

119th Congress }
1st Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
AUTHORIZATION AND OVERSIGHT PLAN

FOR THE
COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

FEBRUARY 25, 2025

Serial No. CP:119-3

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

59-351 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	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Chief Counsel for Oversight
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel
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

	Page
Meeting held on February 25, 2025	1

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

* *No documents were entered into the record for this meeting.*

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING: AUTHORIZATION AND OVERSIGHT PLAN

Tuesday, February 25, 2025

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

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 12:50 p.m., in HVC-210, Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

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

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

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

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

Now pursuant to notice, I call up the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Authorization and Oversight Plan for the 119th Congress. The clerk will report the plan which has been distributed in advance.

The CLERK. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Authorization Oversight Plan for the 119th Congress.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Committee's Authorization and Oversight Plan, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

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

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

Good afternoon. We are here today to approve the Committee's Authorization and Oversight Plan. The Rules require us to mark up and submit this plan at the beginning of each new Congress. Last Congress, on February 28, 2023, the Committee's Oversight Plan was adopted by voice vote after the Democrats worked with me to finalize the plan. In fact, I accepted some suggestions from the previous Ranking Member last Congress. Because of this and Mr. Connolly's past efforts to forge bipartisan consensus, I was hopeful that our Oversight plan for the next 2 years would once again be a bipartisan work product this Congress. In an effort to facilitate a productive conversation, we shared a draft of the plan with the Democrats 1 week ago. We also offered to discuss any questions or legitimate additions the Democrats had. Our hope was that Ranking Member would meet us at the table, but we did not hear anything back.

Then this week, we offered to add in their Minority Views to the plan. This offer would allow the Ranking Member to have his voice heard and contribute to the plan, but unfortunately they declined. Instead of working together, the Democrats informed us that they have amendments to the plan but are refusing to discuss them with me in advance. They kept any changes they wanted a secret.

Democrats have rejected every opportunity I offered to contribute to the Oversight plan, so how am I supposed to incorporate secret opinions that they refuse to share? You may be asking yourself why would the Democrats do that? Democrats say they want to participate in oversight, but if that were true, why would they decline multiple opportunities to actually engage in the plan for that oversight? Because they do not want to participate. They want to stonewall and engage in theater. In fact, they say they were sticking to their original plan today.

So, whatever you all hear from the Minority, just know it was their plan all along. It was their plan to distract from the Committee's mission. It was their plan to delay a hearing on rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse. It was their plan to obstruct the operations of this Committee. The Minority made this clear when they previously stated they had zero interest in working with me and Republicans on this Committee to help them with anything as it relates to DOGE. No interest in working together to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead of legislating and conducting actual oversight, the Democrats are more interested in disruption and spectacle. Their actions speak louder than their empty words. They want to pretend that they are trying to fight to put their words in the Oversight Plan, but I already gave them two opportunities to work with me to do that, and they rejected both of those gestures.

I would like to list a range of important topics that the Democrats have declined to participate in working together on in the Authorization Oversight Plan that I have submitted for the 119th Congress. This year's plan includes sections for lapsed and expiring authorizations; preventing waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in Federal programs; the Federal workforce; Federal regulations; the Government Accountability Office; Inspectors General; GSA real property disposal; whistleblower protection; Federal fi-

nancial management; government contracting; grant reform; cybersecurity and data privacy; information technology and management; open government and transparency; the United States Postal Service; oversight of the District of Columbia; National Archives and Federal records; Office of Government Ethics; and the Federal disaster response and recovery. Those are a lot of important topics that Democrats apparently do not consider worth their time. They would rather hear themselves talk about President Trump and the evil Elon Musk than work together on actual oversight that the American people are demanding.

And newsflash to the Democrats: according to a new poll released this week, the American people overwhelmingly support the work President Trump and DOGE are doing. And the hypocrisy is that the longer they pontificate today, the longer they delay the start of an important hearing with the Government Accountability Office on Federal Government programs at a high risk of fraud, waste, abuse, and improper payments. So, I would urge my friend, the Ranking Member, to ask his Democrat colleagues to stop with the spectacle and pretense and actually come to the table to work on oversight. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this comprehensive plan for oversight.

With that, I yield to Ranking Member Connolly for his opening statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I must say, it is a bit much being lectured about cooperation from the Republican Majority that chased every rabbit hole on impeachment of Joe Biden, and suddenly we are the ones who are obsessed with the President of the United States.

Today, we are considering the Committee's Authorization and Oversight Plan for the 119th Congress. At its core, this document should serve as a road map for the Committee's work, an articulation of our constitutional responsibilities, and a demonstration of our unwavering commitment to accountability, transparency, and good governance. But what has been presented by the Chairman on behalf of the Republican Majority is not a serious or comprehensive plan for congressional oversight. Rather, it is Exhibit A of the Majority's unilateral retreat from Article I of the Constitution and their duty to conduct meaningful oversight of the executive branch, particularly when that executive branch is led by a President of their own party. The sins of omission in this plan are damning.

It is as if this Committee, which should serve as a proud sentinel of accountability, has chosen to don blinders, shielding itself from the very real abuses of power we have witnessed during the first month alone of this Administration. That is why I intend to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute which would more clearly identify the urgent oversight priorities that ought to be before this Committee. My amendment would restore the Committee's proper role as a watchdog, not a lapdog.

It would ensure the Committee investigates urgent matters that sit at the heart of its legislative and oversight jurisdiction, issues the Majority's plan ignores, conveniently. Among the many crises demanding our attention, we must examine President Trump's infamous Friday night massacre of 17 Inspectors General across 18 agencies and departments, a blatant effort to purge the Federal

Government of its independent overseers and lower a veil of darkness to conceal potential waste and corruption sure to follow. This Committee must reinvestigate the Trump Administration's purge of nonpartisan civil servants, which will have catastrophic results for the American people who rely on government every day for services and benefits all across this country.

The Administration is engaged in a rapid and sweeping effort to purge the Federal workforce through mass terminations of new or recently transferred employees, scam resignation offers, efforts to replace career professionals with partisan loyalists, attempts to eliminate entire agencies without congressional approval, and general threats of mass firings based on arbitrary decrees from Elon Musk. The Administration's concerted attacks on Federal employees risk grinding the essential functions of our government to a halt, and when they do, it is going to be the American people who suffer. The most glaring example, of which the Republican Majority has abandoned Article I duties of Congress, is the Administration's unconstitutional impoundment of congressionally appropriated funds.

Whether the attempted elimination of entire agencies established in statute, such as USAID and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or the Administration's disastrous Federal funding freeze, the Administration's impoundment broadside against congressional authority cannot be ignored by this Committee and ought to be part of our work plan. Congress, not the executive branch, has the constitutional power of the purse. That has been reaffirmed by the GAO, the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court, time and time again.

At the center of many of these crises that scream out for Congressional oversight sits Elon Musk, the world's richest man, who gave President Trump and congressional Republicans nearly \$300 million in campaign donations last year. In return, Mr. Musk received the reins of exactly one United States Federal Government. Mr. Musk and the so-called DOGE have since gone on a rampage. They have inflicted their brand of cruel, and I mean cruel, and arbitrary chaos on our government by targeting agencies for elimination with outright lies, infiltrating sensitive Federal payment and taxpayer data systems, and bypassing congressional authority to promote Mr. Musk's financial and political interests. Mr. Musk and DOGE have shielded themselves from critical oversight mechanisms, silenced career public servants who dare to question their actions, and hastily developed false savings metrics to justify their dubious actions. Their reckless and self-serving agenda has left agencies in disarray, eroded public trust, and placed essential government functions at risk, all under the guise of so-called efficiency.

President Trump and Mr. Musk do not have a mandate to do what they are doing. President Trump did not even win a majority of the popular vote, much less a mandate, and Mr. Musk is an unelected billionaire. The approval ratings are falling faster than the stock market for what he is up to. And my Republican colleagues are getting an earful back home from constituents who are fed up with the wrecking ball approach that is destroying their government. If my colleagues think it is bad now, just wait until the

American people start to hear what Republicans are willing to cut in order to deliver tax cuts for billionaires.

The Majority may have no interest in oversight of the executive branch, but the American people do. They expect this Committee to do its job. They expect us to provide a check on executive overreach, to expose corruption and self-dealing wherever we find it, to safeguard the institutions that uphold our democracy, and, above all, bring transparency and accountability to this government. If the Majority continues to abdicate its duty, that is their choice, but let the record reflect today that we had an opportunity to be responsive to an American public calling out for more, not less, accountability. And Oversight Democrats are answering that call.

In the past month, we have pursued nearly 2 dozen investigations of the Administration, made more than 100 related requests for information and documents, and exposed the systemic abuses, conflicts of interest, and unlawful actions that have become, unfortunately, a hallmark of this Administration. Our work has shed light in the Administration's attempt to silence independent oversight and conceal critical public records and erode safeguards that protect taxpayer dollars. And we are just getting started.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to moving my amendment at the appropriate time.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Mr. Min. Go ahead. You are recognized.

Mr. MIN. One minute? For 1 minute or 5 minutes? Five minutes. OK. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Ranking Member Connolly. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the Committee's Authorization and Oversight Plan. Investigation and oversight, of course, are fundamental responsibilities of Congress, and as the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, we should be exercising these powers to fulfill our constitutional duties as a check on the consolidation of executive power. Ensuring good government that works on behalf of all Americans is not a partisan issue. However, at this time, as the Ranking Member alluded to, we are living through a constitutional crisis, and this committee must lead right now.

We need to meet this unprecedented moment. Anything else is to cede the legislative branch's constitutional duty and to deny the American people the kind of oversight that they deserve and are demanding. And, yes, we are all hearing it in our districts. So, I must say that I am extremely disappointed that this proposed Administration and Oversight [sic] plan completely ignores the elephant in the room: the gross abuses of power and flagrant disregard for the Constitution and the rule of law that Donald Trump and Elon Musk are engaging in.

Within days of taking office, President Trump fired nearly a quarter of Inspector Generals across the Federal Government. He has tried to fire FBI agents and DOJ staff that he views as insufficiently loyal to him. And this weekend, he fired not only a number of top generals at the Pentagon, which made the news, but also the judge advocate generals at each of the major military arms. Let us be clear: these are the people and institutions that are actually supposed to be monitoring waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. They are the watchmen at the front lines, and Donald Trump has fired them all. And it is, frankly, outrageous that this

Committee has refused to investigate this or to address it in our Administration and Oversight Plan [sic].

President Trump, of course, also issued the DOGE executive order, which authorizes the creation of the Department of Government Efficiency, which, to be clear, is not a department. That would require congressional action and also Senate confirmation, but is a temporary organization limited by law to a specific study or project, in this case, as the White House order made clear, data modernization. But what DOGE has indeed done has gone far beyond a temporary data modernization project. Under the leadership of Elon Musk, DOGE has asserted sweeping powers to undo congressionally enacted laws and to redirect congressionally mandated appropriations, powers which are not only clearly illegal for a temporary special government employee, which is how Musk has been categorized to exert, but which would also be illegal if the President tried to do this.

The Constitution is clear. Congress, and only Congress, has the power to make laws and appropriate money. This is so simple that it is taught in our elementary schools. I know this because I have kids who are 14, 12, and 9. They have all learned this. All of us here swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, an oath that, by the way, Elon Musk has not taken. But too many members of this Congress have chosen to ignore Donald Trump and Elon Musk's blatantly unconstitutional attacks on our congressional powers.

And I want to make clear, this is not a partisan issue. When Musk steals our congressional appropriations authority, when he usurps our congressional legislative authority, it affects Democrats and Repubs together because it is your power on the other side of the aisle that is also being taken away. And by being silent on this, you are setting the precedent that in any future administration, a special government employee can rewrite congressionally enacted laws and redirect congressionally appropriated funding. That is why I introduced the Bolstering American Democracy and Demanding Oversight in Government Ethics or BAD DOGE Act because DOGE is violating Federal laws and the Constitution every single day.

Now let us also talk about the particular problems posed by Elon Musk. He is the world's richest and most ethically conflicted person. He reportedly failed a high-level security clearance because of his rampant drug use and close ties to Russian and Chinese leaders. Musk has taken control of our Federal payment systems, and he has acquired access to the sensitive personal information of anyone who has ever received a check from the Federal Government, and now he is trying to gain access to our tax returns. In so doing, he is violating dozens of laws around privacy and ethics.

At the same time, he appears to be using DOGE for his own personal interests to settle scores against agencies like the FAA and the California Coastal Commission, which prevented him from launching SpaceX rockets indiscriminately due to concerns around safety and environmental impact; or USAID, which was reportedly investigating his interference with Starlink terminals used by Ukraine; or to advance his business interests, such as by canceling contracts with his rivals, like the \$6.6 billion federally guaranteed

loan to Rivian that was canceled. And let us not forget that he is keeping all of his contracts and getting new ones, like the \$400 million contract for armored cyber trucks.

Now, Elon Musk is out of control. What he is proposing is out of control. He is violating a number of laws. He is ethically conflicted, and the American people need transparency and answers, and we need to be looking into this. I respectfully yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Grothman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Just a comment because I have heard similar comments from other members of your party and, of course, I love working with you guys.

When Elon Musk or DOGE or the President look into some of the Federal employees around here, and we all know Federal employees around here because maybe we have relatives, we have friends, whatnot, who work in the government. We hear some scare stories about people doing—and there are many, many hardworking Federal employees, I am glad we have good Federal employees—but we hear anecdotal evidence of people doing very little.

If President Trump is the head of the executive branch and he discovers some employees doing very little, your position is apparently that we must keep these people going through the next budget, or what have you, and keep doing very little. It is obvious to me that both President Trump and the American public, upon discovering people who are doing very little work, should ask that those employees be terminated. It is not something he does joyfully, but that is what you do if you are running the executive branch.

And it is ridiculous that we have to have President Trump attacked and the Republican Party attacked when an effort is made to find employees who are doing very little. I am glad that President Trump has assigned people to look into this. And there are critical things you can say about the Republicans, but I wish you would focus on that rather than trying to claim that every Federal employee here in this town is necessary.

Mr. FROST. Would you yield for a question?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Sure. I would love to.

Mr. FROST. Well, because you are bringing up that it should be OK and you see no problem with the Trump Administration and with DOGE doing this mass firing because “people are doing very little.” How are they figuring out who is doing very little? I am just curious.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Well, you will have to ask them, right?

Mr. FROST. Oh, I will have to ask them? So, you are OK with being behind something that is happening, the mass firing of people, firing of veterans?

Chairman COMER. It is Congressman Grothman’s time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. The President is in charge of the executive branch. I would assume at any given time, people are being hired and being fired, probably more than have been the last 50 years around here, but they are. They are not going to report to Congress every time they feel a position is unnecessary.

Mr. GOSAR. Chair?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields his time to Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. You know, Glenn, I would like to ask you—this is not novel, having somebody like this. Wasn't Ezekiel Emanuel part of Obamacare? And I do not know what is more personal, personal financial or personal—

Mr. GROTHMAN. All Presidents have unconfirmed advisers.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you.

Mr. GROTHMAN. That is not a new thing either.

Mr. MIN. Would the gentleman yield?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back, right?

Mr. MIN. Is it your position that the President can delete any agency?

Chairman COMER. Yes, the gentleman, he yielded his time back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Krishnamoorthi from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to very briefly address Mr. Grothman. I take you as being serious about wanting to improve efficiency in government and so forth. I think the issue is when you fire or give a pink slip to 200,000 probationary workers at one time, regardless of their efficiency. I think that is where there is a serious concern that is raised. But I want to just address one other issue, Mr. Comer, and that is the U.S. Postal Service.

On December 14, 2024, the *Washington Post* reported that the Trump Administration was considering, at that time, a move to privatize the Postal Service and push thousands of Federal service employees out of their jobs in favor of a broad privatization of the Agency's essential services. Then, just last week, on February 20, the *Washington Post* stated that the Administration is preparing to "dissolve the leadership of the USPS and absorb the independent mail agency into his Administration," as you know, the Commerce Department, potentially throwing trillions of dollars of e-commerce transactions into turmoil. These reports are beyond troubling, and I respectfully request that you have a hearing again on the USPS. You had a very good hearing the other day, where we were able to grill Mr. DeJoy, and I learned a lot. I think a lot of our Members on both sides learned a lot. I think we need to have a hearing on this particular issue.

As you know, the USPS is the foundation of our \$1.92 trillion mailing industry, led courageously by numerous veterans, letter carriers, who deliver 44 percent of the world's mail. More importantly, no private sector entity provides universal service across the Nation. And without these letter carriers and others, more than 51.5 million households and businesses, especially in rural communities, Mr. Chairman, would have no guaranteed delivery.

As a member of this panel tasked with oversight of the Federal Government's activities, including the USPS, I believe it is essential, it is imperative that we have this hearing, sir. I know that you and the Ranking Member care deeply about the USPS, and what the Administration is proposing to do with the USPS, in my opinion, is illegal. It is against the framework of the USPS and we need to look into it. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Before I recognize Ms. Greene from Georgia, I will just respond. When we see a proposal or something, we will have something, either a briefing or a committee hearing or subcommittee hearing or something. You mentioned potentially throwing it into turmoil. Some would argue

the Postal Service is already in turmoil right now with the delays in certain mail sorting facilities. So, I agree with what you said. I know you are sincere, and I think Ranking Member Connolly and I have demonstrated we want to support the Postal Service. And so, when we find out more, we will do something immediately, have a briefing or a subcommittee hearing or a full committee hearing. OK. The Chair recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Democrat colleagues across the aisle are complaining and pitching tantrums over Elon Musk and his DOGE team's cutting waste, fraud, and abuse from the executive branch and the Federal Government. Claiming this is unconstitutional is an outright lie. Article II of the Constitution clearly states that the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. President Trump exercised that power by appointing Mr. Elon Musk as a special government employee. The President, via executive order, created the U.S. DOGE Service within the former U.S. Digital Service to implement the President's DOGE agenda by modernizing Federal technology and software to maximize governmental efficiency and productivity. DOGE has been brought in exactly like the U.S. Digital Service during President Obama's tenure. This is not unconstitutional.

Seventy-two percent of Americans—this is on both sides of the aisles, you guys, these are people in your district, these are people in my district—agree that we need to cut the ridiculous amount of waste, fraud, and abuse because Americans, all of us together, are \$36 trillion in debt. Thirty-six trillion dollars in debt is what should be unconstitutional, not doing everything we can to save the American people their hard-earned tax dollars.

You can protest all you want outside of departments of this government. You can protest all you want, but the American people disagree with you. You are protecting the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy is not a business. Those are not real jobs producing Federal revenue. By the way, they are consuming taxpayer dollars. Those jobs are paid for by the American tax people who work real jobs, earn real income, pay Federal taxes, and then pay these Federal employees. Federal employees do not deserve their jobs. Federal employees do not deserve their paychecks, and these are jobs that can be fired at will.

But you want to know why? The American people cannot pay for it anymore. We cannot afford it. Thirty-six billion dollars in debt. If you want to make that your platform, your hill to die on, go ahead because 72 percent of Americans agree with DOGE, agree with cutting the waste, fraud, and abuse, and agree with what this Committee is supposed to be about: oversight. So, continue your temper tantrums. I would love to win the midterms. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Frost from Florida.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it. In the mission statement that you have put out for this Committee, it says it is to ensure that the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the Federal Government, which I think we all agree on. We all want to combat waste, fraud, and abuse. But the thing is that you all are all looking in the wrong places. You want to talk

about making cuts to things like Medicaid, which, by the way, over 35 percent of all the children in this country are covered under Medicaid. Over 100,000 people in my district are covered under Medicaid. People like the [words stricken] Trump and president Musk are openly using their public offices to enrich themselves to the tune of billions of dollars.

So, if we want to look at waste, fraud, and abuse, which I am down to do, why is there complete silence on the other side of the aisle about looking at the complete grifter that is the President of the United States and the richest man on the earth, which is looking into things like Social Security and different things like that?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, personalities and——

Mr. FROST. Why don't we investigate the real corruption?

Mr. HIGGINS. Point of order.

Chairman COMER. Hold up. Hold up.

Mr. HIGGINS. Point of order.

Mr. FROST. I reclaim my time. I reclaim my time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Hold up. Point of order.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

[Cross-talking.]

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Hold up. Hold up. There was a point of order when you said something. Who asked for it?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Higgins.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. He referred to the President as a [words stricken] and Elon Musk as the President. Mr. Ranking Member, put some reins on that.

Mr. FROST. I can refer to Elon Musk as the president.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I do not believe the First Amendment has been suspended in this Committee yet.

Mr. FROST. Yes. You all were fine when your other Members calling for a fight a few weeks ago.

Chairman COMER. All right. Suspend for a second.

Let me speak to the parliamentarian.

[Pause.]

Mr. FROST. Would anyone on our side make a meme coin——

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost? Mr. Frost? Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Right after being elected President of the United States?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost, before we proceed on all of this, would you like to——

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Hold on. I am the Chairman. I recognized Mr. Frost, and we will recognize you. Would you like to revise your remark with respect to improperly identifying the President of the United States?

Mr. FROST. I will say president Musk and grifter-in-chief Trump——

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, point of order. If I wanted to challenge someone to a fight, they would know it. Thank you.

Mr. FROST. There is an extra fundraising video for her.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that Mr. Musk is protected by the Rules of the House or the Committee.

Chairman COMER. We are looking at the disparaging the President now.

Mr. CONNOLLY. But I do not believe Mr. Frost disparaged the President. I believe he disparaged Mr. Musk.

Chairman COMER. Well, he did disparage the President when he called him the——

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Musk actually came here, then maybe the rules of the Committee would apply to him.

Mr. FROST. All right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I heard no disparagement.

Mr. FROST. I will say something else.

Chairman COMER. We will save a lot of time.

Mr. FROST. I will say something else.

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. We are going to let—the Chair recognizes Mr. Frost. You still have 3:49. You are going to maybe revise the disparaging comment about the President because that is supposed to be our decorum here.

Mr. FROST. It is supposed to be. President Musk and the President of the United States, Donald Trump, who has engaged in grifting of the American people, often use their public offices to enrich themselves. Someone on the other side was just asking how would you feel if you called someone else from the——

Ms. BOEBERT. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Hold off. Hold off. Mr. Frost, hold up. There is a pending motion for disparaging the President. So, the motion was words taken down about disparaging the President, and the Chair finds the words from the gentleman from Florida are not parliamentary because they constitute personalities toward the President, which if you sit on the House Floor, that is always uttered by the presiding officer on the House Floor. You cannot disparage the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, would you please read back to us the words that were disparaging because I did not hear them.

Chairman COMER. If you are willing to request unanimous consent to withdraw the disparaging comments about President Trump—I guess, you can disparage Elon Musk if you want.

Mr. FROST. I will withdraw [words stricken] and——

Mr. BIGGS. You said President Musk and President Trump were grifting.

Mr. FROST. I will say the President is grifting because you spent the last 2 years saying President Biden was corrupt.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. BOEBERT. Take down his words.

Mr. FROST. I can say that Trump is grifting. What I will withdraw is calling him “[words stricken].” That is what I will withdraw.

Chairman COMER. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the words in question are ordered stricken from the transcript of this proceeding. So, the Member is barred from further participation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I challenge the ruling of the Chair.

Chairman COMER. Challenge the ruling of the Chair, all right.

Mr. GOSAR. I move to table.

Chairman COMER. OK. We have a motion to challenge ruling of the Chair, and then Mr. Gosar made a motion to table Connolly's motion.

Ms. BOEBERT. Second.

Chairman COMER. So, there is a motion and second to table Mr. Connolly's motion. The motion is not debatable. As many as are in favor of tabling, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes.]

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

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

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes.

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?

Mr. CLOUD. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.

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?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.

Mr. Timmons?
 Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
 Mr. Burchett?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. McGuire votes yes.
 Mr. Gill?
 Mr. GILL. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gill votes aye.
 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?
 Mr. KHANNA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
 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. Absolutely not.
 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. Insulting people's appearance as well as trying to fight them is not a problem?
 Mr. FALLON. Point of order. It is a "yes" or "no."
 Ms. CROCKETT. But we are so set——
 Mr. FALLON. Point of order.
 Chairman COMER. Order. Order. Order.
 Ms. CROCKETT. We are so set——
 Ms. BOEBERT. Order, order, order.
 Chairman COMER. Skip her. Skip her. Skip her. Go to the next one. Go to the next one.
 The CLERK. Ms. Randall?
 Ms. RANDALL. No.
 Chairman COMER. Go to the next one. Do not count that. Go to the next one.
 The CLERK. Ms. Randall votes no.
 Mr. Subramanyam?
 Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Subramanyam votes no.
 Ms. Ansari?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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.
 Ms. Pressley?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib?
 Ms. TLAIB. Nope.
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Ms. Crockett recorded?
 Chairman COMER. Let us try this one more time. How is Ms. Crockett voted?
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett is not yet recorded.
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague.

The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Mr. Casar recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Casar is not recorded.

Mr. CASAR. I vote no.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.

Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 19.

Chairman COMER. All right. The motion to table passes.

I now recognize Mr. McGuire.

Mr. FROST. I want to say it is despicable that this Committee is going to silence me for bringing up—

Ms. BOEBERT. The gentleman's words have been taken down. He is not permitted to speak for the rest of the hearing.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Making millions of dollars—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost. Mr. Ranking Member, I am going to have the Sergeant-at-Arms remove him if he does not refrain. All right. The Chair recognizes Mr. McGuire.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. Mr. McGuire.

Ms. STANSBURY. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record. President Trump—

Chairman COMER. Order.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry on the motion that just passed.

Mr. MCGUIRE. President Trump did win a mandate. He won the popular vote, and he won the electoral college, and he is delivering on those promises. And I find it interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are mad at the folks that are having success, like Elon Musk, in identifying and correcting waste, fraud, and abuse, and not upset with the folks that committed that waste, fraud, and abuse. And if you were supportive of the last Administration, I do not know if you are an authority on how we solve that problem, considering we are getting more results in the last 5 weeks than our country has achieved in the last 50 years.

Also, I want to talk about the Post Office. In my district, we have 4 hospitals and 42 health clinics. I went to visit a health clinic, and one of the things they do is every day they mail prescription drugs to older folks all over the district. And so, I said, well, how does that work with the post office, and they said, we do not use the post office because sometimes they are a week or 2 weeks late on delivering those drugs, which could have life-saving implications. So, I said, well, who do you use, and they said they use UPS, and I said, well, how reliable are they, and they said they are 100 percent reliable. And I said, well, what is your worst-case story of the UPS? And they said, well, we sent something in the mail in 2013, and we got it back in 2023. So, definitely, we need to do some oversight on what is going on with the Postal Service, so I can understand why we need to look at that.

Also, I think that President Trump is an incredible President. He is a peacemaker, and he is on a roll, Trump warp speed. This is the most historic first month of our presidency, and I think the

other side does not have an answer for this. He signed 72 executive orders. He ended burdensome regulations. He sealed the border. He unleashed American energy, eliminated divisive DEI—which is illegal discrimination, from our Federal Government. He saved women's sports. He ended censorship of free speech. He cut waste, fraud, and abuse, restored common sense. He signed the Laken Riley Act, and the Senate has confirmed 19 of his cabinet nominees. President Trump is on a roll. He has a mandate, and I am glad that we are going to make progress and win the midterms if you guys keep creating this manufactured outrage. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Before I recognize Mr. Fallon, Ms. Stansbury has a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Chairman COMER. And I want to note that they just called votes on the Floor, but, Ms. Stansbury, you are recognized. What is your point of order?

Ms. STANSBURY. Well, it is a parliamentary inquiry. So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that I am clear on the vote that was just taken. So, the vote that was just taken in the Committee was to table a motion that would overturn striking down the words that Mr. Frost said, essentially saying that—I am putting quotes—that Donald Trump and Musk were grifting.

Chairman COMER. No, no, that is not correct. It was to table his motion challenging the ruling of the Chair.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes, that is exactly. OK. Yes.

Chairman COMER. OK.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, just to be clear, the outcome of this—

Chairman COMER. I mean, that is the question. It was to table the motion by the Ranking Member to challenge the ruling of the Chair. All right.

Ms. STANSBURY. And the ruling of the Chair—this is my parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is if this essentially silenced Mr. Frost, took down his words, and makes that he cannot speak again—

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, am I recognized?

Chairman COMER. You are out of order, Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Because he criticized the President. I am asking if this is what happened parliamentarily just now. Did you just silence Mr. Frost by procedural vote. Yes, you did. You just silenced him.

Chairman COMER. I do not even think—

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, if I am recognized, I believe I am, I move the previous question.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury, if you can just wait until the Committee hearing starts. Mr. Fallon?

Ms. STANSBURY. Do we even have free speech anymore?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing me.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. I move the previous question.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury.

Mr. FALLON. Let us talk about free speech, Mr. Chairman. I move the previous question.

Chairman COMER. There is a motion to move the previous question. Is there a second?

Mr. BIGGS. Second.

Chairman COMER. Second by Mr. Biggs.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The motion is not debatable, but I will recognize you, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If this motion were to be acted upon, it would prevent the Minority from providing its ANS, which I understood earlier we were going to be allowed to be considered.

Chairman COMER. We have a hearing on waste, fraud, and abuse that has not even begun. These normally last—even in this Committee—the organizational thing just normally lasts 5 or 10 minutes. We have been in here 35 minutes arguing over the same things that the people on each side of the Committee argue over on TV multiple times a day. We have got to get to business if we want to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. We have got witnesses waiting. We have tried to do this. The debate has gone on well beyond what was expected. Now there is a motion by Mr. Fallon, a good Subcommittee Chair, to move to previous question. The motion is not debatable.

And shall the main question now be put, those in favor of signifying support for Mr. Fallon's motion to move the previous question, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[Chorus of noes].

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

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

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes.

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?

Mr. CLOUD. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Cloud votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?
 Mr. HIGGINS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes aye.
 Mr. Sessions?
 Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.
 Mr. Biggs?
 Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
 Ms. Mace?
 Ms. MACE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.
 Mr. Fallon?
 Mr. FALLON. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.
 Mr. Donalds?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry?
 Mr. PERRY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.
 Mr. Timmons?
 Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
 Mr. Burchett?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. McGuire votes yes.
 Mr. Gill?
 Mr. GILL. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gill votes aye.
 Mr. Connolly?
 Mr. CONNOLLY. A resounding no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes no.
 Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
 Mr. Lynch?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
 Mr. Khanna?
 Mr. KHANNA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
 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?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. 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.
 Ms. Pressley?
 Ms. PRESSLEY. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Pressley votes no.
 Ms. Tlaib?

Ms. TLAIB. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Mr. Casar's vote recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Casar is not yet recorded.

Mr. CASAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Mr. Frost recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Frost is recorded as voting no.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Ms. Tlaib recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib is recorded as voting no.

Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 19.

Chairman COMER. All right. The motion passes. We will immediately roll into voting on the Rules, but because the Floor votes have been called and they were called about 10 minutes ago, pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess subject to 10 minutes after the final vote.

[Recess.]

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I want to address the course of events that preceded our going to the Floor to vote. Comity and dignity in this Committee are important. Mr. Frost was threatened with the Sergeant-at-Arms. I believe that was a very unfortunate outburst from the Chair. I understand his frustration in having to manage an unruly bunch of people, and I am part of that unruly bunch of people too. But I just want to say, before Mr. Frost would be removed by the Sergeant-at-Arms, you would have to remove this Ranking Member and all of the Democrats on this side of the aisle. I thank the Chair for his consideration.

Chairman COMER. I appreciate the Ranking Member. What do we do when he has gaveled out for 3 minutes and continues to ramble? What is the process there?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I believe, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Frost was not rambling, and I believe Mr. Frost would have finished his thoughts and proceeded with the motion. I know Mr. Frost not to be a disruptive presence. He was trying to articulate a point of view and be heard, and, of course, everything was suppressed. By ordering the previous question, the Minority has been denied its right to have an alternative work plan considered, which I consider unfortunate and a suppression of our rights.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, go ahead. Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Look, Gerry Connolly is my friend. I know that many in the room are frustrated. I have been frustrated in the past, too—you know, John Kerry out as the President's special envoy; signing us up for the Paris Climate Accord; Alexander Moniz signing us up for the Iran nuclear deal, of which nobody signed. Look, we all get frustrated. I get it. But if the Chairman has to maintain order here, quite honestly, I think he has to rely on the good graces and the integrity of the Members

themselves. And if they refuse to abide by that, and I have been frustrated in the past, too, and I probably pushed the limits, but sometimes you say something that you should not have said. And when you are given an opportunity to have—to take it down yourself, that is your opportunity, and if you are not going to do it, that is your choice.

We all make decisions, but then there are consequences for those decisions, and I would say by moving the previous question, it is not taking anyone's right away. We still had a vote. I appreciate fully that you do not agree with the vote, but we still had the vote. We still considered it. We still heard your narrative on it. I appreciate it. I can see a lot of work went into it. But at the end of the day, the Chairman is the Chairman. He has got to make sure that we have order so that we can have the arguments in a fashion by which we can respect one another, have our voices heard, knowing that there are going to be disagreements, and then move forward so that we can proceed around this place. And I appreciate you, Mr. Connolly. I just think in this one, I think the Chairman did the right thing. And with that I will yield.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, and I let Mr. Connolly speak, Mr. Perry speak. We are going to now resume the Committee hearing.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of the substitute.

All those in favor of the vote on the ANS for the Committee oversight plan—that is what this hearing is about, our prehearing—offered by me, offered by Mr. Comer from Kentucky.

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 the Chair, the ayes have it.

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

Chairman COMER. OK. A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll—oh.

Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to—the ANS.

All those in favor signify by voting yes. All those opposed, no.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members voted who wish to vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 22. The nays are 17.

Chairman COMER. The motion passes. Pursuant to this vote, the Committee—OK. Now—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Just pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2(i), I intend to file Minority Views on the report.

Chairman COMER. OK. The ayes have it on the amendment in the nature of a substitute. It is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting the plan, as amended. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Does any Member wish to change the vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will call the vote.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 22. The nays are 18.

Chairman COMER. Pursuant to the vote, the Committee hereby adopts this Authorization and Oversight Plan for the 119th Congress.

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

Now, before we roll into the regular hearing, I am going to grant the Ranking Member time to express whatever he wants to. Go ahead.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I was just notifying the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2(i), I intend to file Minority Views, especially in light of the fact that we were denied the opportunity to move our ANS.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, given we did not have much time, could we get 1 minute to speak on this or no?

Chairman COMER. No, we have been moved to previous question, so that ends debate.

Now we will have a committee hearing. We are going to start the committee hearing and——

Mr. MIN. Point of order.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Everybody will have 5 minutes.

Mr. MIN. A point of order. Mr. Chairman, point of order. So, I am new to this Committee, but I guess I was hoping for some clarification on how we are allowed to describe people. I watched a lot of footage last year as Members of this Committee made comments about President Biden that may or may not have been factually true, but certainly could be taken as insulting. And I guess the question I have is, some people might say that launching a meme coin or the fact that the President's wife took a \$40 million deal from Amazon might qualify him to be a grifter, and I am not calling him that. I am just wondering what we are allowed to say. For example, are we allowed to describe him as a convicted felon, given that he was convicted by a jury of his peers for felony counts? What are we allowed to say or not say?

Chairman COMER. You all have been saying that, so you can say that. It is just the personalities, not to engage in personalities with the President of the United States. And pardon me, if I said anything to offend you about the Biden family.

Mr. MIN. No, I am not offended. I do not get offended. I was just wondering what the rules are because some people might say that Donald Trump——

Chairman COMER. OK.

Mr. MIN [continuing]. Is a grifter, and I think that that could be seen as factually asserted, in fact.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the plan ordered reported today, subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

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

[Whereupon, at 2:29 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

