that those were caused by crazy conspiracy theories. I do not think anyone should take any advice on how fires are created, certainly by someone that has said space lasers actually create forest fires. And so that deserves an apology to the people of California.

And this idea that somehow Elon Musk is going to save us—the richest person on the planet, multiple times over—and that we are arguing about what he can do for this country but we are not actually bringing in people that are actually impacted by the policies of our friends on the other side of the aisle, I think, is quite shameful.

And the gentlelady from Georgia should apologize.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

Ms. Mace from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On this conflict of interest that we have before us today—I am hearing about “conflict of interest”; quote, “most basic ethics standards”; quote, “basic ethics”; “resources for personal profit”; making sure we are—you know, “financial interests are at stake,” et cetera.

I just—Mr. Chairman, I find it rich that the same Members of Congress who defended the Biden crime family, who are making millions of dollars from international business deals while trading on public office, are now here lecturing us today about conflicts of interest. Like, they have—they should just sit right back down. They have no room on this issue. I would love to know if they think Nancy Pelosi trading stocks is a conflict of interest.

So, you know, if the Biden family international business dealings, trading off the Vice Presidency and Presidency, is or is not a conflict of interest, I would love to know where they stand on that, Mr. Chairman. Because this is ridiculous.

We need to work for the American people. We need to get to work fast. There was a mandate in November, on November 5, to push our country forward, to get out of the worst economy in my lifetime that the left forced upon the American people. They cannot afford groceries. They cannot afford gas. They can definitely not afford childcare. And the education system in this country is down the tubes. Taxes are hurting American families on top of it. We have at least 14 million illegals in this country. It is probably far

higher than that. We cannot keep count. We do not even know where the 300,000 kids are.

And so, what they have done to destroy the fabric of the United States of America, everything we were founded on—freedom and liberty, the ability to prosper, to work, live, and retire in the greatest Nation in the world—they have destroyed that.

And it is our job to get back to the basics. And, quite frankly, I do not think government efficiency is enough. I think we are going to have to go much further than that and, in fact, you know, look at dismantling entire departments or even agencies. Because it is just—the bureaucracy we have created with the deep state of bureaucracy here is hurting our country, it is hurting our national security. We are weaker on the world stage. Our economy is going to be a national-security issue in very close order.

I was hoping that American families would be able to refi with lower interest rates this quarter on their homes and be able to afford housing. It does not look like that is going to happen because of what the Biden-Harris Administration has done in the run-up to President Trump's swearing-in on January 20.

This is un-American. It is disgusting. It is gross. Let us move forward. Let us get these votes done this afternoon, and let us get to work for the American people, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Any other Members seek recognition?

The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My colleagues can expect conflict in this Committee. There is going to be a lot of conflict. And Elon, Mr. Musk, is absolutely bringing conflict to the United States' focus. We are in conflict with the Big Government machine that has been devouring the wealth and smashing the individual rights, liberties, and freedoms of the American people whom we serve.

You think that is funny, young man? Talk to your great-grandchildren, your yet-unborn generations that is inheriting the debt that the machine of D.C. has forced upon our country.

We are \$36 trillion in debt. That is \$36-thousand-billion dollars. Were we to balance the budget and run a \$1 billion surplus, it would require 36,000 years to address that debt. And that is not funny. And we are not playing. So, you can expect conflict in this Committee.

And with men like Elon Musk coming in, working with our President, who my people elected, you can absolutely look forward to many discussions that will cause wailing and gnashing of teeth across this town that has crippled the future of our country with debt.

You should look forward to that conflict, because we will be saving a generation yet unborn of our country. And that is exactly what we intend to do.

I yield the balance of my time to the Chair.

Chairman COMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Any other Members seek recognition?

Seeing none, the question is now on the Stansbury amendment, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[Chorus of noes.]

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman—

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

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

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

Do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have an amendment as well.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will distribute the amendment to every Member.

I believe every Member has a copy on their desk.

The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress, as offered by Mr. Garcia of California.

Mr. GARCIA. Well, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think we are obviously all aware, as a Committee, that the President of the United States should serve the American people, never their own financial interests. Yet, we are facing some of the most serious conflicts of interests, going into this Administration, in the history of our country.

Now, Donald Trump and Elon Musk, who are at least appearing to essentially be co-Presidents in this next few years, are plotting to remake our government and our very social safety net. And they could get, of course, we know, richer in the process.

Now, this amendment will make sure that we do not advance any legislation from this Committee that enriches Donald Trump or his businesses. And, unfortunately, as we know because of the work of this Committee and House Democrats, this legislation could not be more important, because we know and we saw Donald Trump trying to enrich himself and his family in his first term.

Now, we know that Committee Democrats showed that Donald Trump received payments from over 20 countries during his first term—20 countries. Donald Trump's network of businesses made it possible for anyone in the world to funnel money to him through his businesses. Now, these countries, of course, included China, Saudi Arabia, and many others.

Now, we actually have, because of this Committee, receipts and documents that prove that he received at least \$7.8 million directly from foreign governments. And, by the way, that number is much larger, but of course we do not have all the documents and receipts because this Committee's Majority blocked us from getting all of them.

We also know that eight Ambassadors stayed at President Trump's D.C. hotel at the time while serving in the office of the Trump Administration, in clear violation of the Constitution.

The Committee also found that Elliott Broidy, a Republican fundraiser and lobbyist, spent \$15,000 at Trump's D.C. hotel while actually lobbying the Trump Administration. Later, he received a pardon—which we know that Donald Trump and his Administration like to give out to people that donated to him. And we know that that, of course, is a clear violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Now, we should all be concerned that this lobbying effort signifies a pay-to-play scheme that capitalizes on President Trump's influence. And these conflicts of interest are a direct threat and a national-security threat.

Of course, this is on top of the fact that this Committee continues—and refuses to investigate Jared Kushner, who received \$2 billion, with a “B,” directly from Saudi Arabia just months after leaving the White House and has used that power to facilitate record arms deals and other pro-Saudi policies.

As he enters his second term, this amendment is incredibly important so that we can ensure that Donald Trump is not directly benefiting, through his businesses, by foreign governments and other people that are interested.

Once again, this amendment would ensure that we work through this Committee to ensure the President does not directly benefit. I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would—

Mr. GARCIA. And I yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Just for some questions?

Mr. Garcia, is it not true that when President Trump was elected in 2016, the then-President of the Philippines, President Duterte, actually named a business partner of President Trump to be a special envoy to the United States?

Mr. GARCIA. Absolutely, sir. And, as you all know, much beyond that. Donald Trump has continued, through his family and through his businesses, to gain the influence of foreign governments and then trade them for policy proposals.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it not also true, Mr. Garcia, that a number of Gulf countries, Saudi Arabia among them, actually pointedly would stay at or rent rooms and facilities at the then-Trump-hotel downtown in order, presumably, to curry favor?

Mr. GARCIA. Saudi Arabia and many other countries, yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And did President Trump then, in fact, financially benefit from those transactions?

Mr. GARCIA. Directly, against the Constitution, absolutely, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And is there a policy at GSA, the Government Services Administration, that actually would prohibit an elected official from benefiting from a lease owned by or provided by GSA?

Mr. GARCIA. That is correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And was that honored in the first Trump Administration?

Mr. GARCIA. Absolutely not, which is why this amendment is needed.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. McGuire.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I heard some accusations on the other side about President Trump being corrupt. And I would say that they tried to put him in jail, they tried to bankrupt him with “lawfare”—we all know the Russia-gate and the perfect phone call. And then, of course, he took a bullet for this country. And of every President in my lifetime, in our lifetime, he left office with less money, not more money.

And he did more in 4 years than any President in my lifetime. Every President in my lifetime talked about a peace treaty in the Middle East, and they got zero, and President Trump got two. When we talk about the greatest economy, when—record unemployment, especially for minorities and Black people and women. When you have low unemployment, record unemployment, you have less people living on the street and you have less people dying on the street.

And we look at the foreign wars, like Ukraine-Russia; you look at October 7, Israel. We all know those things would not have happened if President Trump were in office.

He is not a corrupt President. He loves our country. He loves the American people. He loves all people. And I am excited that we are going to be able to work on oversight, hold the government accountable, and help him put America First and not America last.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Any further Members seek recognition?

Mr. Jack from Georgia.

Mr. JACK. Mr. Chairman, I will just add, President Trump was one of the last—or most recent Presidents and one of the shining examples of a President that did not take a salary from the day he was sworn in through the day he left office. He donated his salary to a lot of incredible causes.

So, I would urge the gentleman to withdraw this amendment. I think it is—I think it is an offense to the American people that gave President Trump and House Republicans a mandate, a clear mandate, this past election.

And, again, if you want to talk about a conflict of interest when the President of the United States does not accept a salary, I think that demonstrates the unique nature that he has and the connection that he has to the American people, wanting to serve them and show that he is not in this for the money. He lost money getting elected. He has sacrificed so much. There is no reason for this nongermane amendment.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, notwithstanding these beautiful love letters and campaign ads to Donald Trump, this Committee has examined a multitude of thousands of pages of evidence and receipts that show that Don-

ald Trump did actually take foreign money through and launder through his hotels and properties. And I know we got some new Members on the Committee, but we are happy to provide that documentation to you as well.

But, with that, I would like to yield the remainder of my time to Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

I think it is comical to say that Donald Trump did not take a salary when he and his family benefited in the billions of dollars from peddling influence to foreign governments. This has actually been documented. The receipts were presented through this Committee from multiple countries.

And the fact that your son-in-law—who was, by the way, advised to not serve as an envoy by the Secretary of State at the time of Donald Trump—could come in and make \$2 billion months after leaving the White House by the Saudi Government—of which, by the way, he has not returned any sort of investment to the country on—and him being the envoy to the Middle East while he was in the White House is absolutely corrupt.

And the President's salary is nothing compared to what he and his family have received, in the billions of dollars, through their foreign peddling and corruption in the White House.

I will yield back—oh, actually, I yield to Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much.

Listen, if you all really believe this—listen, I will do this in a very diplomatic, bipartisan way—we are sitting in the proper Committee that can do the investigation. If you feel as if there is nothing to see, then prove us wrong. Prove us wrong. Because the last time that I checked, we were shut down as we were getting documents from his attorneys.

So, if you say that there is nothing there, then let us go ahead and have a hearing and an investigation and prove it. Show it to the American people that we do not have to be concerned that this incoming President has been paid off by the likes of people that do not like the American citizens that live in this country. Because last time I checked, he was palling around with Putin and he was loving on Xi Jinping. I mean, like, I do not know what you have to hide then.

So, in Oversight, let us go ahead—Chairman, can we go ahead and get a hearing set up and an investigation just to prove us wrong? Because the Democrats are—

Chairman COMER. Would the lady yield?

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. The Democrats are—hold on, Mr. Chairman—because we lying, according to you all. We lying. So, prove us to be liars. I will sit here and I will be the first one to say, “I apologize.”

So, let us go ahead and do it. Will you do that, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Let me ask—will the lady yield for a question?

Ms. CROCKETT. I will absolutely yield for a question.

Chairman COMER. So, you are suggesting that we investigate Donald Trump?

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, because you all saying that we lying about—

Chairman COMER. Would—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Him. Prove us wrong.

Chairman COMER. My question is, have there ever been any other investigations of Donald Trump? Have there been any—

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.

Chairman COMER. I mean—

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, there have been.

Chairman COMER. I mean, it just seems like he is—

Ms. CROCKETT. And he had trouble—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. The most investigated person in the world.

And, look, I love this newfound concern for ethics by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This is rich, to be honest with you, especially when you were talking about violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, I think, Mr. Garcia or Mr. Frost, one of you mentioned, and things like that.

So, you know, I think there are a lot of interesting things coming that I have not heard over the past 2 years. So, look—

Ms. CROCKETT. So, Mr. Chairman, is that a yes or no that you all are going to prove us wrong?

Chairman COMER. Well, I mean, Ms. Crockett, there have been so many investigations of Donald Trump. You have weaponized—I would argue, and I think the American people would agree, that the judiciary has been weaponized, that the man has had so many investigations—

Ms. CROCKETT. But, Mr. Chair, if you were the one that is conducting it—we know that he trusts you. You are a good Republican.

Chairman COMER. You are wanting to investigate him and he has not even been sworn in yet.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Well, we can wait a few more days—that is only on Monday—and we can get started. I just want you all to prove us wrong, because I—

Chairman COMER. Well, I think the—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Believe in functioning in facts.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. American people are concerned about their tax dollars being flushed down the commode, being spent—

Ms. CROCKETT. I think they are also concerned about foreign influence upon—

Chairman COMER. Foreign influence?

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. The highest—absolutely. Why wouldn't they be? That is something that would fall under our purview in this Committee.

And, Mr. Chairman, listen—

Chairman COMER. With all due respect, ma'am, you were not concerned about \$27 million of foreign influence that was laundered.

Now, Ms. Stansbury, "laundered," we can debate on the term of "laundering." I do not think you—

Ms. STANSBURY. Would you like to?

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Understand what "laundering" means.

Ms. STANSBURY. Do you yield? We can discuss—

Chairman COMER. No, because this is Ms. Crockett's time—

Ms. CROCKETT. I will—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And it is about to expire.

Ms. CROCKETT. I will go ahead and yield to Ms. Stansbury then.

Chairman COMER. She has 10 seconds.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is—this is a bit absurd, but, you know, it is very clear, this Committee did investigate, Donald Trump did launder his money—

Chairman COMER. Time has expired.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Through his hotels.

Chairman COMER. Do any further Members seek recognition?

Ms. STANSBURY. And we will provide—

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chair?

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. The report, which you suppressed.

Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Gill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Gill from Texas.

Mr. GILL. Thank you.

I find it rich that the other side of the aisle is suddenly concerned about corruption and ethics whenever President Biden just gave his son a 10-year blanket pardon for foreign influence-peddling and whatever else he was doing while high on whatever drugs with whatever prostitutes.

I also find it rich that all of the sudden the other side has some problem with successful businessmen being involved in politics whenever you guys are the party of George Soros, of Bill and Melinda Gates, of Sheryl Sandberg, of MacKenzie Bezos, of Taylor Swift, of so many other billionaires across the country, as well as every woke, weird pervert in Hollywood. I find this incredibly disingenuous.

I think the reality is that the Republican Party, under President Trump, has a very clear mandate from voters, and you guys do not like it, because voters rejected everything you stand for and every policy that you have shoved down the American people's throats over the past 4 years, whether it is open borders, a failing economy, raging inflation, this weird woke stuff that you guys have been shoving down our children's throats. And the voters rejected you, and they welcomed our party.

So, with that, I yield my time, but I find this conversation incredibly rich from the other side.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion on this?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by Mr. Garcia.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, by saying no.

[Chorus of noes.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not—do you seek a recorded vote?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes, please, sir.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. Garcia requests a recorded vote. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Does any further Member seek recognition?

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk—everyone has the amendment—everyone has the Crockett amendment on their desk?

Would the clerk please report the amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment to the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress, as offered by Ms. Crockett of Texas.

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

I reserve a point of order.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

During the 118th Congress, Oversight Republicans disbanded one of the most important subcommittees in Congress, the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

And now, in the 119th Congress, the Chairman and House Republicans have decided to prioritize the demands of the real President—Elon Musk—and his billionaire friends over the needs of the American people.

Now, we are about to approach the birthday of Martin Luther King. It is actually tomorrow. And on January 20 will be the inauguration of Donald Trump, but it will also be the observation of MLK Day.

And the fact that we have decided that in this country we are not going to honor civil rights should be something that we all take issue with, considering the fact, for some that do not know what civil rights are about—because some people only believe that it deals with Black folk—let me explain.

Civil and political rights are a class of rights that protect individuals' freedom from the infringement by governments, social organizations, and private individuals. They ensure one's entitlement to participate in the civil and political life of society and the state.

Defined another way, the right to be free from discrimination, the freedom to worship as we choose, the right to vote for our elected representatives, the protections of due process, the right to privacy.

If any of that sounds familiar, it is because these are rights that are born out of our Constitution, something that we all supposedly have sworn an oath to. And we swear to not only—we do not just swear to it; we are supposed to protect those rights.

Interestingly enough, we just had the funeral of one of our beloved Presidents. And I caught a flight to Austin on the day of the funeral, and I had the honor of sitting next to someone who was a little familiar with the White House. That person was Luci Baines Johnson. And when I tell you that she is a wealth of information, I really mean that.

And when we had an opportunity to talk about what she experienced as her father was President during a time in which, honestly, our country was on fire—and I would argue that, unfortunately, our country is on fire right now. When I first ran for office, I ran for the Statehouse and said that we were in the in the midst

of a modern-day Civil Rights Movement, and I have not been convinced otherwise just yet.

But this is the daughter of the President that signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. She was also there when he signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And, to be perfectly honest, without that Voting Rights, I do not believe that I actually would have a seat in Congress.

And so, I do believe in preserving the fact that everyone should be entitled to real and true representation, because I do have a Section 2 seat as our Voting Rights Act has been decimated.

But one of the stories that she told me was that her father asked her about coming over to the Congress for the signing of the bill as it relates to the Voting Rights Act. Now, for her, it was a bit inconvenient as an 18-year-old to have to leave the White House and go over to Congress, and she asked her father, "Why should we go over to the Congress, Daddy, to sign this particular bill?"

And she [sic] said, "We need to go over to the Congress because we need to pay due respect to those Members of Congress that knew that voting for this bill meant that they would not be returning to Congress but they had the courage to do what was right for this country and make sure that everyone's voices were going to be heard."

The one thing that we could do, the very small thing that we could do, is have a little bit of courage and decide that we are going to reinstitute this particular subcommittee. Because, unfortunately, I do not see the type of courage that the people that served back in the 1960's had coming out of some of our colleagues.

And so, I am asking you to do the courageous thing today and just institute a subcommittee that would make sure that we are looking out for those protections of everyone in this country to make sure that we have real freedom, something that we all supposedly espouse to believe in.

And, with that, I will yield, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Do any Members seek recognition? Mr.—

Ms. MACE. Yes.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Higgins? Oh, oh, Ms. Mace was first. I am sorry.

Ms. MACE?

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I do not know what is going on today. I find it extremely rich and offensive.

So, we are talking about civil rights. I am the former Ranking Member on the Civil Rights Subcommittee, something I believe in, civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans. And we were talking about infringement of individual people; also, quote, "the right to privacy of individuals"—coming from a party that cannot define what a woman is and will not give women the right to privacy.

You all want men with penises, chicks with dicks, in the bathroom with us. You want women to be forced to undress in front of men in the locker room and in dressing rooms. And it is so hypocritical for you to sit here and say—and be, you know, screaming from the rooftops about the right to privacy and civil rights when you do not respect women and you do not respect women who have

been raped, women who are victims of sexual abuse. And you want me, a victim of rape, a survivor of rape, to go into a locker room and be forced to undress in front of a man? You have to be f'ing kidding me.

So, I do not want to hear about you talk about rights, individual rights, civil rights, because you cannot find the courage from the 1960's to fight for women all around America, fight for women like me, every single woman.

And as a rape survivor, I should not have to explain to you why women have rights and why women, when we are in the bathroom, when we are in the locker room, when we are in a dressing room, why I do not feel safe when there is a man nearby.

And the fact that we are going here and we are going to say all these things is the ripeness of hypocrisy on the Hill. People need to tell the truth, and if we are going to talk about the rights of individuals, we have to talk about it. Everybody has rights, including women. And, at some point, men are infringing on the rights of women.

We just had it today; we just had a vote about protecting women and girls in sports. And I believe it was not one, it was two people from the Democrat Party who voted to protect women's rights in sports today. Two, yes.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a deeply offensive conversation to me today. We want to talk about real freedom? Women have freedom in this country. Women have the freedom to go to a private, women's-only space and not see a man in it. Women have the right to change and not be feared that somebody, with their sexual perversion, someone who is confused about their gender—we have the right to feel safe in these spaces.

We have the right to know that we are not going to have trans people filming us in the bathroom. How many of these trannies are taking selfies, these men are taking selfies in women's spaces, in the bathroom? It is gross, it is disgusting.

So, if we are going to talk about civil rights, let us talk about the rights of women in this country and how you are stripping them away every single day. And you are doing it in your legislation, you are doing it in your messaging, you are doing it on X. You are making women feel unsafe in this country. And you are making the opportunity for women and girls to be raped, to be sexually abused in this country even greater than they have ever, ever been.

So, do not come over here with your attitude and talk to me about rights when you are trying to take my rights as a woman, a rape survivor, away.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Any Member seek recognition?

Ms. STANSBURY.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the gentlelady across the aisle demonstrating why we need civil rights. We need civil rights to protect all people, especially trans Americans, who are under attack right now.

I would like to yield the rest of my time to the gentlelady who is carrying the amendment.

Ms. CROCKETT. I do not even know how we got there, because I tried to make it clear how many civil rights—it does not just boil down to one conversation. But I can see that somebody’s campaign coffers really are struggling right now, so she going to keep saying “trans,” “trans,” “trans” so that people will feel threatened.

And, child, listen, I want you all to——

Ms. MACE. I am no child.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Tell me whether or not——

Ms. MACE. Do not call me a child. I am no child. Do not——

Ms. CROCKETT. I want to find out——

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Even start. I am a grown woman. I am 47 years——

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Which of those emails actually has——

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Old. I have broken more glass ceilings than——

Chairman COMER. All right. Order, please.

Ms. CROCKETT. Chairman, I am reclaiming my time.

Chairman COMER. Let us go.

Ms. MACE. You will not do that. I am not a child.

Chairman COMER. Order.

Ms. CROCKETT. Chairman——

Ms. MACE. I am not a child.

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. I am reclaiming my time.

Ms. MACE. If you want to take it outside, we can do that.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is not in order.

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. Order. Order.

Mr. FROST. Point of order. Point of order.

Chairman COMER. Order, order, order.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett.

Mr. FROST. No. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. State your point.

Mr. FROST. Is it allowed in the Rules for a Member to incite violence against another Member? I mean, she just said she wants to take it outside with Crockett, and——

Ms. MACE. Hey, I have the First Amendment right, too, young man.

Mr. FROST. And so——

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. MACE. I have the First Amendment right.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. I would like those words to be taken down.

Ms. MACE. I am not going to be a child——

Mr. FROST. I am moving to have those——

Ms. MACE. I am not going to be called a child by any of you.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Words taken down. I believe it is against the Rules——

Ms. MACE. “Going outside”——

Mr. FROST [continuing]. To incite violence——

Ms. MACE. [continuing]. Does not incite violence. It is just to have a conversation——

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Against another Member of Congress.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. That is not interrupting——

Chairman COMER. The Committee will suspend.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. This Committee.

Chairman COMER. The Member will state the words he wishes taken down.

Mr. FROST. Where she said that we can take it outside, which is a direct violation against the rules, inciting violence against—

Ms. GREENE. What rule?

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Another Member.

Ms. GREENE. What rule? What rule? Cite the rule.

Ms. MACE. How does that incite violence?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, there are—if I might point out, Mr. Chairman, there are decorum rules in the House of Representatives.

Chairman COMER. And the two parliamentarians are discussing this right now. We will suspend for a second.

The Chair is going to make a rule.

What the gentelady said was, “We can take this outside if you want.”

Mr. FROST. OK. So—

Chairman COMER. And that could mean you could go outside and have a cup of coffee or perhaps a beer or—you know, I mean, we have lots of conversations outside.

So, I am going to rule that it was, you know, just a—

Mr. FROST. That it is OK.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. That it is OK.

Mr. FROST. All right.

And then point of inquiry—or, I have a question—

Chairman COMER. And, remember, this is a slippery slope you are going down, because we have a—

Mr. FROST. Oh, you are going down the slippery slope.

Chairman COMER. Inquiry before in this Committee, as you know.

Mr. FROST. So, just to be clear, in this Committee, we can ask—

VOICE. Apparently.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. We can threaten violence on someone as long as—

Chairman COMER. No, no, that is not—

Mr. FROST. Excuse me. As long as that behavior—

Ms. MACE. I did not threaten violence.

Mr. FROST. Excuse me. Excuse me.

Ms. MACE. I threatened no violence.

Chairman COMER. There was no violence—

Ms. MACE. I threatened no violence.

Chairman COMER. No violence—

Mr. FROST [continuing]. As long as at the end—

Chairman COMER. Do not create a false narrative.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. We add a question—

Ms. MACE. I threatened no violence.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. That the other person—

Ms. MACE. None. You are making shit up—

Mr. FROST. That is good to know.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. As you go along. You might want—

Mr. FROST. Good to know.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. To figure this one out.

Chairman COMER. OK. Order, order. There was no——
 Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman?
 Mr. FROST. I thought you were not cursing today.
 Chairman COMER. There was no violence.
 Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. No violence.
 Mr. FROST. I am going to appeal the ruling of the Chair.
 Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have a——
 Mr. FROST. I am going to appeal the ruling of the Chair.
 Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Point of inquiry.
 Chairman COMER. State your point.
 Mr. FALLON. And I apologize because I had a meeting and came right down.
 Is it true that Ms. Mace was belittled by being called a child? Is that against our Rules?
 Chairman COMER. I would have to look up the Rules. I do not know that it is——
 Mr. FROST. I would like to appeal the ruling——
 Chairman COMER [continuing]. Specifically in the Rules. We ask for proper——
 Mr. FALLON. Well, can we strike it then?
 Chairman COMER [continuing]. Decorum. We ask for everybody to cooperate——
 Mr. FALLON. I would like to have it stricken.
 Chairman COMER. OK. There is——
 Mr. FALLON. If I could have Ms. Crockett's words stricken then.
 Chairman COMER. There is a motion. You have a motion, Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. Yes. I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.
 Chairman COMER. There is a motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair.
 The Chair recognizes Mr. Gosar.
 Mr. GOSAR. I move to table——
 Mr. FALLON. There is a motion to strike words, Mr. Chairman.
 Mr. GOSAR. I move to table, Mr. Chairman.
 Chairman COMER. There is a motion——
 Mr. FALLON. Motion to take down words. Sorry.
 Chairman COMER. There is a motion to table. The motion is not debatable as—OK. The motion is not debatable.
 All those in favor of—OK. We are going to vote on the motion to table by Mr. Gosar, to table Mr. Frost's appeal.
 So, the motion is not debatable.
 All in favor of Mr. Gosar's motion to table Mr. Frost's motion, 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——
 Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, I ask for a recorded vote.
 Chairman COMER [continuing]. And the motion is agreed to.
 A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll. We have to do that right now. The clerk will 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?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.
Mr. Cloud?
[No response.]
The CLERK. 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?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace 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?
[No response.]
The CLERK. 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.
Ms. Boebert?
Ms. BOEBERT. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Boebert votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Crane?
Mr. CRANE. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Crane votes aye.
Mr. Jack?
Mr. JACK. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Jack votes aye.
Mr. McGuire?
Mr. MCGUIRE. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. McGuire votes aye.
Mr. Gill?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
Mr. Khanna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. No.
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?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
Ms. Randall?
Ms. RANDALL. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Randall votes no.
Mr. Subramanyam?
Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Subramanyam votes no.
 Ms. Ansari?
 Ms. ANSARI. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Ansari votes no.
 Mr. Bell?
 Mr. BELL. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Bell votes no.
 Ms. Simon?
 Ms. SIMON. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Simon votes no.
 Mr. Min?
 Mr. MIN. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Min votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. Has Mr. Cloud voted?
 The CLERK. Mr. Cloud is not recorded.
 Mr. CLOUD. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. Has Mr. Biggs been recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Biggs is not recorded.
 Mr. BIGGS. I vote aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. Has Mr. Turner been recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Turner is not recorded.
 Mr. TURNER. I vote aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. Has Ms. Foxx—has Dr. Foxx been recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Foxx is not recorded.
 Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. Any other Member wish to be recorded?
 Would the clerk report the tally?
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 22, the nays are 17.
 Chairman COMER. The motion to table passes.
 Now we will go back to debate. And I believe it was Ms. Crockett, with 2 minutes and 57 seconds remaining.
 Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman—
 Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair, I actually had more time than that, but—
 Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I have a quick motion.
 Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. I can finish up in the 2—
 Mr. DONALDS. Chairman, I have a quick—Mr. Chairman, I have a quick—
 Chairman COMER. We will give you 4 minutes.
 Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I have a quick motion.
 Chairman COMER. Oh, wait a minute.
 The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds.
 Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that we move to structure debate for 15 minutes on Ms. Crockett's amendment.
 VOICE. Second.

Chairman COMER. Motion and second to structure debate for 15 minutes.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. Any opposed, no.

[Chorus of noes.]

Chairman COMER. The motion passes to limit debate to 15 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair, I would ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER.

All right. The clerk will call the roll on Mr. Donalds' motion to limit debate to 15 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Are we in the middle of debating this motion?

Chairman COMER. I do not believe it is debatable.

Is it?

It is debatable. It is debatable?

Yes, the motion to debate has already passed. I apologize. So, now we are on the vote to—the clerk is calling the vote——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Right, the recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. The recorded vote——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. On Mr. Donalds' motion to limit debate to 15 minutes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Cloud?

Mr. CLOUD. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes aye.

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?

Ms. MACE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.
 Mr. Fallon?
 Mr. FALLON. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.
 Mr. Donalds?
 Mr. DONALDS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes aye.
 Mr. Perry?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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.
 Ms. Boebert?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mrs. Luna?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy?
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
 Mr. Burlison?
 Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
 Mr. Crane?
 Mr. CRANE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Crane votes aye.
 Mr. Jack?
 Mr. JACK. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Jack votes aye.
 Mr. McGuire?
 Mr. MCGUIRE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. McGuire votes aye.
 Mr. Gill?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly?
 Mr. CONNOLLY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly 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. Krishnamoorthi?
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
 Mr. Khanna?
 [No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
 Mr. MFUME. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.
 Ms. Brown?
 Ms. BROWN. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
 Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.
 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?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
 Ms. Randall?
 Ms. RANDALL. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Randall votes no.
 Mr. Subramanyam?
 Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Subramanyam votes no.
 Ms. Ansari?
 Ms. ANSARI. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Ansari votes no.
 Mr. Bell?
 Mr. BELL. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Bell votes no.
 Ms. Simon?
 Ms. SIMON. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Simon votes no.
 Mr. Min?
 Mr. MIN. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Min votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. The Chairman votes yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. How has Ms. Boebert been recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Boebert is not recorded.
 Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. Yes.
 Ms. BOEBERT. I vote aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Boebert votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. And has Mr. Perry been recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry is not recorded.
 Mr. PERRY. Mr. Perry votes aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition to vote?

All right. The clerk will report the vote tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 23, the nays are 16.

Chairman COMER. All right. The motion passes for Mr. Donalds to limit debate to 15 minutes. Ms. Crockett will get her remaining 4 minutes, and then each side will have 7 1/2 additional minutes, if necessary.

So, the Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett for the remainder of her 4 minutes that do not count toward the limit to debate. Then from thereon, if there is further request for debate, there will be 7 1/2 minutes each time.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett for her remaining 4 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The final points that I was going to make is, while this amendment has to do with civil rights, for whatever reason, the colleague on the other side of the aisle decided to attack Democrats and pretend as if we do not look out for women. And I want to be clear that it is Democrats that were pushing for the equal rights amendment, and I do not recall any Republicans supporting us having the equal rights amendment.

I also want to make it clear that just because someone fantasizes or wants to be dramatic about the idea of someone could be a, quote/unquote, man in a locker room or in a bathroom, I have yet to hear an actual testimony of someone who, for whatever reason, has experienced this in real time.

But I can tell you some real numbers and some real facts, because I do not like to live in fantasy when I am talking about how I am going to govern for the American people. The facts are, in my state alone, in the state of Texas, once they decided that they were going to overturn the Roe decision, 26,000 women then ended up raped. 26,000 is what we had reported, and that was only within about a year's time span. And when they reported those rapes, none of them seemed to have anything to do with trans folk, and I do not recall any legislation to help out those women in Texas and beyond that are actually dying, we are not projecting may die but are actually dying or have died in southern states that have decided that they wanted to go after our reproductive freedoms.

So, as a woman in this country, as a Texan, and as a Black woman, who when we look at the numbers—and I believe in data and science, and I know that that escapes a lot of people in this chamber—but the numbers are clear that, specifically, Black women have always struggled when it came down to the maternal mortality rates in general.

The fact that somebody who looks like me, no matter how much money they have—because I can remind you of a very wealthy tennis star that almost lost her life while trying to give birth—some things I honestly just do not think should be partisan. And, frankly, I do believe in privacy, because honestly, I do not want none of you all making decisions if I ever end up pregnant and have to decide what it takes for me to save my life. And I give the same opportunity for other women in this country to make decisions as they see fit.

So, while we look at how we protect women completely differently, I can tell you that at least in the 766,000 women—or

766,000 constituents that I represent, I have had them come to me concerned about whether or not they could survive childbirth. But I have not had a single person in my district tell me that they were concerned that they may be raped by a trans person. So, if there is an issue to solve in this country based on facts, data, and statistics, I think that we need to look at the type of healthcare that we are going to advance for women in this country.

And with that, I will yield.

Chairman COMER. All right. The gentlelady yields back.

We are going to now go into the 15-minute cap. The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins from Louisiana for 3 1/2 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the 3 1/2 minutes, especially given the fact it takes me about 30 minutes to deliver a 5-minute speech. So, I am sure the other side is quite delighted that we are limited in time.

So, to my brothers and sisters on both sides of the aisle, I am going to have the gavel of the Federal Law Enforcement Subcommittee, and I would encourage you to participate, because it is a subcommittee that is going to respond to the needs of our time.

And, respectful of the good lady's comments regarding civil rights, liberties, and freedoms, this is a page that we happen to agree upon, ma'am. We have sworn a mutual oath. I swore oath as a police officer, long ago as an Army veteran, long before that as a military police officer, and that oath does not expire. We have an obligation to address the weaponization of our government against the American people that we have indeed witnessed, and in nowhere is it more frightening than when the weaponization of government is actually our Federal law enforcement.

So, since November the 5, Mr. Chairman, your rank-and-file Federal law enforcement professionals have been celebrating, because they know that they—their beloved agency or department has been corrupted from within at the highest levels by oppressors of individual rights, liberties, and freedoms. But your rank-and-file guys, they want to enforce the law, uphold the Constitution, defend individual rights, liberties, and freedoms.

Meanwhile, the elitist executives, the oppressors who have rooted their agenda deep within the highest levels of Federal law enforcement, they are packing their desk right now. But those men and women will appear before my subcommittee, Mr. Chairman. We will have our time with those men. And we will pull—we are not just pulling the curtain back, we are ripping it from the rod. We are going to reveal the oppressive nature of Federal law enforcement at its highest levels that we have experienced.

And I will yield the balance of my time to the Chairman. I believe the Ranking Member would like some time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member for however much time he wants. You have got 7 1/2 minutes on your side.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair.

Well, this is a circuitous route to an amendment that would, I would remind my colleagues, reestablish the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Why would we do that? Because almost nothing matches the importance of guaranteeing civil rights and civil liberties as a Member of Congress than ensuring the expan-

sion of and protection of fundamental rights, including voting rights.

We have seen suppressive activity all over America, whether it comes to women's reproductive rights or the right—the fundamental right to cast a ballot and have it counted. Ballot boxes have been suppressed. Voting times have been restricted. This is America. And if this Committee can contribute anything to America, it is the preservation of the sacred right of franchise guaranteed in the 14th Amendment.

It took 100 years from the Civil War to the Civil Rights Movement and the adoption of the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act in 1964 and 1965, respectively. And by the way, a higher percentage of Republicans voted for each than Democrats at that time. We had bipartisan consensus. We understood that we had been bankrupt in meeting that moral obligation, and it was time to correct the record back in 1964 and 1965.

Having this subcommittee anchors us in that fundamental commitment that ought to transcend our politics. I support the amendment to reestablish this subcommittee as something very fundamental to the function, role, and dedication of this Committee, the Government Operations and Accountability Committee [sic]. And I support the adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Chairman COMER. You all have 5 minutes and 20 seconds left. We have 3 1/2. I am going to recognize the gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. Greene.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When we talk about civil rights, we should talk about the rights of over 63 million unborn people that were slaughtered in the womb by what Democrats call reproductive rights. Your reproductive rights are murder. And when you want to talk about which form of murder do you want to use against an unborn, innocent person who should have the right to life, we should go into all of those nasty, disgusting methods. Whether these innocent people are ripped limb from limb, and they are washed in saline and murdered in the womb, or are their heads crushed before they are pulled out of their mother's cervix and womb; let us talk about those rights.

And let us talk about rape. Yes, let us talk about it. A former student convicted of sexually assaulting two girls released by Loudoun County judge. You know, you were talking about stats and data, there is information if you just take a minute to go look it up on your cell phone that you are looking at right now. You can look up a biological male student that was mentally ill and dressed up like a girl and went in the girl's high school bathroom and sexually assaulted two women, two young women in their school. Yes, it happens all the time.

And when you talk about civil rights, let us talk about women's rights in sports. A male swimmer competed on the men's team for 3 years before winning the women's NCAA Division One championship in the 500-yard freestyle event. This same man was nominated NCAA Woman of the Year. That is a big violation of women's rights.

After playing on a college men's team 30 years prior, a 52-year-old, 6-foot-6 man joined a women's junior college basketball team and destroyed them on the court. Oh, wow, I thought you cared about rights, civil rights, women's rights.

A male runner was named women's athlete of the week after competing in an NCAA Division One women's cross country meet. One male athlete won first place in the women's mile race at an NCAA Division One conference championship, and a 17-year-old female volleyball player was left partially paralyzed with brain damage after a ball was spiked at her by her biological male opponent. The team rightfully forfeited the remainder of the games played against that school out of safety concerns.

Why don't you care about these women's rights? If you want to preach about civil rights, civil liberties, and protecting people's rights, you should be standing up and protecting women and girls' rights in sports, and keep your biological men who are mentally insane and have sexually perverse ideas, thoughts, and fantasies out of our bathrooms, out of our sports, out of our women's spaces.

And if you want to continue to be the party that stands up for that absolute insane bullshit, we will keep beating you election after election after election. You want to know why? Because you all are for they/them, and we are for the American people. And we actually do stand up for people's rights. We stand up for the unborn. We stand up for women and children. And we will protect them from the deranged lunatics that you all call women.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

That is going to wrap up our time. You all have, what did I say, 4 1/2 minutes? Is that what—does anyone seek recognition, or are we going to go straight to votes?

All right. The motion now is on the Crockett amendment.

All those in favor of Ms. Crockett's 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. The amendment is not agreed to.

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Ms. Crockett.

Ms. CROCKETT. I would ask for a recorded vote.

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

So, pursuant to the previous order, the Committee stands in recess for 10 minutes while we prepare the electronic voting system. Good news, we think we have got it fixed. So, 10 minutes. Do not run off very far. Ten minutes, we are coming back, and we are going to vote electronically. It should be quick. So, the Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee comes back to order.

We are going to have a test vote first. If everyone will make a vote, whether it is yes or no, it does not matter, just make a vote and make sure your button works. It is looking good, I think. Make

sure everybody's button works. Make sure the voting card is on. This is just a test vote just to make sure the system works.

The Committee will now resume consideration of the Committee Rules. And the Ranking Member and I have discussed and have an agreement, if somebody's electric voting system does not work, we are just going to try to get through this hearing and do a thumbs up or a thumbs down and you will be recorded as voting yes or no until we get all these kinks worked out.

So, the question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Connolly from Virginia. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the Rules.
[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Does any Member wish to change the vote?

The clerk will close the vote and report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 16, the nays are 24.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Connolly amendment is not agreed to.

The Committee will resume consid—OK. The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Mfume from Maryland. Members will record your votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the Rules.
[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Does any Member wish to change their vote?

Any other Members wish to vote?

Seeing none, the clerk will close the vote, report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 16, the nays are 25.

Chairman COMER. The nays have it, and the Mfume amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the Stansbury amendment.
[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will close the vote, report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 16, the nays are 25.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Stansbury amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Garcia from California. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the Garcia amendment.
[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Not yet. OK.

Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will close the vote, and report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 16, the nays are 25.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Garcia amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Crockett from Texas. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the Crockett amendment.

[Voting.]

Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will close the vote and report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 16, the nays are 25.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Crockett amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on adopting the proposed Rules as the Rules of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for the 119th Congress. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on adopting the Committee Rules.

[Voting.]

Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will close the vote and report the vote total. And leave your voting devices at your desk, please.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 25, the nays are 16.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Pursuant to House Rules, the Rules adopted by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability for the 119th Congress will be published and in the congressional Record and made available to all Members and the public on the Committee's website.

Without objection, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to reflect the action of the Committee in adopting the Rules.

Without objection, so ordered.

If there is no further business before the Committee, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:23 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

