

119th Congress }
1st Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS

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

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 25, 2025

Serial No. CP:119-4

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

59-844 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
CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy 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

	Page
Meeting held on March 25, 2025	1

BILLS CONSIDERED

* H.R. 1295	
Bill Discussed	1
* H.R. 1210	
Bill Discussed	44
* H.R. 2249	
Bill Discussed	59
* H.R. 2174	
Bill Discussed	71
* H.R. 2193	
Bill Discussed	78
* H.R. 2277	
Bill Discussed	80
* H.R. 2056	
Bill Discussed	82
* H. Res. 187	
Bill Discussed	87
* H. Res. 186	
Bill Discussed	93

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Article, 12News, ““This is a Crucial Job’: Valley Veteran Working for Phoenix VA Loses Job”; submitted by Rep. Ansari.
- * Article, VA News, “VA dismisses more than 1,000 employees”; submitted by Rep. Ansari.
- * Article, *Psychiatrist.com*, “Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy Shows Promise in Treating PTSD”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Biden Hides As His Admin Considers Rewarding Illegal Immigrants”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Border Patrol Monthly Apprehensions, 2012–Present”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “CBP Nationwide Encounters By Month, 2020–April 2023”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Judd: Dems’ Plans to Offer Amnesty In Spending Package Will Ramp Up Border Chaos”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Migrant Protection Protocols Concerns”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “New CBP Pursuit Policy Encourages Smugglers To Evade”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Response to Outrageous Claims by Biden Admin”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Statement on President Biden’s Del Rio Disaster”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “Statement on President Biden’s Proclamation”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “The Border Crisis Continues”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, NBPC, “U.S. Border Patrol Apprehensions, 2012 –2022”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Press Release, “Pelosi Statement on Obama Administration’s Government Reorganization Proposal”; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- * Report, CRS, “Presidential Authority, History, Recent Initiatives, and Options for Congress”; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- * Article, *The Washington Post*, “Long waits, floods of calls, web crashes, Social Security is breaking down”; submitted by Reps. Connolly and Mfume.
- * Statement for the Record, Americans for Tax Reform, “Protecting Taxpayers Wallet Act”; submitted by Rep. Perry.
- * Article, *The New York Times*, “Trump Administration Dropped Policy Prohibiting Contractors From Having Segregated Facilities”; submitted by Rep. Pressley.
- * Article, *The Grio*, “Trump’s move to dismantle DOE sparks fears of racial segregation, ‘Attack on Black children’”; submitted by Rep. Pressley.
- * Article, *The Atlantic*, “The Trump Administration Accidentally Texted Me Its War Plans”; submitted by Rep. Frost.

Documents are available at: docs.house.gov.

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING: MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

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

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, HVC-210, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Cloud, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, Fallon, Donalds, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, Boebert, Luna, 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 yeas and nays are ordered.

The Committee will continue to use 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.

Our first item for consideration is H.R. 1295, the Reorganizing Government Act of 2025. The clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 1295, the Reorganizing Government Act of 2025, a bill to amend Chapter 9 of Title 5, United States Code, to reauthorize the executive reorganization authority of the President and to ensure efficient executive reorganization, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should 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 designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, 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 bill and the amendment.

My bill, the Reorganizing Government Act of 2025, would renew and extend the authority of the President to propose a government reorganization plan. President Trump promised he would eliminate Washington waste and reform the unchecked Federal bureaucracy, and he is delivering on his promises made to the American people. For decades and on a bipartisan basis, Members of this Committee have lamented the inefficiency of the Federal bureaucracy. We fought never-ending battles against the waste, fraud, and abuse the bureaucracy generates during both Republican and Democrat administrations.

The Federal Government has expanded dramatically since the early years of our republic. Today, there are more than 400 executive branch agencies and subagencies and roughly 1,000 Federal commissions. Most of these entities are relatively new creations. They did not exist for most of our Nation's history. Not only has the government grown in size and complexity, but it has also taken on many functions once handled by the states or the private sector. Over time, the expansion of entities and programs has led to an increasingly complex bureaucracy with a massive amount of overlap and duplication. For instance, the Government Accountability Office recently found 43 job training programs scattered across nine different Federal agencies. That is just one of dozens of areas of wasteful duplication GAO has identified across a range of Federal activities. Since 2011, GAO's report on government duplication and overlap has found more than \$667 billion in potential cost savings from proposed efficiency reforms. The President has considerable authority within existing law to reorganize certain government offices and functions, but some reorganizations do require changes in law.

Throughout our Nation's history such reorganization legislation typically originated from the White House. That is, in part, because for much of the 20th century, Presidential reorganization proposals requiring changes in law were granted special consideration by Congress. The Reorganizing Government Act of 2025 amends the Reorganization Act amendments of 1984 to renew and extend the special consideration through December 2026. This reorganization authority has not been active since 1985 despite several Presidents, including Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama, having asked Congress to renew the authority, as this bill would do.

Under H.R. 1295, a reorganization plan must be considered via an up-or-down vote on a joint resolution of approval within 90 calendar days. This joint resolution is highly privileged, expedited, and not subject to the filibuster. The bill also expands the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans that impact

whole executive departments instead of just agencies under current law. Renewing the special reorganization authority, requiring Congress to take an up-or-down vote on reorganization proposals by the President will help facilitate needed improvements in government operations. It will also allow Congress to have a say in how government reorganization is carried out. That should be what we want here. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I now yield to the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, congressional Republicans have finally admitted with this bill that President Trump and Elon Musk do not have the legal authority to delete whole Federal agencies, nor do they have the legal authority to take a chainsaw to essential programs like Social Security and Medicaid or Medicare, or to purge the Federal workers that care for veterans, keep our food supply safe, and fight cancer. Congressional Republicans also know these dangerous and deeply unpopular cuts would face a real challenge in congressional approvals through regular order, as they have in the past, which you just pointed out. So, now they have brought H.R. 1295, the so-called Reorganizing Government Act, in a desperate attempt to circumvent normal congressional process. The bill is not about reorganizing government. It is about dismantling it.

H.R. 1295 would use the shell of a long dormant statute as a Trojan horse to give President Trump and Elon Musk unprecedented filibuster-proof authority to eliminate Federal department and agencies' statutory programs, government services, and regular protections to promote the health and well-being of American families. This dormant authority was used in the past between 1932 and 1984 to allow a President limited authority to present plans to reorganize limited portions of the government, which could then be fast tracked through Congress. Congress has chosen not to renew that authority in over 4 decades, despite requests to do so, as you point out, for Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Barack Obama.

In the past, Presidential reorganization authority was used to respond to the needs of the American people, including creating the agencies of EPA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and it came with key limitations and guardrails. H.R. 1295 dramatically and recklessly expands the power it would give to President Trump and Elon Musk, and without these key limitations, the guardrails that have always existed. In fact, the bill would include new Presidential powers Congress explicitly prohibited the last time it granted this authority. For example, it would strike the language that prevented past plans from abolishing whole executive departments and independent regulatory agencies, terminating any enforcement functions or statutory programs.

The Dismantling Government Act would grant Donald Trump and Elon Musk a filibuster-proof pathway to get their reckless actions blessed by Congress, and we already know exactly what they will do with that power. They will abolish whole departments and agencies. President Trump could use his new power to abolish the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the National Labor Relations Board, the Institute of Peace, the Agency for International Develop-

ment, and any other Federal entity with a simple majority vote in the House and the Senate. They will wipe away statutory protections authorized by Congress.

Trump would be able to use this power to eliminate statutory programs through his reorganization plans, a feature that was expressly prohibited by Congress in the past. Republicans in Congress would not be able to amend the plans, so they will be forced to support a broad reorganization package that cuts or eliminates Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, or the programs beloved by their constituents. They will eliminate regulatory protections that keep people safe and healthy. President Trump will use this new power to gut agencies' abilities to enforce laws and regulations. Goodbye regulations that are protecting Americans from junk fees, air pollution, and lead in our drinking water. And they will use this authority to eliminate the defenses we have against reckless purges of our Federal workers, purges that have often been found unlawful by courts all around the country in the last month.

Unlike the previous reorganization authority, Trump's new power would explicitly authorize any plan he deemed necessary to reduce the number of Federal employees. The Dismantling Government Act does nothing more than hand even more power over to an unelected billionaire, Elon Musk. It is an unconscionable affront to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I would like to raise my objections to H.R. 1295. As I review the bill, I think it is really important that the American people understand what this bill is and does and the ways in which it really gives away the constitutional power of Congress to the executive branch. So, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if I could just ask you a couple of questions about this bill since this is your bill.

So, I am trying to understand the purpose of this bill, and I know as you presented the bill, you said that this is really to empower the Trump Administration, which you believe is using its authority to try to reform the government. But I see under pages 2 and 3 of your bill, that it includes the discretion of the executive branch to eliminate the operations to be determined unnecessary for the execution of constitutional duties. So, this means, essentially, if I am understanding it, Mr. Chairman, that if Donald Trump or Elon Musk decided that an agency and its operations was unnecessary, under your bill they could just eliminate it. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. It requires Congress to vote on it.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, as I read it, your bill is giving the congressional authority to the executive to do it without Congress.

Chairman COMER. No, that is not true. You are misinterpreting the bill.

Ms. STANSBURY. Can you please point us to the language in the bill that retains Congress' authority?

Chairman COMER. It requires a privileged resolution in Congress.

Ms. STANSBURY. Can you please point us to the page and the line number that requires congressional consent for reorganization of the Federal Government?

Chairman COMER. In Sections 908 and 909 of Title 5.

Ms. STANSBURY. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. Section 908 says “striking December 31, 1985.” Can you please refer to the language that retains Congress’ authority under the United States Constitution to reign in the executive to stop it from eliminating unnecessary duties, reducing Federal employees, amending rules and regulations, and eliminating executive departments, agencies, independent establishments, offices, or officers of the executive branch?

Mr. CONNOLLY. If my colleague would yield?

Chairman COMER. Just let me answer that question. This bill amends Title 5, Section 908 and 909.

Ms. STANSBURY. Again, Mr. Chairman, can you please point us to the place in your bill where it retains Congress’ constitutional authority to reign in the executive branch?

Chairman COMER. You are intentionally misrepresenting the bill.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I am reading the bill——

Chairman COMER. No——

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. And I am asking you, as the sponsor,——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. You have not read the bill.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. To point to us where your bill, which you are trying to pass through this Committee today, retains the authority of Congress?

Chairman COMER. It changes the date to 2026. It amends the date.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I am just going to read from your bill. I have got 40 seconds here. “It allows”——

Chairman COMER. The bill amends current law.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, this is my time.

Chairman COMER. What you are looking for already exists as law.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, your bill, as introduced here, allows the executive to eliminate any executive department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation within the United States, an office or an officer, to essentially repeal/amend any regulation, and to eliminate anything that the executive branch determines to be unnecessary. And I strongly oppose this bill because this is a blank check to Donald Trump and Elon Musk to continue to dismantle the Federal Government.

Chairman COMER. Just let me say for the final time, the bill amends current law to extend an authority where the President submits to Congress a reorganization plan, so this should be something that we all support. Now does any other Member seek recognition?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, are amendments are in order now?

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. I do not even know where it came from. Oh, Ms. Mace. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Yes, sir. I was just going to emphasize what you were saying earlier, that this bill amends to renew and extend it through

December 2026. I would appreciate it if Members on the other side of the aisle spoke the truth, actually read the bill, understood what it did after reading it. Maybe some reading comprehension perhaps might be needed.

And also, you know, the offense that President Trump or Elon Musk get carte blanche authority, well, it was Presidents Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama have asked Congress to renew Presidential reorganization authority, so this is actually bipartisan. But because the orange man is President, it cannot be right. Just because they do not like the President of the United States, it cannot possibly be. But this has been a bipartisan effort in the past, in normal times when people had common sense on both sides of the aisle. So, I appreciate your leadership and transparency, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. A very good explanation. Does any other Member seek recognition? Mr. Connolly?

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

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Mr. Connolly of Virginia.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member for his amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. The Chairman's bill to authorize Presidential reorganization plans that are clearly and specifically designed to aid and abet Elon Musk in a chaotic, cruel, arbitrary dismantling of our government threatens the essential lifesaving services Americans rely on every day. My amendment would simply prohibit any reorganization plan for the sole purpose of reducing the number of Federal employees and would instead require any reorganization plan submitted by the President to restore the Federal workers already recklessly purged by Elon Musk.

Civil servants perform critical work that helps keep the Federal Government performing its essential missions. The American public relies upon the work of dedicated Federal civil servants for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and so much more. Civil servants turn down lucrative jobs in the private sector where they can make a lot more money because they believe in the mission of public service. Nearly one-third of these public servants are veterans. The Trump-Musk Administration is working overtime to purge these dedicated individuals from the Federal Government and Federal service. Enough is enough.

My amendment clarifies critical protections against waste, fraud, and abuse and corruption by requiring any President reorganization plan to include the commonsense protections for Inspectors General included in my bill, the Protect Our Watchdogs Act. IGs play a critical role in independently and objectively holding Federal agencies accountable by rooting out fraud, waste, and abuse and mismanagement in government operations.

Late in the evening of January 24, President Trump attempted to fire 17 IGs across 18 agencies by sending them a Friday night email stating they were "terminated effective immediately due to changing priorities." The email sent to those IGs attempting to terminate them immediately failed to provide the required notice or a legitimate rationale for termination as required by law. To date,

18 IGs across 19 agencies have been terminated by the President, and another 11 Presidentially appointed IG positions are vacant.

The amendment I offer would require that any attempt to terminate an IG must be done for cause, for instance, due to a neglect of duty, malfeasance, or gross mismanagement. It creates specific criteria for the substantive rationale, including detailed and case specific reasons that the President is already required of providing to Congress as mandated by the Inspector General Act of 1978, amended in 2022 with broad bipartisan support. President Trump's contempt for lawful protections of IGs is unlawful, unwise, and un-American and warrants this amendment's clarification so that independent IGs are protected and their independence preserved. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I will recognize myself for a statement in opposition. This amendment is yet another attempt by Committee Democrats to misconstrue what this bill does and use this markup to rant about the Trump Administration's work to eliminate Washington waste and reform the unchecked Federal bureaucracy.

Presidents have sent Congress reorganization plans for an up-or-down vote for decades. This bill, the Reorganizing Government Act of 2025, renews this longstanding authority for the Trump Administration, thus reestablishing a process for how Congress will review and consider reorganization plans from the Administration. This authority is not some new abusive or unprecedented power as the Democrats would like us all to believe. In fact, President Obama requested Congress revise or renew the same reorganization authority during his presidency. A reorganization plan will only go into effect if Congress approves it, thus preserving Congress' role in rightsizing the Federal Government on behalf of the American people. That should be what we all support, I believe. This amendment seeks to unprecedentedly limit the President's authority under the Reorganization Act by limiting the types of functions and employees that can be included in the plan. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Connolly amendment.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Connolly.

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, the noes have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed. Are there any other amendments?

Ms. BROWN. Yes.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Brown.

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

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

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Ms. Brown of Ohio.

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

I reserve a point of order.

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

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let us be clear about what this bill really does. It hands sweeping, unchecked power to the executive branch, allowing the President to dismantle our Federal agencies with virtually no oversight from Congress. This bill allows the President to abolish any Federal agency or department he deems unnecessary or burdensome without any check from Congress. It allows him to gut rules and regulations he personally dislikes.

And let us talk about Federal workers because this bill strips away critical job protections who keep our government running. Right now, Federal employees can only be laid off for a valid reason, but this bill would let the President fire them at will for any reason he sees fit. That means career civil servants who serve the public, not a political party, could be dismissed for purely political reasons, silencing experts and weakening the very institutions that keep our government running. In other words, this bill would embolden and enable this President to continue his chaotic assault on our Federal Government, more indiscriminate firings, more funding freezes, and more attempts to shut down agencies that provide services to the American people. So, make no mistake, this is not just about streamlining government. This is about dismantling our system of checks and balances and consolidating absolute power in the hands of one man.

America fought a revolution to free ourselves from kings. Now some of my colleagues are trying to crown one. The American people deserve better. That is why I am offering a simple amendment to protect the American people's private and personal data from this power grab. My amendment will require the President's reorganization plan to include a list of executive data bases that contain personal and private information of American citizens that DOGE has accessed. And prohibit any employees of DOGE or anyone partnering with DOGE from accessing this private information. I think we should all agree no President, no bureaucrat, and no unelected billionaire should have free reign over our American citizens' private information. Let us protect the American people, not strip them of their rights and safeguards.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Ms. BROWN. Yes, I will yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I want to endorse her amendment and thank her for this initiative. Privacy is key to our liberty. Privacy is a key value in America. We do not want people accessing our private data and using it for whatever purpose they may decide to use it for, and I think that yours is a commonsense amendment that gives us a guardrail and requires a rationale for anyone, including Elon Musk and his DOGE team to access private data bases. So, I want to endorse the effort, and I thank my friend for her initiative, and I yield back to her.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I will recognize myself for a moment. This amendment is yet another attempt by Committee Democrats to misconstrue what this bill does and use this markup to rant about the Trump Administration's work to eliminate Washington waste and reform the unchecked Federal bureaucracy. For decades, Presidents have sent Congress reorganization plans for an up-and-down vote. This bill, the Reorganizing Government Act of 2025, renews this longstanding authority for the Trump Administration, thus reestablishing a process for how Congress will review and consider reorganization plans from the Administration. This authority is not, and let me repeat, is not some new abusive or unprecedented power as the Democrats would like us all to believe.

As I said earlier, President Obama requested Congress to revise and renew the same reorganization authority during his presidency. A reorganization plan will only go into effect if Congress approves it, thus preserving our role in rightsizing the Federal Government on behalf of the American people. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Brown Amendment.

Does any other Member seek recognition on the Brown Amendment? Seeing none—Ms. Stansbury?

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I might ask the sponsor of the amendment a few questions and engage in a friendly conversation about the background on the amendment. So, Mr. Chairman, Representative Brown, can you tell us a little bit more about why you believe it is necessary to include a list and description of the data that is being accessed by the Administration?

Ms. BROWN. In response to the American people and to what we have been hearing in the news, DOGE has been accessing private information, and we do not know to what degree or what length. And when we attempted to subpoena Mr. Musk to clarify the work that they have been doing in this newly created department, we were rejected by our Republican colleagues. I would imagine if they were proud of the work that they were doing, they would allow Mr. Musk to come before this Committee to clarify the work that he is doing. So, I am just asking for clarification on behalf of the American people.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Representative Brown. And to my knowledge, I do not believe that Mr. Musk or any member of the Administration has actually been in front of this Committee to even hear this bill. Is that your understanding, Representative Brown?

Ms. BROWN. That is my understanding.

Ms. STANSBURY. And yet here we are in a process to pass it without any clarification about why this authority is needed, why these expanded definitions are needed, why they want to have this put into statute as there are literally over 160 lawsuits in the Federal court system that are challenging the legality of what they are doing, including hacking private data of American citizens, and that is exactly what your amendment is about, identifying and protecting. And, Representative Brown, as I understand it, just a couple of days ago, in fact, the courts found that the accessing of Social

Security data by Elon Musk and DOGE was illegal and unfounded, and we know that millions of Americans out there are frightened right now that their Social Security payments are going to be shut down by Elon Musk. Is that correct?

Ms. BROWN. You can tell from our town halls that it is absolutely correct.

Ms. STANSBURY. Well, it would be probably useful for our friends across the aisle to actually hold their town halls because then they would hear from their own constituents about the millions of Americans that are upset about this. But in addition to that, there have been numerous other court orders around data, including one of the very first and highly identified breaches of Federal data privacy and security, which was when Elon Musk sent his hackers into the Treasury Department to hack our Treasury payment systems, which, by the way, is not only a violation of privacy, but a violation of the law. But because the U.S. Department of Justice is not pursuing Federal cases against administration officials who are breaking the law, the states and nonprofits and individuals are having to go to the courts in order to enforce these laws.

So, what I find very difficult to understand is how we can be sitting in this Committee today hearing a bill that would actually expand the scope of what would be considered for government reorganization, including the wholesale, as Elon Musk likes to put it, deleting of agencies that they find unnecessary that allows, essentially, a complete reworking of the Federal Government, and we still have not even had the Administration in front of this Committee yet. They have not even come here to answer what they are doing to the American people, and our colleagues are not even listening to the people in their districts.

So, I strongly support your amendment. I think that the breaches to data, and especially data privacy and whatever they are doing with this data, is one of the most egregious and abusive things that this Administration is doing, and I am grateful that you brought this amendment to defend the American people's rights. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the Brown Amendment.

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——

Ms. BROWN. I would like to request——

Chairman COMER. Ms. Brown?

Ms. BROWN [continuing]. 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—OK. The Chair recognizes Ms. Randall.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. You have an amendment at the desk, right?

Ms. RANDALL. I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK. Will the clerk distribute and report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Ms. Randall of Washington.

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. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, this amendment is what I think should be a simple bipartisan fix to this bill as introduced. I have heard over and over and over this Administration say that one of their goals is to lower prices for regular people. We hear a lot about the cost of eggs, about the cost of healthcare, about the cost of housing, about the cost that working and middle-class families are facing every day, and, you know, this Administration has promised to work on lowering those costs for people. And I have heard from my constituents, nearly 20,000 of them at town halls over the last month, who are really struggling under high costs of living. Folks are especially struggling who have been laid off or fired from their Federal work or contractors who have lost their jobs because their Federal contracts have been canceled. I think we can all agree that prices are high and it is hard out there for working families.

What this simple amendment does, it says that a reorganization plan may not provide for or have the effect of increasing consumer prices or eliminating or otherwise diminishing existing consumer protection actions by an executive department. So, what this does is says that we want to safeguard the consumer protections that exist and ensure that no plan that is submitted for congressional approval would increase prices. I do not know anyone out there who is hoping for this Administration to raise the prices of the goods that they are struggling to purchase every day. So, you know, as we work to ensure that, you know, working families can have good jobs, make a good living, you know, protect the promise of an American Dream, I think working to make certain that no plans introduced to Congress would increase prices is a common-sense solution.

And, you know, speaking to the consumer protection piece, you know, last month, accidentally somehow, staff at the USDA, who are responsible for managing our bird flu response, were fired. And because of bird flu, we have seen the largest ever price jump for eggs since 1980, but indiscriminate firings of Federal workers are leading to higher prices. And so, I think we should do everything we can to make sure that we keep prices as low as possible for folks out there who are just trying to live their lives and build a strong future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield to the Ranking Member?

Ms. RANDALL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank Ms. Randall, and I thank her for this amendment. Nothing being done by DOGE ought to increase consumer prices. Nothing done by DOGE should threaten public safety, food and medical safety, especially. There have been a number of recalls already on food stuffs around the country that comes

from FDA, the Federal Drug Administration. We must protect the American consumer. I applaud my colleague's initiative and urge my colleagues to support her amendment, and I yield back to her.

Chairman COMER. Does the lady yield back?

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you. Yes, I yield.

Chairman COMER. All right. I will recognize myself. I obviously oppose the amendment for the same reason I opposed the two previous amendments. And all I am going to do is ask for a unanimous consent to enter into the record a press release dated January 13, 2012, when Nancy Pelosi issued a statement on Obama's Administration's government reorganization proposal. Nancy Pelosi supported this exact same piece of legislation in 2012. I would like to enter that into the record.

Without objection, so ordered.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, a question?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. With respect to that, I do not object, but I think Nancy Pelosi was responding to Barack Obama's request to simply reauthorize the underlying bill. Barack Obama did not ask for the kind of bill you are proposing here today. Is that not correct?

Chairman COMER. I am pretty sure he did. Yes, he asked for pretty much the same bill, similar, very similar.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I think we disagree about that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right. Any other Members seek recognition on the Randall Amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Randall.

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—oh, Ms. Randall asks for a recorded vote. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Ms. Ansari?

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the table as well.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please distribute and report the Ansari Amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Ms. Ansari of Arizona.

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

I reserve a point of order.

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

Ms. ANSARI. Arizona.

Chairman COMER. I am sorry, Arizona. I apologize.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. I was close.

Ms. ANSARI. Like millions of Americans, I am deeply concerned about the authoritarian nature of this administration. It is very clear that Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and the entirety of the President's Cabinet want to operate without any sort of accountability, without willingness to come here and speak to the Oversight Committee, by attacking journalists, by attacking rightful American citizens. And they want to do whatever they want without any checks and balances, and that is exactly what Republicans on this Committee are handing them with this bill. They want to allow want-to-be dictators to completely dismantle the Federal Government without review, without consideration of how it affects families who depend on government programs, and without a care in the world.

And the reason they are pushing for this bill is because Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and DOGE have already been found, consistently, to be acting outside of the law in their mass layoffs and agency closures by the courts. They shut down USAID, and the courts ruled that they violated the Constitution because they need congressional approval to do so. Now, instead of defending their own powers, congressional Republicans are pushing forward this bill to hand over their powers to the President. Again, this is further revealing cowardice and weakness and deep fear about a primary challenge funded by the richest man in the world. So, those are my overall issues with this bill.

Now speaking to this amendment directly, this is in regard to veterans. Earlier this month, the Department of Veterans Affairs announced plans to fire more than 80,000 of its employees. This is a Department that we all know is already woefully understaffed. They desperately need more nurses, more doctors, and more administrators to provide the care and benefits that Americans need. More than 9.1 million veterans rely on VA healthcare. Over 32,000 veterans are homeless. Upwards of 17 veterans commit suicide daily.

Two of the VA employees from the regional office in Phoenix are a 20-year Air Force veteran, and the other is a former Marine. They were both loan specialists helping struggling veterans from losing their homes and were each handling 1,500 cases at the time of their termination. Just two people were managing 3,000 cases. Now, imagine 80,000 workers laid off from the VA. These are men and women who put their lives on the line for each and every one of us, and this country has already failed them in many, many ways. Now Elon Musk wants to decimate the Agency that cares for them.

My amendment protects veterans and VA workers from these cruel actions so that the VA can continue improving the level of care our veterans receive, rather than hanging them out to dry. So, I hope my colleagues will vote in support of this amendment, and I will yield back to the Ranking Member. Thank you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague, and I thank her for this initiative. Nothing is more reckless than gutting the Veterans Administration. As you point out, millions of veterans and their families rely on VA for healthcare. I have visited dialysis clinics run by the VA. They are essential. Laying off people who are technicians, who are in admittance, who are providing technical and nursing

and medical services to our veterans is disgusting. If the United States has any obligation, going back to Lincoln's eloquent call to heal the wounds of our veterans and their widows and their orphans, it is this.

So, I applaud my colleague for taking this initiative and highlighting how serious this is. Remember, a third of all Federal employees are veterans. Deliberately. We wanted to give them a leg up. And as my friend pointed out, the suicide rate is alarming. We have got to provide mental health services as well as medical services. So, I think this goes a long way to protecting our veterans. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back to Ms. Ansari.

Chairman COMER. Does Ms. Ansari yield back?

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you so much. I appreciate the comments of the Ranking Member. I could not agree more, and again, I really urge colleagues to vote for this to protect veterans who are Republicans, Democrats, Independents, but deserve all of our support. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I recognize myself. I do not think President Trump, or any Republican, has advocated for reducing nurses at the VA or classroom teachers in the Department of Education. What they are talking about are bureaucrats, many of whom have not been to work in years. Hopefully, we can get rid of the bureaucrats and have more money to hire more classroom teachers and more nurses. We have to have a reorganization of the government. It has gotten out of hand over the past 4 years. Bureaucracies have grown, bureaucrats have increased in number, and the people taking it on the chin in the Federal workforce are the ones who actually do the work at the bottom of the organizational chart. This is a reorganization for them. I just feel like if the Democrats would fight as hard for the working-class taxpayers and the frontline Federal employees as they fight for unnecessary bureaucrats, then we could accomplish a lot in this Congress. So, I oppose this amendment.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman?

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. All right. You have already—

Ms. ANSARI. I just have a question for you.

Chairman COMER. Go ahead. Sure. Then I will recognize—

Ms. ANSARI. I am new here. This is my first term. You know, in my second month, on Valentine's Day, I was at the VA in Arizona for the Valentines for Vets. It was the night before that the Administration fired, I believe, a thousand employees from the VA, again, a woefully understaffed agency. So, I guess, do you agree that that occurred, and do you believe that that is waste, fraud, and abuse, taking from an already understaffed agency that supports our veterans?

Chairman COMER. I do not know about that particular instance you are talking about.

Ms. ANSARI. I would recommend you look into it because it happened, again, completely aligned with the day we are all supposed to go and visit our veterans and support them. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I am going to directly address my veteran brothers and sisters across the country. We are going to fix the VA whether anybody in the bureaucracy machine likes it or not. I have helped thousands and thousands of veterans across Louisiana, and every one of them has the same issue. It is a problem with the bureaucratic machine of the VA, not the nurses and the doctors, not their fellow veterans. Their problem is with the waste and the ignorance and the audacity to be arrogant from the bureaucracies toward our veterans that we serve.

And you just sit by and watch, but if you are in our way, we are rolling over you because we are about to fix the VA, and that means we are going to eliminate waste, fraud, abuse, and theft within the VA. We are going to fire people that do not work, do not show up for work, or do not even exist, and we are going to work together with the executive. Finally, we have an executive branch that is courageous enough to tackle this thing, and that executive branch has advocates for the America First agenda and a Veteran First agenda within this Congress, and I am one of those advocates.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose any amendment that restricts Congress' obligation and legislative effort through this oversight committee to assist the executive branch in its focused intent to fix the bureaucracies of our country by eliminating waste, fraud, abuse, and theft. I oppose this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I yield to my colleague, Mr. Biggs, from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also oppose this amendment, and I want to give you an example of how the bureaucracy has prevented good healthcare practices for our veterans. TBI, traumatic brain injury; PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder; one of the very best ways to deal combat and help heal is hyperbaric oxygen treatment. I have been trying since I got here, but the bureaucracy has consistently stood in the way. We need to provide that type of treatment. And when the bureaucrats say, oh, well, you know, there are no studies that show this, they are wrong. The IDF, almost everybody comes out getting HBOT and it helps them. The studies are crystal and clear. What is preventing us from providing that type of medical care is the bureaucracy. It is the bureaucracy that says no, and they would rather give PTSD or TBI patients a surfeit of opiates, get them addicted. What they need is HBOT therapy—

Voice. That is not true.

[Disturbance in hearing room.]

Mr. BIGGS. Who in the hell are you? Be quiet. I have the Floor.

Chairman COMER. Order. We do not allow comments from the crowd.

Mr. BIGGS. It is true. The studies are clear. Over and over again, TBI, PTSD is helped by HBOT.

Chairman COMER. Ma'am, you will be asked to be removed with one more outburst. Under the Rules of the House, the Chairman is responsible for maintaining order and preserving decorum in the committee room. I expect audience members to be respectful of the witnesses and the public. Mr. Biggs, please proceed.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Your Honor. It is true. There is study after study that show it and demonstrate it. You could shake your head until the rocks fall out, but the reality is it is true that is the study. I yield back to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentleman yields back to me, Mr. Chairman, and let me say that we admire the young lady's passion. The bottom line is that bureaucrats are in the way of actual VA service to actual veterans. And whatever the manifestation of that interference may be, we certainly subject to a legitimate debate, but we are going to oppose bureaucrats standing in the way of actual service to our veterans. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. You know, that would be great. I do not know how Mr. Biggs and Mr. Higgins have a special code to pick only bureaucrats and they are the ones we are going to eliminate because they have decided they are the problem. That is not what Elon Musk and Donald Trump have done. They have gone into the VA and fired thousands. They do not know whether they are nurses. You do not know it either, Mr. Higgins. They do not know if they are technicians. They do not know if they are specialists for hospital care or home care. They do not know. They did not take the time to study the architecture of the VA to make sure no harm was being done.

That is what this amendment is designed to try to do, to protect veterans from having negative consequences because of those actions which were not vetted, still have not been vetted, and are definitely going to hurt our veterans. So, it is great to say we are only going after bureaucrats. There is no evidence that that is true, and, in fact, I worry deeply it is not only not true, it is the opposite. I yield to Ms. Stansbury.

Chairman COMER. The Ranking Member yields back. Do any other Members seek recognition? The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Wow. OK. Let us break this down. I am going to read the amendment here. It says essentially here that it would insert the following language, that basically it would not allow the Administration to "reduce, degrade any existing services, benefits, or jobs for veterans provided by an executive department, and is required to fully restore all veteran services, benefits, or jobs at the executive department that have been reduced, degraded, or eliminated by the United States DOGE service."

I am sorry. I represent one of the highest proportion of veterans and active-duty military in the country, and I find it deeply offensive that my colleagues would not support a simple amendment that would protect our veterans. And to sit here and claim today that what the Administration is doing has not impacted veterans is completely a lie because I can tell you that 3 weeks ago, veterans who work for the VA showed up on Monday after Elon Musk, not even the VA, issued a mass firing of probationary staff on a Friday afternoon, and people showed up to their jobs at veterans' hospitals and administration offices across the country and could not even

get into their emails because they were locked out. But inside of those emails were actual statements saying that they had underperformed, and they were being fired basically without cause. Now already, the Federal court system has found that those firings were illegal, so you cannot sit here today and pretend like the actions of the Administration have not impacted our veterans and the VA system because that is a lie. That is a bold-faced lie.

Second, last week before we went home, the Republicans passed a CR that underfunded the PACT Act. We passed the PACT Act a couple of years ago to expand healthcare to the VA system to 3 million veterans who were impacted by burn pits, Agent Orange, and other toxins over the course of their service. This was the largest expansion of VA benefits since World War II, and you underfunded it in your own continuing resolution. And I am sorry, if you were actually holding town halls and actually listening to your constituents, you would know that our veterans across the country are pissed as hell. You are not representing the interests of our veterans.

Third, under the auspices of your DEI order, thousands of veterans, who have proudly served this country, had their history erased from DoD websites. Last week, New Mexico's Navajo Code Talkers, who helped us win World War II, were erased from the DoD website. Tuskegee Airmen, thousands of instances of people of color, women, LGBT service members who proudly gave their lives and served this country were erased from the DoD website.

And finally, you want to talk about impacts to veterans? You know what we should be actually doing oversight over today? How about the fact that the DoD Secretary leaked a Yemeni war plan yesterday to a non-classified journalist on an unsecured text chain? Let us do real oversight here. You want to talk about risks to our veterans? These are the same people that accidentally fired nuclear scientists and engineers who literally maintain our stockpile. These are the same people who leaked classified documents to a journalist. And this is the same DoD who on Friday almost gave our classified war plans for China to Elon Musk. So, do not sit here and pretend like you are actually protecting our veterans and you are not even doing your most basic oversight. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The chair recognizes Mr. Biggs for a unanimous request.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is original research published in the Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, November 11, 2024: "Dedicated HBOT protocols can improve PTSD symptoms. Sixty-eight percent of participants showed at least a 30-percent reduction in symptoms, and then upon revision, 39 percent." Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Do any other Members seek recognition? Mr. Subramanyam.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to make clear that many of these so-called bureaucrats are actually veterans. In fact, many of them served their country well. Many of them had exemplary work records. Many of them did a lot of work. In fact, they wanted nothing more than to serve their fellow veterans. And the real problem with the system was that they were

using antiquated technology, they were constantly underfunded, and all these rules were in place to make their job 10 times harder.

And many of those people live in my district, and I hear from them all the time that all they want to do is the best that they possibly can for our veterans, and yet, we have failed them. We, in Washington, have failed them, and so they will continue to serve, but many of them are now being fired, and what is going to happen when you decrease resources again and again and again? Our veterans will suffer again and again and again. We are breaking our promise to our veterans, and all this amendment does is say that let us actually fulfill that promise for our veterans. And so, I support this amendment. I am actually going to yield over to Ms. Ansari to continue her remarks.

Ms. ASARI. Thank you. Thank you, Congressman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter two items into the record. One is the one you said you do not recall, an article from February 13, 2025: "VA dismisses more than one thousand employees." And then——

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. The second article: "This is a crucial job. Valley veteran working for Phoenix VA unexpectedly loses job in widespread layoff." So, as my colleague said, the people being fired from the VA are largely veterans. My colleague——

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

Chairman COMER. Well, first of all, without objection, so ordered on the UC.

Chairman COMER. You are not objecting to the UC?

Mr. BIGGS. No, I am not objecting to the UC at all.

Chairman COMER. All right. And now I recognize you for a point of order.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. The point of order is, when you are giving a UC, you do not get to read the article.

Chairman COMER. That is right. That is correct. Just the title and the——

Ms. ANSARI. That is the title of the article.

Chairman COMER. Right. You did that.

Ms. ANSARI. That is the title of the article.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. ANSARI. If I could use the rest of my time. The callousness that we are seeing from colleagues across the other side of the aisle——

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

Chairman COMER. A point of order to——

Mr. BIGGS. She has had her minutes to speak. She is now trying to use her UC to go forward to speak.

Chairman COMER. Yes. Mr. Subramanyam yielded to her.

Mr. BIGGS. OK. Then I apologize.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Chairman COMER. But you are correct on how to propose a unanimous consent request, but I do not want any confrontation.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. Otherwise, I would like to go forward with the next person.

Chairman COMER. I am trying, and before we got into an argument with Ms. Pressley—she was going into detail on the——

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. You had time.

Ms. ANSARI. I read the title of the article.

Chairman COMER. Right. Right. That is fine.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Everybody is correct here.

Ms. ANSARI. Perfect.

Chairman COMER. Please proceed.

Ms. ANSARI. All right. So, the callousness that we are seeing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in regard to veterans, you are obsessed with buzzwords that do not recognize that real people are suffering in the midst of it. When on February 13, a thousand veterans are fired, then on February 24, VA axes another 1,400 employees. The point was made today, what was the reason for the firing of these employees? Allegedly, under the auspices of diversity, equity, and inclusion, again, buzzwords they are obsessed with. Diversity, equity, and inclusion means women, it means members of the disabled community, it means African Americans, it means Latinos, it means Native Americans. It means anyone who they do not deem qualified in their sense, hard-working, the real people who deserve the positions that they are in have been fired from these positions simply because this Administration does not recognize them and does not value them. So, let us just be honest about who is being impacted here. Veterans are suffering.

Last week, I held a town hall with the Arizona Disability Coalition. Several are veterans. We held the town hall with hundreds of people who came and showed up. Veterans in Phoenix showed up and are devastated about the cuts to their healthcare, about the cuts to the VA, and these are, again, real lives. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not listen to their constituents. They hide from their constituents, and they do not understand the issues that they are talking about. I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. I think the points are made quite aptly. This process undertaken by DOGE and Elon Musk and Donald Trump will jeopardize veterans. They work there. They serve there. They are also the customer base of the VA. To have 9 million veterans put at risk under the false pretense of we are going after the bureaucracy, there is no way you are not going to get into heart and tissue in terms of the quality of medical care provided to veterans. Nothing in this Congress—nothing—should ever promote or provoke us to providing less than absolute excellent quality care for our veterans. They have earned it. Their families have earned it. It is a sacred obligation. I really appreciate the amendment and I urge its adoption.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of personal privilege.

Chairman COMER. Absolutely.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Ranking Member—I am going to go this far—and on behalf of you, I just want to call

the attention to the young people who have joined us, and we welcome you, this group of young individuals and students who have stopped by to the Capitol. This is your House of Representatives in action. Look at it, learn from it, and grow from it. It is a unique experience. I do not know where you might be from, but all of us here on the Committee really like it when we see young people and students stop in to see what we are doing and to check us where possible. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. Welcome. Do any other Members seek recognition? Yes, Ms. Randall.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to add my voice to disputing the position that everyone who has lost their job has been a wasteful bureaucrat. I have an email from one of our colleagues at Veterans Affairs in Washington State, and they share with me some of the folks that they lost on February 24, six from supply chain management, which includes an inventory specialist, a position that is in such critical short supply that they can no longer staff the night shift. Those are the folks who ensure that the hospital is supplied with medical supplies and equipment. This inventory specialist was hired on a veteran's preference, and her position was so necessary that she was hired during the budgetary hiring pause, but she lost her job on February 24.

They lost two program support assistants who go out in the community to help house homeless veterans, folks who are living on the street. One of them was a disabled Iraq War veteran and a cancer survivor, who was so happy to be back at the VA, supporting the organization that supported him through his bone marrow transplant and other procedures. Another program support specialist worked in geriatrics and extended care, where he was working in the Home-Based Primary Care Program, traveling and supporting nurses who were visiting patients who were unable to leave their homes to come to the hospital to get the care that they needed. Another in radiology, a similar program where we have had extreme shortages, dedicated public servants who believe in the mission of the VA, who believe in helping their fellow veterans, who show up every day to serve, but are being characterized as bureaucrats, as a waste of our taxpayer dollars, when real people, real veterans who have served our community are relying on them to help them access care.

Mixed up in the midst of all these firings, we have also seen truly wasteful and inefficient use of government resources when procurement cards were limited to one dollar. There was a pause on procurement cards, and what that meant was that folks who were traveling, like that veteran I mentioned earlier, to receive essential care, like a bone marrow transplant, were not able to have their housing paid for while they and their family were traveling out of state. These are serious impacts on veterans in our community who have served bravely and who continue to do the work of caring for others who have served. This is not about wasteful bureaucracy. This is about ensuring that we are keeping our promise to take care of those who have stood up for us. I yield to my colleague, Mr. Subramanyam.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you. I just want to read a story that someone wrote into my office who lives in the district. She said

that, "I have worked as a contractor on a project for the Department of Veteran Affairs for 8 years. When I first started, our businessowner was a woman who had worked for the VA for 20 years. Her husband and children were veterans. She had more passion about taking care of our vets than any other businessowner I have ever seen. She is a role model for so many people in our office, and for me, and we were able to accomplish so much good for veterans because of her. In 2020, she left the VA, and in 2024, she returned to our project. We were so excited to have her back and have her guidance for our program moving forward, but she was laid off last week as part of the probationary firings. Her position has no near-term plan to be filled, and other VA employees are stepping in, but they do not have the capacity, knowledge, or deep personal relationships to make the project successful. This has been a devastating and a huge loss to our veterans and their families. We work in backend IT, so it is not something a veteran would ever notice, but we work behind the scenes to keep the VA modern and as efficient as possible, and this is a terrible loss for the American people."

That is just one person who is serving the VA. Imagine you multiply that by thousands, that is what is going to happen to the VA. That is not getting rid of waste, fraud, and abuse. That is making things worse for our veterans. I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend for his observation. That is exactly what is happening because there was no vetting.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. Any other Members seek recognition on the amendment? Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. Oh, OK. Hang tight. You are next on the amendment. No other speakers on this amendment? This was Subramanyam?

OK. No, this was the Randall Amendment. OK. All right. A lot of amendments here.

Counsel. This is Ansari's amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK, Ansari. All right.

OK. All right. OK. I got it.

The question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Ansari. 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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would request a recorded vote.

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

Now, I will turn it back to Mr. Subramanyam.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Mr. Subramanyam of Virginia.

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

I reserve a point of order.

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

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. The amendment is pretty simple. All it does is ask that we do a real review and a comprehensive mitigation plan for any conflict of interest that may threaten the ability of the executive department to serve the public interests, including any conflicts of interests of the President, Vice President, an officer, employee of the executive branch, any officer serving in the Level 1 of the executive schedule, or any special government employee.

And the reason for this is also simple. The American people do not want corruption in our government. They want to make sure that the decisions being made by the executive branch are not to line the pockets of people in the executive branch, but, rather, to make sure we are doing what is best for the American people. And if there is anything that is bipartisan, it should be that we want to rid ourselves of corruption. I have heard it over and over again we want to get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse. I think lining your own pockets and using the Federal Government as a slush fund is fraud and it is abuse of our Federal Government.

And so, whether it is a Democrat or Republican, we should all come together in Congress and make sure that we get rid of people lining their own pockets and using their office to enrich themselves, and that is what is happening right now. And so, I want to make sure if we are going to try to do this reorganization of government, that it is not full of corruption. But what I think is happening instead is that we are going through a practice where we are making corruption easier, where we are embracing people lining their pockets and using their office and using their positions in the executive branch to enrich themselves. And by getting rid of some of the safeguards, getting rid of the Inspectors General, getting rid of the people who are in charge of getting rid of waste, fraud, and abuse, we are making it worse.

And so, it is a simple amendment. I hope it has bipartisan support because this should be a bipartisan effort to rid ourselves of corruption, and I will yield back to the Ranking Member and hope that both sides of the aisle support the amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I support his amendment. The American people ought to be reassured that whoever is involved in government efficiency is clean and has no conflict of interest. Elon Musk has huge conflicts of interest, whether it be Tesla, whether it be SpaceX, whether it be his interest in China. He is a walking sandwich board for conflict of interest. I think this amendment would go a long way to reassuring the American public and Congress that we have scoped it out and that the people involved in the so-called Department of Government Efficiency are, in fact, themselves clean. If they are not, it taints everything they are doing.

So, I thank Mr. Subramanyam for bringing this to our attention. I thank him for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I yield back to the Chair.

Chairman COMER. Any Members wish to speak on the Subramanyam Amendment? The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would love to ask the sponsor of this amendment a few questions just to clarify why it is necessary. You know, I think we have seen an unprecedented effort to not only dismantle the Federal Government, but the kind of self-dealing—I mean, let us all be honest. We saw a lot of that during the first Trump Administration, but we never saw an unelected billionaire placed in a key decisionmaking role that would literally be dismantling wholesale agencies, cutting thousands of Federal jobs, ending contracts, data mining Federal data, who had direct financial conflicts of interest with the Federal Government.

And so, I want to ask the sponsor of the bill, you know, we have seen, for example, just a couple of weeks ago, as the FAA was infiltrated by DOGE and by Elon Musk, it is my understanding that he replaced the communications contract for the FAA with his own Starlink program. Is that correct?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. That is correct.

Ms. STANSBURY. And it is also my understanding that Mr. Elon Musk, who has also infiltrated NOAA, which is the agency that does our weather service and tells the Americans and the world, you know, what is going to happen with the weather, that there are also indications inside the Agency that he would like to have SpaceX become the primary contractor for the satellite systems for NOAA. Is that correct?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. That is correct.

Ms. STANSBURY. And we have also heard that Mr. Elon Musk, who the DoD Secretary almost gave access to secret war plans for China last week, is also angling to get billions of dollars in new contracts under the Department of Defense. Is that correct?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. That is correct.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, I do not know about all of you guys, but this sure looks like a scam to me. I mean, right? They are calling it waste, fraud, and abuse, but really, what we see is a special government employee who is a private businessman. He is the wealthiest man in the world, and he is literally infiltrating these Federal agencies that he has a personal financial interest in. He is cutting the programs, he is eliminating staff, and then he is essentially positioning himself to put into place private contracts.

Now, I also want to take a minute to talk about some of the social programs that we are also highly concerned about because, as we know, our colleagues across the aisle passed a resolution, a budget framework, a couple of weeks ago here in the House that is setting the stage for one of the largest tax breaks in American history to go to billionaires. So, they are robbing the Federal Government, they are getting ready to give themselves massive multi-billion-dollar contracts, and then they are going to rob our most vulnerable members of our communities: low-income families. They are going to dismantle the Medicaid system. Now they are talking openly about dismantling Social Security, and then they are going to take those so-called savings, which are you, the American people, and give permanent tax breaks to the same guy that is dismantling the Federal Government and giving himself private contracts.

This is a total scam. A total scam. Like, folks need to wake up. This is not about waste, fraud, and abuse. This is a scam. They are running a scam on the American people and on the Federal Government. And what this bill does, because we had a little bit of debate about this earlier, you know, they are saying, oh, this just preserves congressional authority. This does not actually expand any authority. If that was true, then why the hell would you want to try to pass this bill? And if you read the underlying statute, since my colleague across the aisle alleged that I do not have good reading comprehension, we downloaded the original statute with the amendments that the underlying bill that is being heard here today would do to the underlying statute. And what it does, is it eliminates Senate authority to stop this bad stuff from happening because it, essentially, only requires a simple majority resolution in the Senate to gut hundreds of years of Federal statutes creating agencies that help the American people so that Elon Musk can make more money, and that is what this bill is all about. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Subramanyam 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.]

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is requested by Mr. Connolly. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. OK. Thank you, Mr. Chair. As a former——

Chairman COMER. You have an amendment at your desk, right? We have to do that first. You have an amendment at the desk?

Mr. BELL. I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the amendment, then we will get you back.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Mr. Bell of Missouri.

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

I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman, Mr. Bell, is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. As a former prosecutor, I know about scams, and in the past, Congress has granted Presidents limited authority to propose structural changes to the Federal Government under expedited procedures, as we have talked about. This authority used responsibly by past administrations allowed for re-

organizations aimed at improving government efficiency, but what we have seen with this Administration has been amateurish and sloppy, just like releasing government or war plans on a Signal chat.

Critically, that authority has always come with guardrails, a prohibition on eliminating entire executive departments or independent agencies, and a prohibition on terminating congressionally mandated enforcement functions and statutory programs. These safeguards ensured that reorganization efforts could not be used as a backdoor to dismantle essential government services or weaken protections for the American people. Unfortunately, H.R. 1295 represents a dangerous and unprecedented expansion of that authority. It seeks to hijack this long dormant statute, stripping away the limitations that previously ensured congressional oversight and balance. If enacted, it would give the President and Elon Musk filibuster-proof power to eliminate entire Federal departments and agencies, abolish statutory programs, and roll back essential regulatory and enforcement functions that protect public health, economic stability, and the rights of working Americans.

Among other vulnerable targets under this expanded authority are the U.S. Postal Service and the Postal Regulatory Commission, two independent institutions that provide vital services and public accountability. The now former postmaster general's perilous agreement with DOGE representatives signals an effort by the President to insert itself in that statutorily independent Postal Service, one of America's most cherished institutions. The President's threat to strip and sell off the Postal Service is very real, and it will devastate service for rural and hard-to-reach areas that are not profitable for the Postal Service.

This amendment is essential to preserving the Postal Service's integrity as a public institution that serves millions of Americans, no matter where they live or how much it costs to deliver mail to them. It will prohibit any effort by the President to reduce or degrade postal performance standards or eliminate any component of the PRC, particularly if such actions are taken in coordination with external actors like the so-called United States DOGE Service, who would appear to be operating with the support or encouragement of this Administration.

So, let me be clear: the USPS is not a tool of private interest. It is an independent agency enshrined in law that millions of Americans depend on. Undermining it, either directly or through regulatory manipulation, would have sweeping consequences for service delivery Federal workers and the American public. This amendment ensures that even as we debate executive reorganization powers, we do not allow political or corporate interests to dismantle the institutions that hold our democracy together. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and stand up for the independence of the Postal Service and the rule of law.

And one other thing. An individual during this hearing spoke out of turn, and that was inappropriate, and the Chair rightfully restored order. But my colleague raising his voice and saying, "who the hell are you,"—there is no place for that in this House. We are talking about guests in the People's House, and to be clear, the guests in the People's House are sitting at this dais. This is their

House, and so this body needs to not forget itself and not get too far to where we are so caught up in making clips to go viral that we are not forgetting that we have a duty to set an example of what good governance and bipartisanship is supposed to look like. Let us keep in mind we have not only Americans watching, but we have kids in the room and we have kids around the country that are watching and following our example. I yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I have got 4 seconds. I agree with the gentleman in all respects, and particularly as champion of the Postal Service that needs to be preserved and approved. I thank my friend.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. Any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to take a moment to support the amendment that is before us. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for offering it, and I want to thank him also for his clear and concise description of the Postal Service, the USPS, and the fact that it is constitutionally established. In fact, Article VIII of the Constitution established the Post Office. We do not see any other name there. DOGE is not listed there. This is Article VIII of the Constitution, and so we have a right, a solemn right, as Congress to protect the sovereignty of the postal system and to make sure that we do everything that we can to ward off attempts to water it down.

I was in a protest picket line 2 days ago with rural letter carriers, urban letter carriers, and others who are worried like hell that there is a move afoot to privatize the United States Postal Service, and those men and women from all walks of life, all races and religions stood out and are standing out every day now to make that clear. Many of them are on the Hill today and will be visiting some of the offices that we represent. This is not a partisan issue. This is a protection of what is constitutionally guaranteed and protected in Article VIII of the Constitution. I want to thank the gentleman for offering it, and I also want to thank him for his very specific call back to order. I yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield for some questions?

Mr. MFUME. Yes, I would.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it true that the Postal Service is created by the Constitution, and in fact, the only service mandated in the Constitution, and the original postmaster general actually preceded the Constitution, and his name was Benjamin Franklin?

Mr. MFUME. That is correct, Article I, Section 8.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it true that the Postal Service represents 635,000 employees?

Mr. MFUME. That is true.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it true that the Postal Service represents the second largest fleet in America, 235,000 vehicles?

Mr. MFUME. That is true.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it true that the Postal Service hits every business and every home, 169 million every day?

Mr. MFUME. That is true.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And is it true that it takes the last mile, but it eats the loss leader that UPS and FedEx are not willing to take?

Mr. MFUME. That is true.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would it be also fair to speculate that were we to damage, privatize, or disrupt the Postal Service, the people most affected immediately would ironically be in red rural parts of America?

Mr. MFUME. That is true.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you. I, too, stood with National Letter Carriers on Sunday as they stood firmly in their conviction of the great work that they do. I want to remind folks that the consequences would be devastating, jeopardizing the jobs of 7.9 million people who are employed by the \$1.9 trillion mailing industry. It would reduce those services that the Ranking Member talked of, of 51.5 million households and businesses in rural communities where private carriers do not deliver, and it would raise shipping costs, driving inflation higher for businesses and consumers.

As we pointed out, these proposals would be illegal and unconstitutional. The Postal Service itself is older than the Nation itself, enshrined in the Constitution, giving Congress, not the President, a key role in setting postal policy. Mandated by Federal law, USPS has been an independent, self-sufficient Agency for 55 years. So, we want to ensure that we continue to protect this Agency that delivers and helps to save lives, not only for those in urban America, but across America, all over the country. So, with that, I yield back. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the Ranking Member if there is any time remaining.

Chairman COMER. I am sorry. Yield?

Mr. MFUME. I would yield to the Ranking Member if there is any time remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Oh, sorry. I think I really had to say what I said in my question to Mr. Mfume. The Postal Service is a vital service, one of the most popular services presented by government or quasi-government, and was a vital link during the pandemic and saved lives by delivering food stuffs, medicine, testing kits for coronavirus. So, I think it is really important that we reinstate our support for the Postal Service. I know you, Mr. Chairman, have been a champion of postal reform, as have I. We should work together to make sure the Postal Service is viable and stable and financially tenable. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. Do any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by Mr. Bell from Missouri.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Ranking Member.

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

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

Does any Member seek recognition? Ms. Simon?

Ms. SIMON. Thank you. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Ms. Simon of California.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you so much.

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

I reserve a point of order.

Ms. Simon is now recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Ranking Member. Before I get into my remarks, I would like to acknowledge the young people from Fremont High from Oakland, California. You all are amazing, and you are here. I want to just say that Ella Baker, one of the mothers of the Civil Rights Movement, said, "Young people come first. They have the courage where we fail". Today, you get to look in the faces of folks who have made clear decisions to gut support services for you to live your dreams, specifically to the HBCU ecosystem.

I want you to know that my daughter graduated from Howard University School of Law and is a prosecutor serving the government. I want everything and all things for you. The HBCUs are not just universities, they are sacred ground where blood was spilled so folks who look like you could have a chance in this country. Today, as I offer this amendment, I offer it with love to you. As folks try to gut Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare, I know what you are worthy of: a government that loves you and supports every single ounce of you and your grandmother and your father and the children that you will have.

So today, I am offering a commonsense amendment, a simple guarantee to protect Americans' access to critical healthcare, food assistance, Social Security benefits. And any future plan—listen to me—any future plan to reduce or eliminate Federal departments in this Administration. Simply put, this amendment would prohibit this Administration from reducing any existing benefit provided or administered by the Social Security Administration, the Center for Medicaid and Medicare, the Food and Nutrition Service at the Department of Agriculture, the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chair, I have mentioned in this Committee time after time in my few short months here that I am a widow and I have waited at the Social Security office for hours to receive a very small survivor benefit for my daughter and I after my husband tragically died of a very, very rare cancer. I had been that single mother in college who received a small bit—it was actually \$27 a month of

SNAP—and I had to put food back routinely at the counter because I did not have enough even with that support.

No one—I do not care how you vote, where you live—deserves to be left behind because this Administration is hell bent on destroying our Federal Government and gutting the core social safety net that we collectively have built to support the fatherless, the widow, and the sick and the elderly. Any reduction in benefits or services provided by SSA, by SNAP, by CMS, or the ACA could be the very difference of life or death, folks living on the streets, or for so many vulnerable population in this great country.

According to the California Department of Public Health, there are over 260,000 hardworking constituents, both young and elderly, working and middle class and low income, in my district who are eligible for Medi-Cal. This includes 13,000 children, some in this room. Look at their faces. They benefit from the basic social safety nets, that we have promised them, to eat, to be well, to study hard, over 46,000 seniors and people with disabilities, and over 3,000 adults who are eligible for ACA. I am just asking for a simple acknowledgement that we will not touch these services for the folks who need them most.

At UCSF Benioff Hospital, last week I toured, over 70 percent of the people that this children's hospital in my district serves rely on Medicaid for the state-of-the-art care that they deserve, including children with cancer and congenital heart defects. No one should have to worry that the Trump Administration is going to end their healthcare. No one should have to worry that this Administration is going to gut their retirement. No young person in this room and in this Nation should have to worry that an administration would touch their rights and their ability to go on to secondary education.

And in closing, I am voting and asking you all to vote for this amendment. It is an easy way to demonstrate to my constituents, these young people, their parents, their neighbors, that we need and trust that they will grow to be strong human beings that will benefit this country. And with that, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment, and I yield back. Thank you, Fremont High, for coming today.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Yes. I recognize the Ranking Member for a UC.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair and I thank Mr. Sessions for waiting. I just ask unanimous consent to enter into the record today a story in the *Washington Post* entitled, "Long Waits, Waves of Calls, Web Crashes: Social Security is breaking down."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Sessions from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to welcome the new Member and delighted that she is here to offer amendments and to have her voice be heard. But I would offer to remind her that this country, as testimony before this Committee and subcommittees, we have a \$300 billion to \$500 billion a year of misdirected payments that have contributed over the last few years to \$1.5 trillion worth of misdirected payments. I think it

would be fair for her to articulate what she would like to, but I would say to her that an audit is going to take place. That audit is necessary. And some of the things the gentlewoman spoke about are not to destroy but to enhance those very systems that we and she have spoken about—ACA, Social Security, and a lot of these other government programs that are important, the integrity of them.

As a matter of fact, I am sure the gentlewoman said do not touch anything. Well, if you touch nothing, that means you fail to do an audit. That means you fail to take people out who have created either an inducement for them that was unlawful or something that might have happened along the way with waste, fraud, and abuse. But I would tell the gentlewoman—evidently, she understands how Social Security works. I really do not, but one thing I do know is, is that if you turn 65 or Medicare eligible and you have an 18-year-old or less than 18-year-old in your household, that person qualifies for Social Security up to \$1,500 a month, and there is no dollar limit about that. A family could make \$300,000, \$400,000, \$500,000, \$600,000 to provide money to that person that is under-age.

No, I do not want to beat up the system. I have a Down syndrome son. If I had not made it to where I am now, Social Security would have gone to help my Down syndrome son. I am not saying we have to delete anything, but a review of these processes is important. An audit, so to speak, is not only proper, it is legitimate for the government to be able to come in and look at the money that is being spent. There will be things that are touched, but it, I think, is, from my perspective, less than a fair argument to say they are going to gut all these things. They are not going to gut them.

Congress has already voted to put all the money for this year that we had last year, and I have seen nothing that has substantially changed those necessary benefits, and it will come to Committee and we will have these debates and we will have these votes, and there will be a vote that a person who is a Member of Congress will make. But for us to say that we should touch nothing, simply means that our country moves further and further and further into not only debt, but literally a debt that becomes so crushing that we can never turn it around, and so those people that are in our future, not just today, that are in our immediate future, will find the diminishment of goods and services and opportunities in the future. And so, I think it is important how we talk about this because believe it or not, there are people who are listening to us.

And so, I would offer some bit of compromise about the fervency that we take this debate to with some balance of reality. Mr. Chairman, we are going to do these audits. They are going to be done, intended for the integrity of the programs, and I do not believe that I have seen evidence that is going to diminish or stop these necessary important items for people who need it the most. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. Very good. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Subramanyam?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to explain the reality on the ground. Right now, what they are trying to do is cut Social Security, but in a sneaky way. What they are trying to do is say you have to show up to the office in person if there is any problems, but then they are firing half the people at these offices and closing down offices. And then, on Friday, I get notice from many constituents that they had appointments already scheduled to do the right thing, and those appointments have been canceled because there are not enough people. So, that is cutting Social Security, that is the reality on the ground, and that is taking a sledgehammer to our benefits.

And Social Security is an earned benefit. People paid into it for years, and now it is being taken away from them, and they deserve better. Our seniors deserve better. Our veterans deserve better. The American people deserve better than what they are getting right now. And so, these amendments are simply to protect the American people and their benefits that they rightly earned. And so, the reality on the ground is much different than what I have been hearing from the other side. I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend, and I wonder if I could ask him a question. Is it not true that this amendment simply prevents the reduction of any existing benefits?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. That is exactly right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Right. And if you read the *Post* article I inserted in the record, chaos is ensuing at Social Security. The idea that everything is fine and we are just going after bureaucrats, not true, and it is going to have huge political ramifications in this country. But more importantly, it is going to affect our constituents and the quality of their lives. Seventy million people rely on Medicare and/or Social Security, including, perhaps, people with Down syndrome, and we have got to take care of those people. That is our obligation. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I will just add that I have a constituent who works at one of the offices, the Social Security offices, who told me that appointments that were made have been canceled because half the workers in her office were fired, including people who actually knew how to make the system better and more efficient. And because of that, our office simply cannot help people right now with their Social Security benefits. That is just Social Security. I mean, this amendment talks about other programs as well, SNAP—

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. Were the workers instructed to diminish or change the benefits as a result of what you have heard today?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. The workers were not instructed that specifically, but they cannot help the people that they serve, with their benefits and with issues with their benefits, if there are simply not enough people in the office to help all the people.

Mr. SESSIONS. But there has been no cut or change in the benefits.

Ms. SIMON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. It is a question.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I will yield.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, sir. When you close down, for instance—let me talk about SBA for a second, too. Six SBAs, and folks have to go in, in person, to acquire their resources for their small business. When you cut thousands of VA staff members who pick up the phone and route folks to emergency services, when you close and fire Social Security workers—see, if you have never had to go into one of these offices and bow your head and beg for a few dollars to put food on the table while you go to college and while you carry your baby on public transportation, do not talk to me about what it means to be poor and try to just survive in this country.

Poor people continuously are being punched down by this Administration, and folks just want the same things, to send their babies to college, to get the healthcare when they need it. These folks, the ones that I represent, are not getting rich off a \$650 Social Security check when they have to pay \$1,800 for rent. We are talking about sustaining basic benefits, and until you walk with these people hand-in-hand and see their hard work, their fury to survive, how could you say no to an amendment that says just keep in place the small amount of resources that poor and the sick are trying to sustain while they pass through these very difficult times in their lives? We cannot be the cruel governments that we pay shade to. I yield back.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I will put a finer point, to answer your question. If what you are saying is they are not cutting benefits, then why not support this amendment that says not to cut benefits, right, put your vote where your mouth is if you really want to make sure that we do not cut benefits. I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And I think it is a casuistic distinction. No one was directed to cut benefits. Well, if I am cutting the people who provide the benefits, I am cutting the benefits. I think that is kind of a simple piece of logic. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I yield back to the Chair.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. Thank you. So, I oppose the underlying bill and I support Representative Simon's amendment, and I agree with what was just said. If you are against cutting these programs, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, you should support this amendment. But I also want to say something else. I find it astonishing that this Committee is focused on passing legislation that would give the Trump Administration more power just 24 hours after we learn that members of this Administration—Secretary of Defense, Pete Hegseth; Director of National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard; National Security Advisor, Mike Waltz; Vice President J.D. Vance, and other top decisionmakers are responsible for one of the greatest national security failures of this century. It is our most basic duty as the Committee on Oversight to find out how this could have happened and what damage could have been done and has been done to our national security.

And as I claim time to debate on this bill, it is relevant to raise the question of why the Republican sponsor considers this issue more important than getting to the bottom of this "Houthi PC

small group” Signal chat, where highly sensitive information about a military operation prior to its being carried out was shared on an unofficial and unsecured channel with a private citizen. Yesterday, *Atlantic* editor, Jeffrey Goldberg, published the astonishing story of how he was added to a Signal chat by National Security Advisor Mike Waltz that included the Secretary of Defense, Vice President, and 16 others, most of whom have yet to be identified. The White House has already acknowledged the legitimacy of this conversation.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record this *Atlantic* article titled, “The Trump Administration Accidentally Texted Me Its War Plans.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. FROST. Over the course of several days, this chat openly discussed military operations against the Houthis in Yemen, putting our service members at risk and putting our country at risk. This is the Oversight Committee. We need to conduct oversight. If a Democratic administration committed such a colossal and possibly criminal failure of national security, I know that my fellow Democrats and I on this Committee would join Republicans in investigating it because it makes our country less safe.

We need to have Secretary of Defense Hegseth in these chairs, under oath, opening up an immediate investigation to answer these following obvious questions: Why was Signal being used for this conversation? Is Signal or other unofficial, unsecured channels being used for other national security conversations? Is it DoD, NSA, or White House policy to use Signal for official business? Whose policy is it? Were laws broken through the use of Signal to discuss these future military operations, and if so, which ones? What other Signal channels discussing classified information exist? The 18 names in this chat mostly appear as just initials. Who are these people, and do they all have proper security clearance to discuss this information?

It was reported that the messages in this group were set to an auto-delete after 8 days. Was that a Department of Defense policy? Did someone in the Signal group make that decision on their own? What operational details were discussed, and could operational security be compromised if an enemy actor has access to the Signal chat? Secretary of Defense Hegseth, was asked if he participated in the Signal group chat, and instead of giving a straight answer, he verbally attacked the journalist asking the question. He should be answering those questions here today under oath.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extreme breach of trust, a violation of the law that demands congressional oversight. Later this afternoon, Ranking Member Connolly and I will be sending a letter that demands that all departments implicated in this confounding episode preserve all related documents and communications, including the Signal chats. I invite all my colleagues on this Committee, Democrats and Republicans, to join us in this effort. Mr. Comer, I hope you will fulfill your commitment to conducting serious congressional oversight and sign this letter. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition? We are still on the Simon Amendment. Yes, Ms. Randall.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, in response to, you know, the arguments that this amendment is going to diminish the ability for us to audit government programs, of recipients, of folks of Social Security, of Medicare and Medicaid Services, of SNAP, I would say that this does nothing like that. It just says that this plan cannot diminish the actual benefits that folks are receiving. And I heard a lot of conversation in this Committee and at the Capitol about waste, fraud, and abuse, and, you know, I would argue that Mr. Frost's comments about an abuse of power and misuse of resources are much greater than the .0002 percent of Medicaid claims in Washington State that have been found to be fraudulent.

Of \$2 million a year—\$2 million—there have been between 30 and 40 fraudulent payments discovered, and I, you know, use the 40, the higher level, when I determine the percentage of fraudulent claims. These are families with children with Down syndrome, like Mr. Sessions, with children with microcephaly, like my family, parents who have just given birth and are trying to stay healthy to care for their new baby, kids and low-income families, seniors who deserve healthcare. Everyone deserves healthcare.

But outside of the underlying bill, Republicans and this Administration have submitted and passed a budget resolution that looks to eliminate \$880 billion from Energy and Commerce, which is impossible without significantly cutting Medicaid. So, we can stand here and say we are not trying to cut Medicaid, we are just trying to make government more efficient, but in the meantime, we are trying to pass a budget that will significantly eliminate Medicaid funds.

So, you know, respectfully, regardless of what this underlying bill seeks to do, the efforts are there to tear away benefits from individuals who need Medicaid to survive, who need Medicaid to thrive, who are just trying to live their lives, while we have been voting on budget policy that would defund those programs in order to give tax breaks to people who are in a position to make a lot of money off some of the decisions that this Congress is making. I think it is the bare minimum to say we will not reduce these existing benefits in any plans that we submit to this Congress. I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentlelady, and I think your observations are quite correct and quite apt. We forget in cloaking ourselves around a fight against bureaucrats that there are real people who have real needs. Social Security, the Veterans Administration, other programs of the Federal Government provide those needs. They service those people. They are vital links for a huge population of Americans, and when we tamper with that, when we jeopardize that, we are jeopardizing their security, their health, their safety. I think that is really important. These are not faceless bureaucrats who are going to be victims. These are our constituents. I thank the gentlelady for pointing that out. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Time has expired. Any other Members seek recognition on the Simon—Mr. Mfume is recognized.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to take a minute to thank the——

Chairman COMER. Oh, OK.

Mr. MFUME. I beg your pardon? Am I still recognized, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, yes. I am sorry. Then I will recognize Mr. Lynch next so I do not forget. I apologize.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you. I want to salute and rise in support of the gentlewoman from California, who succinctly put this in human terms. Someone once said your passion is where your pain is, and for those who pain at the suffering that is going on, their passion is something that we should welcome. And I just cannot underscore enough what it is like to be in this Committee and what it is like to be out on the ground where you are in a line, if you are able to get in it, where you wonder are things going to be cut, where you see jobs being eliminated, where you see people being eliminated, and where you understand the need has not left us at all.

I want to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the *Washington Post* story which went online just 7 hours ago entitled, "Long Waits, Waves of Calls, Website Crashes," and the like, "Social Security 'is breaking down'", and if I can just from that article offer a few things to this Committee that was reported.

The Social Security Administration website crashed four times in 10 days this month, blocking millions of retirees all over the country and disabled Americans all over the country from logging into their online accounts because the servers are overloaded. In the field, office managers have resorted to answering phones at the front desk as receptionists because so many employees have been pushed out. But the Agency no longer has a system to monitor customers' experiences with these services because that office was eliminated as part of a cost-cutting effort by Elon Musk. And the article goes on by saying, "and the phones keep ringing and ringing and ringing." So, there is a need here to preserve, and that is what the gentlewoman has asked for, to preserve the very basics provided by this government.

Social Security is in my district in Baltimore. It is the heart and soul of Baltimore County, and I can tell you firsthand that people continue to hurt and continue to wonder what have they done to deserve this? If we are after waste, fraud, and abuse, there is a way to go after it, but not to summarily punish people by saying today you are working and next week you are not. So, I think process here is important. Otherwise, this all becomes suspect. If there was a real, elongated effort to review, reorder, re-substantiate, and re-prove the need for these programs, that would be taking place in a very orderly way. But order is out the door, due process is out the door, and in its place we have gotten this chaos, almost designed chaos, that has left so many of us asking these questions. So, it is not a personal issue. It is not an issue to try to get time on anybody's network. It is an issue of people and pain and their passion and where things are standing on in this country.

So, I would ask unanimous consent for that, Mr. Chairman. I again want to commend the gentlewoman from California for succinctly laying this out in real terms, and I commend those who will vote for this amendment, which I hope will be most of us. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, we will enter into the record the *Washington Post* story from Mr. Mfume.

Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to ignore what is at the root of today's hearing, and it is sad. You know, I have been on this Oversight Committee for 25 years in Congress, and it is sad to see that this once proud committee has stooped to the situation where we are in right now.

Let me first say that I support Ms. Simon's courageous amendment and I oppose the underlying bill, and I am thankful for the leadership of our Ranking Member in this fight. But at a time when we are sitting here punching down at the most vulnerable in our society and trying to rip holes in the safety net that protects those individuals, and I speak, of course, of, you know, the efforts and the attitude of the Commerce Secretary of this Trump Administration, who said the other day basically, "It is not a problem if people do not get their Social Security checks. It is not a problem." And I am speaking, of course, of the Republican budget resolution that identifies \$880 billion in cuts from Medicaid, which is the major program that cares for the poor, and it also cares for seniors in nursing homes and people who go to the local community health center to get their care, and I speak especially to our veterans.

Now, we in this Committee know that over the past year, we had the Inspector General of the VA look at all of our VA hospitals, and the VA said we were down. In order to get a base level of care for our veterans, we needed to add about 3,000 more people. That is what they told us. They told us that 86 percent of our VA facilities needed a medical director. They said 82 percent of our VA centers across the United States needed nurses. So, what does the Administration do when they come in? They announce that they are going to cut 80,000 more employees from the VA. So, we have an administration here that is punching down—

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am sorry. Did you say 80,000?

Mr. LYNCH. Eighty thousand.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Eighty?

Mr. LYNCH. Eighty thousand. And so, this Administration is punching down at the weakest in our society, the most vulnerable. We are talking about the poor. We are talking about seniors who cannot help themselves and cannot go out and get another job and generate more income. We are talking about wounded veterans at our VA hospitals, wounded veterans, and there is something special about VA benefits, veterans' benefits. Those benefits are for courageous services previously rendered. And so now, after our veterans put on their uniform, fulfill their obligation honorably and come home, many of them with the scars of war both visible and invisible, the Administration is cutting the benefits that should automatically accrue to them. It is unthinkable. That has never been a tradition in this country to ignore the valiant service of our veterans, but it is today, unfortunately.

I do want to say one thing to followup on what Mr. Frost was talking about, about what happened over the weekend with Secretary Hegseth, and the fact that they had a live, real-time discussion prior to sending our sons and daughters in uniform into a war zone, giving the details of that operation within an unsecure line of communication on Signal. Anybody could have picked that up.

They elevated the status of the assistant editor of the *Atlantic* to someone who was part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I want people to remember that when Lloyd Austin a couple of years ago declined to make public his prostate cancer exam, my Republican colleagues said he should resign, he should be fired. That is because he did not disclose his prostate cancer treatment. We should be calling for Hegseth to resign right now and the people who were on that call with him. They put our sons and daughters at risk. We could have had pilots shot down, we could have had a frigate sunk because they let the information of an operation against the Houthi rebels, who have anti-aircraft capability, who have naval warfare capability. We exposed our sons and daughters to that.

For that reason, a real reason, a fact, we should call on those people who were on that call to resign, and if not, we should fire them, as President Trump did on social media when Secretary Austin failed to disclose his prostate exam. I have the tweet right here: "Lloyd Austin should be fired for unprofessional conduct." He did not disclose his prostate cancer exam. What about this? What about Hegseth? What about the rest of them for exposing our sons and daughters to real danger?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Lynch, your time expired a minute and a half ago.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate the courtesy, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members seek recognition on the Simon Amendment? Mr. Cloud from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Yes, there is no doubt that this Signal chat issue was a blunder, but it was referred to in this Committee as the largest intelligence failure in a century. Lloyd Austin did not report for duty. He went AWOL for a couple of weeks. That was the issue. Now, it might have been because he had cancer, and that is tragic, but the fact was he went AWOL, and that is the reasons for the call.

Mr. LYNCH. It was less than 24 hours.

Mr. CLOUD. Excuse me. This is my time, sir. This is the hyperbole coming from the left is just amazing. In spite of the fact that, my understanding, an operation was discussed, my understanding is that the operation has happened. Was that operation successful? My understanding is it was. My understanding is that there were no U.S. casualties. This is very unlike Afghanistan where we saw 13 people killed during a botched withdrawal. Let us try to get back to some sensible sort of conversation, please. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. OK. Any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, yes, I realize that the gentleman ran out of time, and I would like to yield as much of my time as he may consume to the Representative too.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman. I thank the gentleman.

Chairman COMER. It is fine. I recognized Mr. Mfume, and he yielded. Go ahead.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman. I just think that, look, over my 25 years on this Committee, we have proudly worked side by side on issues where we failed——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, excuse me for interrupting. I just would ask the courtesy of attention. The gentleman is speaking.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Lynch is recognized. Please have order.

Mr. LYNCH. OK. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have had the opportunity, the honor, really, to serve on this committee for 25 years, and there have been moments. I was elected on September 11, the day of the attacks. And so, when I got here, there was a real sense of unity, a real sense of being Americans and identifying the real threats to this country and coming together, Republican and Democrat, working on that together, and, frankly, I miss that. I miss that. Here is a situation where clearly, clearly—I mean, you cannot put lipstick on this pig. We had a real-time conversation with rich details about a real-time attack on an adversary, and we allowed that to occur with a whole host of defense and intelligence personnel in the Trump administration on an unsecure line.

So, it was not an error on one person's part. It was a tawdry example of the Keystone Cops here, where all of them—all of them—on an unsecure line discussed the details of a military operation that was happening imminently. First of all, that Signal system is, as we know on this Committee and we are warned not to go on that in our official capacity, we are warned, so we know how vulnerable that is, and they knew, the officials knew. They went on and discussed the details.

Now, we know—we have all received those warnings here from our intelligence personnel about the vulnerability we might present if we have important discussions on that network, on Signal. We are told that the Russians and the Chinese, the Iranians, the North Koreans are watching that and watching us, and we are told not to go on that network, OK? That is a fact. We all know that. They went on that network and discussed the plans of an imminent attack, an imminent operation against the Houthis who have anti-aircraft capacity, anti-naval capacity, and could have killed a whole lot of Americans because of the carelessness of this group.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Not yet. That used to be the type of thing that brought us together when we recognized that danger, when we recognized that vulnerability, and we would hold people accountable back in the day, and we are not doing that. Right now, we are giving it a good leaving alone.

And I am just saying that this goes to the very heart of this Committee. We were built for this. This Committee, we were built for this. We were made for this, and I am just saying we are missing an opportunity. You know, there is politics. I get that, but then there is also the safety. Look, there is the responsibility for us. When I nominate a kid to the Naval Academy or to West Point, that comes with responsibility. And those are the kids we are sending in here, putting them at risk because we are allowing this inept group of people, who should not be in the positions they were in in the first place. They were totally unqualified, but this is exactly

what happens when you put accountability in your back pocket and you refuse to stand up to the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my time has expired, and I will yield back.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. Any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I would move adoption.

Chairman COMER. All right. The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Simon.

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, the noes have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would like to request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote—

Ms. SIMON. I do request a recorded vote, sir.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Now, the Chair recognizes Ms. Pressley. For what purpose does Ms. Pressley seek recognition?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Would the clerk please report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295, as offered by Ms. Pressley of Massachusetts.

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

I reserve a point of order.

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. This should be a simple and unanimous addition to this bill. It reads, "Rule of construction: nothing in this act may be construed to allow an executive department to enact a policy that supports racial segregation." There should be no debate about whether our government should be able to implement segregationist policies, but without this amendment, nothing stops an administration from using reorganization powers to roll back civil rights.

Now, I represent a diverse and beautiful district, the Massachusetts 7th Congressional District, where people at town halls in my district, this last in-district work period, genuinely expressed concern that our country is moving backward. Trump's slogan, "Make America Great Again," begs the question, when exactly is he talking about? What year does Donald Trump want to return to? I would like to know. I can venture a guess based on many actions, which I will enumerate shortly, but let us take a moment to revisit Donald Trump's origins and his track record.

Donald Trump was born in the 1940s and raised under Jim Crow, a time when laws were codified to give him an advantage with the segregation of schools, businesses, and public spaces, and when he started taking control of his dad's real estate businesses

a few years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Trump made front page news when he was sued for discriminating against Black families who applied for housing. Sixty years later, he is still making front page news for racial discrimination. Just last week, the Trump Administration revoked a decades-old policy that prohibited Federal contractors from having segregated facilities.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record this *New York Times* article from March 21, 2025, titled, "Trump Administration Dropped Policy Prohibiting Contractors From Having Segregated Facilities."

Chairman COMER. Without objection so ordered.

Ms. PRESSLEY. All right, you all. Now let that sink in. This Administration just made it easier for businesses to reintroduce White-only waiting rooms, White-only bathrooms, and White-only water fountains in the year 2025, but this is not just about one policy change. It is about a broader coordinated assault on civil rights to take America back to Jim Crow.

Trump has appointed judges that do not support the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, an obvious opening for a return to segregated schools. Trump is dismantling the Department of Education as we speak to prevent access to equal education and upend more than 300 active civil rights cases in my district alone. Trump has overturned executive orders from the 1960s, including one signed in 1965 that mandated equal opportunity for people of color in the recruitment, hiring, and training of Federal contractors. Trump has even removed Black history from government websites, including the Department of Defense. He is literally trying to prevent people from learning about Black veterans and their contributions and sacrifices in this country. I could go on, but we would be here until tomorrow.

And listen, I will be the first to acknowledge Democrats and Republicans alike have a bad history on this issue, but today, only one party is acknowledging that shameful legacy while the Republicans remain silent, deafeningly so. So, I will give everyone here a chance to clarify. This vote is simple: are you against racial segregation? This is your chance to go on the record if you are, in fact, opposed to racial segregation. Let us ensure that no administration, present or future, can support policies of segregation. Clearly Donald Trump, your President or perhaps your king, does support segregation because Donald Trump was born in, benefited from, and wants to return to a segregated society. I urge passage of my amendment.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Before we close debate on what I hope is the last amendment to this bill, I want to reiterate that between 1932 and 1984, Presidents submitted more than 100 reorganization plans. Presidents from Roosevelt to Reagan used this authority to create or dismantle Federal Agencies. Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Obama requested renewed and expand authority. This bill does just that for President Trump.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a CRS report titled, "Presidential Authority, History, Recent Initiatives, and Options for Congress," which details what I just mentioned.

Without objection so ordered.

Do any other Members seek recognition on the Pressley Amendment? Ms. Simon?

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, Chair and Ranking Member. I want to thank my esteemed colleague for this amendment, and we have seen just in the last couple of months a very clear attack on the beauty of inclusion, the fabric that we have weaved together as a Nation saying that we all have culture and history that makes up these great states. I will yield my time to Congresswoman Pressley.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you to my esteemed colleague from California. Look, I do not want us to lose sight of what is actually happening here. Let us not revise what is happening. The Trump Cabinet is on track to be one of the Whitest cabinets in modern history, and when the government is given unchecked authority, civil rights are often the first to be sacrificed. Without this amendment, nothing in this bill stops an administration from using its reorganization powers to weaken the enforcement of civil rights and anti-discrimination protections. So, I do not know why anyone here would be either deafeningly quiet or be opposed to a guarantee that government cannot support segregation. This bill grants the President and executive departments new powers, and it is essential that we explicitly limit these powers from rolling back civil rights and supporting segregation.

Now, listen, I am somebody who believes, you know, in the power of data, so let me offer some data points here. The Department of Housing and HUD, Trump is firing HUD workers in my district, including those that oversee anti-discrimination work. If we do not pass this amendment, he could try to allow for segregated housing like he did with his real estate properties in New York. Department of Labor, Trump has fired members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, an independent agency leading to power being concentrated in the Department of Labor. If we do not pass this amendment, we could see the erasure of all progress made for equal employment and equal pay regardless of race. And finally, the Department of Veterans: the erasure of the contributions of Black veterans is already happening under the Trump Administration. Without this amendment, Trump would go further than websites. He will deny Black people care at local VA hospitals throughout the country.

So, I do not understand why anyone would be opposed to what should be an easy amendment to support unless you support the efforts of Donald Trump to resegregate this society, which he is clearly on track to do having just dropped this policy prohibiting contractors from having segregated facilities. Why would such an action be taken if that is not the root and the motivation of his dangerous and draconian actions that seek to take us back?

Mr. MFUME. Would the gentlelady yield for a second?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Who is asking?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Mfume of Maryland.

Ms. PRESSLEY. I yield to Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Following up on what you just said, is it true that the Department of Defense erased all accounts of the Tuskegee Airmen and all the bravery that they demonstrated during World War II?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Shamefully, yes.

Mr. MFUME. And is it true that the Tuskegee Airmen are all Black?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. Is it true that the Department of Defense erased Jackie Robinson's contributions when he was away serving his country as he played baseball?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. Is Jackie Robinson Black?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. Is it true that the Department of Defense recently, yesterday, erased mention of Dorris "Dorie" Miller, the first mess attendant cook who ran upstairs while Pearl Harbor was under attack with no training, and grabbed a gun and artillery and shot down enemy planes?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. And was Dorie Miller Black?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MFUME. So, your point about erasure here is very well taken, and these are not things that I made up. These are things that have been reported in the last 10–15 days that have taken back. I yield back. I thank the gentlelady for her time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Proceed.

Ms. PRESSLEY. I want to enter into the record this article from *The Grio* from March 21, 2025, titled, "Trump's Move to Dismantle Department of Education Sparks Fears of Racial Segregation. "An attack on Black children"—I am sorry?

Chairman COMER. Without objection so ordered.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Your time is expired, but I will give you a few more seconds. I do not want to get into a TikTok battle with you here.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Well, I am fine with us making news to expose what is actually happening here in this country with this government. Is there someone who would yield me time? Any of my colleagues, please?

Chairman COMER. Yes, let us do that. Ms. Stansbury, you are recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to read this amendment really quick. It says, "Nothing in this act may be construed to allow an executive department to enact a policy that supports racial segregation." If you guys vote against this, you are voting against a sentence that says that nothing in this bill should allow or support racial segregation. I want that to be on the record. So, when we have a recorded vote on this, if you vote no to this amendment, you are voting to racially resegregate the United States. Let us be clear about that. I yield my time to the gentlelady.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Stansbury. You know, again, I do not want us to get distracted here. When I am in district and my constituents are expressing their fears about ongoing, unrelenting, coordinated efforts to resegregate society, the reason the public is talking about segregation is because Trump is talking about segregation. Trump is repealing policies from the 1960s, not me or other Democrats. Trump is al-

lowing businesses to discriminate against Black people, not me or other Democrats. In fact, immediately after Trump issued his executive order targeting the Department of Education, Google searches for the term, "segregation," surged to their highest recorded level, skyrocketing to more than 5 times the volume of searches from just week prior. Why? Because our communities are preparing for a rollback in civil rights because Donald Trump is not just talking about it, he is doing it. And our constituents, the American people, are smart enough to recognize that attacking the Department of Education will disproportionately impact Black and Brown students. The Agency was created in the 1970's after segregation ended, and destroying it now is laying the groundwork for segregation to restart.

Chairman COMER. You finished?

Ms. PRESSLEY. I yield. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Ms. PRESSLEY. I yield back to Ms. Stansbury.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Pressley.

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?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered as previously announced. Further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify that there was a recorded vote requested because all of the Republicans just voted orally against an amendment.

Chairman COMER. That is not a point of order. That is not a point of order.

Ms. STANSBURY. Basically, it allowed the Administration to racially resegregate the United States.

Chairman COMER. You will get on MSNBC tonight some other way. All right. No point of order. You are out of order.

Ms. STANSBURY. No, I am just making a point that the American people are——

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order. She is out of order. The gentlelady is out of order.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Understand what just occurred. You are on the record.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury, you know what the parliamentary procedure is on a point of order.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, that is true, but you all are going to have to answer to the American people.

Chairman COMER. Oh, yes, you go on. Eliminating the Department of Education bureaucrats is going to lead to White-only water fountains. That is what you all have just said. All right. The American people are going to buy that.

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

OK. We go to the next bill. All right. Our next item for consideration is H.R. 1210, the Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act of 2025. The clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 1210, the Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act of 2025, a bill to amend Chapter 71 of Title V, United States Code, to charge labor organizations for the agency resources and employee time used by such labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should 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 designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210, 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 bill and the amendment.

H.R. 1210, the Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act would charge Federal employee unions a fee to compensate Federal agencies and the Nation's taxpayers for resources used to support union activities.

Under Federal law, certain Federal employees are authorized official time for collective bargaining purposes during the time the employee otherwise would be in a duty status. In other words, Federal agency employees who also serve as employees of a Federal employee union may conduct, and be paid to conduct, official union activities during work hours instead of performing their regular job duties. The bill would shift the financial burden of supporting such official time away from the taxpayers to the Federal employee unions.

It should shock American taxpayers that Federal employees are being paid to work substantial hours in support of public sector unions instead of the agency operations, missions, and programs they were hired for in the first place. In some notable cases, Federal employees dedicate all their working hours to union activity. This bill would discourage overuse and abuse of official time by Federal employees. This bill would discourage overuse and abuse.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. Perry, from Pennsylvania for his attention to this matter and for leading the Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act. I urge my colleagues to support this sensible reform. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This bill is an attack on our Federal workers. Official time is often used to engage in

projects that improve efficiency and productivity. I know this because I have heard it directly from my constituents. Many Federal workers in my district have said that it is used for management trainings to increase productivity in departments, and it is used to resolve office conflicts to make sure employees can do their jobs effectively. If we continue to attack the workplace of the Federal Government, how can we expect to retain any talent and compete with the private sector? How can we expect to get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse? And what is going to happen is there is going to be a brain drain in our Federal Government. We need these workers to keep our air travel safe, food supply secure, and public health protected, so this is not about government efficiency. This is yet another example of targeting our Federal workers. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act requires Federal employee unions to reimburse Federal Agencies for the use of Agency resources and official time spent each quarter. Now Federal Agencies will assess public sector unions a fee to utilize resources such as office space, equipment, expenses incurred while on union time, and any official union time used by labor representatives affiliated with these organizations.

American taxpayers would be shocked to learn that Federal employees are paid for work hours while supporting public sector unions rather than the Agency operations, missions, and programs they were hired to support in the first place. So, let me make it plain. If you go to the VA and we have hired somebody there to be a nurse, maybe a physician, any position, really, well, they might be doing that work, but they just might as well be doing work for the union, making the same pay, but not doing the work that we are paying them to do. And so, you might be being held up at the VA because the person that, your practitioner, instead of dealing with you, is dealing with these other programs instead.

Now, according to OPM, official time logged by Federal employees can be used for lobbying Congress alongside allowing employees to spend 100 percent of their time handling union representation functions while still being paid by Federal Agencies. So, most people in the private sector I know, do not get paid to lobby Congress. They go vote. In 2019, before President Biden halted the OPM tracking reporting of official time, it was reported that employees across the Federal Government were paid \$135 million to do 2.6 million hours of union work while on the clock at their government jobs, which they were not doing.

Additionally, Federal Government unions are heavily involved in party politics, staging massive political protests and contributing lump sums of money and manpower into influencing key elections, which, look, that is fine if you want to do that on your own time with your own money, but it is not fine with taxpayer money and time. Forcing the American taxpayer to foot the bill for Federal union organization is outrageous and absurd. Even FDR, President Roosevelt, agreed with that. It is quite simple. If Federal employees and resources are going to be used for union tasks, the union should quite clearly have to foot the bill. It would be like having

an NRA convention or something in your Federal Government office. Most of the people here would not agree with that, but somehow, they agree with this. American taxpayers are paying government employees to do a job, not the bidding and strategizing of organized union bosses.

The Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act addresses these priorities by implementing robust oversight mechanisms and enhancing the transparency of expenditures on the Federal workforce. We want to know what this is costing. These measures are essential for preventing waste, fraud and abuse, and for restoring public trust in the government's management, and that people are actually doing the job they were hired to do. Additionally, this legislation will benefit all Americans by ensuring that taxpayer money is spent wisely, that any misuse is swiftly identified and rectified and be identified because it was reported and we could see it, which did not happen under the Biden Administration at all. This should be a reminder that hard-earned taxpayer dollars are not to be taken advantage of. They are meant for a purpose, and they are scarce, and they are precious. This legislation has been endorsed by both the National Right to Work Committee and Americans for Tax Reform.

At this time, I would like to enter into the record the Americans for Tax Reform endorsement letter, Mr. Chairman, and with that, I yield the balance of my time.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to also just comment on this discussion. I think that what is happening today is we are seeing House Republicans working with Elon Musk to cripple not just our Federal agencies, but also our unions and our public workers, and this is not about efficiency or about services. Now, we know why Elon Musk and this Committee are working together to destroy Federal unions. It is because Federal unions are working to defend their workers, but they are also working to defend us from Elon Musk's looting of the Federal Government. They are suing to protect your private financial data from DOGE at the Treasury Department, they are suing to make sure that Trump cannot purge the bureaucracy and replace them with his personal loyalists, and they are suing to make sure that critical programs can go forward.

Now, the American Federation of Government Employees Union alone has nine ongoing lawsuits, and they have secured several real wins already. If they can destroy Federal unions, it is easier for the DOGE agenda to steal resources, gut Federal Agencies, gut healthcare, cut education, and fund giveaways to Elon Musk and his billionaire friends. We should not forget this is not just about Federal unions. Elon Musk has fought to attack his own workers and unions for years. We know that Tesla has violated safety rules leading to electrocution of a contractor working in a plant in Austin this last August. Tesla has violated national labor laws by suppressing employees from discussing pay and bringing up grievances on working conditions. Now, in 2019, we know that Tesla illegally retaliated against pro-union employees, and the National Labor Re-

lations Board also ruled that Tesla unlawfully restricted union materials in the workplace.

Now, Tesla is currently under investigation for firing workers for discussing working conditions, and they are also accused of union busting when they fired employees for attempting to unionize while hiding behind other layoffs. Now, in the past, we know that Mr. Musk has tweeted that if employees joined a union, they would lose their stock options. This, of course, is anti-worker and the absolute wrong approach to supporting good working conditions. We also know, of course, that it gets worse. Now, that he is in the White House, Trump and Elon are working to destroy Federal regulators, who we know protect workers and hold abusive billionaires like them accountable.

We should be very clear. Unions protect working people, not just their own members, and they make sure that businesses and agencies do their work safely and responsibly, and that is why Trump, Elon Musk, and congressional Republicans are trying to cripple unions at every turn. We, of course, oppose and say no to this. We should absolutely vote against all union legislation and amendments that are being filed today. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

Ms. ANSARI. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Ansari.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you. This is yet another attack on workers and labor from this Administration. Union representatives are invaluable in making sure that employees are treated fairly and protected from unlawful discrimination from other practices.

I am very curious whether my colleagues on the other side of the room know what union representatives actually do when they use official time. They protect workers from discrimination, harassment, and retaliation. They find ways to improve working conditions and keep workers safe. They develop new employee trainings to make the workplace more efficient. They represent employees in grievance and disciplinary proceedings, leading to faster resolutions and saving the Federal Government money by preventing costly litigations, and they do all of that while only being able to use a few hours per year representing each employee. At the VA it is only 4 hours per year.

Voting for this bill means voting for worse working conditions, higher employee turnover, less efficiency and costly legal battles. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition on the Perry bill? The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This bill, in my opinion, is nothing short of union busting. This bill would count what is known as official time, or time spent representing employees with grievances before an Agency, as personal time. Which is kind of way out of bounds, considering this has been discussed in both the House and Senate going back to 1978 and we had a clear bipartisan bicameral agreement that pretty much established what union time was and what it was not. Possibly even more egregious, this bill will allow an agency to unilaterally decertify a legally formed public sector union if it refused to pay fees incurred by this bill. Now, that takes it all.

This bill flies in the face of 47 years of statute and practice in an overwhelming bipartisan vote. As I mentioned before, Congress enacted the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 which specifically codified official time. The Senate report that accompanied that law stated that official time is of mutual interest to both the agency and the labor organization. Part of that law's original intent was that a recognized Federal employee union was required to represent both union and non-union employees. So, Federal unions represent all Federal employees at their designated agencies, and membership in a Federal employee union is 100 percent voluntary. That was also codified. That is still the case today.

So, this bill would compel labor unions, which are, in fact, private organizations, to perform unpaid representational work on behalf of employees who choose not to be a part of the union and who are often the majority of any given bargaining unit. Official time—let me state this again—can only be used for representational activities and not the internal business of a union. So, representational activities, like creating fair promotional procedures, establishing flexible work hours, setting procedures that protect employees from on-the-job injuries, enforcing protections from unlawful discrimination, and representing employees in grievances and disciplinary actions, are all covered under that.

I think this is a gross overreach, in my opinion, to authorize an agency to terminate the certification of any labor organization. It is workers, not the agency, who chooses who represents them. No agency should have the authority to decertify unions that represent its workers. I would urge Members to vote against this. I yield back any time, Mr. Chair, I have remaining.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition on the Perry bill?

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. I have an amendment, Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER. Yes. OK. Will the clerk report the amendment to the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210, as offered by Mr. Subramanyam of Virginia on behalf of Ms. Stansbury of New Mexico.

Chairman COMER. The amendment to the amendment is considered as read.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia to discuss his amendment to the Perry—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am introducing this amendment today to include our TSA employees and to protect our TSA employees from further attacks by this Administration. TSA employees who keep our communities safe, including at Dallas Airport in my district, and just this month, the Trump Administration revoked collective bargaining rights for transportation security officers. And let me be clear: the Administration's decision to rescind the CBA for 47,000 TSA workers is one of the most anti-worker and anti-union Presidential actions since Ronald Reagan fired striking air traffic controllers in 1981, which is not only dangerous, a dangerous betrayal of our frontline workers, but it also hurts our national security priorities. And this amendment would bring permanent protections for TSA workers and prevent changing Presidential administrations from undercutting our national security.

TSA workers not only ensure that we get to our destinations, but also keep an eye out for dangerous substances, like fentanyl, entering our country. They are also on the front lines of watching for and often intervening in cases of human trafficking and attacks on TSA workers make us all less safe in the process. To all the TSA workers in my district and across the country, thank you for your service, thank you for keeping us safe, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Member seek recognition?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—yes, sir.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment. This bill is just another attempt to undermine a statutory right to official time that is afforded to Federal employees under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. That Act is reflective of labor relations framework that was collectively established by some pre-eminent American labor laws that preceded it: the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and Taft-Hartley of 1947. Developed against the background of labor strife that occurred across industries nationwide, these statutes codify the enduring principle that union representation promotes workplace efficiency. Those laws also evidence the intention of Congress to balance the need—that is the key word here—to balance the need for economic productivity with the importance of preserving and protecting the rights of employees to fair terms and conditions of employment.

The Civil Service Reform Act recognizes the right of Federal employees to form and join a labor organization and engage in collective bargaining over the conditions of their employment through their elected representatives. And it authorizes Federal employees to use official time that is granted by management based on the consent of management and labor that that time is reasonable, it is necessary, and it serves the public interest. Those are the standards upon which the agency time is measured, and those activities must be in the joint interest of labor and management.

At the same time, the Civil Service Reform Act includes an express prohibition on striking and expressly provides that while Federal employees may request official time, Federal managers and supervisors retain exclusive authority over whether or not to approve official time requests, so that is really, really important. People seem to forget that we in government made an agreement with our Federal employees. We said your work is so important, so important to the country, that we are going to take away your right to strike. So, whatever you think about the way you are being treated as a Federal employee, you were stripped of that right by Congress, but as part of that contract, that agreement, was that we would preserve in every respect your ability to grieve, to use a certain amount of time as Federal employees, and that would be your recourse. That would be your recourse because government thought your job was so important that we had to strip your right to strike.

You cannot put your tools down and walk away, that is what the private sector does. Private sector workers, they can just say, hey,

this job is unsafe and I am not doing it anymore. They can lay their tools down and walk off the job. Federal employees do not have that. They do not have that right. They have got to keep working even if they feel it is unsafe, but they can grieve it. They can file a grievance, and they can take the time necessary, official time, if it is granted by management, to protest the way they are being treated.

So, that is the balance here that was struck in the Civil Service Reform Act, so we are trying to maintain that, and the underlying bill by Mr. Perry is trying to strip that away. And I guess if you want to go back to the point where we did not provide decency and an opportunity for Federal workers, you could also say, OK, let us give them back the right to strike because that is where we started. They had the right to strike, and we had the right to strip away whatever we could. That was the original fight, and that was resolved by the Civil Service Reform Act.

So, I just call on my colleagues, you know, official time by Federal employees is a statutory right, and it is designed to promote agency cost-saving productivity and workplace safety. Federal employees use official time to participate in labor management meetings and they seek to identify ways to improve agency efficiency and workplace safety. That is really, really important, and official time can also be used to address potential employee grievances that could grow into something larger and could negatively affect morale in the workplace. Official time can be used to participate in health and safety programs led by OSHA, which is really important to keep workplaces safe. Official time may not be used to solicit union membership or conduct union activity or meetings or elections or any partisan political activity, and that is right. That is right.

So, I just think that this is a wrongheaded bill, and I support the further amendment. I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition on the Subramanyam amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman 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.]

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

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Chairman, I request 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—

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210, as offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona.

Chairman COMER. The amendment has been considered as read.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the sponsor of this bill, Mr. Perry, for his leadership on this issue. My amendment is simple. It would exempt the Border Patrol Association from the requirements under this legislation, and here is why. While the Biden Administration and DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas took action to undermine border security and facilitate an invasion of at least 10 million illegal aliens into the country over the past 4 years, this Committee had no better friend than the National Border Patrol Council.

When political appointees in the Biden-Mayorkas Department of Homeland Security stonewalled oversight requests from this Committee and from Members like me, the National Border Patrol Council provided us with an unfiltered look into the chaos. The National Border Patrol Council took principled public stances in opposition to Joe Biden's reckless policies from the very first week of his Administration, where they outlined concerns with the Administration's removal of the successful migrant protection protocols. When Members of Congress, including Members of this Committee, traveled to the Southwest border to conduct oversight and DHS slow walked requests for briefings or facilities tours, it was the National Border Patrol Council who met with us and provided us an unfurnished look into the Biden border crisis.

If you have traveled to the border with me over the past 4 years, and there have been more than 5 dozen Members of Congress who have, you have met past and present leaders of the National Border Patrol Council who were instrumental in ensuring that we could see the impact of the Biden border crisis, and they could hear how the decisions of President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas created that crisis. When the President of the United States, his White House staff, and Secretary Mayorkas lied to the American people about the border crisis—for instance, about the so-called whipping incident, about the Biden Administration's pursuit of policies that rewarded illegal immigration, about their culpability for eliminating the secure border that President Biden inherited and more—the National Border Patrol Council issued public statements calling out those lies.

The National Border Patrol Council published data and provided data to Members of this Committee showing how the Biden Administration broke the border and made our country less safe. They highlighted specific policies that put Border Patrol agents and the communities they serve in greater danger. And when President Biden began to cave to public pressure in the summer of an election year, the National Border Patrol Council highlighted publicly how a so-called solution was nothing more than a shell game that pushed the masses of illegal immigrants to enter the country through flights and CBP One app appointments at ports of entry rather than by crossing the border illegally and encountering Border Patrol. They had one hiccup in that 4 years: they supported the massive stinker of the Senate bill, the Lankford bill, but the rest of the time, they gave us information, went out on the line, and provided us with opportunities to come see the border and see what was really going on.

I support the underlying bill sponsored by my friend, and I intend to vote for its passage, but I also ask that you support my

amendment. The National Border Patrol Council, its leadership, and its members have been integral to the work of this Committee over the past 4 years. They have publicly stood with us, have met with us, and have informed our oversight work.

And Mr. Chairman, I have some unanimous consents I want to read in so we can all remember what they were saying publicly at potential cost to them: January 26, 2021, NBPC, "Migrant Protection Protocols Concerns"; September 21, 2021, the NBPC response to outrageous claims by the Biden Administration; September 24, 2021, NBPC statement on President Biden's Del Rio disaster; November 4, 2021, "Brandon Judd, Dems Plans To Offer Amnesty And Spending Package Will Ramp Up Border Chaos;" November 10, 2021, "Biden Hides as His Administration Considers Rewarding Illegal Immigrants With Your Money;" March 10, 2022, "The Border Crisis Continues;" February 1, 2023, "New CBP Pursuit Policy Encourages Smugglers To Evade;" May 18, 2023, "Border Patrol Monthly Apprehensions, 2012 to present;" May 31, 2023, "CBP nationwide Encounters by Month;" June 6, 2024, "NBPC Statement on President Biden's proclamation."

Mr. Chairman, I ask that those be——

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, and I encourage my colleagues as you consider this amendment to remember where this particular association has been. They have been our friend, and they have fought the unjust border policies, the national security risk of this Administration. That is why I think we should single them out and recognize them. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. Thank you. You know, I do not have any criticism for the gentleman's further amendment. You know, he is trying to carve out an exception for the Border Patrol personnel, and maybe they deserve it. I am not down on the border regularly, but I could understand where he might have a favorite union, but I got some favorite unions. You know, I will start off with postal workers, you know, letter carriers, mail handlers, who go out there 6 days a week to every home and business in America and do their work. And they happen to have the distinction of, for over the past 20 years, they are regarded by the American public as the most trusted and the most valued public servants in all of our government, and they walk away with that award every single year, and now we are trying to privatize them. So, I would like a carveout for my postal workers, letter carriers, mail handlers, you know, supervisors, et cetera.

Another group that I think does tremendous work is the workers at our VA, so about 30 percent, 35 percent, of the workers at our veterans' hospitals are veterans themselves. And talk about giving back, they come out of the military, and they go to work to take care of other veterans who are injured and bear the scars of war. Some of those wounds are visible, some of them are invisible, but they help them all, and they are unbelievable. You know, previously I mentioned that the Inspector General determined that we needed 3,000 more VA workers at our VA hospitals, we needed nurses, we need medical officers at our VA facilities, and then President Trump came in and laid off 2,400 of them, more, so now

we are about 5,400 in the whole. And now we have another directive from the VA to lay off an additional 80,000 workers at the VA, which, if you do the math, it comes out to another 27,000 veterans would be fired.

So, I would like to protect our workers at the VA. They do God's work there—and think about the service that they are providing there. Every single one of those veterans has honorably served, and now it is our responsibility to step up and provide for them, provide for those veterans, and what are we doing? We are cutting the number of people at the VA. That just means it will be a longer and longer wait for veterans to receive care or an appointment or benefits. That is what that amounts to.

Another group I would like to protect as well, carveout that I would like to see, is for our nurses. The nurses are the backbone of our healthcare system. They are sort of the marines of the healthcare system. They do yeoman's work. They are working way too many hours. You can talk to your local nurses at whatever hospital they are at. They are all working way too many hours right now. It is to the point where I worry about their health and their ability to do their jobs. We need them tremendously, so I would like a carveout for the nurses. And then also, and this is not an exhaustive list, but how about teachers? I mean, dear God, is there anybody who has more of a responsibility in protecting the future of this country than the teachers who, you know, spend a whole lot of time with our kids and try to provide the guidance and education that they need so that they can be productive adults and good citizens?

So, I do not discount the gentleman's amendment, which would make a carveout for Border Patrol personnel, but in order to support that amendment, I would have to have those carveouts that I mentioned as well as some others that I did not have time to enlist. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I guess I will yield back. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition on the Biggs amendment? Mr. Sessions.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and I want to thank Mr. Perry not only for his amendment, but I want to stand up and support Mr. Biggs for what he is doing. I think Mr. Perry understands it. He sees it. In this case, the Border Patrol was maligned politically. The discussions that we are having here today about a lot of other Federal employees, I do not believe are maligned on a political basis, at least not to a greater degree by any one party or the other. But the Border Patrol, the men and women, have served this country along our borders, and they are spread out, and sometimes it is a two or three-men operation, sometimes it is a one-man, person, operation, and their ability to effectively communicate with each other is diminished as they do their job. I believe it makes sense to say that they could be treated differently in this case, would not be a part of the legislation, and I believe that they have earned this opportunity because of the success of what they have done.

I think it is also interesting that despite their opposition to what the mandates and things which they were subject to, they served this great Nation most admirably. Their families, they came into

contact with drug cartels, COVID that killed a number of them. I think that the opportunity for them to talk as a union, as a group, is important to spread information about what happens from one end of the border to the other borders. I think that it serves a purpose. I think that union serves a purpose that should be carved out. And notwithstanding Mr. Lynch's arguments about a lot of other people, I think this is different. I think that they need each other. They need the ability to communicate through channels that are open and honest with each other and to express their opinions, and thus, with great respect to Mr. Perry and Mr. Biggs, I will be voting with Mr. Biggs on this amendment. I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Subramanyam.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think the reason why this is different and this union is different, is because it is the only one that supported the President in his election. I am not aware of any other union that endorsed the President. And so, what makes this different is their willingness to support the President and endorse him, and so that is why this amendment is actually happening, in my opinion.

If all the things you said should be applied to TSA, it should be applied to other unions as well that keep us safe and make us a safer country. I mean, I have nothing against, I thank the Border Patrol. We want to support all Federal workers, and CBP is included. So, why do this for all these unions, right? Why are we singling out and exempting CBP? I just think that the case has not been made very sufficiently. What is being made is that this clearly is a favor to the President. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members wish to speak on the Biggs amendment?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir. Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member inquired, like, what is a notable difference between Border Patrol, and we discussed this at length. Because of my background, and I considered Mr. Biggs' amendment, I am going to support it. But my point is we put a great deal of thought into it and discussion, and not one time did any of us discuss the politics of the last election cycle and the cause of the Border Patrol's union support of the President. It was not even in our mind, man, but this is what is real.

The Border Patrol guys are in their units. Like, that is their office. That is a difference from TSA and other agencies. They are in their units in the middle of nowhere. Like, that is your office. As a cop for a long time, patrol officer on night shift, when I would lean back in my seat and look at my ceiling light, it was a dome light of a Crown Victoria or a Tahoe or a Charger. Like, that is your office. So, when you are spread out across 1,954 miles of Southern border, and one of your roles for Border Patrol is that you are communicating and working on union stuff, appropriately according to the law, but in your unit, this is a notable difference and variance from other Federal agencies, including other Federal law enforcement agencies. This is the exception.

But not one time—I mean, it makes an old fellow like me chuckle when the youngsters always indicate that we are always, you

know, considering some Trump factor in the politics when really we do not consider that at all when we are talking about amendments like this in legislation. So, I yield the balance of my time to the bill's author, Mr. Perry.

Mr. BIGGS. Can I have——

Chairman COMER. You yield to Mr. Perry or Mr. Biggs?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield back to the——

Mr. BIGGS. I will take it.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. The underlying bill is what I meant. I thought Mr. Perry wanted to take it. I yield back to the Chair. I yield to Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you for yielding. So, what I want to make clear, which I did not even speak to a moment ago, and, first of all, Mr. Higgins is exactly right. I do not think anybody talked to President Trump about this, even the underlying bill. Nobody talked about it, so it is really kind of a gasp. But here is the deal. Most of the union dudes for CBP that I know and know well and have been on their board, those guys were cutting shifts. They were pulling shifts besides doing their union work. Their union work was off time. They were pulling shifts. I mean, they are a unique union. They are unique people. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to speak—are you going to speak on the amendment, or are you going to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. PERRY. I am going to speak on the amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK. The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and this is one of the very few occasions, maybe it is the only occasion, that I would differ from my colleague from Arizona, Mr. Biggs. I would just put it this way. You know, I am like every other Member here. I come into contact with Federal employees, whether that is at the TSA, at your mailbox, at the VA. They are great people. Almost every single one you meet is dedicated to their job. I get that it is different being a postal carrier, vastly different than being on the border dealing with cartel members who will shoot at you, knife you in the back and leave you in the desert. I mean, vastly different.

But I also come from an organization of standards. We either have a standard or we do not. And I can already tell, and I am sure my friend, Mr. Biggs, can tell, too, well, if we are going to do it for one, then let us do it for all. Then what is the point of this whole exercise? And I think it is awesome that they are pulling shifts and meeting afterward to do their organizing activity. Then this should not affect them. You know, this does not diminish anyone's care, Democrat, Republican, Independent, on this Committee or any other one's affinity for the people that work in the Federal workforce that are dedicated to their job.

But we also know, and I must disagree with the gentlelady from the other side of the aisle regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs. I think she said there were 4 hours used in 1 year. Well, according to OPM, on the last year that we took records or kept records, bargaining unit employees was 324,105. 324,000 bargaining unit employees. So, you are working at the VA, who knows what your job is? But 324,000 of them are doing bargaining unit work. It is just the reality of the circumstance.

Now, I appreciate my very good friend Andy Biggs. He says, you know, if the amendment does not pass, he is going to vote for the bill, and I would say if the amendment is going to pass, I am going to vote for the bill too. I appreciate his probably more in-depth knowledge of this circumstance than most of us here, but I do think that we ought to have a standard for Federal employees so that the taxpayer money is not abused, and it has been a recipe for abuse.

Like I said, I am an individual who has visited the VA. By the way, the most successful, the least scandal-ridden, the most productive VA in the country, which is located in Lebanon, Pennsylvania. But I will remind everybody here that the Department of Veterans Affairs, and this is just one—I have got the whole list here—has 324,000 people working for the union. They are not delivering care. They are not there waiting for you to walk in to say, sir/ma'am, how can I help direct you to get the care that you need because the VA is big and confusing? They are working on this other stuff, and there is a whole lot of that going on across the Federal Government, and the taxpayers are paying for that, and that not only does not seem right to me, I know it is not right.

And so, I have got to continue on my mission here and very respectfully disagree with my friend from Arizona, try and maintain a standard here by which everybody can follow and that does not carve out special exceptions. Everybody believes that they are doing the right thing when they are working at the Federal Government or wherever they are working. That is why they are there, and their job is important to them, and the job that they do is important to us, whether it is on the border, whether it is at TSA, the VA, or the Postal Service. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields. Any other Members seek recognition on the Biggs Amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none—now, Mr. Perry, do you seek recognition on amendment to amendment or not?

Mr. PERRY.

[Inaudible.]

Chairman COMER. You have to do the amendment on the amendment before the amendment is voted on.

So, Mr. Perry? Mr. Perry, do you seek to call your amendment to the Biggs Amendment?

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman—

Chairman COMER. Wait. If you do, we will ask her to record it.

Mr. PERRY. I have an amendment at the desk, a secondary amendment.

Chairman COMER. All right. Will the clerk please report?

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Now, the Chair recognizes Mr. Perry to discuss his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. This is a pretty simple amendment. This amendment would codify the Biggs Amendment at such time where the Secretary of Homeland Secu-

rity certified that the Department had completed 100 percent of the construction of the wall on the Southern border. So, the Biggs Amendment would be in place and there would be a special exception for the Border Patrol once the Secretary of Homeland Security certified that the Department had completed 100 percent of the construction of the wall at the Southern border. With that, I yield the balance.

Chairman COMER. All right. The gentleman yields back. Do any—

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that Members on this side of the aisle have a copy of the amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK. You have electronic copies. We will also make sure you have this here.

Mr. BIGGS. They are similar but different on the last line, and, Mr. Chairman, when—

Chairman COMER. I will give you all a minute to read it. It is a brief one.

All right. It is not like the thousand-page CR. Yes, that is right.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs to speak on Mr. Perry's amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. Thank you. So, may I inquire of the amendment to the amendments to another amendment's sponsor a question? Would Mr. Perry yield to a question?

Mr. PERRY. I certainly will.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you. I respect what you are trying to do here. In your opinion, what is 100 percent of the construction of the wall on the Southern border?

Mr. PERRY. It is what had been outlined in the original plan for the complete construction of the border wall in the—not the last Administration, but the Administration previous to that.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I do not know where that was codified anywhere, and there was always question with regard to the river, so I guess that is what I am asking. Where—

Mr. PERRY. I do not think we were planning on putting the wall in the river.

Mr. BIGGS. But we were talking about putting it next to the river. Now they are talking about sticking buoys in the river. I guess I am trying to figure out how do you define "100 percent?"

Mr. PERRY. Well, that is fair for the amendment, but as it says, the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies, so it would be up to Secretary Noem to certify.

Mr. HIGGINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIGGS. OK. Yes, I will to you, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. I would say, respectful of Mr. Perry's second-degree amendments to your amendment, is essentially, it would be difficult to define 100 percent completion of the wall. I have the legislation to Build the Wall Act.

Mr. PERRY. Right.

Mr. HIGGINS. And, by definition, building the wall and continuing reconstruction and improvement and enhancement of the existing wall never ends. So, I am strictly responding to your query of how do you identify a hundred percent? At least in debate and discussion of my legislation, we discussed what does completion of the

wall mean, and there was an understanding that it would never be a cessation of improvement and modernization of the wall. It would just continue in stages as long as you had a Congress that would support it and an executive branch that would execute the authorization and the appropriations for said purpose. So, I am conflicted on this second-degree amendment. I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you. That was my next point is, I know, like, for instance, if you were to go down to Del Rio, you got holes right, and those holes include Conex containers, right? I know that the Cocopah Reservation is eight miles that, because it is tribal land, they refuse to allow us to build fencing. I know that the Toho O'odham has 62 linear miles of border. They will not let us build a fence, 62 linear miles, and so you will never finish that part. But the other aspect to it, too, is down near Sasabe, we have got a full-time contractor that all they do is repair holes in the fence that are being cut because right on the Southern border, there is a highway, and the coyotes use that highway, and they will go and they will cut that hole, and they will get bodies in as fast as they can, and then here comes the contractor has to fill it up. I am struggling with the definition that you have here, and I will yield you some time so you can respond.

Mr. PERRY. I appreciate you yield to me. So, it says very clearly here, the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the Department has completed 100 percent of the construction of the wall on the Southern border. It does not say maintains it. It does not say enhances it. It does not say rebuilds it, makes it better.

Mr. BIGGS. Can I—

Mr. PERRY. Reclaim.

Mr. BIGGS. That is it. I want to reclaim for just a sec. So, if someone comes down, as they were doing, takes down a 4-foot bollard fencing area, have they completed the construction because they had it up there, but now it has been taken down?

Mr. PERRY. If the Secretary certifies it as so, it does, and I would say, look, once you build something, definitionally, you have built it. If somebody else destroys it, it does not mean you did not build it. It does not mean also that you do not have to repair it.

But it is pretty clear here what this says, at least it is clear to me.

Chairman COMER. All right. Any other discussion on the Perry Amendment to the amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry.

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, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BIGGS. I ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. You ask for one? OK. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Now, they have just called votes. Do you want to keep going? What do you want to do? They have called votes, so.

If it is OK, Mr. Perry, Mr. Biggs, since they have called votes, we are going to recess until 10 minutes after votes are concluded, and then we will come back and reconvene. Is that OK with everyone? Everyone good with that? Mr. Mfume? All right.

The Committee stands in recess until 10 minutes after the conclusion of the last vote.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come back to order. We are going to suspend debate on H.R. 1210 until a few more Members come back, and we are going to skip ahead to H.R. 2249, with ANS.

So, our next item for consideration is H.R. 2249, the Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act. The clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 2249, a bill to amend Chapter 71 of Title 5, United States Code, to provide that the President may unilaterally modify collective bargaining agreements entered into under such chapter, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should 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 designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2249, 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 bill and the amendment.

Federal employee unions focus on advancing the interest of government employees who belong to the union at the expense of government management and mission achievement. Collective bargaining agreements, or CBAs, are negotiated by Federal employee unions and frequently result in civil service policies that prevent poorly performing Federal employees from being held accountable and conflict with the policy priorities of newly elected Presidents. For instance, the outgoing Biden-Harris Administration finalized long-term CBAs with Federal employee unions in an attempt to limit President Trump's management authority. In these CBAs, the Biden-Harris Administration made unprecedented concessions, including guaranteeing telework for Federal bureaucrats. Specifically, outgoing Social Security Administration Chief, Martin O'Malley, approved an agreement with the American Federation of Government Employees that seeks to lock in minimum telework levels for 42,000 Social Security Administration employees until 2029. The agreement was finalized on November 27, 2024, just days before O'Malley stepped down from his job at the SSA. This highlights everything problematic about Federal sector collective bargaining, agreements that tie the hands of future executive branch policymakers.

A duly elected President should not be constrained by a Union deal with Federal employees made by the prior Administration on the way out. This bill, the Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act, would ensure that a duly elected President is not bound by CBAs negotiated under the previous Administration. CBAs cannot run counter to Federal law, including newly passed statutes. This bill reform will also ensure that the CBAs cannot counter presidential policy, including executive orders and presidential memorandums.

I thank Mr. Cloud from Texas for his leadership in preparing this new legislation for the Committee's consideration. These are necessary and reasonable reforms. I urge my colleagues to support the Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act. I now recognize Ms. Crockett for her opening statement.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act is simply another effort by Republicans in Congress to attack and attempt to eliminate Federal Government unions. The bill would specify that an incoming President may terminate provisions of public sector collective bargaining agreements, or CBAs, signed prior to the President's term of office. In doing so, it would give the President unilateral authority to terminate any provision of a CBA that the President does not like.

I remind my colleagues that collective bargaining agreements are legally binding agreements, and the President already has the power to renegotiate provisions of CBAs based on new management priorities. For example, if the President signs an executive order to change telework policies, he or she already has the power to renegotiate a CBA provision relating to telework flexibilities, even if it is bad policy. The bill also provides the President or an agency head unilateral authority to render any provision of a CBA unenforceable simply because they deem it in conflict with an executive order or presidential memorandum.

Perhaps, for example, the National Border Patrol Council entered into a collective bargaining agreement with the Federal Government, which included a provision requiring periodic rest breaks for agents and personnel when working in extreme heat and humidity. If the Secretary of Homeland Security stated in an Agency memorandum that they no longer believe in providing workplace health and safety programs, those Border Patrol agents and personnel, with one swipe of a pen would have their rest breaks taken away. This is just one example of an alarming effort by congressional Republicans to take away the voices and rights of Federal workers. As President Trump and his Administration attempt to consolidate power in the executive branch, the American public must be reassured that the President and his agency heads are not above the law.

Federal unions do not have the power to terminate any provision of a CBA they dislike, and they certainly do not have power over private sector unions either. This concept for this legislation was raised by Republicans in a hearing earlier this year on the Trump Administration's effort to dismantle our government. Republicans used the hearing to push a conspiracy theory that the Biden Administration saddled the Trump administration with collective bargaining agreements that would tie President Trump's hands. The

hearing exposed that conspiracy and laid bare the fact that the collective bargaining agreement in question was previously negotiated by the Trump Administration and extended far into the Biden Administration. So, what the Majority has done is invent a problem and use it as justification for an executive branch power grab.

This legislation would have extremely alarming implications for Americans employed by the Federal Government and is, put simply, a public sector union busting effort. I oppose this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Any other Member seek recognition? Well, do we have any on this side, first? Oh, I am sorry. I recognize the sponsor of the bill, the most important person on the bill, Mr. Cloud from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Well, thank you, Chairman. Certainly not the most important person, but I would like to speak to the bill, and thank you for your words at the beginning. I appreciate it. This is an important bill, something that needs to be done.

The Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act would ensure that the duly elected President is not bound by collective bargaining agreements negotiated under a previous Presidential administration. This is important, and we can see most recently that in the last days of the Joe Biden presidency, his Administration worked around the clock to saddle President Trump with onerous collective bargaining agreements. As you mentioned, Chairman, for example, in December 2024, a month before Trump was to take office, the Social Security Administration Commissioner, Martin O'Malley, signed a collective bargaining agreement to lock in pandemic-era telework policies for 42,000 Federal employees, oddly, until 2029, the entire duration of President Trump's term. Again, on January 17, 2025, 3 days before Trump was to take office, the Department of Education signed a collective bargaining agreement with AFGE until 2030. Even *Politico* ran an article titled, "The Feds Race to Ink Union Deals That Last Beyond Trump," which documented CBAs and negotiations with the EPA, National Park Service, Federal Regulatory Commission, and the Bureau of Land Management.

It is not just telework that is the issue. As we have established in other committee hearings, these unions that have been negotiating these CBAs have demonstrated a clear political bias. AFGE, the largest Federal union workforce, has donated over \$3 million to PACs since the 2020 cycle. Of that total, 95 percent went to Democrats. AFGE also endorsed Kamala Harris for President, which they certainly had the right to do, but it is notable that in 2020 they endorsed Biden, 2016 they endorsed Hillary, 2012 and 2008, they endorsed President Barack Obama, so we are seeing a trend here. This is a political organization that is as much as it is a union for our workforce. Additionally, the National Treasury Employees Union has donated over \$700,000 to PACs in the 2020 cycle. Almost 99 percent of the money was given to Democrat organizations.

It is clear we need a solution to these midnight CBAs, which only serve to ensnare President Trump and his agenda. My bill allows any incoming President to terminate any provision of a CBA and nullifies provisions of a CBA which conflict with rule, executive

order, or presidential memorandum. This bill ensures that existing CBAs do not conflict with any incoming presidential policy. And, ultimately, this really comes down to the fact that elections matter, and the Article II of our Constitution gives an executive, the President of the United States, the authority to execute the laws of the land and to administer his administration. And so, it is important that no previous President, regardless of if I like the policies of that President or not, be encumbered by a previous President's contracts and agreements with the Federal workforce. And so, this bill seeks to amend that and ensure that any incoming President has the ability to revisit those contracts and to renegotiate them if necessary. And thank you, Chairman, for the time and for your consideration of this bill in Committee markup today, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. I thank the sponsor of the bill. He yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch, then we will go to Mr. Biggs.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just as someone who has negotiated collective bargainings for a living, I just want to point out that this would put both the government and the contracting party, in this case the unions, at a severe disadvantage. As we all know, sometimes it takes years to negotiate a contract with a large labor union, unfortunately, because of the rights involved and the number of employees involved. So, it is quite common that an administration, such as the Trump Administration, might need 18 months or 2 years to negotiate a contract with a government employee union.

What this would do would be to basically abrogate the Fifth Amendment rights to have their contract rights respected and also to attain due process in the abrogation of those rights. It is the nature of our government that when administrations change, we oftentimes have a new view that comes into play, especially when the administration changes from either a Republican to a Democrat or from a Democrat to a Republican administration. This amendment is totally unworkable in terms of trying to create some predictability for the government that would also respect the rights of the employees involved. To have the President of the United States and Congress, you know, approve a contract with the labor union, and then because of the vagaries of a next election, have that completely blown up is, you know, a complete destruction of the rights that are embodied in that that contract. So, you know, well, the bill is confusing and unworkable from a practical aspect, and it would effectively render all collective bargaining agreements meaningless. In other words, you have a contract until we say you do not. That is what this bill does.

Bargaining involves negotiation. It involves compromise by all parties. A lot of times those employees are locked into very low wage increases over 4 or 5 years, and so by adopting this bill, you would deny the government of that advantage that they have gained through negotiations and executing an agreement with that union. It implies that you are just taking the rights away from the union. You are actually taking rights away from the government itself, from losing the advantage that might be gained in a collective bargaining agreement of multiple years with the particular union. You know, as I said, bargaining involves negotiation. It involves compromise by all parties, resulting in a signed contract

that balances those interests. By design, no one is necessarily happy with all the terms of a collective bargaining agreement. This bill will result in management being able to subvert a new management, so a party not party to the original contract can come in and just tear that up, even though it was signed, you know, by a person of authority and valid when executed. After the fact, it could be simply negated, simply by obtaining a new presidential order, so this bill is an affront to the basic principles of contract law.

And remember, in that collective bargaining agreement, we restate that those employees do not have the right to strike. They do not have the right to stop work. They are bound by that agreement and by statute. This rewriting of the law would negate all those rights that protect the employees and the union within that agreement, but also the predictability and the advantage gained by the taxpayer as well. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Yield back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. OK. Does anyone else want to speak on the Cloud bill? All right.

Ms. CROCKETT. I think we have got one.

Chairman COMER. We will halt on that.

Ms. CROCKETT. On the amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK. Go ahead.

Mr. CASAR. Chairman, this bill at its core is about giving the President the authority to try to screw over workers in the middle of a contract. We do not have a bill here before us today to give the President the authority to go and change contracts with big businesses that do business with the government because those are the big businesses that fund so many of my Republican colleagues' campaigns. But what you are looking at right here is a bill to come and tell frontline employees that even though they bargained and organized and did all this work to be able to win a set of wages and benefits and working conditions, that the Republican Majority wants to be able to come and undercut those working conditions for those workers.

Look, in a private company, it has been the law of the land for nearly a hundred years that if you organize a union, you organize and come to a collective bargaining agreement, that if a new owner comes in and buys the company, those workers should have the right to continue to have their wages and working conditions honored in their collective bargaining agreements. And so it makes no sense why here we would just give a President the authority, not because there is a particular problem identified, just to give the President carte blanche authority to come in and change terms and conditions for workers that have already been organized, that have already been agreed to, that have already been bargained for, and not say, well, why don't we take a look at the way that we are being overcharged in some of these contracts.

But, you know, there would be a whole uprising of corporate lobbyists and special interest groups here before us today if we said we are going to go take a look at the way the Big Pharma is overcharging Medicare and Medicaid. You know, we would have a whole fleet of people. But instead, the Republican Majority says we

are going to go pick on working people, go pick on workers, whether in the public or in the private sector.

And so, I know that President Trump has gone out campaigning saying that he is for the working person, but these first drafts of bills in the Oversight Committee, they do not seem to be about actually saving people money. They seem to be about going and, you know, picking on working people that have negotiated their contracts. And I just do not see how the Republican Party can claim to be the party of working people while they are going out of their way to screw over workers in this way. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back his time. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Biggs, seek recognition?

Mr. BIGGS. I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. SESSIONS. The clerk will distribute the amendment to all the Members. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2249, as offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona.

Mr. SESSIONS. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment would exempt the Border Patrol from the particulars of this legislation. I want to indicate and remind people that this underlying bill, and I respect the bill's sponsor, actually is dealing with the change with elections and is permissive, not mandatory.

So, in 2018, President Trump issued an executive order ensuring transparency, accountability, and efficiency in taxpayer-funded union time use. It instructed Federal agencies to renegotiate the collective bargaining agreements and cutoff time saying that "executive branch employees should spend their duty hours performing the work of the Federal Government and serving the public." In November 2019, a new collective bargaining agreement for the Border Patrol Council took effect with President Trump's support. The agreement expanded the number of border agents whose roles as union officers allow them to engage in political activity and increase the amount of hours agents could spend on union activities.

Under the previous agreement, agents could utilize 18,000 hours of official time per year, and under the new agreement, they can utilize 153,000 hours per year. That is equivalent of roughly 74 full-time employees. While union representatives generally use official time hours to work on employee grievances and other labor-related matter, they can also advocate for specific border policies, and that is what they did under the previous Administration, and they did that because the previous administration destroyed our border security policies. So, consider how beneficial that time was under the Biden Administration. It turned out to be serendipitous actually.

For instance, the NBPC assisted with several trips to the border for Members of Congress. The NBPC officials were on TV constantly during the Biden Administration telling the truth to the public about the border crisis. Were it not for them and a select few

dedicated reporters, the world would not have known how bad it was. The NBPC defended the Border Patrol Agent who was falsely accused of whipping Haitian migrants in Texas. Amid a rise in assaults on Border Patrol Agents, 601 in Fiscal Year 2023 and over 400 in Fiscal Year 2024, the NBPC has defended agents by calling out the Biden Administration for insufficient action. And one more, following the May 2022 Uvalde shooting, in which Border Patrol agents, including BORTAC, were among the first responders, the NBPC provided the emotional counseling and professional support to agents and the community. So, that is important here.

But the other thing that is important to understand about this particular union is they were the only group under DHS that was not getting paid overtime and got no raises. And in the NDAA of 2023, the NDAA included provisions spearheaded by NBPC, which I supported via other legislation, to allow agents to earn time-and-a-half for overtime hours, 81 to 100 in a pay period, which they otherwise were not getting.

This association has been uniquely positioned, and I want to just talk about something that one of my colleagues, in the previous iteration, a previous argument, was talking about. These agents are in places that were so remote you could not reach anyone, and I have met with agents who were attacked, assaulted, seriously injured in these places where no one else is and no one else goes. Other times I have been with agents who have literally had to stand on top of the roof of their truck to try to reach a signal to report to other agents to please come pick up a group. That particular group, that time there was 22 people. I have literally been with agents when there have been groups totaling 300 people together, and it has been me, a couple of Congressmen, and one agent as they deal with 300 individuals coming in.

I have respect for what they do. I think they deserve this cutout, and that is why I am doing it. I also support the underlying bill. I have great respect for Mr. Cloud and his efforts in this area. He has been a leader here, but that is where I stand. I thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes, yes, Casar.

Mr. CASAR. Chair, well, first of all, I would say to Mr. Biggs and to the point of this amendment, I certainly support the Border Patrol agents' CBAs to be respected and, also, am, of course, alarmed by the dangers that agents face, and, of course, by any violence against any Federal employee or Federal agent. My question for the sponsor of the amendment, I really am interested in having some discussion on this point, is why not also include other people who put their lives at risk that work for the Federal Government?

I was just in conversation with Federal employees that literally fly a plane into a hurricane at NOAA to go and let us know when and where a hurricane is going to hit. It is probably the most dangerous job on earth. Shouldn't we extend and make sure that their workplace protections and their workplace contracts have to be respected? Shouldn't FBI agents who also put their lives on the line have their CBA agreements respected? Shouldn't our veterans, who have served and then come back and serve at the DoD and a variety of other agencies, also have their collective bargaining agree-

ments also protected for the reasons, in fact, where I actually genuinely do agree here with Congressman Biggs, that if we are going to respect that work, why would we come in and say we are going to not respect the collective bargaining agreement where you have, in good faith, bargained back and forth to the government and come to an agreement? And so that is my genuine question, and I have time to yield back to the sponsor of the amendment or anybody else that would answer that.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair—

Mr. CASAR. No, no, I would yield. I am saying I would yield to anybody that has that answer. In a moment I am going to yield to Mr. Lynch, but I want to better understand, if we are going to, as I believe we should, honor the collective bargaining agreements of Border Patrol Agents, why not also honor the collective bargaining agreements of FBI agents? Why not also honor the collective bargaining agreements of Department of Defense workers that have served in our military? Why not also honor the collective bargaining agreements of people that put their lives on the line to protect us from natural disasters.

[No response.]

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman, without a response, I will yield a minute here to Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Great. I agree with the gentleman's reasoning. Not only is there a sense of fairness at play here, but there is also the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment. So, we cannot have a situation where the constitutional right to contract is unprotected for these unions because we have a new President and so he can just rip up the contract and say, OK, your rights are destroyed, and we are going to start fresh and I am going to negotiate an agreement that probably could be overturned by the next President. You know, that does not work, not for workers in the least bit, so.

Mr. CASAR. And Mr. Lynch, it sounded like part of the reason the amendment was laid out was because one union supported one political cause or candidate versus another.

Mr. LYNCH. Exactly.

Mr. CASAR. And so, you would see that as a violation of equal treatment under the law, equal right to contract because it sounds like, the sponsor laid out, one of the unions that supported one candidate for President, another union that supported a different candidate for President, and wanting to respect the contracting rights for people that supported their preferred candidate versus not.

Mr. LYNCH. Exactly. It allows a political dimension to this that is inappropriate. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. CASAR. Chairman, and now we have the sponsor of the amendment back, and so I would genuinely yield time to him, if that is allowed here. I want to voice my support for allowing CBAs to carry on for all of the different people at all the different agencies that put their lives on the line for the American people. So, I would want to extend this to FBI agents, to people that fly their planes into the heart of the storm at NOAA. I just want to get a better understanding because what I just laid out with Mr. Lynch is, it sounds like we want to treat certain people one way because of their political views and other people another way because of their views, and I am opposed to that and I will continue to be op-

posed to that whether there is a Democratic or Republican President. So, I want to better understand why not extend this to the other Federal employees that put their lives at risk every day. Chairman, I still have some time, so I do not know if the sponsor of the amendment or others would want to speak up.

Mr. BIGGS. I think I made my position very clear in both the earlier amendment that I ran and my statement with this amendment, and I will just tell you, most of those agencies that you just referred to, they were not being attacked by their bosses, their administrators. CBP was.

Mr. CASAR. And Mr. Biggs, I would work with you and anyone else to make sure that workers are not attacked by administrators, no matter which presidential candidate or whichever Presidential administration we are under. And we should support the free speech rights of those employees regardless of whether they agree with my preferred candidate or not, but it sounds like what we are talking about now is giving people certain rights because they had certain political ideas instead of others, and I believe American workers have the right to speak up whether they agree with me or not. Unfortunately, it sounds like the Republican Majority thinks otherwise.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek—Mr. Cloud?

Mr. CLOUD. As much as respect as I have for Mr. Biggs, I speak in opposition to this amendment. I agree with Mr. Biggs and everything he said about our Border Patrol. I have been to the border with Mr. Biggs, and, also, I am from South Texas, so I have been there on my own a number of times. And it is true the work they do is heroic, and it is also true that they were unfairly treated by the previous Administration. However, for similar reasons, I should say, that Mr. Lynch and Mr. Casar brought up, I think we run into dangerous grounds when there is a very good chance that the Border Patrol Union is my favorite union. But I think that is the point, is we should be treating them all fairly, and this comes down to really the question of does the executive have the authority to be the executive and to manage his workforce or her workforce if the time comes. And so that is simply what it is, and so I think it is a dangerous precedent to start making caveats. And for that, I must oppose this amendment, and I thank the Chairman for the time and yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none. The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment—

Mr. BIGGS. Request a recorded vote.

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

Now we are going to resume H.R. 1210, Mr. Perry's amendment to Mr. Biggs' amendment in the nature of a substitute. Mr. Perry? OK. You have another amendment? Yes, I think we have already done the first one. Now we are going to do the second one.

Will the clerk please report the Perry Amendment 2 to the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment Number 2, offered by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania, to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment shall be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This, again, is another quarter page amendment, but the operative portion of the amendment essentially says, or does say, "shall not apply to any employees working in a sector of the border in which more than one pound of fentanyl has been seized in the past 12 months," and so, again, the Biggs Amendment would apply under that provision. If they were able to stop everything other than 1 pound of fentanyl in the 12 months preceding, then the Biggs Amendment would apply at that time. And, you know, some people would say, well, that is unrealistic. That is impossible. We just cannot give up. And look, we appreciate these folks and we have all the confidence in the world in them. If they are on the line, if they are out on the border, that that will be a reality that can be realized.

Look, that is where we want to head, right? That is exactly where we want to be. We want to stop all of the fentanyl. We are tired of Americans dying at the hands of Chinese fentanyl trafficked across the southern border. And it is my feeling that these folks that work for Border Patrol are the ones that can stop it, and we want to provide the incentive for them to stop it as well, not that they do not want to do it anyhow, just as a course of their job is the right thing to do, is the right thing for America, but this is an added bonus or a perk, if you will, for excellent work and for reaching the milestone that we all seek.

And so, I do not want to give up. I do not want to think it cannot be done. I want to believe it can be done, and if it is done, then Mr. Biggs' amendment and the language therein would be in order and in force. And with that, I yield the balance.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition? The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With appropriate adulation and respect, I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and let me explain why. When you talk about operational control, that is actually a statutorily defined term, and in the statute, it says "no person," "no contraband." Nothing enters illegally into the country. There happens to be places that even now, it is the most secure in my lifetime, the border is right now, but you actually have places that have nothing there. You have 62 linear miles on the TO reservation. I mean, you cannot put enough personnel there because we are not allowed to put adequate fencing and infrastructure. You have got the Cocopah. That is eight miles. That is a little

easier because it is only eight miles and you are coming right into the agricultural district of Arizona and Yuma. But the point is, I do not know that you can talk to anybody other than Alejandro Mayorkas, who still thinks that he had operational control of the border, and really come to understand that operational control is an idealized statutory goal.

And with all due respect to my friend, I think he knows that if any one of his three amendments were to go onto my amendment, it would actually defang and almost render my amendment a nullity. And with that—

Mr. PERRY. You said “almost.”

Mr. BIGGS. That is because I never know. Just like operational control is hundred percent.

Mr. PERRY. I did not say operational control.

Mr. BIGGS. What did you say?

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, what the amendment says is no more than 1 pound of fentanyl in the past 12 months.

Mr. BIGGS. Excuse me. I am sorry. I will reclaim. I was anticipating your next amendment, which is operational control. With this amendment, with fentanyl, right now it is almost impossible to stop. Well, it otherwise would be impossible, quite frankly, and you are going to get more than a pound of fentanyl. We see that even now. We have had some of the biggest drug busts in history, and we are nowhere near there, and I think the gentleman knows that, Mr. Chairman. And so, with that, I will respectfully have to oppose his secondary amendment.

Chairman COMER. Any other requests to speak?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the Perry amendment to the amendment.

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, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BIGGS. Request 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. Perry, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have one last secondary amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment considered is read, and Mr. Perry is recognized.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is another quarter page of which the operative terminology is, “The Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the Department has hundred percent operation control over the southern border and northern border of the United States.” Now, my good friend, and I mean that

sincerely, will say, well, that is impossible. Well, I do not think it is impossible. I think Secretary Mayorkas said we had operational control, so it is not impossible for the Secretary to certify it, certainly.

And shouldn't we be swinging for the fences here? This is the standard by which we want to attain, and while it is the lowest point that it has been certainly in 4 years, maybe in 20 years, are you saying there is no room for improvement? I do not think my colleague would say that. So, we should try to get to, and we should demand that we get to, operational control of the southern border. Other countries do it, and if other countries do it, are we saying that our fine men and women wearing the uniform on the border cannot meet the challenge? I do not believe that at all. I think they can meet the challenge. I think we should expect them to. I think the American people do expect it, and, again, it would be a further incentive.

And once again, if the Secretary certified that we had operational control, then my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Biggs, his amendment would be in order. The policy would be in order, and everybody apparently would be happy, including me, so hundred percent operational control seems like a reasonable agreement for both of us. So, with that, I will yield the balance and urge adoption.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I respectfully oppose, and I did elaborate on what operational control of the border is statutorily. So, I want to just nitpick, just a tich, at my good friend's bill. One hundred percent operational control is a redundancy because operational control in the statute requires perfection. Perfection. So, let us think of some of the borders that I have been told, oh, these guys are great, they have absolute operational control.

Hungary, I was told Hungary does. No, Hungary does not. They still have folks coming in. Now, what do they do when they get them in? They try to get them out, right? They are going to remove them. That is different than having hundred percent operational control. Also, I think of some of the authoritarian nations. I think of China. China does not. Oddly enough, there are some people that are trying to get into China, but they do not have operational control. That is why I was going to say North Koreans. North Koreans are very successful in some respects in getting into China. They do not have operational control. I do not know of a nation that has operational control the way we define statutorily.

And so, again, what happens here is you make my amendment a nullity, moot, ab initio, and that I understand, and I respect my colleague for his efforts to do so. But I would encourage everyone to understand, I have expressed the reasons why I think that the Border Patrol Council should receive an exception to the underlying bill. But this notion of operational control, it is not just a notion, it is a statute. They are obliged to get there. Maybe 1 day they will, but it may not be in my lifetime. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment to the amendment, offered by Mr. Perry. This is Perry Amendment 3.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. BIGGS. Request a recorded vote.

Mr. PERRY. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. OK. Both Perry and Biggs request a recorded vote. A recorded vote is ordered.

All right. Our next item for consideration is H.R. 2174, the Paycheck Protection Act. The clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 2174, the Paycheck Protection Act, a bill to amend Title 5 United States Code to provide that agencies may not deduct labor organization dues from the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should 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, please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174, 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 recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

Recent years have shown a growing public appetite for civil service reforms to enhance government efficiency and bring accountability to the Federal workforce. These priorities culminated in President Trump's second election and his ensuing efforts at streamlining the Federal Government. Fortunately, we now have a chief executive who is determined to see his mission through. However, a primary obstacle to effective Presidential management of the executive branch are Federal employee labor unions whose mission is often to protect their existence at the expense of the American taxpayer. A common tactic for these partisan organizations is to push legal accommodations to put their memberships on autopilot. Currently, Federal law provides that employing agencies are responsible for withholding union dues from Federal employee union member paychecks. It should not be the responsibility of the Federal agency resources to facilitate public sector union membership dues collection, which is why I support Mr. Burlison from Missouri's bill to remedy this problem.

The Paycheck Protection Act prohibits Federal agencies from collecting dues from Federal employees' paychecks on behalf of labor unions. I thank Mr. Burlison for his leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. [Presiding]. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Like a few of the bills that we are considering today, the Paycheck Protection Act is simply an anti-worker and anti-union bill. The bill would prohibit Federal agencies, including the U.S. Postal Service, from deducting labor union dues, fees, or contributions from employee pay, and current law requires agencies to deduct union dues upon receiving a request from an employee to do so. And that is because Congress recognized in the Civil Service Reform Act that, "Labor organizations and collective bargaining in the civil service are in the public interest," but apparently, times have changed, and this bill is simply a swipe at Federal unions.

And payroll deduction costs the government nothing, actually, to administer. They occur electronically, just like other voluntary payroll deductions, such as the combined Federal campaign, tax withholding, and contributions to the Thrift Saving Program. So, I oppose the bill and urge all Members to join me. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Member—oh, the Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison, the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee. I am here to support the Paycheck Protection Act, H.R. 2174. This bill stops the Federal Government from deducting union dues directly from the paychecks of its employees. Instead, it requires labor unions to collect their own dues from their members. This bill is commonsense. It is about freedom of choice. How much longer are we going to force this on our workers? Federal employees should have the right to decide whether to join a union and pay dues, and if DOGE has taught us anything over the past few months, it is that we would be better off without the government making decisions about our money.

It is also about transparency. Right now, if you are a newly hired Federal employee in a unionized workplace, dues are deducted automatically. Employees might not know and not be fully aware of how much that they are paying. Even worse, how many employees do we think know that they have a portion of their hard-earned money taken out of their paycheck at all? Members of the Committee, do you think that our Federal employees know what their dues are being used for? How many Federal employees know that their dues are being used to promote political causes that they may or may not support? By requiring direct collection of dues from Federal union members, which this bill does, we ensure that employees are informed and can make informed decisions.

I hope that you will see that by making unions collect their own dues is common sense. The Paycheck Protection Act is going to help unions be more accountable to their members and give Federal workers greater control over their finances, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other? Ms. Pressley.

Mrs. PRESSLEY. Thank you. Make no mistake, the bills we are considering today are a coordinated and shameful attack on Federal workers and labor unions. This is not about efficiency. This is not about accountability. This is about silencing workers and stripping away their rights in the name of unchecked power.

Let me be plain about what is happening here. These bills would gut Federal unions, weaken worker protections and strip employees of their rights to fight for fair wages, save workplaces and the basic dignity they deserve. They are meant to intimidate, isolate, and disempower the very people who keep our country running, the people who inspect our food, protect our veterans, process Social Security checks, and uphold services that millions of people use. It is union busting, but instead of targeting corporations, Republicans are targeting our very own public servants.

Let us talk about what these bills actually do. Republicans want to eliminate official time, a tool that allows workers to report fraud, waste, and abuse without fear of retaliation. Just to be clear, this would make it harder for workers to blow the whistle on corruption and inefficiency. That does not sound like it protects taxpayers to me. Republicans want to give the President unchecked power to tear up collective bargaining agreements at will, making every worker's contract essentially meaningless. Imagine signing a contract for a mortgage only to have the bank come back 6 months later and say, never mind, we are changing the terms and you have no say in it. That is what they want to do to Federal workers. Republicans also want to ban Federal workers from deducting union dues from their paychecks, even though it is completely voluntary and no different from deductions for retirement funds, healthcare, or charitable donations. They are singling out unions here, not because it saves money, but because they do not want workers to have power.

So, no, this is not about efficiency, and it certainly is not about protecting the taxpayer. If it were, the Republicans would not be rolling back whistleblower protections or forcing unions to provide representation for free. In reality, it is about giving more power to co-presidents Trump and Musk, dismantling the one force that stands up against abuse and injustice in the workplace, unions.

The right to unionize is not just about making a living, it is about making a life and a good one at that. In my district, the MA 7th, from Cambridge to Roxbury, median income drops by \$50,000. We cannot address longstanding inequities like this if workers are not empowered. Throughout our history, unions have fought for and won better wages and benefits, safer working conditions against the greed of big corporations and special interests. I have witnessed many of these victories firsthand from my early days on the picket lines with my mother, may she rest in power, who taught me early on that workers' rights are human rights and economic justice is workers' justice. That truth has not changed.

Now more than ever, we need to support unions in protecting their workers. I will continue to do just that, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins. You want recognition, yes?

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman's bill simply addresses the withholding of union dues from paychecks of Federal agencies and departments. There is nothing to the service that unions provide or the right of the worker to participate in any unions, but whether or not that Federal employee is going to essentially be forced to participate from day one with the union organi-

zation that they have the right to oppose, but they take a job and they have to, like, actively stop their participation in the union and become a red flag and they just do not do it.

So, across the country, you know, we find the best examples of freedom in this aspect made manifest in the private sector where you want to join a union, join a union. If you do not, do not. You know, why would we as a representative republic not reflect that level of freedom within the infrastructures of the Federal Government and the Federal bureaucracies? Why would we not reflect that core principle of individual rights, liberties, and freedoms? So, the gentleman's bill simply restores that freedom with specific regards to union dues being deducted from your paycheck.

These Federal employees are quite capable of paying their own bills. They pay their own mortgage, their own utility bills, their own car note. They pay for their insurance. They buy their groceries. They are quite capable of paying their own bills. If they want to join a union, join a union. If you do not, do not. That is called freedom. And Mr. Burlison's bill supports this inherent God-given right to conduct our own affairs. Why anyone would oppose such a core principle, that is at the very bedrock of our republic, is fascinating to observe. But I am in support of the gentleman's legislation.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition?

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk please report?

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174, as offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona.

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

I reserve the point of order.

The gentleman is recognized. Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Similar to my other amendments on these three bills, I express my appreciation and gratitude to the bill's sponsor. He is a leader on this subject and he has worked hard on this, and I appreciate where he is going and I will be supporting the underlying bill, but I do think, again, for the reasons that I have iterated multiple times today that there should be an exception on behalf of the National Border Patrol Council. I appreciate what they do, and if I need to, I can go through and again list many of the same reasons that I have done multiple times today, but I would urge a yes vote on my amendment. Thank you, and I yield.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition on the Biggs' amendment? Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I oppose this amendment offered by someone I consider my mentor, Mr. Biggs, but, unfortunately, while I understand his motivations and I, too, support our Border Patrol's mission to secure a Nation's border, the underlying bill does not affect their operational control of our borders or the ability of Border Patrol to carry out its mission, period. And the bottom line is that the Federal Government has absolutely no busi-

ness serving as the Federal unions' dues collector for any public sector union, even if we agree with the political activities of a union. The administrative costs should be handled a hundred percent by the unions. Laws should apply generally, not in a way that provides preferential treatment for special interests. We should not be providing a targeted exemption from the law for a specific union based on politics.

In the case of Border Patrol officers, the unions can simply set up their own administrative services to collect union dues. This would not put an undue burden on the unions or members but, rather, create a parity with the dues collection in the private sector. Simply, this will end the Federal Government from providing a service that it has no business providing. This is exactly what the DOGE efforts have been about as well. This amendment would ultimately defeat the entire purpose of the bill to provide fairness by treating all public sector unions equally and get the government out of the business of collecting dues on behalf of Federal unions. Thank you, and I urge a no vote on the amendment.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition? Seeing none—for what purpose does Mr. Burlison seek recognition?

Mr. BURLISON. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Would the clerk please report the amendment to the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. Burlison of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174.

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison.

Mr. BURLISON. This is a simple amendment. In fact, it is very similar to the one that we heard before on a different bill. This says that the exemption that is being expressed in the underlying amendment would not be available unless the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies to Congress that the Department has a hundred percent operational control of the Southern border of the United States and Northern border, and I move for its adoption.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any Member seek recognition? Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, again, not to nitpick, but this hundred operational control is redundant because within the definition of "operational control," statutorily, no person, no contraband, would be getting into the United States, so that is just a nitpicky flaw. But of course, the purpose of this is to basically emasculate the amendment that I have offered, and so I get that, but I want to go to just a thought here. If I wanted to have my retirement dollars or my health insurance dollars or some other beneficial dollars withheld, I just contact H.R. and they do that.

I guess I am struggling to understand. I understand the underlying, but here you have a union of employees who were actually out, almost all of them, at least certainly over the last 4 years, were working double shifts. They were out in the middle of nowhere, getting no credit for time as they drive to that remote duty post. It seems to me that we would take and give them some kind of special recognition and this is probably the least special recogni-

tion you could give them. And I have made my case for them and re-urge UC over all of those articles that I have put into the record already. Because I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Burlison, I regretfully have to oppose his amendment, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on Mr. Burlison's amendment to Mr. Biggs' amendment, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. BURLISON. I request a recorded vote.

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

For what purpose does Mr. Burlison seek recognition?

Mr. BURLISON. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Would the clerk please report?

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. Burlison of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174.

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison.

Mr. BURLISON. Again, this amendment is similar to one of the amendments that we have heard previously. This is an amendment that says that the exemption can go into place, but cannot go into place unless the employees are working in a sector of the border in which more than one pound of fentanyl has been seized in the past 12 months, and with that, I urge the body for its adoption.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition? Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With all due respect, again, I am afraid I must oppose this secondary amendment. The idea is that you would give an exception to the Border Patrol if they have not seized more than one pound of fentanyl in a 12-month period, and what that does is, actually has a perverse incentive, does it not? Does it not say to CBP agents, well, if you want the underlying bill to go into place, then simply stop trying to interdict fentanyl? And so, it does have a bit of a perverse rationale there, but again, for that and other reasons that I have iterated multiple times today, I would respectfully oppose the secondary amendment.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on Mr. Burlison's Amendment Number 3 to Mr. Biggs' amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Amendment Number 2 instead of 3.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. The final amendment, Mr. Chairman, is at the desk.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is requested by Mr. Burlison. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed. OK.

Mr. BURLISON. I did not request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. Oh, you did not? Oh, I am sorry. OK. I thought you did. All right. Scratch that.

Mr. BURLISON. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Oh, OK. That was your thing. Would the clerk please report the amendment?

The CLERK. Amendment Number 3, offered by Mr. Burlison of Missouri, to the amendment offered by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174.

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison.

Mr. BURLISON. Again, this is an amendment that we have seen previously today. This says that this exemption that Mr. Biggs is trying to put in place would go into effect at the moment that the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies to Congress that the Department has completed 100 percent of the construction of the wall on the Southern border. And with that, I would say, if anything, this will provide a motivation, which I think we want. We want to provide merit-based opportunities, and this would certainly motivate the Border Patrol to complete the border construction, and with that, I urge adoption.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any Member seek recognition? Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri's efforts here today. He is doing yeoman's work. I would actually point out one other interesting thing about this. CBP does not erect, construct, repair, extend anything along with the wall. The Army Corps of Engineers and its contractors do that. So, what you are saying is we are going to hold the Border Patrol guys, their union, hostage based on the ability of the executive branch to engage a contractor that Congress is funding to build a fence before they can get this benefit. I appreciate that you are willing to give them that benefit, but that seems like a condition that is almost unmeetable. And with that, I must respectfully oppose this amendment and yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the Mr. Burlison's Amendment 3 to Mr. Biggs' amendment, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. BURLISON. I do request a recorded vote.

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

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 2193, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Protection Act.

Would the clerk please designate the bill?

The CLERK. H.R. 2193, the FEHB Protection Act, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to take certain actions with respect to the health insurance program carried out under Chapter 89 of Title 5 United States Code, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should 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 designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2193, 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 bill and the amendment.

The Federal Employee Health Benefits Program provides quality health insurance coverage for approximately 8 million Federal employees, retirees, and their families, with nearly \$60 billion in combined annual premiums paid by the government enrollees. This Committee has a vested interest in ensuring the program is free from waste, fraud, and abuse. In 2022, the Government Accountability Office released a report that found ineligible family members enrolled in FEHB plans. According to the Office of Personnel Management's Inspector General, the enrollment of ineligible family members may cost as much as \$3 billion in improper or fraudulent payments annually. The bill incorporates solutions from GAO's report to better prevent, identify, and reduce fraud, waste, and abuse resulting from enrolling ineligible family members in FEHB.

First, this bill requires OPM to verify the eligibility of family members receiving FEHB coverage to better ensure those who are added to the roles are legally eligible. Second, the bill requires OPM to audit the documentation and ranks of FEHB enrollees to identify those who may have slipped through the cracks. The bill requires a disenrollment or removal of ineligible individuals from FEHB coverage and requires OPM to incorporate a review of ineligible family members in their fraud risk assessment of the FEHB to better inform the scope of the problem and identify additional solutions. Finally, the bill incorporates an OPM Inspector General recommendation to centralize the FEHB program administration under OPM, thus consolidating the current enrollment manage-

ment mess from over 160 employing agencies. The bill would also direct the OPM Inspector General to provide ongoing program oversight to ensure this problem does not develop again in the future.

I thank Mr. Grothman for his leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this common sense bill to address costly waste, fraud, and abuse. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I actually support this bill. The FEHB is the largest employer-sponsored health care program in the country, with over 8 million participants. And as the Chair mentioned, December 22, the GAO issued a report on the FEHB program that estimated that ineligible family members could be costing the program approximately \$1 billion a year, and the OPM Office of the Inspector General has estimated the cost of ineligible individuals be somewhere between \$250 million to \$3 billion per year, and this overspending is entirely avoidable. And so, this bill would help ensure rules that are already in place about who is eligible for coverage under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program are enforced, and this bill specifically requires OPM to conduct a comprehensive audit of employee family members enrolled in the FEHB program to strengthen the program for all Federal employees and their families.

And, as I and others on this side of the aisle have said time and time again, we support efforts that actually promote government accountability, transparency, and effectiveness, and particularly with respect to addressing improper payments and this bill would do just that. I would note though, that this legislation is fixing a problem identified by some of our government's critical nonpartisan watchdog agencies, GAO and the OPM Inspector General. President Trump illegally fired the OPM Inspector General earlier this year as part of his Friday Night Massacre of 17 IGs across 18 agencies, despite the critical and independent mission IGs play in rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse.

Our Federal IGs do this work with integrity and transparency, and, unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the DOGE initiative, which is not operating with the same transparency and evidence-based approach advanced by the GAO and Inspectors General in this bill. So, I encourage my colleagues to support efforts like this that seek to make government more responsive to the needs of the American public through thoughtful, evidence-based efforts, not what is happening with DOGE. I intend to support this bill, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Grothman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Well, thank you. You both did such a good job. Well, not to add a lot to it, point out that last time this bill did come out of Committee very bipartisan. Well over half the Democrats voted for it, and I hope we get another booming big vote today as we make another dent in our massive government debt.

Chairman COMER. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Grothman. Does any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Grothman from Wisconsin [sic].

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 2193, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The bill is ordered favorably reported, as amended.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. I guess we are told we want a roll call on that.

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

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 2277, the Federal Accountability Committee for Transparency Act.

The clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 2277, to amend the CARES Act, to extend the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee through December 31, 2026, and to change the name of such committee to the "Fraud Prevention and Accountability Committee," and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes himself for the offer to amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Would the clerk please designate the amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2277, 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 amendment.

I now recognize the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Sessions, from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. When I speak today, I want to speak on behalf of the co-sponsor of this, Mr. Mfume, who serves as the Ranking Member on the subcommittee which we sit, Government Operations.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today about a bill that is called the Federal Accountability Committee for Transparency Act, FACT Act. As we all know, this Committee and the subcommittees of this Committee have discovered that there are billions and billions of dollars each year that go under the term of waste, fraud, and abuse, or misdirected payments. As a result of this work on the Subcommittee, Mr. Mfume and I discovered that there was something called the Pandemic Analytics Center of Excellence, or known as

PACE, which was prescribed in law in 2020, and which actually served a role of trying to figure out what payments were misapplied to people who had filed for those payments.

And it is important to know that since the beginning of last Congress, we have worked diligently to work with OMB, and the Inspector Generals, and other organizations to find out best practices about how we, across government, can avoid giving money to people where it is unintended, in other words, giving money out and then chasing money when we found out it was wrong. We have learned that PRAC was an opportunity where they developed over 1.8 billion pieces of information, which would give them insight as to who was properly to receive the payments that came from the government, that is going to find that PRAC moves through law and will be eliminated at the end of the summer.

So, what this bill is attempting to do is to bring forth an agreement that we would keep PACE [sic] through the end of 2026. It is a commonsense bill that will allow us to not only work with PACE [sic] and understand how they operate, but to potentially bring that to bear for the rest of the government agencies, including OMB. So, Mr. Chairman, I would move this bill, and I want to thank Mr. Mfume for his work in support of the development of this piece of legislation. I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members—oh, I recognize the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support this bill as well. I intend to be a co-sponsor as well. This bill, the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee, or the PRAC, is a committee of council of the Inspectors General on integrity and efficiency. And the PRAC's purpose is to coordinate and support the oversight of the significant emergency relief funds authorized to respond to the COVID pandemic and to identify major risks that cut across program and agency boundaries that will sunset on September 30, 2025, and this act would extend that to December 31, 2026.

And many Offices of Inspector General are small and cannot afford the technical infrastructure and skill data analysts necessary to use the capabilities developed by the PRAC, which has amassed the data, established the systems, and employed the data analysts necessary to provide these analytics services to small OIGs. And the FACT Act is intended to give the Committee additional time to work toward permanent reauthorization of the PRAC. So, I strongly support this bill, and urge Members to do so as well. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I just want to recognize myself for a second. This bill would enable the PRAC to continue to assist with law enforcement efforts to investigate fraud because there are still people out there who need to be held accountable. The PRAC needs to continue the fight to punish the bad guys and retrieve some of the billions that have been stolen from the American taxpayer. This bill would enable them to continue to do that. I want to thank Mr. Sessions and Mr. Mfume for working together in a bipartisan way to lead this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill that cleanly extends the PRAC through December 31, 2026.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion the Chair, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 2277, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The bill is ordered favorably.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman? Recorded vote?

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

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 2056, the District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act.

I now recognize the clerk.

The CLERK. H.R. 2056, a bill to require the District of Columbia to comply with Federal immigration laws.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The clerk will please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2056, 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 the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Higgins, for his opening statement.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We recently have had extensive hearings regarding the negative impact of sanctuary city policies in the District of Columbia. Our Nation's Capital is of unique significance to the entire Nation and should reflect the best policies of enforcement of local, state, and Federal law, and the immigration policies and laws of the United States. The reality, however, Mr. Chairman, is that District of Columbia does not reflect those law enforcement traditions and the professional understandings and agreements between law enforcement authorities across the country at the local, state and Federal level, wherein cooperation is the standard norm. The sanctuary city policies removes those cities from the historically very effective operations of law enforcement, wherein a jurisdictional authority that has possession of an offender, if there is a warrant for that offender that has been issued and is legitimate and has been communicated from

another jurisdictional authority, then there is a cooperative effort across law enforcement. Sanctuary cities do not do that.

So, my bill enforces the District of Columbia into compliance with Federal law. It nullifies any statute, ordinance, policy, or practice of the D.C. Government, which restricts any entity or official from providing citizenship or immigration status to Federal, state, and local law enforcement or from complying with a lawful request by the Department of Homeland Security under Sections 236 and 287, that regards the apprehension and detention of aliens and the powers of immigration officers and employees is all under the Immigration and Nationality Act, including complying with detainers or notifying at the point of release of an individual, wherefore that release will be directly to the security and control of DHS if a proper detainer has been noticed.

The bill also provides safe harbor for individuals who come forward as a witness to or as a victim of a crime, wherein, specifically in the legislation, Mr. Chairman, any human being that is witness to or victim of a crime would not be subject to further enforcement if it is specifically under this law. D.C. would not be considered not in compliance with this law if they are protecting the identity of a victim or a witness to a crime in an ongoing investigation. So, in summary, Mr. Chairman, this bill would be opposed by our colleagues across the aisle, no doubt, but it simply brings the Nation's Capital into compliance with the Nation's laws and with the standards by which law enforcement at the local, state, and Federal level have a longstanding relationship of cooperation. It forces our Nation's Capital to be in compliance with those standards of norm.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the consideration of this bill in today's markup. I urge your support on both sides of the aisle, and I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. [Presiding.] Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I discuss my opposition to this bill, which my friend anticipated, I must ask, are House Republicans trying to sabotage the operations and finances of the District of Columbia, and to what end? The recently enacted continuing resolution cut D.C.'s local budget by more than a billion dollars. If that stands, D.C. will likely have to lay off first responders, police, fire, teachers. And Fitch Ratings placed D.C., because of no action on their own, on a rating watch negative. Every CR for the last 2 decades contained a provision that allowed D.C. to spend under its current local budget during the CR. House Republicans omitted that this year.

Let us be clear about the absurdity of this situation. D.C.'s local budget consists of local funds, not Federal. D.C. raised its own fiscal 2025 money. That money is in D.C.'s bank account. D.C. has been spending that money for 6 months, and now Congress has ordered D.C. to abandon its strategic priorities and investment opportunities. I served for 14 years on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, just across the river in Virginia, including 5 years as Chairman. Like being mayor, I cannot imagine running a local government subject to the whims of a dysfunctional Congress. There has been a bipartisan agreement on this dais—we want D.C. to be safe and prosperous. The Senate passed a standalone bill sponsored

by a Republican Member to fix treatment of D.C. in the CR. That bill is within this Committee's jurisdiction. I urge the Republican Majority in the Committee to work with Republican leadership to bring that bill up immediately.

Now, let me turn to the bill before us which I strongly oppose. D.C. should be free to govern itself. My friend from Louisiana has no more business telling them how to run their business than I do from Fairfax, Virginia. The bill nullifies D.C. laws and policies that, like those of other jurisdictions, are in full compliance with Federal law. They do not obstruct ICE from carrying out its duties, and they are backed by evidence demonstrating that they keep people safer. Counties with laws that do not honor extradition warrantless civil detainers had significant lower levels of violent crime than counties that do not have such laws. Mayors, police chiefs, sheriffs, local leaders have made clear that the way to combat violent crime is allowing local police to do their job of ensuring public safety in their own communities, not commandeering them to spend limited time and resources rounding up and detaining nonviolent immigrants who pose no threat.

The Committee had a hearing on this issue. That hearing accomplished none of the Majority's objectives, which were primarily to demagogue immigration enforcement policies in large urban areas. Instead, that hearing showcased American cities that were focused on public safety and complying with Federal immigration law without getting dragged into the costly business of the Trump Administration's cruel, unconstitutional, and inhumane immigration policies. That hearing failed to force the Trump Administration's immigration enforcement operations down the throats of American cities. So now, Republicans are turning their eyes to a vulnerable Washington, DC, where they are hoping to press the hobnailed boot of the Federal Government that they control to the throat of the Nation's Capital. It is a shameless moment and it is one I cannot support, and I oppose this bill. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support Mr. Higgins' bill and the ANS offered by the Chairman. I am going to focus just on two brief aspects of this, and Section 2, subparagraph (a)(2), requires compliance with a request lawfully made—that should not cause anyone heartburn. It is a lawfully made request pursuant to 236 or Section 287 of the INA. And then, a new or a diversionary tactic that we are seeing now, but what has happened here that Mr. Higgins has done, that, I think, addresses and should assuage much of what my friends across the aisle have traditionally raised, is he has provided a safe harbor for those who are witnesses or victims who wish to come forward, so that there can be no other action against them. So, with that, I think Mr. Higgins' bill is strikingly good, necessary, and appropriate at this time, and I will yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona and I respect the Ranking Member. It may surprise the Nation to know that he and I have a very friendly and respectful relationship. And I respectfully would remind the gentleman that the District of Columbia is indeed unique amongst all municipalities in the country for

our Nation's Capital, and Congress does indeed have authority within the decisionmaking process of the District of Columbia. And we have ceded some of that, to be sure, for local affairs, but the interaction with Federal law enforcement as it relates, specifically, in this case, to the removal of illegal aliens, this is certainly a Federal consideration, and, therefore, our Nation's Capital should be in compliance with Federal laws and should be exemplary therein. However, that is not the case, and the gentleman knows that laws are written, statutes are written at the local, state, and Federal level with words like, "may," and "shall," for a particular purpose. This removes discretion. This shows the severity of the intent of the statute as it was written.

And under the Dode of the District of Columbia, 24-211.07, the prohibition on cooperation with Federal immigration agencies, the District of Columbia "shall not hold an individual after they have been otherwise released to comply with an ICE detainer request; provide any facility or equipment to assist ICE with a search or inquiry about an individual in D.C. custody; permit ICE to interview a suspect in D.C. custody unless compelled by court order; provide ICE information about an individual's release date or location or any information about why they were detained; grant access to Federal immigration authorities to District of Columbia Detention Facilities; or inquire into the immigration status of an individual in custody."

D.C. laws go on with similar sanctuary city policies prefaced by "shall not" or "will," not "may" or "can." No discretion there. These laws were written with severity, leaning toward sanctuary city policies, and our Nation's Capital should not reflect a refusal, in fact, a mandated denial of compliance with Federal immigration law. I thank the gentleman for yielding me some of his time, and I yield back to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. I thank the gentleman. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields. Any other Member—the Chair recognizes Ms. Norton from Washington, DC.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I strongly oppose this undemocratic, anti-immigrant bill, which would nullify duly enacted laws, policies, and practices of the District of Columbia. Before I address the details of this bill, I want to discuss democracy and the lack of democracy in D.C.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation, yet more than 700,000 D.C. residents are denied voting representation in Congress and full local self-government, even though D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any state and more total Federal taxes than 19 states. Last Congress, Republicans introduced more than a hundred bills and amendments to repeal or block D.C. laws and policies. This Congress, Republicans have already introduced 17 such bills and amendments. Two weeks ago, Congress passed a bill drafted by Republicans that cut more than \$1 billion from the D.C. local budget, which consists entirely of locally raised revenue.

Although Congress has plenary authority over D.C., legislating on D.C. matters is a choice. In 1953, the Supreme Court held that, "There is no constitutional barrier to delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power." D.C. has a local leg-

islature. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office. That is called democracy. The voting Members of Congress are elected by residents of states. If D.C. residents do not like how members vote on D.C. local matters, they cannot vote them out of office. That is the antithesis of democracy. Congress has the authority to grant D.C. residents full democratic rights. It simply needs to pass my Washington, DC. Admission Act, which would make the residential and commercial areas of D.C. a state.

The merits of D.C. local laws and H.R. 2056 are irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress interfering in D.C. local matters, but I will briefly discuss them. Consistent with Federal law, D.C., like states, cities, and counties across the country has passed laws to support and protect the safety of all its residents regardless of immigration status. In passing such laws, D.C. followed its values and the evidence on the benefits of such laws for the entire city. H.R. 2056 contains an exception for victims and witnesses to crimes. The exception is a fig leaf. If elected, the bill would deter immigrants from seeking assistance from or cooperating with the D.C. Government, including the police department. I urge Members to vote no on this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. May I ask my friend to yield?

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend. I just want to say local control is best, and I say to my friend from Louisiana, he is my friend. I do not think Baton Rouge would like Congress telling it how to do its policing or its fire services or other municipal services provided, neither would my jurisdiction, neither does D.C., which is 700,000 people. We either believe in the principle of local control or we do not. Even when we disagree with decisions they make. God knows, I have disagreed with decisions made in D.C., but I have never tried to interfere. I have never presumed. If we are going to go down this road, why don't we take over zoning, so we can do zoning for D.C.? We can decide on the building height limit. We can decide on where commercial goes, where residential goes. We can get involved in the geothermal experiment, which is exciting, and do whatever we want to do about it.

We can really tie up this Committee with a lot of D.C. business that belongs in the hands of the locally elected, empowered D.C. City Council, and I believe very firmly in that principle. I have never tried to overturn or legislatively question a decision made by that council. It is not about my personal preference. It is about the democratic will of the people of the District of Columbia, 700,000 fellow citizens. I urge to defeat of this bill, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek recognition on the Higgins bill?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 2056, as amended.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If Mr. Higgins is not requesting a recorded vote, I do.

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

Our next item for consideration is House Resolution 187, of inquiry, requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the termination, removal, placement on administrative leave, moved to another department of Federal employees and Inspectors General of agencies.

Would the clerk please designate the bill?

The CLERK. House Resolution 187, inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives, referring to the termination, removal, placement on administrative leave, moved to another department of Federal employees and Inspectors General of agencies.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the resolution should 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.

Would the clerk please designate the amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to House Resolution 187, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

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

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the resolution and the amendment.

Democrats are offering this privileged resolution of inquiry to vocally protest President Trump's actions to increase the Federal Government's efficiency. This is another attempt by partisan Democrats to distract President Trump and his Administration from bringing accountability and efficiency to the executive branch.

The expansion of the Federal Government has led to a frequently redundant bureaucratic black box. There are currently more than 400 executive branch agencies and sub-agencies and roughly 1,000 Federal boards and commissions. To support this, the Federal workforce has grown to more than 2 million Federal civilian employees. Instead of working to find areas agreement with President Trump and his Administration, Committee Democrats are refusing

to acknowledge obvious government waste and are obstructing common sense reforms. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution of inquiry so this Committee may adversely report out this measure and remove its privilege for consideration by the full House.

I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair. I am not sure what Democrats my friend, the Chair, is talking about. We Democrats object to the fact that 24,000 probationary employees were summarily dismissed at the direction of President Trump and Elon Musk without cause. There is no efficiency argument there. We object to the removal of 17 Inspectors General without cause, and unlawfully, I might add. We object to the summary firing and prospective firing of 80,000 workers at the Veterans Administration, not an efficiency move. It is putative. It is just to cut down on the size of government to save money to finance a big tax cut that is coming in the reconciliation. That is what the Democrats are opposing.

Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution. I thank my friend, Kweisi Mfume, and I would ask unanimous consent to enter into the record letters I and others on our side of the aisle have sent related to the Federal workforce.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend, and I yield back. I yield back unless Mr. Mfume wants my time.

Mr. MFUME. Yes, if I could be recognized.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much, Chairman Comer. I really do offer this on behalf of Federal workers in every state of the Nation who have been impacted by the decisions recently, the flurry of decisions by DOGE, which occurred without due process. Those persons cannot be here today to speak on behalf of themselves or to offer this resolution of inquiry, but I do so on behalf of all of them. I thank you and the Ranking Member for the markup and for making this resolution in order.

H.Res. 187 requests the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the termination, removal, placement on administrative leave, and reassignment to any other department of Federal work, these individuals who have been affected. It also covers all of the Inspector Generals of the agencies that were also fired. The purpose of the resolution is simple, I hope at least. If passed, the President would receive a formal request from Congress to share information with us and with the American people about what his Administration is doing to our Federal workforce, including independent, nonpartisan Inspectors General.

Specifically, the resolution would require the Trump Administration to provide documents, communication, and information regarding all Federal employees who have been fired, reassigned, or placed on administrative leave. It would also request the documents of the Office of Personnel Management's decision that employees classify or working in diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility programs be subject to immediate removal. Americans have every right and every expectation to know how these determinations were made. Finally, this resolution requires the transmission of any and all documents related to the removal of non-

partisan Inspectors General, and whether the Administration discussed with Congress of any of these removals since they are legally required to do so.

The resolution of inquiry is an extraordinary step that we are forced to take today after the Administration has failed to respond to over six requests from Members of this Committee for information. The simple fact is that Elon Musk and Donald Trump's actions at DOGE, or as I prefer to call it, the Department of Government Evil, affects constituents in every congressional district in America and affects the congressional districts, obviously, of every Member of this Committee.

Every American, regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, region, or anything else, suffers when the wait times at the Veterans Administration and wait times at Social Security double, when there are no longer enough staff to administer Federal grants that support cities and support farmers and support families. Those persons and those entities we all represent, and without any respect to due process, we have seen the unfolding of this and the hurt and the pain that has been inflicted upon. It is not something that anybody in this Committee made up. It is real.

Despite the claims to the contrary, 80 percent of all Federal workers live and work outside of Washington, DC. Altogether, outside of those that represent the National Capital Region, Members of this Committee represent an estimated 416,000 of those Federal workers. These workers are almost equally distributed across districts, as I have said before, on both sides of the aisle, in red states and in blue states. In my home district of Baltimore, 19,000 residents made a choice to dedicate their lives to the profession of public service, and they have worked for the Federal Government and as such, supported the Federal Government. This resolution of inquiry is an opportunity for those constituents and, really, for all of our constituents to gain insight and transparency into why the Trump Administration has made the decisions that they have made and give Congress an opportunity to fulfill our Article I responsibilities and demand real intentional oversight.

Beyond the impact to Federal workers, this resolution also demands documents regarding the firing of independent Inspectors General. As the Ranking Member of the Government Operations Subcommittee, I agree with many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that our country needs reforms to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse, to make it work better for all that it is supposed to serve. That is why I could not believe it when, upon taking office, the President immediately fired 18 Inspector Generals. As we all know, Inspector Generals are Senate confirmed. They are non-partisan officials who work to provide oversight to the agencies that they are assigned to. These Inspector Generals and their teams have decades upon decades of institutional knowledge of the problems facing agencies and more importantly, how to fix those problems. Many of them have been making important reforms to reduce improper payments and fraud, but now they are not able to do that. And if there was any instance of their repeated efforts to bring about change, just remember that the Department of Defense has failed seven straight audits. Any supporter of DOGE ought to have an interest in knowing why these inspector generals were ille-

gally fired and why Congress did not even receive notice as required under law.

And so, I would like to close, Mr. Chairman, by again emphasizing our duty to the Federal workforce, to contractors, and to others who have been shamefully treated without due process for the crime of wanting to serve their country. These workers are Americans, Americans with families, Americans that are part of their communities, and Americans whose livelihood, in many respects, is now being destroyed. And so, I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rare resolution of inquiry in order to give transparency and accountability a chance. Our constituents, all of them, are depending on it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition? Mr. Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to voice my strong support for House Resolution 187 and thank my colleague from Maryland for bringing this forward. This resolution seeks transparency and answers about the abrupt and illegal removal, reassignment, and termination of Federal employees as well as the independent watchdogs, the Inspectors General, who are supposed to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. These are the employees who ensure that our government functions efficiently and remains accountable to the American people.

And let us be clear: these dismissals did not improve efficiency or eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. When Donald Trump fired the Inspector Generals from a number of key agencies and departments in his January 24 Friday night massacre, he substantially increased the likelihood of corruption and fraud. And when Elon Musk decided to arbitrarily and illegally fire thousands of Federal workers, this was not about eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse. Firing air traffic controllers and then hiring them back is not efficient, firing nuclear weapons security personnel and then trying to rehire them is not efficient, and as we are seeing unfold in real time, firing Social Security personnel and making it harder for seniors to get their checks is not efficient.

This endeavor is not about efficiency. It is about finding spending cuts to justify \$4.5 trillion in tax cuts primarily directed to billionaires, and I want to note that, of this, hundreds of billions of dollars of those tax cuts go to foreign investors. The tax cuts that the Republicans are hatching up are predominantly designed to benefit investors in corporate securities, in real estate investment trusts, and in private equity funds. As it turns out, over 20 percent of those investors are foreign. That is right. Elon Musk is literally trying to eliminate 14 percent of funding for our public schools, end funding for cancer trials and science research, and cut Social Security so that Saudi, Chinese, Russian, and, yes, South African billionaires can get a bigger tax break.

But the real issue is that all of this is grossly illegal and unconstitutional, and I know that at least some of my colleagues across the aisle know this. Congress, and only Congress, has the authority to create laws and appropriate funds. And what Musk and Trump are doing in purporting to fire Federal workers and Inspector Generals without cause, what they are actually doing is undoing appro-

priations mandated by Congress to fund these Federal agencies and overturning acts of Congress that created these Inspector Generals. They are stealing Congress' constitutional authorities. And so, I have to ask, when will congressional Republicans stand up for our powers and our rights here in this body?

Look, if House Republicans want to get rid of IGs and fire all the air traffic controllers and eliminate Social Security, they have the majority, and they can do that, but we all know it is supposed to be done here in Congress, not by unelected special government employees, not by 21-year-old coders. It is through Congress, and the Constitution is clear on this point. It is all grossly illegal, and that is why the courts keep ruling against Elon Musk and Donald Trump. But instead of standing up against these unprecedented assaults on our congressional powers, congressional Republicans are instead attacking the independence of the judiciary, including attempts to impeach judges, many judges appointed by Republicans, who have issued decisions against Trump and Musk.

And I just want to state the obvious here: America is not a dictatorship. It is a democracy based on three co-equal branches of government, all of which are sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. We all take that oath here, but here is the problem. Trump and Musk are basically saying they can do whatever they want—fire Inspector Generals in violation of the law, fire commissioners in violation of law, fire Federal employees in violation of the law—and instead of standing up to this illegal and unconstitutional behavior, congressional Republicans are basically saying Trump and Musk can do whatever they want. We are supposed to be a co-equal branch of the government, not a lapdog for the President. And by attacking the judiciary, congressional Republicans are going after the independence of the third co-equal branch of government. This is not supporting and defending the Constitution. It is assaulting and attacking the most important provisions of the Constitution. It is dangerous, and it is wrong.

House Resolution 187 is a necessary step to try to reclaim our congressional authorities. It is about reestablishing trust in our institutions and reaffirming our commitment to accountability and the rule of law and the Constitution. Again, if congressional Republicans want to fire thousands of Federal employees and eliminate Inspectors General, if they think that is efficient, they can do that through appropriations and legislation, not by allowing Musk and Trump to claim that authority, and in so doing, you are creating a constitutional crisis. So, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to stand up for the principles that have defined this country for 2.5 centuries. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Pressley.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Representative Mfume, for your steadfast leadership on this and so many other important issues. I appreciate your introducing this resolution, and I am proud to be a co-sponsor.

Since taking office, co-Presidents Trump and Elon Musk have engaged in an unlawful and unprecedented purge of nonpartisan civil servants using intimidation, threats, and outright retaliation to force them out of their jobs. These firings were not about performance, not about accountability, and certainly not about serving the

people. My district, the MA-7th, is home to thousands of the Commonwealth's 46,000 Federal employees. My constituents are not faceless bureaucrats. They prepare us for national disasters and public health emergencies, they ensure our veterans who risked their lives for our country get the care they deserve, they make our schools run, our food safe, and our government accountable. And for their service, they have been met with a reckless, cruel, and illegal assault from this Administration. This Administration targeted career civil servants for no legitimate reason. They stripped them of their livelihoods, their pensions, and their ability to serve the country they love, and they did it behind closed doors with no transparency and no accountability.

In the great words of the great Elijah Cummings, it is this Committee's job to be in efficient and effective pursuit of the truth. Mr. Mfume's resolution of inquiry is simple and necessary. It is about revealing the truth. It uncovers how many Federal employees were wrongfully fired, why they were targeted, and how these unlawful purges were carried out. I have met with many of the impacted workers in my district and their stories are heartbreaking: public servants who uprooted their families, moving states to serve at the Boston VA, only to be fired within months for no reason; dedicated professionals who spent their careers bettering the lives of others, only to have their own livelihoods ripped away in an instant. These workers deserve answers. They deserve justice.

To that end, in addition to supporting this resolution, I am leading my colleagues in the Massachusetts congressional delegation and requesting information from the Office of Personnel Management about the impact of these mass firings on our Commonwealth. We will get the facts, we do demand accountability, and we will work to ensure that no administration now or in the future can ever abuse its power to silence, intimidate, or unlawfully fire workers again. I urge my colleagues to stand with the public servants, many of whom are our shared constituents and the communities they serve by supporting this resolution. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Any other Members seek recognition? Ms. Randall.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, as my colleague, Mr. Min, stated so clearly, this Administration nor my Republican colleagues in this Congress seem to care that Congress is a separate and co-equal branch of government. I served for 6 years in a Democratic trifecta where I knew my responsibility was not to serve our Governor, but to serve the constituents who elected me to represent them. That is our job here as well.

And my constituents, 26,000 Federal workers included, over and over have told me that they are fed up with this Administration acting illegally, unconstitutionally, and taking a chainsaw to programs that our neighbors rely on, not just the jobs of the people who are losing them, but the safety and security of our community. So many of my Federal employees in the 6th congressional District have national security jobs, work for the Department of Defense, maintain our nuclear submarine fleet, ensure that our naval ships are ready for their work in the Pacific Theater. This is important, essential work, and the folks who show up every day, many of

them veterans, to keep our country safe have been attacked over and over and over again by these reckless and dangerous firings.

This resolution of inquiry seeks information about what is happening and seeks answers for our neighbors who deserve them, you know, folks who have moved their families, folks who put their lives on the line, folks who are doing very important work in our communities. And it is not just Federal workers, of which we already have a shortage in the Department of Defense. You know, we have to recruit from out of state. People have to move in order to do these important jobs. But we have folks in the Park Service and the Postal Service, people who are ensuring that our communities are thriving and that people can rely on the services that they need in order to build their futures. But instead of listening to the workers on the front lines of these programs, who could tell you, if asked, how to make their departments work more efficiently, how to save taxpayer dollars, how to deliver real results, we are seeing mass firings of folks who could save us money. And in fact, some courts have determined that these firings are, in fact, illegal, have required folks who were fired illegally to be reinstated in their jobs and to have to be paid back pay, which is not saving taxpayer dollars. It is costing us to spend more money for our government to work inefficiently.

You know, as much as we hear about waste, fraud, and abuse and wanting to get answers, it is not clear to me why we wouldn't pass this resolution so that we could get more information about what is happening in the Federal Government. Mr. Chair, I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I would request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. Pursuant to House Rules, further proceedings on this measure are postponed. All recorded votes will be rolled to the end, at a time to be announced.

Our last item for consideration is H.R. 186, of inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain document to the House of Representatives relating to the conflicts of interest of Elon Musk and related information. The clerk will please designate the resolution.

The CLERK. House Resolution 186, of inquiry requesting that the President to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives related to the conflicts of interest of Elon Musk and related information.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the resolution shall 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 designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to House Resolution 186, 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 purpose of further amendment.

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

The Democrats are also offering this second privilege resolution of inquiry to vocally protest Elon Musk's critical role in helping President Trump fulfill his promises to the American people. Democrats spent the last 4 years covering up for the corrupt Biden crime family and obstructing efforts at seeking executive branch accountability. Over the last 2 years of Biden's presidency, while they were serving in the Minority, the Democrats offered zero resolutions of inquiry, and before that, while serving in the Majority, the Democrats routinely dismissed Republicans' ROIs seeking information from the corrupt Biden Administration. Elon Musk is offering his expertise and business best practices to assist President Trump in identifying new efficiencies for the Federal bureaucracy. However, it seems Elon Musk's efforts in service of the Administration's government efficiency and cost-cutting goals is the very reason for the Democrat skepticism and opposition to his involvement in this Administration.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution of inquiry so that this Committee may adversely report out this measure and remove its privilege for consideration by the full House. I now recognize the Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our government is a great experiment, the first-ever government designed to be of, by, and for the people. It is mostly made up of dedicated public servants who take an oath to serve the American people and support and defend the Constitution of the United States. No one swears loyalty to a king or an emperor or even the President or Congress, but to the Constitution. The oath is the foundation upon which every civil servant's career is built. Yet President Trump has shown since the day he illegally fired 17 nonpartisan Inspectors General across 18 agencies that political loyalty is paramount. It is far more important to him than the interests of that oath that our civil servants take to protect the American people.

Along with his chainsaw-wielding billionaire donor, Elon Musk, President Trump is working to turn a Nation of laws for the people into a Nation of gift for the wealthy. In an unprecedented arrangement, Trump has outsourced government in an unlawful and possibly unconstitutional way, conferring unprecedented powers on an unelected billionaire. While slashing Federal Government employees, programs, and services, Elon Musk remains in charge of a sprawling private sector business empire that continues to rely on billions of dollars in government funding and has been charged with managing his own conflicts of interest. As of February 2025, Musk has been promised a combined total of at least \$38 billion in Federal contracts, loans, subsidies, tax credits from Federal and state Governments.

Musk continues to profit from taxpayer dollars and now finds himself in charge of determining which Federal contracts the government will keep and which will be cut, an arrangement that runs afoul of the law and is a recipe for potential corruption. Musk's space exploration company, SpaceX, and the satellite and telecommunications subsidiary, Starlink, have benefited from a GSA multiple award schedule for satellite services and equipment through which the companies have received already \$1.8 million from various Federal Agencies since 2021. At the Department of Transportation, Musk's DOGE operation has directed the firing of 400 employees at the Federal FAA, which just months earlier fined Mr. Musk's SpaceX company for disregarding license requirements for 2 of its launches. Could that be retribution?

DOGE has fired 4 percent of the 800-person workforce at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which has opened five investigations into Tesla, several of which concern life-threatening flaws with the car's self-driving mode, including unexpected braking, loss of steering control, and crashes. He is circumventing Federal ethics laws to avoid filing public financial disclosures required of senior administration officials, which further obscures the extent of his conflicts of interest.

This resolution of inquiry is simple. It would require the President to provide information about Musk's actual status within the Federal Government, any conflicts of interest Musk has related to his role in the Federal Government, and any Federal contract involving Musk-owned company to which he serves on the board or on the board of directors. I did not introduce this resolution lightly, Mr. Chairman. In fact, Committee Democrats have made numerous attempts to get this information before taking this step. We sent 54 letters, over 400 requests. We have even requested you, Mr. Chairman, to invite him to testify, all to no avail. Given Musk's expansive influence in the Trump Administration, the American people have a right to know this information. The American people have a right to know how an unelected billionaire bureaucrat is taking a chainsaw to their government, aggrandizing himself.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for once for transparency and accountability, no matter who is in the White House, and to ensure that this government remains of, by, and for the people. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also want to voice my support for House Resolution 186. As the great Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once said, "Sunshine is the best disinfectant," and yet we have continually seen this Administration and its allies in Congress refuse to allow transparency, to continually be hostile to basic disclosure requests. So, the resolution of inquiry here is pretty simple. People want to know what is Elon Musk's exact role in the Federal Government. This question, by far, has been the one my constituents are most concerned about. Since taking office, my office has received thousands of calls and letters on this. Just this past week, we had over 1,500 constituents show up to my town hall to make sure that I knew how concerned and outraged they are.

Right now, Congress and the American people that we represent have no way of knowing what potential conflicts of interest Elon Musk has, and the reason we do not know is because this Administration has refused to tell us, and Congress has conducted zero oversight on this question. This resolution is just about transparency. The American people deserve to know how decisions are being made and whose interests are being prioritized. Elon Musk's dual role as a private business magnet and a Federal Government advisor is of unknown origin because he is supposed to be a temporary special government employee but is wielding powers far beyond that. This combination raises serious ethical concerns.

His companies, including SpaceX and Tesla, have received billions in Federal contracts, and yet he is now in a position to influence the very agencies that regulate and fund his business, and to no one's surprise, Elon Musk and DOGE seem to continue coming out ahead here. SpaceX, Tesla, their contracts are never touched by DOGE. In fact, they seem like they get expanded. Elon Musk's private business interests are directly benefiting from his government role, and he and others have been weaponizing government to benefit Tesla and SpaceX's bottom line.

President Trump turned the White House's south lawn into a shameful Tesla display, almost like a Tesla dealership, earlier this month, and Commerce Secretary Howard Lutnick appeared on TV hawking Tesla stock in what was an obvious violation of law, and since then, we have learned that Lutnick and others in the Trump Administration are heavily invested in Tesla stock. There are Members of Congress, including one on this Committee, who reportedly are heavily invested in Tesla stock and who are trying to use the government to weaponize it to specifically help Tesla's revenues. Where is the investigation? Where is the oversight from Congress and from this Committee?

H. Res. 186 is a necessary, but not sufficient, first step to try to bring these issues to light, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this Resolution of Inquiry. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Do any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, that concludes debate. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair?

Chairman COMER. Go ahead, Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Were you going to call for a vote?

Chairman COMER. Oh, it is a good idea. We will call for a vote. I was excited there.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I know.

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

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, the noes have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is requested by Mr. Connolly. Pursuant to House Rules, further proceedings on this measure are postponed.

Now, that concludes debate. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess until 6:30, at which time we will vote on a postponed measure.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 1295, The Reorganizing Government Act of 2025.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Connolly. OK. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1295. This is the Connolly Amendment.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. We will wait extra time on this to make sure everybody's working. This is the Connolly Amendment, the first one we are voting on, and I cannot see that. Gary, you need to vote.

Have all Members been recorded who wish to be recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Brown from Ohio. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1295, the Brown Amendment.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Randall from Washington. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Randall Amendment of H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded? I think—

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Ansari from Arizona. The Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Ansari Amendment of H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Subramanyam from Virginia. Members will record the vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Bell from Missouri. Members will record their votes using electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Bell Amendment to H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Mr. Timmons, have you been recorded?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Simon from California. Members will record the vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1295, the Simon Amendment.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Pressley from Massachusetts. Members will record the vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Pressley Amendment of H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 23.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295. 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, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1295 is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 1295. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 1295.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. The chair votes aye. If we can get the screen up. All right. 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 close the vote and report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 20.

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

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 1210, The Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act of 2025. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico. Members will record the vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Stansbury amendment of H.R. 1210.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Parliamentary inquiry. I think on many of our sheets, this is noted as Subramanyam Amendment since he carried it in my stead.

Chairman COMER. The what now?

Ms. STANSBURY. That you noted that this is a Stansbury amendment, but Mr. Subramanyam carried it for me.

Chairman COMER. He offered it on your behalf.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. So, on many people's sheet, it is noted, Number 5, yes.

Chairman COMER. Number 5 is the Biggs——

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, point of order. She does not know what bills are. She does not know what amendments are. We are done with this. Let us move on.

Chairman COMER. This is your amendment offered by Mr. Subramanyam, so, OK.

This is the Stansbury Amendment, but it was offered by Mr. Subramanyam during the markup. Everybody understand?

Ms. MACE. Stansbury does not understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. MACE. No.

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 21. The nays are 23.

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 1210, The Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act of 2025. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania to the amendment by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1210.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 18. The nays are 26.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment by Mr. Perry, the Perry Number 2 amendment, to the Mr. Biggs amendment in the nature of a substitute. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1210. This is the Perry Number 2.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 17. The nays are 27.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania, the Number 3 Perry Amendment, to the amendment by Mr. Biggs of Arizona, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Members will record the votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment. This is the Perry Amendment Number 3 of H.R. 1210.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 17. The nays are 27.

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 1210, the Protecting Taxpayers' Wallets Act of 2025. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Biggs from Arizona. Members will record the vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 1210, the Biggs Amendment.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 9. The nays are 35.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210.

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, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1210 is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 1210. Members will record the votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 1210 by Mr. Burlison.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 21.

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

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 2249, the Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Biggs from Arizona. Members recorded their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 2249.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Does anybody wish to change their vote?

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 13. The nays are 31.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2249.

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, the ayes have it, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2249 is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 2249. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 2249.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 21.

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

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 2174, The Paycheck Protection Act. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment by Mr. Burlison of Missouri to the amendment by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Burlison Amendment Number 1 of H.R. 2174.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. 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 28.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment by Mr. Burlison of Missouri to the amendment by Mr. Biggs of Arizona to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the Burlison Number 3 amendment to the amendment of H.R. 2174.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 18. The nays are 26.

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

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 2174. The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Biggs from Arizona. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of H.R. 2174.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 14. The nays are 30.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174.

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, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2174 is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 2174. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 2174.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 21.

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

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

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 2193. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 2193.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the vote total.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 29. The nays are 15.

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

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

The question is now favorably reporting H.R. 2277. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 2277.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded?

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

Wait, wait. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The clerk will now close the vote and report the vote.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 44. The nays are zero.

Chairman COMER. As I always said, Mr. Connolly, this was a bipartisan Committee. The ayes have it. The bill is ordered favorably reported.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute. OK. The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 2056.

Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting H.R. 2056.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 21.

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

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

The question is now on favorably reporting House Resolution 187. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting House Resolution 187.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 21. The nays are 23.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the resolution fails.

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

The question is on favorably reporting House Resolution 186. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system. The clerk will now open the vote on favorably reporting House Resolution 186.

[Voting.]

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

[No response.]

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

[No response.]

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

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 21. The nays are 23.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the resolution fails.

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

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, I ask that the Committee Members have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee supplemental, additional, Minority, and dissenting views without objection. Additionally, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the bills ordered reported today subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

If there is no further business before the Committee, I thank everyone for coming out. This is a 7-hour markup.

Without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 7:11 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]