

119th Congress }
2nd Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

{ CP: 119-10

FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL RESOLUTIONS

for the

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
GOVERNMENT REFORM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 21, 2026

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

62-609 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Chairman*

JIM JORDAN, Ohio
MIKE TURNER, Ohio
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
GARY PALMER, Alabama
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
PAT FALLON, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri
ELI CRANE, Arizona
BRIAN JACK, Georgia
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia
BRANDON GILL, Texas
Vacancy

ROBERT GARCIA, California, *Ranking Minority Member*
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
RO KHANNA, California
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
MAXWELL FROST, Florida
SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
GREG CASAR, Texas
JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
EMILY RANDALL, Washington
SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
WESLEY BELL, Missouri
LATEEFAH SIMON, California
DAVE MIN, California
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JAMES R. WALKINSHAW, Virginia

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
RYAN GIACHETTI, Chief Counsel
BILLY GRANT, Deputy Chief Counsel for Investigations
PETER SPECTRE, Deputy Director of Oversight
ELLISON TOLAN, Counsel
WILL HARNICE, Staff Assistant
MALLORY COGAR, Director of Operations and Chief Clerk
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

ROBERT EDMONSON, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
Hon. James Comer, U.S. Representative, Chairman	2
Hon. Robert Garcia, U.S. Representative, Ranking Member	3

BILLS CONSIDERED

H.Res.—, Recommending That the House of Representatives Find William J. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply With a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Bill Discussed	2
H.Res.—, Recommending That the House of Representatives Find Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply With a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Bill Discussed	65

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Article, *Politico*, “Clay Higgins Explains Why He was the Lone No Vote on Epstein Files Release”; submitted by Rep. Frost.
- * Article, *CNN Politics*, “GOP Reps. Perry and Biggs Formally Object to Subpoena From January 6 Committee”; submitted by Rep. Frost.
- * Article, *Politics PA*, “Representative Perry Referred to the House Ethics Committee for Refusing Subpoena”; submitted by Rep. Frost.
- * Email, Clinton Attorneys Redacted; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * 2025.08.05 Subpoena and Schedule to DOJ; submitted by Rep. Higgins.
- * 2025.08.05 Subpoena Cover Letter to DOJ; submitted by Rep. Higgins.
- * Transcript of July 23, 2025 Federal Law Enforcement Subcommittee Hearing; submitted by Rep. Higgins.
- * H.R. 6982, Preventing Prosecutors from Protecting Predators Act of 2026; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * November 28, 2025 tweet—X; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Alexander Dickey; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Donald Gresh; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Eric Bowman; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Logan Frederico; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Robert Merting; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Scott Spivey; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Weldon Boyd; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Photo, Travis Reed Gaye; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Post, *Truth Social*, “November 14”; submitted by Rep. Min.

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

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL RESOLUTIONS**

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2026

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

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:09 a.m., in HVC-210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

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

Now, pursuant to notice, I call up a report containing a resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find former President William J. Clinton in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a duly issued subpoena issued by this Committee.

The clerk will report the report which has been distributed in advance.

**H.RES.—, RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES FIND WILLIAM J. CLINTON IN
CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY
WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE
ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM**

The Clerk. A report containing a House resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find former President William J. Clinton, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a duly issued subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

The clerk will please report the amendment.

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

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

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

**OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JAMES COMER
REPRESENTATIVE FROM KENTUCKY**

Today, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform meets to advance two resolutions recommending that the House of Representatives find former President Bill Clinton and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in contempt of Congress for refusing to comply with duly issued subpoenas. The Committee does not take this action lightly, but subpoenas are not mere suggestions. They carry the force of law and require compliance. Former President Clinton and Secretary Clinton were legally required to appear for depositions before this Committee. They refused. As Democrat Ranking Member Garcia stated, “Defying a congressional subpoena is highly illegal.” He also stated, “No one is above the law.”

Actions have consequences. Six months ago, Republicans and Democrats on the House Oversight Committee’s Federal Law Enforcement Subcommittee unanimously approved deposition subpoenas for the Clintons by voice vote as part of our investigation into the Federal Government’s handling of the Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell criminal cases. More than five months ago, I issued those bipartisan subpoenas. The Clintons’ testimony is critical to understanding Epstein’s sex-trafficking network and the ways he sought to curry favor and influence to shield himself from scrutiny. Their testimony may also inform how Congress can strengthen laws to better combat human trafficking.

Since issuing the subpoenas, this Committee has acted in good faith. We have offered flexibility on scheduling. The response we received was not cooperation, but defiance, marked by repeated delays, excuses, and obstruction. The Clintons claim they had been treated unfairly because this Committee accepted written state-

ments under penalty of perjury from former U.S. Attorneys General Holder, Lynch, Sessions, and Garland, as well as former FBI Director Comey. Those written statements were accepted because none of those officials recalled information relevant to the Epstein investigation, nor did they have personal relationships with Epstein. By contrast, the Committee required in-person testimony from former U.S. Attorney General Barr and former U.S. Secretary of Labor and U.S. Attorney Acosta, both Republicans, because they possessed information directly relevant to the investigation.

The Clintons are in a fundamentally different category. They had documented relationships with Epstein and Maxwell, evidenced by numerous photographs, flight log records, wedding invitations, and other materials. Some of these photos can be seen here.

[Photos]

We repeatedly informed the Clintons' attorney that written statements would not be accepted. The subpoenas required depositions. Federal courts have consistently held that witnesses may not impose their own conditions upon the manner of congressional inquiry, yet the Clintons attempted to do exactly that, submitting brief, bulleted written statements that are neither comprehensive nor responsive to the Committee's many unanswered questions. No witness, not a former President or a private citizen, may willfully defy a duly issued congressional subpoena without consequence, but that is what the Clintons did, and that is why we are here today.

I would expect bipartisan support for enforcing those subpoenas by voting in favor of these resolutions. Unfortunately, it appears that Ranking Member Garcia has chosen to follow marching orders designed to distract from the issue at hand. I hope I am wrong about this. Over the weekend, Ranking Member Garcia made clear that Democrats intend to divert attention from the Clintons by instead calling for Attorney General Bondi to be held in contempt. The difference is clear. Attorney General Bondi and the Department of Justice are producing documents. While the pace is slower than any of us would prefer and must speed up, I believe that much of the delay involves the Department of Justice trying to take care to redact victims' personal information. By contrast, the Clintons have flatly refused to appear at all, despite repeated warnings that the Committee would move forward with contempt proceedings. Today, the Clintons must be held accountable for their actions, and Democrats must support these measures or they will be exposed as hypocrites.

We must do what is necessary to uphold Congress' investigative authority, which is imperative to the legislative process, and we are doing so to demonstrate to the American people that justice is applied equally to everyone, regardless of position, pedigree, or prestige. I urge my colleagues to support this contempt report. I now yield to Ranking Member Garcia for his opening statement.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER ROBERT GARCIA
REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA**

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to just make one thing clear. Oversight Democrats, from the start of this investigation, have been crystal clear that we are willing to talk to anyone

who has information about Jeffrey Epstein and his crimes, and we do not care if they are wealthy, their position, if they are Democrats or Republicans, and we agree subpoenas issued by our Committee must always be respected. No President or former President is above the law, and I think every single person on this Committee agrees with that. In fact, I appreciate that you brought those posters.

Mr. Comer, can I actually see that? Would you mind if I actually use that poster that you brought, the ones that you put up? The two that you put up earlier. I will put those up in a sec.

Now, this Committee from day one, and we agree, we have had questions for former President Clinton. And as you know, former President Clinton has begun answering some of those questions in a signed declaration that this Committee has received recently, including last week. We know that President Clinton has offered to answer additional questions in different formats. He has also called for a full release of the files immediately, which you or no one on this Committee has actually done. It is interesting that it is this subpoena only that Republicans and the Chairman have been obsessed about putting all their energy behind.

Now, we also want President Clinton to answer questions. In fact, he should continue to answer the questions from this Committee as he has begun doing in not just a signed declaration, but also in other offers to meet with this Committee, of which you have rejected. But it is also incredibly interesting that this energy you have to attack whoever you believe your political opponents are, you are unwilling to use on Ghislaine Maxwell, a monster who has trafficked, abused, and raped children and women, and which every Committee Member and this body knows should be in front of this Committee. Where is the contempt charges to bring her into this Committee to answer the questions, and I hope that you would agree, Mr. Comer, that that should be one of our top priorities.

And let us talk about the President. Your former colleague, Marjorie Taylor Greene, on this Committee reported that Trump told her that he wanted to continue his coverup because "My friends, will get hurt." Donald Trump is leading a White House coverup right now of the Epstein files, and we all know that Epstein himself said that Donald Trump was his best friend for over ten years. And it is shameful, illegal, and unconstitutional that the Department of Justice has released one percent of the files. One percent of the files. Where is the pressure to get Pam Bondi to release the files? Instead, your focus and the Committee is focused on whoever you perceive to be your enemies and the enemies of Donald Trump. Because let us be clear. We want to talk to President Bill Clinton. We want him to answer our questions. We also want Ghislaine Maxwell to answer our questions. We also want to understand why Pam Bondi refuses to release all the files. One percent of the files have been released, millions have been left, no publications for weeks. That is a crime.

And so, this White House coverup continues every single day that the files are not released, and yet where are those calls, Mr. Comer? You are saying they are complying. That is both a lie and shameful. It is time to end this White House coverup. I want to yield to Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Federal Law En-

forcement, Summer Lee, who originally made the motion to subpoena Attorney General Pam Bondi.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. I just want us to speak plainly and lay the facts out on what is really happening in this Committee. We are one week out from Bill and Hillary Clinton, who did not show up for their depositions—1 week—and we are already having a markup to hold them in contempt. Meanwhile, the Department of Justice has been legally obligated to hand over the full unredacted Epstein files to this Committee since August, the same exact subpoena that they are using to hold the Clintons in contempt. And please note that these resolutions are allowing the DOJ to prosecute the Clintons for the exact same things that the DOJ itself is violating.

They have handed over one percent of the files and heavily redacted. We are five months overdue, Mr. Comer, but you have made no effort to bring in Pam Bondi, so, no, the difference is not clear. You have made no effort to demand any answers, to exert any pressure. So, with that, Mr. Chair, I do have an amendment at the desk, which would hold Pam Bondi in contempt for non-compliance with the bipartisan subpoena that you issued on August 5, 2025. I hope that my colleagues will support. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Minority's time has expired. We are still debating the measure, and we will take up your amendment once we finish debating the initial measure. I just wanted to respond to a couple of things.

I agree we need to hear from Ghislaine Maxwell. We have been trying to get her in for a deposition, and her lawyers have been saying that she is going to plead the Fifth, but we have nailed down a date, February 9, where Ghislaine Maxwell will be deposed by this Committee. Now, her lawyers have made it clear that she is going to plead the Fifth. I hope she changes her mind because I want to hear from her just like I want to hear from—

Ms. LEE. Then bring her.

Chairman COMER. What is that?

Ms. LEE. You said the difference is clear.

Chairman COMER. What did you say?

Ms. LEE. If the difference is clear, the difference here is that they are also trying to negotiate. She says she does not want to do it. You have not moved in the same way. So, you are actually not applying the same standard here across the board. The DOJ is in the same exact subpoena—

Chairman COMER. No, you are out of order, Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE [continuing]. Ghislaine Maxwell says she will not do it.

Chairman COMER. You are out of order.

Ms. LEE. Bring her in then. Let us do the contempt.

Chairman COMER. Listen, you are out of order, Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE. Let us do the contempt.

Chairman COMER. You are out of order. So, we were going to depose Ghislaine Maxwell on February 9.

Mr. GARCIA. Where are the contempt charges, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. You are out of order too, Mr. Garcia, and we will proceed with that deposition. Ms. Lee said the Clintons just missed their deadline by a week. We have been negotiating with the Clinton attorneys for five months. Five months.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, whose time are we speaking on right now?

Chairman COMER. This is my time. This is my time. I recognized myself, so I have 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. You already had your 5 minutes.

Chairman COMER. Well, I am about finished anyway. I have not used 5 minutes. I have used about 1 minute.

Mr. GARCIA. You used your full 5 minutes, sir.

Chairman COMER. No, I have not used the 5 minutes, Mr. Garcia. So, does any other Member seek recognition on the underlying bill?

Mrs. Luna.

Mrs. LUNA. So, I think this is really important for everyone to get context. I just actually talked to Todd Blanche this morning, and as we proceed in this Committee today, I wanted to give an update, but also to let you all know that Todd Blanche has told me that he is willing to talk to any of you. And I think it would be very important as we proceed with the seriousness of this investigation, specifically pertaining to Jeffrey Epstein, that there is open dialog directly with the DOJ. When I went to move to hold Garland in contempt of Congress, part of the issue was is he was not even willing to talk to Congress, period, at least not some of the Members that were concerned about some of those audio tapes.

But specifically pertaining to the Jeffrey Epstein update, as of right now, what I have been told by Mr. Blanche is that the files, and I think, in total, it was over five million files, actually have finished review at the DOJ. They have had 500 attorneys from NSC, the Southern District of Florida, SDNY, and the FBI basically working on this six days a week to get these files appropriately redacted with victim information. But specifically, what the hang up is for the file release is the judge in New York that made the order from the SDNY's prosecutor's office, Jay Clayton, basically certified under oath that there would be a review to protect some of the victim information. And so, that is part of the reason why it has, I guess, been more of a delay. I do think that this information needs to be released, but it is important to provide context that, unless we are going to bring in the judge in New York, which I agree with him, I do think that there needs to be a proper review of the documents if it is pertaining to victim information, it is just important to know that context. But I would be happy to, Garcia, I would be happy to facilitate that phone call, give you his personal cellphone. He said he would actually like to talk to all of you guys, and I would encourage you guys to actually engage in that conversation because I do think this is important.

And then also, too, a last update, I was told and I have been trying to obtain information of one victim specifically. If you have victims that specifically want their files, they will actually take those names and get whatever files they can to them. So, some of the Democrats are working with some of the victims, I am working with some of them, but it is important to know for context. So, I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. Very good, and would you yield? You got 2 minutes left, but I just want to make clear.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Like most everyone on this Committee, I do a lot of interviews, and I have stated repeatedly, publicly, on conservative networks, liberal networks, and everything in between, that we want the Epstein documents released, and I appreciate the update from Mrs. Luna on the progress. They have been complying. We all wish that it was moving much faster, but there are a lot of documents. And if you will remember, the last document dump that the Department of Justice released, there were many people on this Committee on the Democrat side that were very critical saying there were not enough redactions. So, they are making triple and quadruple sure that the victims' personal information is redacted. Now, do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Ranking Member Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Representative Luna, I appreciate those statements, but I just want to be clear, that is a lie, and here is why. Mr. Blanche said that they have been reviewing the documents since the passage of the law, the Khanna-Massie law. We have had a legal subpoena in place since the summer, since July. It has been the job of the DOJ to comply with this law since a subpoena passed the subcommittee of this body. Since that subpoena passed in July, we have received 33,000 documents, of which 99 percent of them were already public documents. And so, when we talk about complying with the law, you have to talk about complying with the very subpoena that this Committee actually passed in a bipartisan way. And so, Mr. Blanche is talking about the Epstein files law, which we should have received all the documents already per the actual law that was voted on. There has been little to zero production of this Committee's requests. And so, Mr. Blanche is wrong, and he is not being truthful to this Committee and to you. Thank you.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield remaining time to Ms. Summer, who has the underlying motion, and I know that you said that we would be dealing with that. I just do not think she had enough time to explain her position on it.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Mfume. I actually do appreciate that, and I would like to really emphasize that one percent of the files is insulting. It is insulting. In fact, when we consider that Pam Bondi herself has publicly stated that the files exist, she publicly stated that she had already given Donald Trump that information, so it is a little bit concerning that you have not moved in the way that you said you would. This type of energy could be well spent on the DOJ. It could be well spent on not just saying that you want us to release the files. You have power here. This markup is evidence that you were never serious about an honest, bipartisan investigation, that you always intended to use this as a one-sided political hit job because if you had your way, we actually would have recessed this summer before we were able to force that bipartisan subpoena through the Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement. So, when we think about this kangaroo court into this honesty that is happening right here, right, it dishonors the integrity of our

Committee and the survivors who have put themselves at risk for justice.

We all remember the roundtable where many of us sat and listened to the survivors. We listened to their stories, and one of them spoke and said that she does not know if we are good liars or if we are telling the truth, but for the first time, she is hoping that something actually happens here. We left that roundtable, and, Mr. Comer, you yourself, said that you wanted to honor those victims. To let Pam Bondi off the hook, to let others, who are obviously in those files, off the hook is unacceptable. We cannot investigate this fully if we do not have the full files. We cannot see all there is to see if the DOJ is not complying. We cannot move forward. Being in the Minority party gives us limited options for actions, and we all must be unwilling to wait if you are not going to subpoena the files. So, I thank you, Mr. Mfume, and I yield back.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back, also.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Member? Mr. Gosar.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes, I yield to the Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Mr. Gosar, for yielding. First of all, let us go back. When this started, everyone was demanding that we subpoena the Epstein estate. That was not in the discharge petition, but I issued a subpoena to the estate. When we met with the victims, when we met privately for two hours, Ms. Lee was there, and Ms. Crockett, and, you know, more than half the Committee. They were demanding that we subpoena the estate, and we did. We got every document from the estate. There were people who said, oh, there are going to be a lot of questions answered, there will be names. We have subpoenaed every document, every picture, everything from the estate. We never held back. We have been serious. We have all supported the full release of the documents. As I have stated many times publicly, we wish this process was going quicker. That is a lot of documents, a lot of redactions. A lot of eyes have to be put on this, so the Department of Justice is complying.

Now, with respect to Maxwell. Maxwell and the Clintons are not treated differently. Maxwell, she was willing to appear but made very clear she would take the Fifth Amendment. The Clintons refused to appear. The Clintons refused to appear, and one of the proposals that Clinton made was if we would let Hillary Clinton off, then Mr. Garcia and I could travel to Mr. Clinton's house and bring one staffer and take notes, but no transcript. That is not even a thing, and you all know that. The media, I am sure, would require a transcript. There is no real investigation without a transcript. So, you know, what few counter proposals the Clintons' massive legal team has made are not acceptable, and I do not think anyone is going to stand up here and willing to publicly argue that they were. So, does any other Member seek recognition? Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The American people deserve full transparency, and anyone who has relevant information about Jeffrey Epstein's crimes must be compelled to come forward and share with this Committee. Wealth and power cannot shield people from accountability from this Committee. It is the victims of these horrific crimes who deserve protection, not Jeffrey Epstein and the people associated with him. We all agree, we want to hear

from former President Bill Clinton, but Committee Republicans have failed to conduct a serious investigation. For instance, they, A, refused to hold Attorney General Pam Bondi in contempt for failure to release 99 percent of the Epstein files on a bipartisan law that we all passed on the House Floor; and, B, that had a deadline, and, B, they refused to hold Ghislaine Maxwell accountable for defying this Committee's subpoenas.

We all know that President Trump has a longstanding relationship with Jeffrey Epstein. His Administration continues to obstruct the release of the Epstein files for this reason. We have seen photos of them together. Even Elon Musk posted, "@realDonaldTrump Trump is in the Epstein files. That is the real reason why they have not been made public." President Trump's own Mar-a-Lago Club appears to come up often in connection to Jeffrey Epstein. From reporting, we know that Epstein was deeply involved with Mar-a-Lago. He was a frequent visitor to the club for years. The club sent employees, usually young women, to Epstein's mansion for massages, manicures, and other spa services. Staff members from the club made frequent calls to Epstein's home in Palm Beach, and on these calls, Epstein engaged in sexually suggestive behavior, such as exposing himself. And in 2000, Ghislaine Maxwell recruited a trafficking victim from Mar-a-Lago where she was working as an employee.

This Committee must also investigate what Mar-a-Lago Club members and the staff knew about Jeffrey Epstein's crimes. Getting documents from Mar-a-Lago is about uncovering evidence, holding these people accountable, and doing right by the victims of these horrific crimes. So, I am for, we are all for, making sure that we hear from everyone. I do not care if you are a Democrat, I do not care if you are a Republican. I am tired of rich people trying to evade justice and accountability, period. But you cannot do it just for the party you disagree with. You cannot do it in a politically motivated way, so here is the opportunity to show it is not a politically motivated thing. Let us also make sure that we get these documents from Mar-a-Lago.

So, with that, pursuant to Clause 2(k)(6) of House Rule XI, I move that the House shall subpoena the Mar-a-Lago Club and all entities under common ownership or control with the Mar-a-Lago Club, to provide the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with, one, all documents, communications, and materials related to Jeffrey Epstein, to include, but not limited to, personnel files and records, client files and records, massage and spa services records, complaints and grievances filed against Jeffrey Epstein, internal communications and the billing statements; two, a list of all Mar-a-Lago Club personnel who provided massages on behalf of the Mar-a-Lago Club between 1997 and 2003, regardless of whether such personnel were contractors or formally employed masseuses or otherwise; and three, a list of all Mar-a-Lago Club personnel who were employed as or acted as managers of the Mar-a-Lago Club Spa between 1997 and 2003.

Chairman COMER. A motion was made by Mr. Frost. The motion is improper as the item is not on the agenda. The Chair recognizes—

Mr. FROST. So, Mr. Chair, you want to use procedure to push back accountability?

Chairman COMER. No, we are holding people accountable today. That is why we are here. The Chair recognizes—

Mr. FROST. Well, why won't you move to make sure that we get the relevant documents from Mar-a-Lago that I just read this, and you are saying it is because it is not on the agenda that we cannot move forward with this? You have full discretion of this Committee to say, you know what, let us have a vote in a bipartisan way to say we want the documents from Mar-a-Lago.

Chairman COMER. I do not have full discretion. It is in the rules. We voted on a rules package at the beginning of the Congress.

Mr. FROST. You are able to say right now that we can vote on this.

Chairman COMER. We cannot vote on it. It is in our rules. We will be breaking our rules. We have to comply to the rules, too. We are not like the Clintons.

Mr. FROST. No, no, no, you are hiding behind process to protect these Mar-a-Lago documents, and I think it is disgraceful.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Cloud.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One thing that was noted in the Clintons' letters is they said the subpoenas were illegal. I would be curious to know if the Ranking Member thinks that they are illegal, and with that, I would yield the rest of my time to you.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Mr. Cloud. I want to make sure everyone is aware. On February 11, Attorney General Bondi will be appearing as the sole witness in front of the Judiciary Committee. Ms. Crockett is a Member of the Judiciary Committee. I would assume—I do not want to speak for Ms. Crockett—but I would assume you will ask her questions about the Epstein investigation and her progress toward releasing the documents. Mr. Massie is a Member of the Judiciary Committee. He has already stated publicly he is going to spend his 5 minutes asking the Attorney General about the Epstein document. So, the Attorney General is slated to be in front of Congress, and I am pretty confident that just about everybody on that Committee is going to ask the Attorney General where we are with the document production. So, I think that is important to note. February 11, she is slated to be in front of the Judiciary Committee. And with the discharge petition, when the House voted for that, we issued the subpoenas for the Epstein documents, then we all voted for the discharge petition. The discharge petition has jurisdiction in the Judiciary Committee. So, she is going to be in front of the Judiciary Committee, the next week we are in session. So, I think that is important to note. Do any other Members seek—okay. Mr. Lynch then, yes, go ahead.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would remind the gentleman, and I am sure he knows this, that the Oversight Committee is the principal investigatory Committee in the House, and we have a responsibility. It may be a shared responsibility with Judiciary, but we nevertheless have a responsibility, and we are the ones who issued that subpoena. This Committee did. We are the ones who sat with the victims, right? We looked them in the eye, including the Speaker of the House. We looked them in the eye, these women who have been struggling to get justice for many, many years, and we promised them, every Member of this Committee, we promised them that we would do everything under our

power to make sure they finally receive justice, and here we are today.

Now, with millions and millions of documents requested back in August, we have still received, what, one percent of the documents? This is evidence, evidence of wrongdoing in many cases, and yet, we are allowing Attorney General Bondi to obstruct justice, basically. Even the little bit of evidence that she has provided, she also included a statement that basically said do not believe this evidence, there is a lot of falsity in these. I mean, I have never seen an Attorney General in this country provide evidence and then give an opinion on that evidence to the legislature, to the Congress. That is unheard of, but it shows her willingness to do whatever she can to obstruct justice from being delivered.

The second thing I want to say is, if we are truly interested in getting information relative to this investigation, there should be some underlying basis for that, and I have reviewed all of the evidence that has been made available so far. I find nothing—nothing—that points to Secretary Clinton in this at all. Yes, she was Secretary of State at one point, but the information that we are trying to get with respect to Secretary of State is available from any Secretary of State that served in that office with respect to trafficking. So, there is no direct reason, no direct evidence to point to Secretary Clinton in any of this. And yet, while those millions of documents are being denied us, we are pulling someone forward, I think, for the point of public embarrassment and because of ill will on the part of the President to bring her forward for embarrassment, but not for the purpose of gaining helpful information for this investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield the balance of my time to the Ranking Member, Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Congressman Lynch. Mr. Comer, I just want to be just pretty clear about two things, and, one, particularly something that you said. Let me just start by saying that you noted in your comments that your concern and your biggest concern was the issue of the transcript, and I want to just go back really quick because you and I share respect for subpoenas.

Chairman COMER. Mm-hmm.

Mr. GARCIA. You and I share that we want the former President to answer questions. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. Correct.

Mr. GARCIA. Great, and so does every other Member of this Committee. We want the former President to answer questions of this Committee, and we want not just the former President, but everyone to follow subpoenas of this Committee. So, let us agree on that, but to be clear, President Clinton, the former President, has submitted a signed declaration. He has offered to sit with you and me and answer questions. He has offered to have staff in the room to transcribe and be there while those questions are being answered, and his request was to do it in a dignified way. Your concern, as you brought up in your last comments, was that he was unwilling to do a recorded transcript. That is actually also not true. And to be clear, there has been public reporting, including in articles that came out over the weekend, that they have not ruled out a re-

corded transcript. I want to ask the President questions. Chairman Comer, I want to ask President Clinton questions. Don't you?

Chairman COMER. That is why we are here.

Mr. GRACIA. I want to ask President Clinton questions in a recorded transcript and with our members of our staff. Would you like to do that also?

Chairman COMER. May I make a comment on the transcript? They have not agreed to a transcript. Staff notes are not equivalent to a transcript.

Mr. GRACIA. They have actually made public reporting.

Chairman COMER. So, they want me to make note. They said, okay, Comer can take notes, but they have called us all liars, and, you know, how the Clintons have gone on offense, and, look, they do not get to make the rules. We make the rules.

Mr. GARCIA. Can I have the rest of my time back?

Chairman COMER. Yes. Go ahead.

Mr. GARCIA. Okay. Thank you. I want to be clear because this is an email, actually, from the Clinton lawyers. You have this actually. "To be clear, at no point were we opposed to the creation of a record of the interview, which is why we offered to allow the notetakers previously." They go on. They go on. You have this email, sir. So, I guess, my question to you is, do you want to sit down and ask President Clinton questions?

Mr. DONALDS. Will the Ranking Member yield to a question?

Mr. GARCIA. Actually, can I have my time back?

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

Chairman COMER. We will recognize Garcia, then Mr. Donalds will be next, so.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. So, my question to you, Mr. Comer, again, is, if we want to actually ask questions of President Clinton, of which those of us in the Minority want to do, then let us get him in. Let us negotiate a recorded transcription of that interview to further our investigation. I thank you for the yield, Mr. Lynch.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Yes. Chairman, point of clarification. Both President Clinton and Secretary Clinton were subpoenaed by this Committee to come in for a transcribed interview. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. For a deposition, yes.

Mr. DONALDS. For a deposition. Chairman, I have been in these closed depositions a number of times in my time being on the Oversight Committee. I fail to see what President Clinton is talking about with respect to a dignified manner. Every time I have been involved in any of these conversations, even when it was former President Biden's son came in for one of those, and I am not trying to bring up all the Hunter stuff. It is just a point I am making. I think, everybody, just take the temperature down, relax. Even the closed-door depositions have always been held in a dignified manner. Members have had questions, outside of questions from Committee staff, but Members on both sides of the aisle had an ability to answer those questions. Those interviews are recorded. The transcripts of those interviews are provided to the public. I fail to see what special accommodations President Clinton and Secretary

Clinton were looking for. Chairman, can you help me understand this, or even the Ranking Member.

I am really trying to understand. I am not trying to make a point. We do too much of that here. I am trying to understand because if we are holding a new meeting to replace what the Committee already requested, my question is why?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Garcia is willing to answer the question.

Mr. GARCIA. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Donalds. I appreciate the question. Look, first, I am not here to defend the Clintons, to be clear. Their job is to negotiate with the Committee, and in this case, you have the majority. Their job is to negotiate with the Majority on coming in for a binding subpoena, to be clear. But I also note that this Committee has historically made accommodations for a variety of folks. In fact, I think it is a bit hypocritical that when this very subpoena for the Clintons were actually made, I believe there were an additional five to six other subpoenas that were issued to numerous other Members of former administrations, Attorney Generals [sic], and so forth. Every one of those other subpoenas, I think, maybe with the exception of one, were given special accommodations. In fact, they were actually allowed to just send their responses in writing. Is that correct, Mr. Comer?

Chairman COMER. That is. May I respond to that?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes, in just one second. And so, accommodations are made, and so while every other folks in that group were given special accommodations, that has been typically the case, and I will finally say just this. Like you, I want to have President Clinton answer questions. I think they are trying to negotiate that with the Majority, and they have been clear that it being transcribed is not an issue. They have not ruled that out, and so let us negotiate with the Clintons, and let us get them to answer our questions.

Mr. DONALDS. Chairman, since I guess we are on my time, and, by the way, Ranking Member, thank you for that. I appreciate that. Chairman, you were mentioning you were going to inject your commentary with respect to special accommodations that have been made for previous witnesses. I do not know if you want to expound on what the Ranking Member said or not.

Chairman COMER. I would love to. So, first of all, you talk about ongoing negotiations. We have been negotiating for five months. This is clearly a stall tactic, hoping that the time clock runs out, and the House flips, and that you all let them off the hook. But second, you mentioned and I mentioned this in my opening statement, there were names on that initial list with the Summer Lee motion and the Scott Perry amendment, Attorney General Holder, Lynch, Sessions, and Garland, as well as Comey. They all complied and had written statements under the penalty of perjury that they had no knowledge of anything with Epstein, that they were not directly involved in the investigation, and, you know, basically, had no personal relationship.

I think we would all agree, the Clintons had a personal relationship with both Epstein and Maxwell. You know, from the evidence that we have received thus far from the estate and all the other documents that we have thus far, it appears that Jeffrey Epstein visited the Clinton White House 17 times while he was President, and then post-presidency, it appears that Bill Clinton flew on

Epstein's plane at least 27 times. So, there is a huge difference between the knowledge and relationship with the Clintons and Epstein and Maxwell versus the former Attorney General. And another note, I do not know if it was Mr. Bell or whoever said that we only are interested in Democrats. We grilled Bill Barr and Alex Acosta, and they are very Republican. In fact, they were members of the Trump Cabinet.

Now, I have been on the Oversight Committee nine years. We have had four other Committee Chairs since I have been here. We have had Jason Chaffetz, Trey Gowdy, Elijah Cummings, and Carolyn Maloney. I do not ever remember a time, and I could be wrong. If I am, I am sure you all will correct me, but I do not remember a time when Carolyn Maloney or Elijah Cummings subpoenaed a high-ranking Democrat to come in for a grilling. So, to imply that this is partisan, that is just simply not true. We have already had two very high—the former Attorney General of the United States under Trump and the former Labor Secretary and U.S. Attorney, so we have done that.

And then one other thing with the Clintons, and I will yield back, one of the arguments the Clintons made, Mr. Garcia, was that our subpoenas were unlawful. Do you agree that the subpoenas we issued to the Clintons are unlawful?

Mr. GARCIA. I believe that all of our subpoenas that we have issued have been lawful, sir.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Does any other Member seek recognition?

Ms. Brown.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is clear to me that the purpose of this meeting today is just to continue this Committee's agenda of political theater, plain and simple. Democrats have been very clear, abundantly, repeatedly, and without room for ambiguity, we want to hear from anyone who has information about the Epstein crimes. And yet, when former President Clinton and former Secretary Clinton offered to cooperate with this Committee, to submit sworn statements, to provide what they know, to engage in good faith, the Majority said no, and that is what brings us to why we are really here today. The Majority is rushing to hold in contempt two private citizens who have demonstrated their desire to cooperate with this Committee and who have called for the release of every file on Jeffrey Epstein, all while the Department of Justice and Attorney General Pam Bondi are breaking the law in plain sight.

Here are the facts. The DOJ was required by statute to release the Epstein files by December 19, 2025. The deadline has passed by more than a month, and what have we received? One percent. One percent is not compliance. One percent is not transparency. One percent is a coverup. What about the one percent they actually released? We have seen redactions, redactions that are extensive, unusual, and very likely illegal. And what is more, the Epstein Files Release Act, passed by super majorities in this Congress and signed into law by this President, required the DOJ to send a report to Congress by January 3, 2026. More than two weeks later, what have we received from the DOJ? Nothing. So, if my colleagues on the other side of aisle were really serious about uncovering the

truth and government and accountability, we would be demanding answers from the Administration. We would be demanding answers from Attorney General Bondi. We would be demanding the release of the 99 percent of the Epstein files still sitting at the DOJ.

So, I have some very simple questions. Where is the subpoena for Attorney General Bondi? Where is the hearing on DOJ's failure to comply with the Epstein Files Transparency Act? Where is the accountability for the redactions page after page after page? This vote feels less like oversight and more like a distraction, a distraction from the DOJ's lawlessness, a distraction from a broken promise of transparency, a distraction from the embarrassment of a co-equal branch of government choosing complicity over accountability, and a distraction from survivors who deserve this truth. If this Committee is serious, then we must hold the Department of Justice accountable. Release the files, all of them, and stop playing politics with justice. Survivors deserve better, and with that, I yield the balance of my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Representative Brown. Chairman, I want to just respond to something that you said. I think it is important. First, I just want to read the folks of the subpoena you have chosen not to enforce. Alberto Gonzales, who we subpoenaed on that same day, I believe you did not enforce. Eric Holder, of course, former AG, you did not enforce. Loretta Lynch, you chose not to enforce. Jeff Sessions, you chose not to enforce. Merrick Garland, who I think it would be important to have answered questions, you chose not to enforce. James Comey, you chose not to enforce.

In fact, I have Attorney General Gonzales' letter. It says, "Dear Chairman Comer, this letter is to confirm that, consistent with my conversations with the Committee General Counsel, I have no present memory or conversations related to the investigation/prosecution of Epstein matter during my tenure as U.S. Attorney General." He, of course, was the Attorney General when the whole Alex Acosta, U.S. Attorney matter was in front of a critical time in this investigation. Now, you chose not to enforce that because, you know, you mentioned that this letter is under penalty of perjury. The declaration the Clintons also made and sent to you to answer some of those questions were also under penalty of perjury. I just want to clarify that.

And that with the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that you have talked a lot about the importance of our subpoenas and that we should all support this Committee's subpoenas, and I agree with you, sir, and I want to hear from the Clintons. It is also important to note that we have Members of this Committee—Congressman Jim Jordan, Congressman Andy Biggs, Congressman Scott Perry—who are obviously very outspoken, which we like to engage with. Now, they are not here, and that is okay. Now, you also know, sir, that all three of them defied legally binding subpoenas issued by the January 6 Committee relating to their efforts to overturn the 2020 election. So, we should be clear that the Majority chooses to be very selective on which subpoenas they want to enforce or talk about. We have Members of the Majority that themselves have defied subpoenas.

So, once again, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, let us ask President Clinton the questions that we have, let us have him come in and testify in a way that we can negotiate, and let us get all the release of the files done immediately. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Would you yield? Could I respond to that?

Mr. GARCIA. Sure. I have no more time, but I am happy to respond.

Chairman COMER. You say we did not enforce the subpoenas. We did enforce. They complied and testified under the penalty of perjury that they had no knowledge. Now, the Clinton declarations were short bullet points, almost like talking points, and the evidence is clear that the Clintons did have relationship with him. Now, again, I have said publicly millions of times, you know, no one is accusing the Clintons of wrongdoing. But the fact that they were that close, and the fact that I have never seen a sit-down interview with Bill Clinton where he has answered questions about his relationship with Epstein and Maxwell, like the current President has. So, we have complied and enforced all of our subpoenas, a hundred percent of our subpoenas, so I just want to make that very clear.

Mr. GARCIA. Can I respond to you, sir?

Chairman COMER. Sure.

Mr. GARCIA. Just to be clear, you are talking about two declarations. The declaration that you chose to use as something that you moved on to not bring him in was one-sixth the size of the Clinton declaration. I am looking at the Alberto Gonzales response to you, sir, that you chose to dismiss, and it is one sentence long. You just pointed out the Clinton declaration, which is six times as long. And so, I just think you are using interesting points to make comparisons. Let us just be clear and get back to the facts. Let us bring President Clinton in to have a conversation with this Committee. You are, instead, choosing to try to prosecute President Clinton and send him to jail, which is part of criminal prosecution, before having him answer questions to this Committee. Him and his team have been trying to negotiate. We want to hear from President Clinton. I am not sure that you do, sir.

Chairman COMER. You do not think I want to hear from President Clinton?

Mrs. LUNA. Chairman Comer, can I? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. So, but before I recognize Mrs. Luna, who will be next, I believe, are you willing to accept those bullet points as testimony, or do you want to hear from Clinton?

Mr. GARCIA. I want to hear from President Clinton.

Chairman COMER. Then I do not know what the point is of talking about their bullet points. I mean, we all know they had a relationship, so.

Mr. GARCIA. I am sorry. I am just responding to the fact that you mentioned that you are dismissing other legal subpoenas with one-sentence answers, and you are the one that pointed out the Clinton's declaration, which is also under penalty of perjury.

Chairman COMER. Do you think that Eric Holder or Lynch or Jeff Sessions or Merrick Garland had more? I mean, do you want to bring them all in?

Mr. GARCIA. I would love to have former Attorney General Merrick Garland in front of this Committee to answer questions as to why more of the files were not released. I have actually said that publicly. And so, sir, I think what it comes down to is we all want to get to the truth, we all want justice for the survivors, and I think more information is better. And so, I think our position is that it is clear to me that President Clinton is negotiating to come in front of this Committee. And it may not be exactly what you and your team want to see as far as that negotiation, or you are not satisfied with the progress, but they continue to negotiate. They have not ruled out a transcript. Let us get them in front of this Committee. Thank you, sir.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Gill, then Mrs. Luna. Mr. Gill has a point to make. No, no. Who is next? Mrs. Luna. Go ahead, Mrs. Luna, then Ms. Mace.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Chairman. I would just like to remind the American people that I was the Member that made the motion to hold Merrick Garland in contempt of Congress, and every Democrat voted against it. And in addition to that, three of my Republican colleagues voted against it, one of which did not come back because his voters decided that he was too swampy for them.

Chairman COMER. Oh.

Mrs. LUNA. So, I would just like to point that out, but aside from that—

Chairman COMER. Mrs. Luna, it has been pointed out to me. You have already had 5 minutes. Somebody will probably yield you some time, so I have got to—

Mrs. LUNA. If I can just finish real quick. If we are looking to see why the files have not been released yet—

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mrs. LUNA [continuing]. Look no further than the Judge Engelmayer, who has actually—

Chairman COMER. Okay. I am sorry, Mrs. Luna.

Mrs. LUNA [continuing]. Who has actually been responsible for denying Rho Khanna and Massie' special counsel.

Chairman COMER. Okay, and I am sorry, Mrs. Luna. I am sorry. Someone can yield you some time.

Mrs. LUNA. I am just saying, I am making a point.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mrs. LUNA. So, this is all political games here.

Chairman COMER. So, we have not recognized the Republican on this side. Ms. Mace, do you want to be recognized?

Ms. MACE. That would be great. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of documents I would like to enter into the record this morning with unanimous consent.

First of all, I want to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop playing politics with justice. Not a single one of you voted for your own party to be held in contempt. I am the only Member of this body, of this Committee that has held both Republicans and Democrats alike in contempt for defying a congressional subpoena. So, the hypocrisy is real, and I do not want to hear anyone on the other side of the aisle say no one is above the law here on this. We are talking about human-trafficking, sex-trafficking. We are talking about children, girls as young as 14, being as-

saulted, being trafficked by wealthy and powerful people. This is not political. This is personal. This should be nonpartisan. We should be working on this together, and it is incredible that we are politicizing rape, or politicizing sex-trafficking, or politicizing this entire Epstein thing. As a survivor, I am telling you, it should not be.

And I have done a lot of work, Mr. Chairman, and advocacy and writing legislation for victims of abuse—male, female, and children, man, woman, and child. South Carolina, my home state, Mr. Chairman, has a huge problem with all sorts of violent crimes, but sex-trafficking in my state is up by over 400 percent. We have domestic violence in our state where you cannot get a trial, and there was a case last year where a woman two years ago was kidnapped by her boyfriend, beaten to a pulp, her face just beaten in. Two years after he kidnapped her and beat her, he murdered her on Mother's Day because our local solicitor refused to prosecute that case. And I have rogue solicitors and prosecutors and Attorneys General who are not doing anything to protect the people of South Carolina, women and children, especially.

Recently, my Attorney General prosecuted a case against convicted pedophile, Donald Gresh. Donald Gresh was convicted of having 1,900 images of toddlers as young as three being raped by animals. Donald Gresh, under the prosecution of my Attorney General, Alan Wilson, served one day in jail. One day. Donald Gresh is not the only convicted pedophile that we prosecute like that. My Attorney General, Alan Wilson, prosecuted this case.

[Photo]

This is Travis Reed Gaye. Well, the other thing, too, is that Donald Gresh, he was facing 60 years in jail, got one day. Travis Reed Gaye was facing seven charges and 70 years in jail in South Carolina. My Attorney General prosecuted this case. He pled guilty in November, did not serve any time. He got probation. He violated his probation 11 days later, and if he violated his probation, he was to serve time in jail. The magistrate or judge—probably did not have a law degree—let him out hours later. He has not served any required time for this kind of thing. And I did a press conference with a bunch of moms, over a dozen moms, last week in Charleston, South Carolina, and there was a local media blackout. I asked, was it my Attorney General who prosecuted this case and let this pedophile out on the streets, was he the one that led the media blackout? Well, I want my Attorney General in my state to know that a young child came forward after seeing my press conference and recognized this man. She filed a police report the same day because he allegedly followed her in a park the week before.

[Photo]

This is Scott Spivey, killed, shot with a bullet in the back, shot at 17 times, not prosecuted by my Attorney General. So, I am going to ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to enter those three images into the record. This is Weldon Boyd. This is Scott Spivey's killer, who shot him in the back and has never really been investigated or prosecuted for that killing in South Carolina. I would like to enter that into the record, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. This is Logan Frederico.

[Photo]

She was executed a year ago, yesterday to the day, by a man named Alexander Dickey. Alexander Dickey was a convicted criminal. He had 39 arrests, 25 felony charges. He executed this beautiful 22-year-old daughter of Steven Frederico in cold blood after stealing a gun. If her killer, Alexander Dickey, had not been let out by a rogue magistrate or judge or a prosecutor, solicitor, that did not care, she would be alive today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter her image and her killer's image into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. I have another image.

[Photo]

This is Eric Bowman. Eric Bowman beat his wife and has been alleged and is being investigated for other abuses against women and, potentially, underage girls. He was just let out free, Mr. Chairman, out of jail in South Carolina. He is a predator. I have reported him to law enforcement. He is under investigation, but I have written bill after bill about predators like Eric Bowman, about voyeurism, about these sorts of criminal sexual allegations. I would like to enter his image into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. I have two more.

Chairman COMER. Your time has expired, but I will recognize you for a UC later on.

Ms. MACE. Okay.

Chairman COMER. Because I want to make sure everybody stays within their 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bell from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. You know, first and foremost, I think we are doing a disservice to the victims in this case when we refer to it as the Epstein files. It is sex-trafficking evidence, and let us call it what it is. And as a prosecutor, we prosecuted these kinds of cases when I was DA back home in St. Louis County, and I met with every single victim and victim's family because I wanted them to know that I was here for them, and I thought it was important that we would look them in the eye and let them know that we are going to do everything we can to bring them justice and treat them with the dignity and respect that they deserve, and this is no different.

That said, I think in D.C., what I have learned in my 11 months here is that this D.C. disease, that of staying in this partisan bubble, is something that you have to continue to be aware of so that you do not fall into these same hypocritical traps. And I talked to Jamie Raskin because I just want to get some perspective on the law, and when we talk about the legal analysis, first and foremost, you cannot read a statute—you learn this in constitutional law first day—you cannot read a statute and understand the law. You have to understand how it is interpreted by the courts, and the courts have been clear that if there is negotiations, that does not meet the threshold for criminal contempt, and the examples are clear on that. When Steve Bannon was held in contempt, he did not negotiate. He did not reply. He did nothing. Meadows, when he started to reply, then Trump told him not to, and then he ceased with his communications with this body.

And so, in this case, I agree 100 percent with our Ranking Member. I want to hear from the Clintons. I think the victims deserve—we want to hear all the evidence, but what I know as a prosecutor is that we do not start doing depositions before we listen to the evidence. Now, if there is not evidence, okay, then there is other things to consider, but the evidence is here. There is evidence that has been duly voted on to be presented to the American people in a bipartisan manner, and of this evidence, we have received one percent? One percent. I mean, put this in perspective. There is zero percent, and then the only thing you can do next is go to one. That is it. We have got nothing, and now we are going to bring the Clintons in before we even have the evidence? That makes zero sense, which is close to the one that I talked about.

And so, there is a legal analysis there about what are we doing to ensure that we are doing a real investigation to get these victims the justice that they deserve. And so, Ghislaine, Ghislaine, whatever her name is, she needs to be brought into this body, and I am hearing that, oh, well, she is going to plead the Fifth? First of all, then let her, but, second, legally on most of these questions, she cannot plead the Fifth. On grounds that she is going to be incriminated? She is already a criminal, so let us bring her in. Let us do those things. Let us bring in every single person. I do not care what they are, Democrat, Republican. And I have said this publicly, and my mother got on me about this, I do not care if my mother is in the Epstein files. We need to see 100 percent of the Epstein files to ensure that we are doing right by these victims.

The legal analysis does not support criminal contempt. A real investigation, a fair, bipartisan investigation would lead us to the conclusion that we want to hear from the Clintons, that we want to hear from everyone. But right now, we do not even know who else is in the Epstein evidence because Pam Bondi has not turned over that evidence, and that is the massive violation that we are seeing that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not seem to have any urgency about the massive violation of the law. And Pam Bondi needs to be here to answer those questions, but that is like, oh, well, we will put it off. We will get there. We are working with them. I will yield the remaining—sorry, Ranking Member.

Chairman COMER. And before I recognize Mr. Gill, I want to point out, February 11, Pam Bondi will be in front of the House Judiciary Committee.

February 9. I am sorry, February 9. February 9.

Ms. Maxwell, and, yes, February 9, we are deposing Ms. Maxwell. February 11, Pam Bondi will be in front of this Committee, so there are a lot of wheels moving right now. The Chair recognize Mr. Gill from Texas.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just think it is worth pointing out that the obvious reality here is that the Clintons are doing everything they possibly can to not come testify before the Committee or have any real transcript or information about his engagement and involvement with Jeffrey Epstein over a long period of time. I mean, we have been working for five months to nail down a date for a deposition, working in good faith, and the entire time, the Clintons have been evading this Committee, at one point even deciding that they were going to propose Christmas Day, Christ's

birthday, as a date for a deposition. I mean, that is not good faith. At one point, they proposed that, instead of doing a deposition, they are going to have Chairman Comer, and a staffer, and a notetaker go up to New York City where they could ask Mr. Clinton questions and create two different sets of records about what Clinton said. That is, obviously, quite different than having an official court reporter precisely write down the words from the former President. Competing staff notes are simply not going to cut it. So, we have spent five months working on this. It is about time that they comply with a lawful subpoena, like many other people have.

And there is some suggestion that we are selectively choosing who to enforce these subpoenas against. I mean, as you pointed out multiple times, Jeffrey Epstein visited the White House 17 times. He flew at least 26 times on Epstein's private plane. There is a clear, longstanding, obvious connection between the Clintons and the Epsteins, and I think we need answers for that, and I hope that we get that, and I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in that. And with that said, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, Mrs. Anna Paulina Luna.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you. I would like to just say that I do agree with some of sentiment of both my colleagues, to include Mr. Bell, who actually just spoke to wanting justice for the victims, but it is important to note that the reason why the files have been delayed in release is because of Judge Paul Engelmayer in New York. This judge specifically ordered the SDNY to do a second review and for those documents to then be certified by U.S. Attorney Jay Clayton. So, if you want to get mad at someone, look no further than Judge Paul Engelmayer, who then, also, at the same time, just denied Massie and Ro Khanna's motion to appoint a special master. So, we can argue back and forth all day long about where are the files. I want to see the files, too. I want everyone to come in and answer questions, but look no further than this person. By the way, this person is not a Democrat or Republican. I think this person actually might be an Independent, but if you are wondering where the files are at, that is the truth of the matter. That is it. As soon as those files come out at the DOJ, we are going get them.

And by the way, I will remind people that were not here earlier, Todd Blanche will get on a phone call with people here, and after this, I am going to go walk over Todd Blanche's cellphone number to Chairman Garcia [sic] and to Chairman Comer so they can both get on a call. I think it is important to open dialog, okay, but the point is that we have to know the facts, and those are the facts. So, look no further than Judge Paul Engelmayer. Again, he is the one person that appointed a second review. And then once those documents are then reviewed, then it goes to the DOJ, but you cannot fast track the process.

Mr. BELL. Can I ask a question, Mrs. Luna?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Okay. Are you suggesting that the reason for not receiving 99 percent of these files is this judge—not 20 percent of the files, 30 percent, half of them—99 percent of the files, some of which are already public?

Mrs. LUNA. From what I have been told, and this is why I would encourage you guys to talk directly to the DOJ on this, is that

there was a second review ordered. I do not know who all is in charge over in New York specifically doing that second review, but I do know that, at least with the DOJ, they are officially done reviewing all the documents that they had had left, right? They had 500 attorneys. I actually said this earlier that Southern District of Florida, SDNY, and the FBI, there are 500 lawyers working on this to review all the documentation. They are officially done with that. Now, I do not know what the second review process because I am not internally at the DOJ, but what I will tell you is when you have this judge then also turning around and denying Ro Khanna and Massie's motion to appoint a special master, which I think Mr. Khanna can probably speak on, I think that that is shady. And I think that it is really terrible that we are sitting here arguing at, you know, each other, pointing fingers, when it is this one guy, who no one seems to be mentioning, that is actually stonewalling it.

So, I am here for it. I want all the documents, and I do think that we are going get those documents. Do I think it is going to be rushed? Absolutely not. I do not want to rush the process, but I will also encourage you guys, just as I did this morning, I got a victim's specific information. The DOJ has said that they will release whatever files they have pertaining to her directly. And she had not, up until recently, been able to, I think up until today, get that because, frankly, a lot of these victims' portals go to just, I think, empty inboxes, but it is important for context, so I yield my time.

Mr. MIN. A question for the Chair.

Chairman COMER. Well, you are next.

Mr. MIN. Before I begin, I have a question for the Chair. I just want to clarify. When you said Pam Bondi is coming on February 11, is she coming to this Committee?

Chairman COMER. She is coming to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MIN. So, is she coming to this Committee at all?

Chairman COMER. Well, we will see how the Judiciary—

Mr. MIN. Is she scheduled to come to this Committee at this point?

Chairman COMER. I have said that she is not scheduled to come to the Committee.

Mr. MIN. Okay. I just want to clarify that.

Chairman COMER. She is coming in front of Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MIN. Okay.

Chairman COMER. You are recognized, Mr. Min.

Mr. MIN. I would like to yield 30 seconds to Ranking Member Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Just really briefly. I appreciate Representative Luna's, you know, interest, I know, in the survivors, so I do appreciate that. I just want to be very clear and clarify. Judge Engelmayer, his rulings, have nothing to do with the legal subpoena passed by the Oversight Committee last July. Pam Bondi and Todd Blanche and the DOJ have been in defiance of a legal subpoena of this Committee that has nothing to do with the Khanna-Massie law that keeps getting referred to. And so, when you are saying that Judge Engelmayer is the reason, that is actually not the case as it relates to the subpoena. And so, they are still

violating the law and have been since July, to be clear. Thank you, Mr. Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, and I just want to begin by echoing the comments of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. As someone who spent my career as a lawyer, as a prosecutor, as a law professor, the rule of law is important. No one should be above the law, including Presidents and former Presidents, and congressional subpoenas are an important part of that rule of law, and I think that Clinton should be here. I think it is very shameful that they are not, but I also have to admit I am very troubled by this criminal contempt motion. As a lawyer, I know that I do not know this area of law, criminal contempt, so what I did is what any decent lawyer does, I asked people who do know this area. I called a number of colleagues, former colleagues, people who are former DOJ attorneys, experts in this area. And it is hard to get ten lawyers to agree on anything, but they all agreed that this was unprecedented, that under a normal administration, a normal DOJ that is not politicized, they would never bring criminal contempt charges in these circumstances.

And I say “non-politicized” DOJ because many of us are very concerned that this Department of Justice has become weaponized under this Administration. Under Pam Bondi, we have seen them go after Trump’s political enemies, including people like Adam Schiff and Letitia James, with bankrupt charges. We have seen them refuse to investigate an ICE agent who clearly shot and killed a woman at point blank. We have seen them fire line attorneys who refuse to go along with indictments that they describe as political and illegal.

Now, the closest comparison to this particular criminal contempt case is Steve Bannon, and there is a well-established precedent here. Steve Bannon refused to answer, saying he would only answer questions from this Committee if Trump told him to do so. That was not, like, delaying or obfuscating. That is willful defiance, and that is what the courts found, and that is why he went to jail. And, again, while I think that the Clinton should be here, what we are proposing here is a very serious matter, bringing criminal charges against a former President of the United States. And I listened to you very carefully, Chair Comer, for the last hour, and I heard you describe them as delaying, as dragging their feet, negotiating for five months, but I never once heard you say they just outright refused to comply with the subpoena, and dragging your feet is not the same as noncompliance. It is not the same as contempt. And so, if we think they are dragging their feet or obfuscating, there are lesser things we can do, including civil contempt. And I have to ask, like, why are we not thinking about alternative measures rather than bringing criminal contempt against a former President?

And I also want to point out that on November 14, and I want to ask unanimous consent to enter this into the record, Donald Trump wrote a Truth Social post in which he demanded that Republicans go after Bill Clinton, Reid Hoffman, Larry Summers in relation to Epstein. Later that day, Pam Bondi announced that they would be bringing investigations, and we saw later that this Committee brought subpoenas against the Clintons. This seems

very political, and the people I talk to in my district view this entire matter as politicized. They view this as, why Bill Clinton? And look, if Bill Clinton is guilty, let us put him in jail, but what I have a problem with right now is that we seem to be doing something that is unprecedented for Bill Clinton. We are bringing criminal charges against him, potentially, that we would not do for any other individual in these same circumstances, and that, again, is not my opinion. It is the opinion of everybody I talk to that says it is not a close matter.

And so, I have deep concerns that this looks like a political witch hunt against Trump's critics, that it will be referred to the Department of Justice that we have seen is politicized. Many of us had deep concerns that they are breaking the law on a daily basis. So, I have trouble with this. I do not know yet how I am going to vote, but I would love to hear from you, Mr. Comer, why we did not pursue alternative measures, particularly when the Clintons, by all accounts, were actively negotiating. And whether you thought that their offers were not sufficient, they do not strike me as noncompliance or defiance of this subpoena.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Min, do you think for five months—

Mr. MIN. Mm-hmm.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Min, will you yield for a question real quick?

Chairman COMER. I mean, do you just want to keep negotiating for 12, 11 more months and hope the—

Mr. MIN. Is that willful noncompliance is my question to you.

Chairman COMER. I mean, let us—

Mr. MIN. Why not civil contempt or something like that?

Chairman COMER. Nobody is buying what you are selling. We have been negotiating for five months. Five months.

Mr. MIN. Why not civil contempt or some alternative measures?

Mrs. LUNA. Can I make a suggestion actually?

Mr. MIN. I do not yield my time to you. I yield it to Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER. I have already answered the question.

Mrs. LUNA. Chairman, can I make?

Mr. MIN. I yield back then.

Chairman COMER. All right. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request unanimous consent to enter into the record the minutes of the hearing conducted by the Federal Law Enforcement Subcommittee on July 23, 2025, over which I presided as Chair. That was the Subcommittee, to clarify for America, where the original subpoena, driven by the Democrats and Ms. Lee, the original motion to subpoena the so-called Epstein files was introduced. Unanimous consent to present?

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. HIGGINS. So, within these minutes, here is the original motion from the Democrats: "Move that the Subcommittee issue a subpoena." Listen carefully, you alleged journalists and the beloved American citizenry that is paying attention to this: "Move that the Subcommittee issue a subpoena to the Department of Justice for the full, complete, unredacted Epstein files to be delivered concurrently to the Majority and Minority of the Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement of the Committee of Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform.” That is it. That was that was the motion presented by the Democrats.

That motion immediately struck me as very poorly written because it had no recognition of recognizing and adhering to the existing, longstanding criminal justice procedure designed to protect the innocent. It had no timeline. There was no timeline mandated in their own motion that would force the DOJ to comply with said timeline. There was no mandate for a particular percentage of release. There was no prohibition for actions in performance of compliance with their motion, which would become a subpoena from the Oversight Committee. There was not even the identification of Epstein. It just said, “Epstein files.” Epstein who? You think the DOJ has not prosecuted more than one Epstein in the history of the DOJ? It was very poorly written. So, Republicans, noting that there were a lot of people missing from this, if we were going to do this, allow it to move, there are a lot of people missing.

So, Mr. Perry introduced—I remind my colleagues that this is my time. When you recognize the decorum of this Oversight Committee, perhaps you will be recognized to speak.

Mr. Perry introduced a motion to amend the motion to subpoena by the amendments to include William Jefferson Clinton—imagine that, used the whole name—and Hillary Diane Rodham Clinton, amongst others, but of everybody on Scott Perry’s list, the most defiant has been the Clintons, and the Oversight Committee has been very patient.

I submit for the record unanimous consent, I ask, Mr. Chairman, the actual subpoena produced on August 5. We had a hearing on July 23. The subpoena was produced on August 5.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. HIGGINS. Everyone has, essentially, complied to the wishes of the Committee. Who is in control? We are. With the majority. We determine. The most defiant has been the Clintons. That is why we are here today.

Back in July, after Scott Perry introduced an amendment to the Democrats’ motion expanding the list to include the Clintons and others, including Republicans, Ms. Mace introduced an amendment to the motion to subpoena saying, “I move to amend Ms. Lee’s motion to include the redacting of names of victims, and any personally identifiable information of said victims and any possible child sexual abuse materials.” And the subpoena itself, and I am closing, Mr. Chair, the subpoena itself stated that the DOJ is to provide all the material requested and recognizing redactions required by law. So, you are talking about a million documents. It takes time to redact a million documents, but the DOJ is performing and is delivering, and the Clintons are obstructing us.

Chairman COMER. Time. I will give Walkinshaw an extra minute.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Before we go to Mr. Walkinshaw, Ms. Mace has two more unanimous consent requests, and I am going to give Mr. Walkinshaw an extra minute if everyone is okay with that. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank my colleagues, too. The whole Epstein saga and working with people on

both sides of the aisle on the Epstein files and then working with the victims has been extremely enlightening.

Mr. FROST. This does not sound like unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Yes, is this a UC?

Ms. MACE. What?

Chairman COMER. Can you present the unanimous consent?

Ms. MACE. Oh, here is the unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Yes. Okay.

Ms. MACE. Through the Epstein thing, and this is a tweet that I did about judges, I learned that, you know, not all the judges have been forthcoming with information and files. I tweeted out—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. On November 28, “Impeach corrupt judges,” especially South Carolina judges. I have done this about a dozen times or more. I am guilty as charged. Last week, an attorney named Robert Merting, I would like to enter his image into the record, too.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. He is trying to hold me in contempt and told a judge I should be thrown in jail for, among other things, tweeting out that judges should be impeached. This is what happens to survivors. This is what happens to victims, and I have worked on—

Chairman COMER. And, then, I am sorry, no commentary—we will take it.

Ms. MACE. I would like to enter my Predator bill into unanimous consent as well.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered, and—

Ms. MACE. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. All right. Thank you. The Chair recognizes Mr. Walkinshaw for 6 minutes.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will restate what others have said, which is that anyone who has information relevant to our investigation, including President Clinton, should talk to the Committee, and I am glad that he has agreed to do so. I have read, Mr. Chairman, that one of the sticking points in the negotiation between you and the Clintons’ lawyers has been your demand that questions be asked about non-Epstein related issues, and it surprised me because I am sitting here today listening to your intense interest in understanding more about the Clintons and their relationship with Epstein. So, I am curious why you have for five months demanded that you and other Members of this Committee be able to ask questions unrelated to our investigation of the Epstein files and Epstein’s sex-trafficking, and I am happy to yield, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. I do not know what you are talking about. Everything that we have pertained to with respect to the deposition pertains to the Epstein files.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay. So, you have not demanded that the conversation, the questions be limited to the Epstein files?

Chairman COMER. You know, the staff attorneys are communicating with the Clinton attorneys. That is the communication going back and forth. This investigation is about the Epstein files.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay. So, you are willing, and you will say here publicly, you are willing to have that conversation that limits the conversation, the questions just to the Epstein issue and files?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay. All right. I think the Clintons' lawyers have been under a different impression, so we have made a little progress.

Chairman COMER. Yes. The Clinton lawyers are full of crap.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. We have made a little progress on the negotiation here today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are 32 days past the statutory deadline and months since this Committee's subpoena, and Congress has received, as we have heard, just one percent of the files. More than five million pages remain hidden. Instead of holding the Attorney General accountable for this failure, the Majority is trying to change the subject today. Frankly, I find it insulting.

We have to bring our attention back to the people who should be our focus: the survivors of Epstein's horrific sex-trafficking operation, the women and girls who were exploited, abused, ignored for years. They deserve the truth, transparency, and justice without delay, without excuses, and without any political protections for the powerful or the wealthy. That is what we should be doing, not scoring partisan points, not creating distractions. Working to uncover the full scope of his crime so the survivors can see accountability. And if we are truly serious about justice, we cannot ignore one of Epstein's most well-documented associates: President Donald J. Trump.

We have documented communications, including a signed birthday note from Donald Trump containing explicit sexual references, and referencing "wonderful secrets," wonderful secrets between them. Emails from Epstein saying that Trump "knew about the girls." Donald Trump acknowledging he knew Epstein was a "creep," and that Epstein recruited girls and women from Mar-a-Lago. Trump saying he wants to coverup the files because "my friends will get hurt." If we are committed to transparency and justice, why is that off limits for this Committee? Why is his name absent? Why no discussion of Attorney General Bondi's refusal to comply for months with this Committee subpoena? Why no contempt for Attorney General Bondi? What we are witnessing today is not oversight. It is not accountability. It is part of a coverup, a diversion, and it did not start today. Despite clear legal requirements in a law that Donald Trump signed, a subpoena that you signed, Mr. Chairman, and repeated public promises, Attorney General Bondi has failed to release the files. It is entirely within her control, and yet, only one percent has been produced, more than a month late, and even that sliver is so heavily redacted that it mocks the law. It mocks the law, and it mocks this Committee subpoena.

[Poster]

Let us be honest about the transparency that Attorney General Bondi has provided. This is DOJ Epstein Dataset Number 4.

[iPad Shown].

It is Number 4. Dataset Number 4. This is part of the one percent that folks have been talking about this today.

I will close with this. Attorney General Bondi and the Trump Administration missed their deadline. They are ignoring our subpoena. They have withheld 99 percent of the files, and they have obscured the little that they did release. It is not a coincidence. It is intentional. It is about protecting one man, Donald J. Trump, from accountability. Release the files. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes—

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Okay. I will recognize you for that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into record a *Politico* article entitled, “Clay Higgins explains why he was the lone no vote on Epstein files release.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes, it will be, on our side, Mr. Perry, then Mr. McGuire. Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I am disappointed at where we are headed here. Look, I think that, legitimately, both sides want all the information—I know I sure do—with the proviso that the victims and innocent people are not damaged in the release of that. What is interesting to me is that, the only time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about any of this is when they can bring up the current President’s name, but they are not interested at all in anything else. And I would just say this regarding the timeline, because I am frustrated with it, too, you know what would have been great, would have been awesome? If we could have truncated the timeline when the Democrat DOJ was in power under a Democrat President and there was any investigation whatsoever.

Ladies and gentlemen, my friends on the other side of the aisle were not interested in these victims at all when they could have done something about it. Nary a word was said, and certainly nothing was done. All this advance work could have been done by them had they cared, but this is not about caring about anybody. This is all political theater because they hate the current President of the United States. I get it. It is disappointing to me. These victims should have their day, and all this information, regardless of who it touches, should be out, with the proviso that the innocent are protected. I know that is not of any interest to you. I get it. That is unfortunate.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, earlier, I asked unanimous consent to receive into the record the actual subpoena presented to Hon. Pam Bondi by this Committee regarding the DOJ’s release of the investigative files on Jeffrey Epstein that was dated the 5th of August. I would like to enter into unanimous consent, associated with that entry, the letter written by this Committee on August 5 to Attorney General Pam Bondi referencing the subpoena and giving specific instructions.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. HIGGINS. I would like to also enter into the record the—actually, I do not believe this has been released prior to right now—is the schedule associated with the subpoena. This is one, two, three, four pages of specific instructions from this Committee re-

garding the subpoena delivered on August 5. Now, unanimous consent to enter that schedule as well.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered. Yes, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS. And I am sure the media will be fascinated with that.

Mr. HIGGINS. So, the professionalism that this Committee has pursued, to clarify for the citizenry, the professionalism that this Committee has embraced and pursued has been squared away, impeccable. And that includes recognition that the Department of Justice, as stated in the subpoena, is to comply with redaction procedures of established law and criminal justice, longstanding procedures. So, I heard someone mention five million files. That is the first time I have heard five million files, but I know that there were originally a quarter of a million files, and the Trump Administration found another 600,000 files, so we were talking about, to round it off, a million files. Every one of those individual documents has to be reviewed by agents of the DOJ and their supervisors before they can be officially approved for release. That is the law. The DOJ has 400 agents working full time on just releasing these documents.

Now, you may argue that at the end of the day, you want to see the release of what they completed that day. I would say it is a fair narrative for discussion, but to say that DOJ is not fully engaged in complying with our subpoena is not accurate. It is not intellectually sound. And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer into the record these official and legal subpoena documents. I yield.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. I have two articles. One is from *PoliticsPA*: "Representative Perry referred to the House Ethics Committee for Refusing Subpoena."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. FROST. The other one is a *CNN* article: "GOP Reps. Perry and Biggs Formally Object to Subpoena from January 6 Committee."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I have sat here listening, and I am quite perplexed. It does take me back to my legal days. And so, when I think about a subpoena, one of the things that we normally look at when we are trying to determine whether or not contempt is going to be ushered into the conversation is whether or not there has been substantial compliance and what it means to actually look like you have substantially complied. It means that you are taking reasonable steps to follow a court order, that you are acting in good faith, and, typically, that serves as a defense.

So, if we are still crafting the parameters of said subpoena, for instance, my colleague, Mr. Walkinshaw, just asked whether or not this would be limited to the Epstein subject matter. For me, if they responded at all, then there is some sort of compliance, which they did. They did not just throw the bird. They did not just say, forget

it. But more importantly, I just want to point out that we are living in an age of hypocrisy because my other colleague just pointed out that Mr. Perry sits here and somehow sits in judgment of others. Frankly, that is what people are kind of getting annoyed by is the hypocrisy because Mr. Perry still has an outstanding subpoena that was never complied with. In addition to that, he talked about, we need to care for the victims. Somebody correct me if I am wrong, and I will yield my time, but I do not believe that Mr. Perry ever signed off on the discharge petition in the first place. So, I do not know if he is just doing what he believes is politically expedient.

But I will tell you this: I refuse to be a puppet because Democrats tend to be of goodwill. We always want to do the right thing. We are always trying to follow the rules and follow the law. Unfortunately, we are living with an Administration that does not care. We just want some type of parity. So, for instance, we all want to hear from President Clinton. If for some reason you said we will give you, say, Pam Bondi, and then we have got President Clinton with it, or say maybe President Trump and President Clinton, two Presidents, because we know that both Presidents actually had a relationship with Jeffrey Epstein. But what looks political and looks like one can get away with everything, especially since that is what the Supreme Court has stated, that is why it looks like it is just gamesmanship. You only care about following the rules so long as you can invoke those rules on what is typically perceived as your political enemies. This is why we are falling apart in this country.

We are supposed to be about checks and balances. It should not matter whether or not you are associated with the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, Independent, or whomever, whether you are rich, whether you are poor, whether you are middle class, whether you are Black, immigrant, or whatever. But it seems like we only have a political agenda in this Committee, and that is why everything goes off the rails. You only love law enforcement when they are going after Black, Brown, immigrants, that kind of folk, right, but on January 6, you did not care about law enforcement because they still do not have their plaques up. We continue to do the right thing and say, yes, apply the rules equally across the board, and then you all play in our faces, and you only apply it to one side.

I am asking for one commitment, and then I will yield to the Ranking Member. Mr. Chair, will you commit to me as the Chair of probably the most important committee in this Congress, especially in this moment where people are concerned about the level of corruption that exists within this Committee, will you promise me that you are good for doing whatever is right and following the evidence no matter who is on the other side of that evidence? Yes, sir.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes. Okay.

Chairman COMER. And that is why I subpoenaed the estate, and we had no idea. Nobody knew. Nobody knew what was——

Ms. CROCKETT. I understand, but——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. In the estate documents, and I, without hesitation, subpoenaed the estate. We have subpoenaed the Department of Justice.

Ms. CROCKETT. And that is where we got the birthday letter. We subpoenaed the estate—

Chairman COMER. Because of the—

Ms. CROCKETT. Hold on, Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Subpoena.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. We got the birthday letter, but we cannot just get the evidence and then not followup on the evidence that we actually get. I will relinquish the rest of my time to the Chair [sic].

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Thank you very much, Representative Crockett. Just to back to Mr. Walkinshaw's point, I think it is important to clarify that in communication, Mr. Chair, with your team and the back-and-forth with the emails, the Clinton team made it clear that they wanted to answer questions about Epstein, but that was not something that your team agreed to, only about Epstein. And so, I just want to make sure we clarified, and I appreciate you clarifying, Mr. Comer, that you said that you would limit the questions to only Epstein. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. That is correct.

Mr. GARCIA. I think that is—

Chairman COMER. And what the Clintons said is not true. What their lawyers said is a complete lie.

Mr. GARCIA. Well, I am glad that you clarified for them because it has been their impression that—

[Laughter.]

Mr. GARCIA. I am just telling you, it has been their impression.

Chairman COMER. He has been paying them too much money, then, over the last five months.

Mr. GARCIA. And, sir, I am just reading emails. I am just reading the back-and-forth between them and your team. It has been their impression that those questions were going to be beyond just Epstein, and so I am glad that it has been clarified. So, thank you, Mr. Walkinshaw.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. McGuire, from Virginia.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with you: five months is plenty of time. The Clintons are doing everything they can to avoid questioning, and the American people want to hear from the Clintons. You know, Bill Clinton brought Epstein to the White House 17 times, and Bill Clinton was on the Epstein airplane 26 times, so the American people want to hear from them. I do not understand why our friends on the left cannot understand that. They support these crazy policies like open borders, 20 million people coming to our country. They have been robbing, raping, and killing the American people. You know, Laken Riley would still be alive, and instead of protecting law-abiding citizens, they defend the criminals, and they want to have a defund the police movement. It makes no sense. These criminals, they put back on the street, recommit the same crime, and they are, like, why did they commit the same crime? All Americans have the same goal, the same American Dream: we want to live, work, and raise our family

in peace. We just might disagree on how to get there, but the Democrats seem to always be wrong. The American people do not want boys undressing in girls' locker rooms, but for some reason, the Democrats support that.

Five months is plenty of time. The American people want to hear from the Clintons, and they said they had no relationship, but they definitely did. And with that, I yield the remainder of my time back to Mrs. Luna.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you. I just kind of wanted to point out, first of all, specifically to the letter, the hand sketch that was allegedly the President's. I believe there was a \$10 billion lawsuit that was filed that, according to the President, the organization that published that is actually trying to currently settle, so just to clarify. But aside from that, I wanted to actually ask Mr. Min a question, if he is here still, if he would be willing to vote for a contempt in the Clintons if they refuse to come in and testify on a fine of about \$1,000 a day until they comply with the subpoena, but I do not know if he is here. Is he still here? No. Okay. Well, I think that that is just something to consider.

You know, we have the ability to do those fines, and I think that that needs to be considered, especially if, you know, optically, there is reason for pause for Democrats not wanting to vote for that based on the fact that President Clinton was a former President. I understand the optics of that, and I also understand reelections. However, nonetheless, the Clintons are defying subpoenas, and so sometimes, financially, people can be motivated, especially if there is a fine, and that is something that we actually all reserve the right to vote on, and I think that that is actually a very good option, especially being that most Americans would go to jail for defying subpoenas.

And so, I do not think that there needs to be any special accommodations made, especially given the nature of this, but I do think that that can be a tool to motivate. So, I would like to suggest that to you, Chairman Comer, also to you, Ranking Member Garcia, that that would be a good method that we specifically reserve if we choose to use alternative means of contempt.

Mr. FROST. Representative, would you yield to me for a question?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes.

Mr. FROST. So, it seems like you are open to changing what we are voting on today so that way we can get to a place where we actually hear from them. Is that right? Is that what I am hearing?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes. I would like to have the Clintons coming into Congress to give a transcribed deposition.

Mr. FROST. Yes.

Mrs. LUNA. I think that Chairman Comer has made that clear, but I also think having just Garcia and Comer drive all the way up to New York without that, I think that, optically, that sends a very bad message as the separation of powers and the authorities Congress has. And then I also, too, think that, you know, it is kind of a slap in the face to people that typically would not have those accommodations made for them.

Mr. FROST. Yes, yes.

Mrs. LUNA. With that also, you know, being a part of this, I think that, you know, Bill Clinton specifically said he wants the

files to be released, and I think that we also need to consider the fact that there is a judge. I know Mr. Garcia disagrees with me on this. But based on the email that I have seen on Judge Paul Engelmayer, you know, if you have someone that is ordering the DOJ to do a second scan of the files, if it is politically motivated, that is impeding an investigation. And I am tired of judges, if they get involved in investigations in Congress, trying to obstruct. And so, I am just putting this out there. I am going to be trying to impeach that judge. Unless he can, basically, give a waiver, let the DOJ release the files immediately.

Mr. FROST. Yes, and just real quick, I just want to say on the general thing, I agree. I mean, I think it would be best if the Ranking Member and Chair can huddle and figure out how we can change it so we can actually hear from them. Because my concern, too, and the other thing is, there is no faster way to make sure that we never actually hear from them in person than moving forward a criminal contempt that says put them in jail. I mean, we are just not going to hear from them for our investigation. And so, I mean, I agree, if they can come to something to figure out how can we move forward in a way where we are, actually, there is a pathway to hear from them, I am for that, so I will give the time back.

Mrs. LUNA. And to be clear, I do not agree with what the Clintons are doing, okay, and I think that they need to come in here to explain. But I do think that when you go after someone's pocket-book, I think that they quickly change their tune, and I think that they might be compelled to come in. I also do not want to set the precedence, though, that, you know, just because you are President means you are outside of this, you know, justice, and that is, basically, what it would be doing. And so, Chairman, I will let you direct the ship on this, but that is my suggestion.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. The Chair recognizes Ms. Ansari.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you. I am going to start by yielding to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, and I want to just respond to Mrs. Luna and Mr. Maxwell as well. Just to be clear, I think two things can be true. It can be true that we want to hear from the Clintons, and that it is important that we hear from them, and that we want to enforce our subpoena. I think it can also be true that they have also begun clearly making efforts to answer questions by declaration, to negotiate coming in to give testimony. They have made offers to—their initial offer was to do that testimony outside of Washington, D.C. with the leadership of the Committee and staff. They have been open to a transcription. And so, I just want to re-emphasize that I think there is room here to continue to negotiate and get the testimony that we need.

In addition, I am incredibly thankful that we are finally moving forward on ensuring that Ghislaine Maxwell come before this Committee, that we are going to get Pam Bondi finally in front of this Congress. We need to release the files, get that testimony, and, of course, ask the questions that this Committee has of President Clinton. I think that is all fair, and I hope that is the direction that we end up moving in. Thank you. Ms. Ansari.

Ms. ANSARI. Thank you. Given much of what we have heard today, and especially in light of some of the hypocrisy that we have

heard today, I just want to walk through the timeline of Donald Trump's coverup of the Epstein files because I think it is important for folks to remember how we got to this point. This was a series of deliberate decisions made at the highest levels in the White House and the Department of Justice to keep the truth hidden from the American public and the survivors of Jeffrey Epstein and his allies' abuse.

Let us start with what the President said during his campaign trail repeatedly. At multiple points in 2024 when running for office, Donald Trump said he would "declassify the Epstein files." He used it as a rallying cry to win over voters. In October 2024, J.D. Vance said, "Seriously, we need to release the Epstein list," but the moment Trump and Vance had power in the White House to act, that commitment disappeared. That is when the coverup began. On February 27, 2025, Pam Bondi said that she was releasing the Epstein files with her statement, "This Department of Justice is following through on President Trump's commitment to transparency and lifting the veil on the disgusting actions of Jeffrey Epstein and his co-conspirators." Then it became clear, very clear, that Donald Trump did not, in fact, want information about Jeffrey Epstein and his crimes revealed to the public.

Starting in July 2025, Donald Trump began to gaslight the public. He said, "Are you still talking about Jeffrey Epstein? This guy has been talked about for years." This is the point when Congress stepped up. On July 23, Congresswoman Summer Lee moved in this very Committee to subpoena the full and unredacted Epstein files, and just to be clear, because of that subpoena, the Department of Justice and Pam Bondi have been required by law to provide the Epstein files to this Committee since the summer of 2025. They have been in gross illegal violation of the subpoena this entire time. To my Republican colleagues on this Committee, do you remember that subpoena, the lawful congressional Oversight subpoena from July 23? Pam Bondi has been in violation of that for six months now.

At the same time, Members on both sides of the aisle filed a discharge petition that would have put a vote on the Floor for the Epstein Files Transparency Act. For a moment, the petition was one signature away from forcing a vote in the full House, and what did Mike Johnson do? He shut down Congress. He refused to swear-in our colleague, Adelita Grijalva, for a historic seven weeks in order to keep her name off the list. He forced the American public to endure a government shutdown to protect Donald Trump and to cover up the Epstein files. And when it finally came to the Floor and it became clear that the bill would pass overwhelmingly, only then did he endorse and then sign the bill so that he would not lose. This required the DOJ to release the unredacted Epstein files publicly by December 19. The DOJ has blown past that deadline, releasing only one percent of the files, which is patently absurd, and the files they did release were heavily redacted, which is completely illegal according to the law. On December 23, the DOJ said they miraculously discovered over one million files related to Epstein. All of these patterns are an attempt to slow down the release and fail to meet the lawful deadlines are consistent and coordinated. This is all part of an intentional coverup, which leads to the

unavoidable question, who is the President protecting when we know he only cares about one person?

I guess I will end with my question to the Chairman. The Attorney General, Pam Bondi, has violated the subpoena issued by this Committee. We should be holding her in contempt to remain fair and to remain transparent. And so, I ask that you do that if you really truly want to be fair and care about the justice for the victims here.

Chairman COMER. May I respond? We have been very clear we expect those documents. She has complied. She has turned over documents in the beginning.

Ms. ANSARI. One percent is not compliance.

Chairman COMER. In the beginning, you all complained and said the first document dump did not have enough redactions, and the second document dump had too many redactions. So, they are trying to get this, and I believe—

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Chairman, with—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. That we will get those documents very soon.

Ms. ANSARI. I hear you.

Chairman COMER. I have been assured—

Ms. ANSARI. I hear you. If I can respond.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. We are going to get those documents very soon.

Ms. ANSARI. I hear you, but with all due respect, given everything that she herself stated in February of last year, her own statements in front of the entirety of the American public saying, we have the documents, they are ready to go.

Chairman COMER. Mm-hmm.

Ms. ANSARI. The subpoena from this Committee was issued in July.

Chairman COMER. And nobody on our side is defending Pam Bondi, I can assure you.

Ms. ANSARI. She should be held in contempt. If we are going to hold—

Chairman COMER. She is complying with—

Ms. ANSARI [continuing]. President Clinton in contempt, then we have to hold her in contempt.

Chairman COMER. They have turned documents over. They have turned documents over, and every time they do—

Ms. ANSARI. One percent of the documents—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. You all complain about too many redactions, not enough redactions, so.

Ms. ANSARI. That is unacceptable. It has been six months, and there has been nothing released.

Chairman COMER. All right. Your time is expired, and we want the documents. We have made that very clear. The Chair recognizes Mr. Crane.

Mr. GARCIA. Can I do a unanimous consent, first?

Chairman COMER. Okay. Before I recognize Mr. Crane, we will let Ranking Member—

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Okay. I just want to do a unanimous consent request. This is actually an email that has been sent to your team, Mr. Comer, and our team from the Clinton lawyer and

the Clintons that, basically, says, "To be clear, we are not objecting to a transcript and never have. Please make that clear during today's testimony." That was sent to you, Mr. Comer, so I just want to reemphasize they are not objecting to a transcript. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. And before I recognize Mr. Crane, let me reply. We just got that email, and we have spent five months trying to get acceptable terms that I think everyone with any sense of fairness would agree needs to occur. After we hold this vote—hopefully it will be a bipartisan vote—they are going to have two weeks before this bill is on the Floor. They are going to have two weeks before the full House votes on it, and make no mistake, to the Clintons and their lawyers, this bill will pass, and I believe it will pass with Democrat votes, even though I have heard Democrat leadership is whipping to try to get you all to vote no on this.

They have had five months to comply with this, and to defend the indefensible and try to act like Bill Clinton is a victim here, I think is a stretch. We know who the victims are, and I think if you ask the victims, do you want to hear from Bill Clinton, I am pretty confident I know what the answer will be because we our staff has communicated with their attorneys. The Chair recognizes Mr. Crane.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, this Committee hearing is about whether or not we are going to hold the Clintons in contempt of Congress. I strongly recommend that we do, especially in pertaining to the release of the Epstein files and trying to get to the bottom of what exactly went on there and how Jeffrey Epstein was allowed to continue doing what he was doing and abusing so many people for so long.

It is interesting when I look at the history of the Congress and look at the fact that Peter Navarro, former Trump trade advisor, who defied the January 6 Committee subpoena, was sent to prison for four months. Steve Bannon, also a former Trump advisor, defied the January 6 Committee subpoena. He was sent to prison for four months and several others. So, it is going to be really telling to see how my Democrat colleagues vote on this one. Mr. Chairman, how many times did Mr. Epstein go to the White House, in your recollection, sir?

Chairman COMER. According to the evidence that we have obtained, it appears he went 17 times during the Clinton presidency.

Mr. CRANE. Is that more times than you have gone to the White House, Chairman?

Chairman COMER. I have been a Member of Congress for nine years and, you know, fairly high up on the pecking order. I have been to the White House, I believe, nine times in nine years. So, he went to the Clinton White House double the number of times that I have been to the White House in my entire congressional career.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, how many times did Mr. Clinton fly on Mr. Epstein's plane?

Chairman COMER. At least 26 times, according to the flight logs that were subpoenaed from the estate.

Mr. CRANE. Right, so we—

Mr. LYNCH. Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Those were four different trips, four trips, and every time they re-gassed the plane,

they counted that as another trip, but it was Asia, Africa, and they had to refuel. So, every time they stopped to refuel, they counted that as another leg of the trip. There were four trips, not 27.

Chairman COMER. That is almost like I did not inhale.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CRANE. Reclaiming my time. That is still enough trips for us to want to be able to ask the Clintons questions about their involvement with Epstein. Is that true, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRANE. Right. So, like I said, I hope that my Democrat colleagues, who, all of a sudden have found religion this Congress, and now they want the Epstein files, even though over the last four years when they had control of Washington, D.C., you did not hear a peep about Jeffrey Epstein out of any of them. And so, I think it is going to be real telling, you know, how my Democrat colleagues, who claim to be all about the victims, how they actually vote on these contempt charges for the Clinton family. And I just think it is interesting, too, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is you have been working for the last four or five months to get the Clintons in here. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. Five months. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRANE. Did they tell you that they would come in over December 24 and 25, Christmas Eve and Christmas Day?

Chairman COMER. They have implied that they would come in, yes.

Mr. CRANE. Okay. So, that just goes to show that they are trying to dodge, suggesting dates that they know none of us are in session. You know, I think that is pretty despicable. The other thing I believe that they said is that you and the Ranking Member could fly up to New York, but you could not record any of the conversations. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. That is correct.

Mr. CRANE. Does that sound like any congressional deposition you have ever heard of, sir?

Chairman COMER. No, and it would be my word against Mr. Garcia's, and I am pretty confident I know whose side the *New York Times* would take, and the *Washington Post* would take, and *MSNBC* would take. And, look, an investigation, you have to have transcripts, and the media wants transcripts. You have to have transcripts. We do not do the notes, and the Clintons have already accused us of lying, and they accused us of saying this was an unlawful subpoena, which I appreciate Mr. Garcia admitting that it is a lawful subpoena. So, I yield back.

Mr. CRANE. I also want to point out one thing that I think has been pretty interesting. When I flew into Washington, D.C. yesterday, my chief of staff told me that he had been contacted by the Clinton attorneys at least three times to try and stop this. So, it looks as if they tried to resist you for about five months, and once we finally pulled the trigger on it, now they are realizing that this could go very poorly for them. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. That is how it appears, that they could stall, stall, stall, and then when it finally came to this vote, they felt like they could count on the Democrats objecting and a few of the Republicans that the media would go to, you know, the moderates,

and say, oh, is this going to affect your election? Is this going to affect your election? At the end of the day, I think even the media wants to hear from Clinton. We all want to see the documents. So, everyone in America that is keeping up with this, which is a majority of Americans, they want answers, and we are trying to get answers here today, and the Clintons have obstructed for five months, five months.

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

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib.

Mr. GARCIA. Ms. Randall, actually.

Chairman COMER. Wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute.

Mr. GARCIA. Ms. Randall.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Randall. I am sorry.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I would like to yield 30 seconds to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. I just want to, again, just clarify that the Clintons have not objected to a transcript. I just want to clarify that, Mr. Comer, which you just mentioned. And I think that, in this moment of negotiation, which you have been in with them this entire time, there is progress being made, and they have not objected to the transcript. Let us talk to President Clinton, and let us get a transcript of it. Let us have the Committee there, and the staff there, and move forward. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. May I respond? We will not—stop the clock. May I respond? They did object to a transcript, Mr. Garcia. They did object to a transcript. They are just now changing because they see that public opinion is not on their side. The Chair recognizes Ms. Randall, and we will give you 5 minutes. We will give you 5 minutes.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. You know, I want to start by saying I do not feel it is my responsibility to defend the former President of the United States. As a Member of Congress in a separate and co-equal branch of government from the executive branch and as an individual person who is responsible to my constituents, it is not my job to defend the former President of the United States. Just like it is not your responsibility, Chair Comer, to carry out the political retribution of the current President of the United States. It is also not this Committee's job to yield to the Judiciary Committee to question the subjects of our subpoenas. It is not our job to defer to anyone else's interest. And in fact, we have the opportunity at any time to amend the rules of our Committee should you choose to take action that our rules keep us from taking. Like, that is a tool that you as Committee Chair and we, as a Committee, have.

And I also want to say, you know, I am not a lawyer. I am a regular person. I am one year into this job, and contrary to attempts by my Republican colleagues to put the burden of decisions made by Congresses of the past on our shoulders, I was sent here by my constituents just a year ago, and it is to them, to my neighbors, who I am accountable, not to party leadership, not to anybody else, but to my constituents. So, I want to talk about what they are seeing and hearing right now.

They are seeing, just as Ms. Ansari previously said, Donald Trump and J.D. Vance and Pam Bondi switch allegiances, decide

they no longer want to pursue accountability and full release, unredacted release, of the Epstein files. But they are also seeing a system that has failed survivors and regular people over and over, that privileges the powerful and well-connected over regular people, you know, regular people who do not have the luxury of saying, I am not going to come to court, and I want to be free of any accountability. Regular people who see us acting and carrying out the demands of the President, former Presidents, rich people, people who come to lobby us, folks who have access to power in a way that regular people do not.

And I think we have all made very clear, all of us on both sides of this dais, that we want to hear from the former President of the United States about any information that he has related to Epstein's ring of trafficking and assault of women and girls. But we also, and, you know, Chair Comer, you have said over and over, over and over and over, that it has been five months that you have been in negotiations with the Clintons. It has been six months since this Committee subpoenaed the Department of Justice for full release of the files, and I am down to hold anybody accountable. I am down for us to enforce our congressional subpoenas, to uphold our power as a separate and co-equal branch of government, but I want to call the question, will my colleagues on the other side of this dais also hold accountable the Attorney General that has been illegally withholding evidence that has been subpoenaed by this Committee and in a bipartisan law passed on the Floor of the House?

Is it just political theater? Are you just trying to point fingers and say, like, it is you, it is not us, it is them, or are we here to do the work of holding accountable people who have committed heinous crimes against women and girls and people who might know about them? Are we doing that work, or are we just pointing fingers and trying to consolidate our own political power? That is a question I know that my constituents have, and it is one that I am asking my colleagues on the other side of the dais. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Any Member seek recognition? The Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I think many of us were there with the survivors, and I would like to bring them into the room because I think it is really important. You know, it is not just one President, but now two that have been connected to the Epstein sex-trafficking. One of them even testified about walking into the house, the butler opening the door, there is an administrative assistant, having no idea she was walking into a horrific scheme that was sending young girls to the powerful, to the rich, the elected officials, and one of the first pictures she said she saw was of Clinton with his arms around Epstein. She saw another one of Trump with Epstein. And I just remember her almost trying to convince us, like, understand that I had no idea, as if somehow she was guilty. Do you all remember that? And so, I am here to tell you, I am ready to vote, but I am also just taken aback and disgusted because I did not need a birthday card to say the President of the United States, current President of the United States, had something. I did not need to see the photos by the Chairman today of

Clinton. All I needed to do was hear the survivors tell us please do something. These are people that have impacted their lives forever.

What I just do not understand, Mr. Chair, and this is with all due respect, I just do not get why Bondi cannot be held in contempt, why we are not for it. I do not care if she says that she wants to plead the Fifth. So, what? Do it in front of the American people. Same thing with Maxwell. She is telling the Committee she is going to plead the Fifth. Fine. Have her come before this Committee to do it in front of the American people. The fact of the matter is, are you saying that if anybody wants to plead the Fifth, they do not have to be forced to come before this Committee? That does not make any sense. What excuse is that? That does not make any sense. The fact that I continue to tell you all, what is the most consistent thing survivors have asked us to do? Follow the money. How come we have not forced JPMorgan Chase before this Committee? How come we have not allowed Bank of America to come before this Committee?

Mr. Chair, it is so disgusting, and this is why. Everybody is so distracted by this whole thing of, like, oh, you know, the Clintons, Trump, and everything, but who was funding it? Literally, JPMorgan turned a blind eye to evidence of sex-trafficking even after his 2008 conviction. Hear me out. After he was convicted, they still hid suspicious activity reports that should have been reported. You know, you see the fact that continuing, them saying, well, in 2008, agreed to pay, what, \$290 million in Federal lawsuit? I do not care. You come here because it is the truth, you all. You guys got to realize Epstein is not the last person. There is probably another Epstein out there right now doing sex-trafficking right now. We should hold everybody in contempt that had anything to do to cover this up, including bank executives that still have their jobs.

The fact of matter is we know what this is. You want to talk about Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, but talk about everybody involved because it does look like you are only doing this to distract everyone when we know not one, but two Presidents were involved, and those young ladies shaking when they were testifying in front of us because they did not know if they could trust us. Some of them literally said, we had no idea what we were walking into, but they were connected to the rich. They were connected to the Presidents. You heard them say that over and over again, but one of the things they continue to say is, follow the money because, Mr. Chair, Bill Clinton, Donald Trump, JPMorgan, all these people, they will not be the last folks that allowed a sex trafficker to harm young women, children.

And so, we have to set a very good precedent that we will not sit back and say, well, Maxwell is going to plead the Fifth, Bondi is going to plead the Fifth. I do not care. You are a public servant. Come before this Committee. Maxwell, you were directly involved. How many times did the survivors mention her? How many times? Saying that she lured them in. She was primarily involved. And, Mr. Chair, you and I had conversations, and you said, give us names. They gave us names, and you know it. So, why are you all focused only on them?

And let me tell you, you know where I stand. I will hold anybody in contempt that will not give us information, I do not care how many lawyers they bounce up on us, but I will tell you, Mr. Chair, shame on us for not forcing Bondi before this Committee. Shame on us for not forcing Maxwell before this Committee. Shame on us for not forcing JPMorgan Chase to answer questions that many of us have of \$1.5 billion in suspicious activity because somebody had to fund this madness, this horrific actions by these men. With that, Mr. Chair, I yield.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Tlaib, if I may, respond to some of that before I recognize Ms. Boebert next.

Ms. BOEBERT. No. I will holler if I need you.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Oh, Okay. Okay. I believe with all my heart, you are as sincere as anyone on this Committee about wanting to get answers about the truth, and I believe your heart is pure. Maxwell is coming in front of this Committee, and we have tried—

Ms. TLAIB. When? No, let us decide that today when. Like when?

Chairman COMER. Well, it is. It is nailed down, February 9.

Ms. TLAIB. February 9.

Chairman COMER. She is coming, and you will be able to ask her questions. One of the things Clinton wanted was only me and Garcia. Maxwell is coming. Anyone who wants to ask her questions on this Committee will be able to. So, that is nailed down.

Ms. TLAIB. I think the American people want answers from President Clinton.

Chairman COMER. I am not trying to argue with you, Ms. Tlaib. I just want to respond. Pam Bondi is coming before Congress in two weeks. I am confident she is going to be grilled by both parties on the discharge petition, and, Ms. Randall, you mentioned something about the Judiciary Committee. Believe me, I do not want to work with the Judiciary Committee on any investigation, okay, but when we passed that discharge petition, that got them involved.

Ms. TLAIB. But we had an outstanding subpoena.

Chairman COMER. I know, but just let me explain. Pam Bondi is going to be in front of the Judiciary Committee. We will see how that goes. We will see if there has been a document dump after that, and then the last thing.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, we cannot forget the banking institutions either.

Chairman COMER. The last thing, this is the most important thing, months ago, I approached Ms. Tlaib, Ms. Lee, and Ms. Stansbury, and I said, please, if you all get a chance, and I know you all are all sincere, try to get some names from these women, and we will continue to try to get documents. I subpoenaed the estate.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, just—

Chairman COMER. If I did not want to know, if we did not want to—

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, let us follow the money, let us bring these bank executives.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Tlaib, Ms. Tlaib, you are out of order. We want to hold everyone accountable. We do not care if they are bil-

lionaires. We do not care if they are Republicans. We do not care who they are.

Ms. TLAIB. Do you agree to work with me, though? We got to get the bank executives here because, Mr. Chair, you and I know that this is still being funded in some other way. Epstein is dead, but we know there is another person out there doing the same thing. We know it because the banks cover it up. These suspicious activity forms, literally these reports that had to be filed, they were there for a reason so we can stop—

Chairman COMER. And last thing, and then I am going to open it, I think, to see if there if there are other Members, but we are going in looking at suspicious activity reports, both Republicans and Democrat staffs going in looking at suspicious activity reports as we speak. I am all about looking at suspicious activity reports. Now, time has expired. Does any other Member seek recognition? Mr. Fallon from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to share a quote with you I thought was interesting: “No one is above the law, and no one should be escaping accountability,” and Hillary Clinton said that. And according to the *L.A. Times*—this is another quote—“No man in this country is so high that he is above the law.” I agree with both of these quotes. Al Gore said that when he was a Member of this chamber, Bill Clinton’s own Vice President. I hope every Member of this Committee agrees with those quotes.

So, we have to ask ourselves, are we a rule-of-law Nation or are we not? When a citizen of these United States is subpoenaed by this Congress, they should comply, plain and simple, regardless of who they are. We all get accused of things, and we should do everything we can, because the accusation is nothing but that, to prove it false if it is untrue. Jeffrey Epstein was a rapist, pedophile, sex trafficker. In street parlance, he was a scumbag, lowlife, and slimeball, and some of the things that I have read in these files, he was evil incarnate. He is also dead. I did not even know who he was until he was not. So, why are we here talking about a dead guy? Because he was associated with powerful people, some of which are highly likely to have participated with him in some of the worst kind of criminal activity, and if they did, they should pay. They should face justice, whether they are rich or poor, famous or anonymous, mighty or meek.

So, is that what we are doing today? Are we pursuing justice and transparency, because transparency makes an easier and shorter path to the truth. We should be pursuing the truth, but some on this Committee and in this Congress are pursuing fame and campaign fortune and exploiting this issue, not in pursuit of justice, but in pursuit of raising hundreds of thousands of dollars using a false premise as a battering ram. Jeffrey Epstein, and here is the false premise, that Epstein was a creature of the political right and they are protecting him, and he was palling around with Donald Trump and those in his orbit, and that is why the Republicans will not release the files. Now, that is incendiary, but is it true? Or is it just a cheap, woke fantasy?

Well, here are the facts, and the facts matter, so let us look at tale of the tape. How many confirmed visits to the White House? Under Bill Clinton, there were 17. Jeffrey Epstein visited the Clin-

ton White House 17 times. How many times did he visit the Donald Trump White House? Zero. How about documented political donations? Twenty-one-thousand to the Clintons, zero to Trump. Documented non-Clinton political contributions, \$118,000 to the Dems, \$18,000 to the GOP, for a total of 89 percent to the Democrats and the Clintons, 11 percent to the GOP.

Now to the matter at hand. Epstein files released by the Oversight Democrats from 2019 to 2023 when they were in charge of this Committee, zero. Epstein released files by the Oversight Republicans from 2023 to present, 53,000 pages. Epstein files released by the Biden Department of Justice in the four years he was in office, again, zero. Epstein files released by the Trump DOJ, 2025 to present, 125,000 pages. And a Member of this Committee completely jumped the shark again, and right after Charlie Kirk was assassinated by a left-wing loon, and it was a time where we really need to turn down the temperature and practice some civility, said, "Republicans have been so busy protecting pedophiles and rapists that they forgot what this Committee is supposed to be about."

Well, I will tell you what this Committee is supposed to be about, Mr. Chairman: about transparency and truth. And on this matter, the Republicans have led and we produced results, and the Democrats have done squat and bupkus. For the record, you know, that kind of incendiary rhetoric, while it may make headlines and make people famous, or, perhaps better stated, infamous, and raise loads of cash, maybe even get you invited to Hollywood parties, but at what cost? Those kind of lies create division and damage, and they are ludicrous, absurd, lazy, and, perhaps worst of all, unoriginal. And I do not think it is going to translate much to journey to the upper chambers. I hope it does not translate to that.

The Trump Administration and Republicans on this Committee and on this issue have served Lady Justice by a count of about 178,000 to zero. So, the Clintons should come in, honor the subpoena, and testify, and you know why, Mr. Chairman? In the pursuit of truth. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You will have to forgive me if I do not give a slow clap to our colleague across the aisle for his Academy Award-winning appearance just now in front of the Committee, but I want to just address some of the things that I heard here today and to talk about why we are here.

What I have heard here this morning in front of this Committee is exactly why the American people hate politics, because the American people do not care if you are a Republican, if you are a Democrat, if you are an Independent, whether you vote or you do not. They want the Epstein files, and they want justice and accountability, and they do not give a damn whether or not it is Democrats or Republicans or who is implicated. They want accountability, and that is what the survivors are asking us for. They are asking us to do our jobs, to make good on the promises that we made them when they came and met with us, and to actually, in good faith, conduct an investigation.

Now, I always think it is important to pull back the curtain for the American people about what happens in these committees. And

I was not shocked and surprised, but, you know, I think it is important to note that when I stepped out of the Committee a few moments ago, the press were huddled on the Republican side of this Committee room to take statements from the Republicans. They are not out in the kind of, like, neutral area. They are standing outside the Republican door so that after this vote is taken, our Republican colleagues can walk out and make a statement to the press.

Now, I think that that is important to note for the public here because this is not about true accountability because if this was actually about getting to the bottom of this case and actually holding individuals accountable for the crimes that were committed by Jeffrey Epstein, by Ghislaine Maxwell, by the associates, and the many, many people who are implicated in this case, what would be happening right now in this Committee is that Pam Bondi and DOJ officials would be sitting right there on the witness panel answering questions under oath because they are breaking the law. They are not complying with our subpoena. They are not complying with the Epstein Transparency Act.

And on the day, the final deadline, that they were supposed to release their final explanation about why they may have redacted some files, and, in fact they have, as has been stated many times, only released less than one percent of the files, Donald Trump used the United States military to invade a foreign country and steal their oil. And while we are sitting here and our colleagues are trying to create a spectacle for the media, every single newspaper in the United States and the world's headline is about how Donald Trump right now is in Europe embarrassing the United States. How he is threatening our NATO allies to invade Greenland. Humiliating the United States. And I have to say, I was home over the weekend for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. celebrations to honor the life and legacy of Dr. King, and the question that I got over and over again from my constituents is what is in those files that is so bad that President Trump is invading Venezuela, threatening our NATO allies, and sending thousands of armed paramilitary troops onto our streets to create violence and chaos in American cities. That is what the American people are actually asking us.

And so, I will be honest, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply troubled that the individuals who are the subject of today's hearing did not appear on their scheduled date. No one is above the law, but I do know, based on the correspondence, that they have been corresponding with you regularly to try to resolve this issue. But I do not believe that is what this hearing is actually about because if it was actually about getting justice and about getting the truth, we would have DOJ here, we would be holding Pam Bondi in contempt, and we would be hearing from the survivors themselves. And so, I have to agree with my colleagues that I believe that this is part of an extended smokescreen to try to cover things up. And so, I do ask my colleagues across the aisle, if you are earnest about getting to the truth and getting to justice, then bring DOJ in here and hold them accountable because that is actually what the American people want. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. And the lady yields back. Before I recognize Mr. Biggs, I want to point out again for the umpteenth time, Pam

Bondi is coming in front of Congress, under oath, and there will be lots of opportunities to ask her questions about the Epstein files. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

Ms. ANSARI. But she has violated a subpoena from this Committee and she should be held in contempt for that. That is a fact.

Chairman COMER. Here is the difference. They have been turning over documents. Now, I have said it a hundred times, it is not as quick as we would like, but they are turning over documents, and I have been very clear today and in hundreds of interviews, we expect—

Ms. ANSARI. You cannot be serious that one percent is turning over documents. What is the deadline for them? When do you expect the full documents?

Chairman COMER. Well, in our subpoena, there was no deadline.

Ms. ANSARI. There was.

Chairman COMER. And then we voted for the discharge petition, and there is a deadline. The discharge petition is in Judiciary. She is coming in front of Judiciary. Now, that is a fact. Do not try to—

Ms. ANSARI. That is irrelevant to this investigation from the Oversight Committee.

Chairman COMER. And Bill Clinton is not a victim here—

Ms. ANSARI. I do not think Pam Bondi—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And the media is not going to take Republican side on anything, so let us just—

Ms. ANSARI. I think Pam Bondi is breaking the law—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs. It is Mr. Biggs' 5 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will just point out, the previous speaker was talking about peeling back so the public can see what goes on in a committee. I mean, I just came from another committee where we were talking about massive fraud around the country and, in particular, in Minnesota, and I am glad that two Democrats could find time out of their busy schedule to even attend that hearing. What a shame. What a shame.

So, when someone says what is in the files that is so bad, I will ask this question. What is in the files that is so bad that the Democrats, for four years, for four years when they had control of this Committee, did not release a single document, did not call a single witness, did not make any motion. In fact, for those four years—go back and look—did they ever say anything about Epstein? No, they did not, but wanting to get it on the press, that is why you are making the issue today because let us talk about why we need to do this contempt is because former President Clinton and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, basically, strung us along as we were bending over backward trying to accommodate their schedule. They did not show up after we finally had to get a subpoena for them.

And I have right here, this is just interesting to me. This is a little note written by Mr. Clinton, former President Clinton, to Jeffrey Epstein on Jeffrey Epstein's 50th birthday: "Jeffrey, happy 50th. It is reassuring, isn't it, to have lasted as long across all the years of learning and knowing, adventures and"—illegible word—

“and also to have your childlike curiosity, the drive to make a difference, and the solace of friends.” He rode on that plane many times. He was apparently close friends with him. Jeffrey Epstein claims that, and I do not know if we should believe anything Epstein says for sure, but, I mean, Epstein says that he helped set up and fund the Clinton Foundation.

And former President Clinton in his note, I mean, this is what he wants. He does not want to come in and testify. He wants to do the same thing that he did in previous times, just, okay, we are going to send a little note, that ought to do it. He says something to the effect that he spent significant time in the Clinton Foundation after he left the presidency. Well, if Jeffrey Epstein set it up, then there is some reason to ask questions of both he and the former Secretary of State. They were given a subpoena. It was a lawfully issued subpoena by a standing committee. By the way, I happened to be at that subcommittee hearing. I was there when every Democrat voice voted that out. Nobody objected and said they did not want him to be subpoenaed, but he was subpoenaed and he did not show up, so here we are.

And, Mr. Chairman, I will yield time to you, if you need it.

Chairman COMER. I appreciate it. I think that everything that needs to be pointed out, we have pointed out, so I will—

Mr. BIGGS. Then I will yield, sir.

Chairman COMER. All right. Any other Members seek recognition? Mr. Mfume.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and the Ranking Member, and I particularly want to underscore the Ranking Member’s opening statement, and that was that Oversight Democrats want the truth about Jeffrey Epstein’s crimes and accountability for everyone, everyone involved. He said, and I agree, “We want transparency, we want the facts, and, above all, we want this Committee to use its oversight tools in a serious and responsible way.” I would be remiss if I did not thank, on behalf of all of us, the efforts of Representative Ro Khanna of this Committee and Representative Massie. Thank God they stood in the way of things and took the heat to get the discharge petition up and voted on.

And I want to also point out something that I think is important, and that is consistencies, Mr. Chairman. The action that the Majority has been proposing today departs from this Committee’s established practices, including its longtime standing acceptance of written testimony and the level of accommodation this Committee has traditionally required before proceeding to criminal contempt. Not civil, criminal contempt. I am glad, as the Ranking Member has stated, that the Clintons have agreed to testimony and to a transcript and to meet. I agree also that that meeting should not be taking place in New York. It sends the wrong reason for anybody that gets something from this Committee. They should come to the Committee. It is just that plain and simple. But it departs, in many instances, with the way this Committee has moved on. And I say that because we never know this time next year who might hold that gavel and who on either side may want to go after the current President, his sons, his wife, his family, and anybody

connected to him as a department head. I am just pointing out the fact that it is a slippery slope.

Now, does Bill Clinton have to defend himself? Absolutely, yes. It is a bit curious, however, why we are going after Mrs. Clinton. I have not seen anything, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said earlier, that suggests that she ought to be a part of this in any way or has done something wrong or is complicit in this matter. And I would hope that there is some consideration, Mr. Chairman, to withdrawing, at the very least, that particular resolution. That just makes me think that this is a fishing expedition and that we want to dust her up a bit if we get her before this Committee.

Now, a couple of quick things. We are being asked to move forward holding a former President of the United States, again, not in civil contempt, in criminal contempt of Congress, and I am going to tell you why it is an extraordinary step. Not that it is unprecedented, it is extraordinary, but it is unprecedented in the fact that we did not do that with Richard Nixon. We did not do that with Donald Trump. There was a subpoena, but there was never an attempt to find them in criminal contempt of the Congress or of this Committee. It is an extraordinary remedy that is usually reserved for situations where a witness has clearly and willfully defied Congress after extraordinary processes have been exhausted. The Majority has not demonstrated that standard so far.

I do want to say, also, that we are in a situation where I do not think that anybody on the Republican or on the Democratic side of this Committee is trying to defend former President Clinton. They are trying to find a way to make sure that we are consistent. So, the reason we keep hearing the need to have Pam Bondi before this Committee is that we are getting ready to bring criminal contempt charges before there has been an investigation. Usually that happens after the investigation, and the notion that somebody is going to come before this Committee, Ms. Maxwell, and take the Fifth, I do not care. She is already a convicted criminal. She cannot take the Fifth. But we can do the actions we ought to be about, and that is to make sure that both of them are before this Committee, and then to make sure, also, or to suggest—it is up to you and the Ranking Member—that that meeting takes place, and those transcripts are made available, and that Mr. Clinton comes before the Committee with counsel so that we then are in a position to move forward. We are taking a big jump here without doing some of the things that we normally do.

Now, I am glad that Ms. Tlaib brought up the matter of victims. She is not here right now, but all of us sat in that room with those victims. It was gut-wrenching, and all of us made a commitment that we would prove that this institution could and would do the right thing. So, we are challenged here, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that you and the Ranking Member can give us a way to proceed here that both of the concerns on both sides are addressed, but if we just move straight as we are going now without an investigation, it begs the question, what happens when the shoe is on the other foot? I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Ms. Simon is next. Before I recognize her, I just want to add, with respect to the Hillary Clinton subpoena, you all voted for that. This Committee voted

for that in a bipartisan manner. Her name was on that list. And with respect to Pam Bondi, again, she is testifying in front of Congress in less than two weeks. The Chair recognizes Ms. Simon.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a quick comment, and I have a friendly question for my colleague, Mrs. Luna, and I will say a friendly question. I have worked with victims for decades. So few opportunities present themselves for victims to sit face-to-face with folks who hold power, to beg and plead that everyone who had anything to do with their harm be held to account, so few opportunities. I have been a victim advocate where brilliant young women who have been trafficked across this country have stood in courtrooms and were demanded to testify against their traffickers and they did with such power and grace and fear that their lives may be taken because of that braveness. And a number of those young women that I witnessed take all that they had to confront their demons. They were murdered because they took a stand. And so, when we did stand in front and sit in front of those victims and they gave us their all, I hope that this is not the only opportunity, Mr. Chair, to speak on their behalf.

From our President to everyone in those files, forget all the political games. If these women who are connected with the largest sex-trafficking ring in modern-day American history cannot get justice, what about the girls in every single state? I mean, it is what it is. That being said, Mrs. Luna, you talked briefly about a proposal.

Chairman COMER. She is not in here.

Ms. SIMON. She is out? There was a proposal put on the table to rethink how we might have a conversation about the Clintons or President Clinton coming in and having a conversation with this body, and, I guess, that time has passed, but I know that I would love to hear from the former President of the United States. I would love to hear from the Attorney General. I would love to hear from the current President of these United States. The victims deserve to be heard, the victims deserve for the files to be released in their entirety, and the victims deserve for us to get to the bottom of this matter. I yield back. Well, I actually would like to yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Actually, I am okay right now on time. I might come back around, but back to Mr. Comer and the Republicans. Thank you, Ms. Simon.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Do any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

See seeing none, there is an amendment at the desk. Well, Ms. Lee, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

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

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk distribute the amendment to all Members?

The clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk. An amendment to the amendment in nature of a substitute to the William J. Clinton contempt report, as offered by Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania.

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. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that even listening to this debate throughout our hearing today, our markup today, I think it is really clear that at the heart of this effort to release the Epstein files are very real human beings who have experienced unimaginable harm. They have been repeatedly victimized by the indifference of the U.S. Government and the injustice that they face. They deserve peace and healing and justice.

When my motion to subpoena the Epstein files passed, this Committee resolved to get that justice for those survivors. And I thank Chairman Comer for pushing this effort forward by issuing additional subpoenas for the Epstein estate and the banks, and we know that without the full files from the DOJ, that that is just not enough. That is why I am introducing this amendment, which holds Attorney General Pam Bondi in civil contempt for failing to comply with the August 5 subpoena, and I urge my colleagues to support it, and we believe that we should start with civil contempt because we are serious about this investigation. We want these files and we want to hear from them, and we must start there.

The Department of Justice needs to be the priority. We can move to noncompliance by anyone else, including Ghislaine Maxwell, after we have received those files. It has been five months, and we are still missing over five million pages of documents, purportedly. The Department of Justice has only released one percent of those files. They have stonewalled this Committee since August, and they have failed to provide even the most basic updates. How is that not an insult both to the authority of this Committee and the survivors? Without the full files, how can we know who might have legitimate knowledge or who might be culpable? We would not have to speculate on the Clintons or anyone else's involvement if we had all of those files.

And to be clear, I am certainly not opposed to the President and Secretary Clinton being held accountable for violating the subpoena. But the fact that this effort to hold the Clintons in contempt was fast tracked and is happening before any action against the Justice Department is just evidence that the Republicans on this Committee are not taking this investigation seriously. It is an unequal application of law. And again, it is a bit ironic that these contempt resolutions empower the Justice Department to imprison possibly two people for defying the exact same subpoena that they themselves are defying. If this Committee wants to be taken seriously, we would be addressing all the bad actors in this investigation, not cherry picking them for political points. The Justice Department needs to be held accountable for their noncompliance and lack of transparency. They have been selectively producing information, shielding powerful people, and obstructing any efforts for oversight, and if we do not hold them accountable, Mr. Chair, we are, too.

Just this past Friday, Attorney General Bondi asked a New York Federal judge to deny an appointment of a special master to monitor the release of the Epstein files. They do not want a neutral third-party making sure they follow the law. I think all of us should be questioning what the Justice Department is doing that

they do not want the American people to see. We cannot just take them at their word that they will eventually get around to releasing the files. Quite frankly, they have put up the same, if not far less of an action as the Clintons have. What little information they have released so far has either already been made public or has been a mess of just sketchy redactions.

A group of survivors sent a letter to the Justice Department's Inspector General complaining that the redactions had been "selective." They pointed out that multiple times, the names of alleged abusers appear to be redacted, yet some survivors' names and identifying information were released. To be clear, the subpoena I moved to secure does not allow for redactions unless it would protect the identity of a survivor or contains child sex abuse materials. They have had plenty of time to work with this Committee to protect survivors' identities. This is bigger than one case. It is about rich and powerful people being protected by each other and institutions. It is about a system that has enabled Jeffrey Epstein, and Ghislaine Maxwell, and whoever their co-conspirators are to buy favors and silence from our government.

This effort is the one time we could get some real accountability and reclaim the power of this system. Republicans, do not drop the ball by allowing Pam Bondi and the Department of Justice to play us for fools. Mr. Chair, you are setting a precedence that non-compliance with this Committee will result in immediate contempt proceedings. So, I challenge you and my Republican colleagues to put your money where your mouth is and pass this amendment in holding Pam Bondi in contempt. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I will recognize myself just for a minute. Look, I oppose this amendment, and I hope everyone on the Committee opposes this. That is because Attorney General Bondi and the Department of Justice, they have released documents, again, not at the speed or pace that any of us want, but they are complying with our subpoena. That is a fact. I oppose your amendment, Ms. Lee, because you amend the "criminal" to "civil," and I think that most of what I am hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is everyone wants to hear from the Clintons. They have had an opportunity for five months. They will have another opportunity between today's vote and the Floor to come in and answer questions. Pam Bondi is coming in front of Congress in less than two weeks to answer questions. Your colleague, Ms. Crockett, again, I do not want to speak for Ms. Crockett, but I am pretty confident Ms. Crockett is going to grill Pam Bondi, right?

Ms. CROCKETT. I am.

Chairman COMER. You agree with me. I would have won that bet.

Ms. LEE. Is she coming with the files?

Chairman COMER. Hmm?

Ms. LEE. Is she coming with the files?

Chairman COMER. Well, we will see. She may. I hope she does. So, I oppose this. Now, the Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to just start by saying I strongly support the amendment proposed by Congresswoman Lee. The House Majority keeps saying that they believe

that no one is above the law. Oversight Democrats certainly believe that, but the Attorney General is violating it with impunity in support of a White House coverup every single day. We want accountability for her failure to comply with our subpoena for the full Epstein files that has been in place since the summer. She fails to comply with the Epstein Files Transparency Act. She fails to comply with the subpoena put in place by Representative Lee and the Committee. This is clearly a White House-directed coverup.

Now, over a month after the deadline, only one percent of these files have been released. No explanation has been given for illegal redactions, again, in violation of the law. Epstein survivors have reported that their names have appeared in parts of the document that were not redacted, and every day, she continues to withhold files and conceals the truth. She continues to give Ghislaine Maxwell special treatment by moving her to a less secure prison that we all are aware, which is completely shameful.

Now, Chairman Comer, you claim, of course, that the Attorney General was complying with our subpoena. I mean, that is absolutely false. One percent of the documents, since a subpoena in place during the summer, is not complying with our subpoena. Now, on August 5, 2025, this Committee issued that subpoena compelling her to produce documents and communications. That subpoena unambiguously required the Attorney General to do that no later than August 19 of 2025. August 19, not December. August 19 of 2025. On August 22, the DOJ made a single production of approximately 33,000 pages to this Committee. All of those documents, however, were already public. The DOJ has made no additional production to the Committee pursuant to the subpoena. The DOJ has failed to provide specific information in response to repeated requests from Democratic Oversight staff as to why the DOJ's timetable continues to move and why it has not fulfill its production or the law.

Now, in response to letters from our Committee, on November 25, the DOJ transmitted a single letter in response to the Committee's inquiries. They claimed that the DOJ was working to comply with the Epstein Files Transparency Act, which now, of course, we know they actually were not doing because we actually have not received very much. The letter made no reference to the Committee's subpoena, no reference to DOJ's plan for compliance. The corrupt failure to comply with the Epstein Files Transparency Act is not just a crime. It also shows that the Attorney General has made no attempt to actually comply with our subpoena.

Now, Oversight Republicans might be happy to give President Trump and Pam Bondi a free pass to break the law, but this Committee should not do so. This amendment will allow us to go to court to force Pam Bondi to comply with our subpoena and to finally bring the Epstein files to light. I urge adoption and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition? Who is next on your side? Lynch? Mr. Lynch from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Look, as the Ranking Member pointed out, we have got about one percent of the documents. I take exception to the declaration by the Chairman that

Pam Bondi and the Department of Justice is actually producing documents, is cooperating. So, we have got the 30,000 documents that they sent us in August. It was a dump, and it was largely already made public. It was not prepared. I will give you a comparison. We have got a handful of attorneys that work for the estate of Jeffrey Epstein, and they have given us more in the same amount of time than the Department of Justice has given. I want to point out that there are 100,000 employees at the Department of Justice. And I know, very recently, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York has now put a considerable number of people on the case redacting documents. But Clayton started to do that six months after we had originally requested the documents, so this is a stall tactic. They have not given us any of the documents.

Remember, back in February 2025, Pam Bondi said publicly that she had a client list of the perpetrators, and the Epstein—excuse me—client list was sitting on her desk right now to review. That was back in February 2025. Later on, on March 3, 2025, she told Sean Hannity that a truckload of evidence had arrived, that “FBI Director Kash Patel is going to get me and himself really a detailed report as to why all these documents and evidence had been withheld.” However, in July 2025, Bondi and the FBI released an unsigned memorandum concluding that the review found no evidence, no evidence that Epstein had a client list or that he blackmailed prominent associates, and this was obviously contradicting her earlier public statements and faced significant backlash. This is clearly obstruction of justice on the part of Pam Bondi.

We have every bit of reason to infer that she has no intention at all of producing these documents. She has made a mockery out of this whole process, including allowing witness tampering and having Ghislaine Maxwell, convicted of trafficking in this instance, removed from one jail to a much more comfortable position. Why is that not witness tampering? We should ask her questions about that. And the idea that some other committee is going to do this is an abdication of our responsibility on this Committee, I believe.

Look, we are the ones that we had the victims sit down in front of us and tearfully ask for justice from this Committee, and we promised that. We promised that we would do everything possible—we did not say, well, we will check with the Judiciary Committee and we will let them do the work. We said we would take on this responsibility, which is ours, Mr. Chairman. This is the rightful jurisdiction for this case, and we should demand people with evidence to produce that evidence so that we can proceed in our work. We have not done that thus far. We have let Pam Bondi distort and obstruct the justice that is due to these victims. It is shameful, it really is, and I want to hear from everyone who has a connection to this. I want to hear from every single witness that might be able to provide evidence to this Committee, and I think Pam Bondi with the millions and millions and millions of documents is at the top of that list, and she has thwarted justice long enough.

She is a lapdog to the President. She is trying to protect the President who is all over this case, all over this case, and I am

hopeful that, eventually, he will be a witness before this Committee at some point. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Before I recognize Scott Perry, if I may, this Committee has done everything that the victims asked that day in that hearing. They asked that we subpoena the estate. We had no idea what was in the estate documents. It could have been all Republicans. I had no idea. It could have been billionaire. It could have been donors to the Republican Party. It could have been donors to the Democrat Party. I had no idea. Without hesitation, I signed that subpoena for the estate. And then, with respect to with your criticism of Bondi, I do not disagree with anything you said in your criticism of the current Attorney General, and I think she is going to have to answer those questions in front of Congress, in front of the American people in two weeks. And I am confident she is going to be asked those questions, and I expect to hear answers from the criticism that you leveled against her. No one is defending her. Again, we expect to get the documents. They have produced some. We are not satisfied with the pace, and she is going to be in front of Congress in two weeks to answer that exact criticism.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Perry from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to address the unjustified and cowardly claims made against me by Members of this Committee after I left, and maybe they were afraid to face me while I was here, but I am here now and I am going to face you. Just to be clear, if you have this job, you should know that any subpoena from another Congress is invalid in the next Congress. It dies with the last Congress. That is minimum information that you should know if you are going to serve in Congress, so just let me inform you of that if you did not know that.

Regarding the so-called subpoena, it is unjust and it is immoral to get a group of your friends together who have a predetermined outcome, put them together in a room, and then use the power of the Federal Government to prevail on your political enemies. The subpoena that was served to me or my counsel was not valid because there was no valid committee serving it. I did not violate any law, and I reject the claims or the appearance that I did. The Democrat Party sought to, by use of the awesome and just the grand power of the Federal Government, to destroy my reputation as a person who was not charged with anything, was not accused of anything, was not the target of investigation. You wished to dirty me up and bankrupt me so you could get rid of me. It is outrageous.

And I have not mentioned that at all, but since you brought up, I felt it was appropriate at this time to clear my good name, and as the years have gone by, more information has come out to prove what I just said was absolutely accurate. What happened during that period of time when you were in the Majority was you set up a star chamber with predetermined outcomes, and then sought to destroy in any way possible your political enemies by fashioning lies and then repeating them over and over again, which you do to this day, which you do to this moment. Now, when I spoke earlier, I did not mention the subpoena. I mentioned the truth, and that

is what this Committee should be all about, wherever it comes from and whoever it touches. And I believe that to my soul, which is why I have been on this bandwagon long before you have ever been on it and much more than you have ever done, much more than you have ever done, legitimately and sincerely. So, I thank the Chairman for allowing me this opportunity to set the record straight, and, hopefully, that will not happen in the future.

Now, regarding the Clintons, as you know, I offered the amendment, the resolution to bring everybody in, Attorneys General from both sides of the aisle, but with the Clintons, in particular, because of their particular knowledge of Mr. Jeffrey Epstein and his exploits with underage women. It is horrific. As a father of two young daughters, I would just say that the perpetrators of whatever happened ought to be thankful that their fathers do not know about it, but I sure hope that they do know soon, and I sure hope that there is justice for all the victims and that we do not seek to destroy the lives of those uninvolved for political purposes, which is what, quite honestly, this whole theater, this whole charade has been about.

This should have been easy. Is Mr. Clinton an American citizen? We appreciate that he was the President, but according to his wife, he is not above the law, and neither is she. This is a lawful subpoena with plenty of time. The Committee has been and the Chairman has been more than generous trying to work it out, but it is pretty obvious to anybody with eyes in their head that the Clintons feel like they are above the law and they are going to get special treatment as Secretary Clinton did the last time she was subpoenaed. I will remind everybody that she worked out a deal to come in with her so-called attorney, but was arrayed behind closed doors on a Saturday without any transcript. That is where we are headed. I will yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from Colorado, if she wants it.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Perry. I just think that all of this is rich. I mean, we have every Democrat here just with their typical talking points, claiming they want to hold the Clintons accountable and hear from them, so I think it is time we move on and get to the actual point of this. We had the Clintons defy a lawful subpoena, and that is what we are here to discuss, but Democrats want to bring up anything but that, and if this continues, I am going to call the question. So, continue with your Clintons and how you are going to protect them or defend them, or I am going to call the question, we are going to have the vote, and end all of this nonsense rhetoric that is going on. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury, who is next on the list, I think. No? Okay. Frost? Who is next? I just go by what the Ranking Member wants.

Mr. GARCIA. You are next on the list.

Ms. STANSBURY. Do you want me?

Mr. GARCIA. No, you can just go ahead.

Chairman COMER. So, who is next?

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Frost.

Chairman COMER. Frost from Florida.

Mr. FROST. I just want to speak in support of this amendment that has been put forth by Representative Lee. Look, at the end of

the day, the U.S. Congress voted damn near unanimously. One Member of Congress voted against releasing the Epstein files, happens to be a Republican on this Committee, but damn near unanimously, we said we want the files. Months before that, in a Subcommittee on this Committee, we issued a subpoena for the files as well. They have failed to comply with the law, not just on one law that we passed, but also on a lawful subpoena that this Committee put forth.

And so, I just want to speak in support of Representative Lee's motion here, an amendment here, because we have to go at this everywhere. We want to hear from everyone. We want to hear from former President. We want to hear from anyone who is implicated. We want to hear from anyone who has information that might help us get justice for the victims. But it is obvious that my Republican colleagues are doing anything they can to play defense for the Administration. One percent of documents is unacceptable. One percent of documents is unacceptable when you have had months and months and months, since June or July of last year, to produce these documents when we sent a lawful subpoena to the Department of Justice. One percent of documents is unacceptable for a bill passed by the U.S. Congress that they are in violation of, they are breaking the law right now as we speak, and all we are asking for is accountability here for everyone.

And so, this amendment, I think, is very simple. I know the Chairman keeps bringing up the fact that Pam Bondi is going to come to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee is not the committee that is leading the investigation on this, we are, the Oversight Committee. And so, she can go over to the Judiciary Committee all she wants, like she, by the way, is supposed to, like every other Attorney General has in the history of this country shows up before the Judiciary Committee at least once a year or once a Congress to talk about a lot of different business. But we have a very specific thing we need to talk with her about, and it is talking with her about the fact that she is breaking the law and that the Administration is obviously slow-rolling putting forth the Epstein files.

And I do not buy this thing that, oh, well, they are taking their time to redact it and this and that. We all know that is a load of BS. We all know that that is a talking point that perhaps the Administration gave some of my colleagues that they are just repeating over and over and over again. But when you have the entire Department of Justice or, you know, a lot of people working on this, you should be able to produce documents in a much faster way, and the law was clear, and by the way, it is the law that we all voted on. So, if you thought that the timetable was unfair, you should have voted no, but you voted yes. We all voted yes except one. And so, I think this is a very sensible amendment that everyone should vote yes on because it is important that we have accountability across the board no matter who you are.

I will yield. Do you want my time, Ranking Member? I will yield the balance of my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you again, Mr. Frost. Just to conclude, we obviously have and support Representative Lee's amendment. We think it is important. It is important to get Pam Bondi

to actually produce the files, and it is certainly important to move this debate forward. And so, I just, again, want to reiterate and reinforce our support as we wrap up this debate on this amendment, and so thank you, Mr. Comer.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. We have one more speaking request on our side, and that is Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and turns out, apparently, I was mentioned as well when I was conducting that hearing on Minnesota fraud, another fraud that the Democrats were so interested in that only two of them bothered to show up. That is interesting.

Well, so let us talk about the illicit subpoenas because I think some of my colleagues may not remember this, but the resolution that we all passed, that passed out of here to install the J6 Committee, gave to then Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy specific authority to name the Members from the Republican side that would sit on the J6 Committee. So, he named them, but Speaker Pelosi did not like those guys, so she said, no, they cannot be on the Committee. So, she booted them and replaced them with people that she felt would be more amenable to get to accomplish the desired political outcome that she wanted the J6 Committee to have. So, she put two individuals, you will remember, Liz Cheney and Adam Kinzinger on there, having removed—and no other Republicans were on there. And so, not only did she violate the resolution, but the resolution all called for a certain number to be on there, and there were not that number.

So, the Committee itself was illicit. It was not a standing Committee like this is where you have jurisdictional authorities. That Committee, by that point, was no longer a Committee. It was an effort to railroad people, including myself, and things have been said about me repeatedly that have been debunked. Everything has been debunked that was said about me, but here we have it today, and Mr. Perry was right. This was designed to go after certain specific people. I am still not quite sure why I was one, but I was one, and bringing it up today is actually kind of an abhorrent tactic because it was an illicit Committee, did not have authority to issue an illicit subpoena, whereas this Committee issued a legitimate subpoena. Not only did it provide the subpoena, but it actually worked for months trying to get the Clintons and accommodate their schedule, including continuing this at least once so the Clintons would find it more convenient to come and respond to the deposition.

Leaving all other deflection aside, if you really want the Clintons to come in and answer these questions, then this would be the appropriate time to vote to hold them in contempt. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. The gentlemen yields back. The question is now—

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. On the amendment, offered by Ms. Lee from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Mfume, go ahead.

Mr. MFUME. So that we know exactly what we are doing here because this has gone way off of where we started with Ms. Lee's amendment. So that Members of the Committee know, this resolves itself that "the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall initiate judicial proceedings in any Federal Court of competent jurisdiction on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to seek declaratory judgments affirming the duty of Pamela J. Bondi, Attorney General of the United States, to comply with the subpoena duly issued to her by the Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as a part of investigating and the investigation into Federal Government's enforcement of sex-trafficking law, generally; and specifically, its handling of the investigation and prosecution of Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell."

How we vote on this will be very telling. I support this amendment. I would urge other Members of the Committee to do so also if we are serious about equal practice and holding everyone accountable. I yield back, sir.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The question is now on the amendment offered by Ms. Lee from Pennsylvania.

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

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, no.

[Chorus of noes.]

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

Mr. GARCIA. A recorded vote, please.

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

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

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

The clerk will designate the Min Amendment.

The Clerk. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the William J. Clinton contempt report, as offered by Mr. Min of California.

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

I reserve a point of order.

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

Mr. MIN. Chair Comer, I motion to amend your amendment in the nature of a substitute to authorize the House Oversight Committee to do three things: first, pursue Federal Court action to enforce a subpoena against former President Bill Clinton related to the sex-trafficking investigation; two, require the Committee to report back any resulting litigation; and three, direct the House General Counsel to represent the Committee, with the Speaker's approval.

Now I have, as mentioned, previously, spent my career trying to enforce the rule of law. I started as an SEC enforcement attorney, went on to become a law professor. I very strongly believe in the rule of law, but the rule of law is not just about not having anyone

above the law. It is also about not targeting people simply because you do not like them, or because they are in a different political party, or because they have done things you do not particularly care for. Going after an individual uniquely because of how they are positioned is also a gross violation of our powers and of the rule of law. And if you look at the precedent of how Congress has operated, we have three inherent powers when it comes to contempt: inherent contempt, civil enforcement, and criminal contempt.

Now, since we initiated criminal contempt back in the 1930's, we have rarely, if ever, used criminal contempt as a charge, and we have almost never leapt from civil enforcement to criminal contempt. The decision here to go from civil enforcement and to ignore that step, jumping to criminal contempt is, in my view, a gross imposition, a gross abuse of power on our part. It is also counter-productive, because if we launch criminal contempt proceedings—I think my colleague, Mr. Biggs, pointed out that we want the Clintons to testify. If we launch criminal contempt proceedings, we will not hear from the Clintons. That is a fact. They will be tied up in court, and we have no guarantee that they will ever testify before this Committee. Civil enforcement will achieve the goal we want of getting the Clintons out here before this Committee.

Now, I just think this is problematic. We talked earlier, Mr. Comer, and I still have not heard you to this point in time say anything about the Clintons defying the subpoena. I have heard you say, “obfuscate,” “delay,” “drag their feet,” “we have had five months,” but at no point in time do they say we are not complying with the subpoena, and to me, civil enforcement is an appropriate intermediate step. It makes sense because it allows a court to step in, secure compliance with the Committee subpoena in a non-partisan, orderly way that follows the rule law. The court would be empowered to impose fines and actual imprisonment if the individual or entity refuses to comply with us.

If we break from precedent, this is going to start, potentially, a chain reaction of partisan warfare with criminal charges. That is not a road I believe we want to go down in this Committee or in this Congress. I think civil contempt will achieve our goals, and it will do so in a way that is consistent with the rule of law. With that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I will recognize myself for a few minutes. The Committee has consulted with the House Office of General Counsel as well as Committee Counsel, who have expressed significant concern with shifting from criminal contempt to civil contempt because it would likely result in extended litigation that would go beyond this term. As Mr. Perry said, a subpoena is only good for a congressional term. He is already five months past his subpoena. The Clintons have lawyered up. There is no question in my mind that if we do this, they will ride this out, and hope that the House flips and that you all are in control, and you all just let them get by without answering any questions, which I think is terrible. So, I cannot support this amendment, and I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to support the Min motion. I just want to reiterate something I think all Over-

sight Dems have said today is that we all want to hear from President Clinton. We all want questions answered from President Clinton. I do not think one Member of this Committee has stated anything differently, and this amendment is a way for us to secure compliance without immediately moving to criminal contempt while they have been trying to negotiate answering our questions. We can continue to let the legal process play out. Both the integrity of our investigation as a whole is critical as we move forward. This is an opportunity for us to get our questions answered from President Clinton. We will do that without empowering a Department of Justice that, quite frankly, has been corrupt and untrustworthy for many, many months.

We should continue to negotiate and work through an established process. Clearly, there is interest to negotiate from the Clinton side. Let us hear from President Clinton. Let us support this motion. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. If I may, and with all due respect, if you want to hear from President Clinton, have him come in for the deposition. They have had five months to do that. For whatever reason, you have been unsuccessful. There are two more weeks before this will be voted on full House. We will hear from Bondi in between, and we will go from there. We expect to hear from Bill Clinton. He is not above the law. Mr. Walkinshaw is recognized.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of points. One, it seems to me like we made some progress in the negotiation to talk to President Clinton here today. You have acknowledged you and your team are no longer going to demand to be able to ask questions not related to Epstein. The Clintons have agreed to transcription of that conversation, so you could go to New York and talk to President Clinton on the date that you all said. That is ready to go. We have heard from Mrs. Luna that it would be a bad look for you and the Ranking Member to have to drive to New York. They got airports there. You all could take a flight and go to New York and have the conversation. That would move our investigation forward.

I am supporting Mr. Min's amendment in the nature of a substitute. And you know, I will share I was a staff Member for a Member of this Committee for more than a decade throughout the Obama Administration, multiple Chairmen of the Committee. And time after time after time, Republicans who chaired the Committee, Democrats who chaired the Committee, negotiated with Members of the Administration or private individuals who they wanted to have come before the Committee, negotiated the terms. Not once did I see this kind of leap to criminal contempt. It is not consistent with the way that this Committee has operated. It is not necessary.

Mr. Min's amendment, or you and the Ranking Member going to New York and having the transcribed-under-oath conversation with President Clinton would move our investigation forward. Either of those are better options than pursuing criminal contempt, which would not get us a conversation with President Clinton, would not move our investigation forward, and would not get the survivors the transparency that they are demanding. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. If I may, Mr. Walkinshaw, to reply to that. One reason that your counteroffers today do not hold a lot of weight with me is the fact that we never demanded to their attorneys that we ask questions outside the realm of the Epstein investigation. We never. That was never a thing. They have just made that up. So, their dishonesty, you know—we have already admitted one lie when they said this was not a lawful subpoena. That was in the letter from Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton to me. They said this is not a lawful subpoena. It is a lawful subpoena. Does anybody disagree with that? It is a lawful subpoena. Number two, we have never asked to ask questions outside of this, and I will give you an example. When we were negotiating with Hunter Biden's attorneys, or Judiciary was negotiating, we agreed when Hunter Biden came in to talk about the Biden influence peddling and the money that they were receiving from foreign countries, we would not ask about the stuff on the laptop. We would not ask about the stuff in the suspicious activity reports about human-trafficking and other things with Hunter Biden. We only asked about the influence peddling, which was what the investigation was, and it has been the same with the Clintons.

So, if their attorneys are trying to spin out with the media that we wanted to talk about Monica Lewinsky or anything, that is not true. All we want to talk about is Epstein. That has always been the deal, and for them to say otherwise is a complete, 100-percent lie by the Clinton attorneys.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Well, I am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman, and I am glad that the Clintons have agreed to have the conversation transcribed. So, it seems to me that the only remaining barrier, of the barriers you have identified, is you do not want to go to New York, and from my view, this investigation is important enough—

Chairman COMER. I am going to New York for the weekend. That is not a barrier.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Go to the moon. Let us have the conversation. You can do it.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes, who is next? Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you. Honestly, I just want to get some clarification because I have heard so many different things here this morning. So, Mr. Chairman, you just said you are willing to go to New York. In fact, you are going to New York this weekend. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. The Committee has released the emails, so we can—

Ms. STANSBURY. No, I am just asking you—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. You can see the communication between that.

Ms. STANSBURY. I am trying to be difficult. I really just want to understand. Are you willing to go to New York to conduct this interview and deposition?

Chairman COMER. With the Committee, with the staff. It is not going to just be—we have negotiated this for five months, Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. No, I am just asking simple questions.

Chairman COMER. And you all are thinking——

Ms. STANSBURY. The question

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And there is no——

Ms. STANSBURY. So, the——

Chairman COMER. They have had five months.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, is the answer a yes?

[No response.]

Ms. STANSBURY. It sounds like it is a yes. My other question for you is, so it is my understanding that you guys have received both correspondence by phone, email, and from a written letter from the attorneys from the Clintons offering to do this on the record with you, with the staff, with the attorneys. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. I was not paying attention to your question.

[Laughter.]

Ms. STANSBURY. Okay. We are here pursuant to a motion you brought for contempt, and the claim is that you have made reasonable accommodations and that they have not been responsive. But they have transmitted correspondence to all of the Members of the Committee, including yourself and all of the Members——

Chairman COMER. Look——

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Basically including a letter from their attorneys stating that they have offered by phone, that they have offered by email, and they have offered any written letter from both themselves and the attorneys to meet with you on the record with the staff to give sworn statements. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. We have negotiated for five——

Ms. STANSBURY. It is just yes or no. Have they?

Chairman COMER. You all are trying to create a false narrative. You have had five months.

Ms. STANSBURY. I am asking——

Chairman COMER. You should have gotten to the Clintons——

Ms. STANSBURY. I am asking——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Before the contempt vote.

Ms. STANSBURY. All I am asking you is if that is true.

Chairman COMER. And if they were not losing public opinion, Ms. Stansbury, they would be defying us now.

Ms. STANSBURY. But, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. That is the only reason there are negotiations at the last minute.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I am just asking if those were the facts.

Chairman COMER. They do not get to make the rules. We make the rules. The Chairman of the Committee, we make the rules.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, Mr. Chairman, is that the fact. That is all I am asking, is that factual?

[No response.]

Ms. STANSBURY. Just to be clear for the public, his staff are advising the Chairman to not answer that question. Okay.

Chairman COMER. No, the staff said they did not understand what the hell you were saying because you have blabbered for 3 minutes, but go ahead.

Ms. STANSBURY. Okay, Mr. Chairman. Let me say it again. Is it true that the Clintons and their attorneys have had multiple conversations with you via phone, via email, and via written cor-

respondence offering to give sworn statements on the record to you and the staff? Just a yes or no.

Chairman COMER. The Clintons said that we could take notes.

Ms. STANSBURY. But they—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Garcia and I.

Ms. STANSBURY. But they are—

Chairman COMER. The Committee would like to ask questions as well.

Ms. STANSBURY. Are you not in receipt of a letter postmarked from their attorneys yesterday saying that they would give sworn statements under oath?

Chairman COMER. That is not a record.

Ms. STANSBURY. You are not in possession of the letter that their attorney sent yesterday to the entire Committee.

Chairman COMER. What their letter is stating, is not what you are stating.

Ms. STANSBURY. Okay. Well, I am not going to read the letter. We will make sure it is available to the public. But in any case—

Chairman COMER. Oh, I am sure they will make sure anything is available to the public. The problem is, they have not been truthful and—

Ms. STANSBURY. But, Mr. Chairman, the legal standard for contempt is noncooperation. And so, my question to you is, are you making reasonable accommodations? Are you cooperating? Are you in correspondence with them? And this is in direct relation to the motion that was made now for an amendment that, essentially, would use our Civil Compliance Code in order to get full compliance from the Committee. And you are saying you are opposed to it because they have not complied, but I have not heard you lay out the case for compliance, so why would you oppose civil compliance?

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury, we have been negotiating for five months. In the meantime, every other person has complied with the subpoena that we have dealt with.

Ms. STANSBURY. That is the—not the legal standard for the court. That is not the legal standard for the court, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BIGGS. You did not write the legal standard either. That is not the legal standard.

[Voice.] Willful defiance. Willful defiance, that is the standard.

Ms. STANSBURY. Okay. Well, I see we have a lot of armchair lawyers here. I am not one, but, Mr. Min, I do support your amendment, and I think that while the Chairman refused to answer questions on the record, I think we established that there has been ongoing correspondence and that it does not meet the standard.

Chairman COMER. Ms. Simon is recognized.

Ms. SIMON. I would like to yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. I just want to clarify two things. The first is, in the comments, I know, Mr. Chairman, you had just discussed about not going beyond the scope of the Epstein investigation with questions. To be clear, though, during the Bill Barr, that you were not interested in, during the Bill Barr deposition, you did go beyond the scope of the Epstein questions. You asked questions about Russia and a bunch of other things. That testimony was public. That has been a pattern that has been in the public realm. And

so, the reason the Clintons have pushed back on that is because you actually have gone beyond the scope of the Epstein investigation in depositions on this investigation with folks you have subpoenaed. I just want to be clear about that because you just mentioned that right now in your comments.

The second thing I want to say, just to Ms. Stansbury's point, to reiterate is, regardless of when it was done, it is false to say that the Clintons have not agreed to a transcript of the deposition. They have agreed to a transcript. They have done it and have they have reiterated that position in an email that they sent today. It is a position they have made before.

Chairman COMER. Today.

Mr. GARCIA. Sir, I mean, obviously, it is the position that they have made before to your team. It is a position that they have made a few days ago. They have publicly said it in the press. In fact, it was covered, I think, today or yesterday in an article in *The New York Times*. And they again reiterated it during this testimony when you said that they have not agreed to it. They have clarified their position. They are willing for it to be transcribed. I just want to clarify that.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes, who is next?

Ms. SIMON. I still have time.

Chairman COMER. Okay. Go ahead.

Ms. SIMON. If that is okay, Chair, I would like to use the remainder of my time and yield it to Representative Min.

Mr. MIN. Thank you, Rep. Simon. I just want to add a couple points here. First, I just want to note something that I think has been a little bit conflated today. This vote today on the contempt proceeding is not about whether Bill and Hillary Clinton were involved with the Epstein sex-trafficking ring. If either or both of them were involved, they deserve to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The survivors deserve justice. But the vote that we are about to take later today is about whether the Clintons' actions in negotiating through their lawyers on the particulars of how, when, and where they might appear before this Committee, whether that constitutes a willful defiance, and that is the legal standard, a willful default, of the subpoena issued to them.

And again, I want to point out that Chair Comer has repeatedly talked about negotiating for five months, delaying and trying to run out the clock. I do not believe that that is willful defiance of the subpoena. That is not just my opinion. It is the opinion of every serious lawyer in this space that I have talked to that actually knows this area of the law. I think we are going far afield here and going straight to criminal contempt. I would also just point out and rebut what the Chair said about criminal contempt leading to the Clintons testifying here. If we issue criminal contempt proceedings, I do not know if you have followed how courts work. A civil enforcement of a subpoena can take place very quickly. Criminal trials will take a very long time, months, if not years. That will definitely run out the clock. We will never hear from the Clintons before this Committee.

And so, I would urge you all to consider this amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute because it will actually allow us to hear from the Clintons, maybe get the answers we want

from them. And particularly since, Chair Comer, you have repeatedly said there is no basis in your mind, the Committee is not accusing them of any wrongdoing, we are just simply seeking answers, if we want answers, if we want more information to get to the bottom of what happened with Epstein and this horrific child sex-trafficking ring, we should be looking to civil contempt, civil enforcement, because that will actually get them before us, not criminal. With that, I yield back to Rep. Simon.

Ms. SIMON. I would like to yield my time to Ms. Stansbury. Ms. Stansbury says no. I would like to yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GARCIA. I think we have made our case. I think that we support the Min Amendment. It is the right way to go, and civil contempt is the right next action if we are going to go in this route. Thank you.

Ms. SIMON. I would like to yield my time back to the Chair. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair [sic] yields back. They have called votes, but Mr. Biggs wants to be recognized, then I think we are going to vote on the Min Amendment.

Mr. BIGGS: Yes, I will be pretty quick. So, when you take into the correct legal standard and you talk about willful and defiance. So, you have a culpable mental state, and you have the act. The act took place here when they did not show up. That is the defiance. They did not show up. Now, the question is, was it willful? Well, the other piece of evidence you have that it was willful is they sent a little note saying this is all we are going to say, this is what happened here, and that is the evidence. It was willful. They knew about the subpoena because they negotiated with you. You even moved the time for them. They chose not to come. When you reissued the date, you gave them the date that, ostensibly, was going to be more convenient, they continued to say they were going to come, and then at the last minute, they slipped a note in saying, "This is what I am going to say. I am not saying anything more." That is the culpable mental state. You have got willful defiance, thus contempt is appropriate, and I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Very good. Very good. The question is now on the Min Amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed say no.

[Chorus of noes.]

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

Mr. GARCIA. A recorded vote, please, sir.

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

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. We will plan to convene immediately after the first vote series.

With that, the Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come back to order.

Now pursuant to notice, I call up a report containing a Recommending that the House of Representatives find Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for refusal——

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

Chairman COMER. Point of order. State your point.

Mr. MFUME. Are the amendments going to precede the vote on the two resolutions, or is it the other way around?

Chairman COMER. We will vote on the amendments. We are going to roll everything to the end of the Committee so we can have everybody back in there to vote.

Mr. MFUME. Okay. Good. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. All right. As I was saying, pursuant to notice, I call up a report containing a resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Secretary of State Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by this Committee.

The clerk will report the report, which has been distributed in advance.

H.RES.——, RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND HILLARY R. CLINTON IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The Clerk. A report containing a House resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Hillary R. Clinton in Contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a duly issued subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

The clerk will please report the amendment.

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

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

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

As with President Clinton, the Committee believes that Secretary Clinton possesses information that is relevant to this Committee's investigation. Specifically, Secretary Clinton's testimony may shed light on the activities of Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell and their efforts to establish relationships and curry favor with influential people. As former Secretary of State, Clinton may also have information regarding the Federal Government's efforts to combat international sex-trafficking, Secretary Clinton's refusal to discuss that information in person and on the record directly obstructs the Committee's investigation.

The Committee must enforce these bipartisan subpoenas through bipartisan support of this contempt of Congress resolution. I urge

all my colleagues to support this contempt report, and I now yield to Ranking Member Garcia for his opening statement.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Comer. I just want to, again, just repeat that once again, Oversight Democrats have been clear that we want to hear from anyone with knowledge of Jeffrey Epstein's crimes. We have made that clear earlier. We will continue to make that clear.

One thing that is important to note is that on numerous occasions, Secretary Clinton has made statements, both in the public and to this Committee, that she has no knowledge of Jeffrey Epstein or his activities, and I just want to put that into the record. It is not clear to me, as it is not clear to many others, as to why Secretary Clinton has been a target of this investigation. The Secretary submitted a sworn declaration under penalty of perjury that she had no memory of ever meeting Mr. Epstein, never flew on his plane, and never held any office with responsibility for investigating his activities. She testified to having met Ghislaine Maxwell possibly in passing, but did not have a relationship with her. Now, Oversight Republicans did not pursue subpoenas to former Attorneys General and FBI officials who certified that they had no knowledge of the case, and Hillary Clinton should have her subpoena dealt with in the same way. Again, having and asking questions of Secretary Clinton is appropriate of this Committee. It is also appropriate that we deal with her case in the way we have dealt with others that have been able to answer in writing or have been dismissed by the Majority.

At least up to this point, the evidence that we have collected by our Committee support Secretary Clinton's assertions. No one who is serious about justice for Epstein survivors believes that Hillary Clinton has somehow been involved in Jeffrey Epstein's crimes. We also know that, of course, that Donald Trump has been very clear about weaponizing against his opponents. In fact, he has famously, of course, led the call to lock her up since the 2026 election campaign and is clearly moving forward to do the same. Now, a contempt resolution against Hillary Clinton would expose a weaponization in this Epstein investigation. If we have additional questions for Secretary Clinton, we should ask those, we should work with her and her team, and we should get her to answer those in front of the Committee, but, again, this is an attempt to politicize and attack Donald Trump's political enemies.

We do ensure that we will hear from folks that are critical to this investigation and at the center of that are folks like Pam Bondi, who will not be appearing in front of this Committee, to be clear, but the Judiciary Committee, and Ghislaine Maxwell, which, finally, we are about to actually hopefully get some additional answers from her, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bell from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I found it interesting that you acknowledged that Pam Bondi is not moving at a speed or pace to your liking. And I think the biggest concern for many of us who are looking at not only ensuring a real investigation to give these victims, these survivors, the respect that they deserve and the justice that they deserve, but it just appears over and over that we are not using the same standards as a result of partisanship.

Again, having conducted these types of investigations as a district attorney, you do not skip steps. If the evidence is there, you review the evidence, and you follow where that evidence leads you. You review the evidence, develop your theory of the case, and then you conduct your investigation based on the evidence. Now, there are times when you do not have the evidence, and you do have to try and investigate in different ways to try to get that evidence, but in this case, we have the evidence. This Congress voted on a bipartisan basis to have that evidence released, but yet, we are trying to skip steps for political points.

And again, Mr. Chair, you acknowledged, Pam Bondi not moving at the speed or pace that you like, but you were still comfortable with the one percent of the files that we got, one percent. Ninety-nine percent, we still do not have anything. Not 20 percent, not 30 percent, we are missing, 40 or 50. Ninety-nine percent of the files that we are missing, but yet there is no criminal contempt push with respect to Pam Bondi or any urgency. But yet the legal analysis for criminal contempt is that there is no cooperation, that there is no negotiation, because the case law, the courts have determined as long as there is good-faith negotiation, you have to give time for that. And that is not moving at the speed or pace that the Committee prefers, but in this case, we are jumping right to criminal contempt.

And what I would say is, like just about every Member on my side of the aisle has said, we want to talk to anyone who has evidence pertaining to these survivors—anyone—and I want to hear from the Clintons. If this Committee is successful in going down a criminal pathway, we are not going to hear from them, and that defeats the purpose. You get your political points, but it defeats the purpose. And so, at the appropriate time, if anyone were refusing to work with this Committee, and as we have seen with the affidavits, this does not apply to the Clintons. If anyone refuses to come to this Committee without, you know, and just ignores it, then all of us will support the appropriate remedies. But in this case, it is clear that this is a partisan attack to try and score points as opposed to actually trying to do a real investigation to give the survivors in this case the justice that they deserve, and this Committee, this Congress should be above that.

I yield my time to the Ranking Member, if he so chooses.

Mr. GARCIA. I am okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman COMER. I will recognize myself for a few seconds.

Our report lays out that Hillary Clinton had both a personal relationship with Maxwell as well as a financial relationship with Epstein. She has had five months as well to come before this Committee. We voted in a bipartisan manner to issue her a very lawful subpoena, and she has chosen not to comply with that subpoena, so.

Mr. BELL. And Pam Bondi?

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members seek recognition? Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay, so we are not seeking information from Secretary Clinton because of her own—look, there is nothing in any of the documents that we have received from either the estate or from the Department of Justice,

there is no indication from talking to the witnesses or the witnesses' attorneys, that Mrs. Clinton had anything to do with this, and yet we are trying to issue a criminal contempt charge because of her reluctance to appear. None of those documents, there is no indication that she has anything to do with this. I am not surprised that she is reluctant to appear. She had nothing to do with this.

And if we are seeking the other count, the other basis for our inquiry from the charge and from the resolution is that, in her official capacity as Secretary of State, she may have information regarding sex-trafficking in general, but that is not unique to Mrs. Clinton. We could summon the, you know, Special Under Secretary for Sex-Trafficking at the State Department if we really wanted to find out information of that nature. Or we could summon any other Secretary of State who has served since 2008, I think, when some of this was first uncovered in depth, but it had nothing to do with the Secretary of State. Then it was between Mar-a-Lago and Jeffrey Epstein. It went from young girls being trafficked from Mar-a-Lago to Jeffrey Epstein's estate, and there is no nexus there between Donald Trump's club and the young girls that were trafficked to Jeffrey Epstein. There is no nexus there where the Secretary of State might intervene. So, with all due respect, I think her name was put in there because of the animosity with which the President regards her, and this goes back to, you know, a political race between those two candidates and has nothing to do with the information that Secretary Clinton might be able to offer.

I want to hear from everyone who has information on this. However, we do not have a shred of evidence that Mrs. Clinton has meaningful information to assist this Committee. But I know where there is evidence. I know Pam Bondi has had millions and millions and millions of documents that she has refused to surrender to this Committee for the past six months. I know where there is also other evidence, sitting in a luxury prison, Ghislaine Maxwell, who should be before this Committee, should never have been taken out of that original prison by President Trump's personal attorney, and by doing so, made her less likely to be willing to offer testimony and evidence to this Committee. That is witness tampering.

When you take someone who has been convicted of a crime, remove them from uncomfortable settings, put them in a nice place, just keep your mouth shut, honey, that is all. That is what was going on there. We know that. All of a sudden, she gets a sweetheart deal. They are bringing in pets for her. They are giving her the royal treatment now. As long as you keep your mouth shut, honey, that is what they are saying to her. Just keep your mouth shut and do not mention the President. That is the scam that is going on here. That is witness tampering, plain and simple. And yet, you have someone who served this country, Secretary of State, elected U.S. Senator, has nothing to do with this, but because it gratifies the President that you dust her up and ruin her reputation.

This is beneath what we should be doing. We should strike the motion to summon her before this Committee. We should drop this effort to hold her in criminal contempt. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. And with all due respect, if you did not want to subpoena Hillary Clinton, the Democrats on the Subcommittee should not have voted to subpoena Hillary Clinton.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Comer, can I clarify that?

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I just want to be clear that we have the video. Committee Democrats actually voted no by voice vote.

Chairman COMER. You had an opportunity for a roll call and you declined it.

Mr. GARCIA. We voted—

Chairman COMER. You called for it and then staff came to you and you said, ah let us not do it, let us not do it.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Comer, actually, you were not there, so I actually do not think that you should—

Chairman COMER. I have watched the video, too.

Mr. GARCIA. Would you like to show the video? I mean, the video is very clear. We actually all voted no. I just want to be clear that in the initial vote, all Democrats voted no. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. That is why we have recorded votes, and you all declined that. So, 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 to the Hillary R. Clinton contempt report.

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 amendment in the nature of a substitute to the report is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting the Hillary R. Clinton report, 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. The amendment to the nature of a substitute to the report is agreed to.

Mr. GARCIA. A recorded vote, sir.

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

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. We plan to reconvene at 3:15. Three-fifteen.

The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will resume consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the William J. Clinton Contempt Report.

The question is now on the previously-postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Lee

from Pennsylvania. Members will record their vote using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the amendment to the amendment of the Report. And I will hold this open to make sure everybody is here.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. I see Dr. Foxx.

Has every Member been recorded who wish to be recorded?

Ms. FOXX. No, sir.

[Voting.]

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 19. The nays are 24.

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 Mr. Min from California. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the Min Amendment to the amendment of the Report.

[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 19. The nays are 25.

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

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the William J. Clinton Contempt Report.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. All those opposed say no.

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Report is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting the William J. Clinton Contempt Report, as amended. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the William J. Clinton Contempt Report.

[Voting.]

Chairman COMER. Have all Members been recorded who wish to be—okay. We are waiting on one more?

Has everybody now?

Okay. 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 34, the nays are eight, with two voting present.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it. Pursuant to this vote, the Committee hereby favorably reports and adopts this Report recommending that the House of Representatives find William J. Clinton in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with the subpoena duly issued by this Committee. We will move the Report to the full House.

Without objection, the motion to consider is laid upon the table.

Mr. GRACIA. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Rule IX, Clause (2)(1), I just ask that Members have the requisite two days to file with the Clerk of the Committee, supplemental, additional, and minority, and dissenting views.

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Mr. GRACIA. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

The question is now on favorably reporting the Hillary R. Clinton Contempt Report, as amended. Members will record their votes using the electronic voting system.

The clerk will now open the vote on the Hillary R. Clinton Contempt Report.

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

The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the ayes are 28, the nays are 15, with one voting present.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it. Pursuant to this vote, the Committee hereby favorably reports and adopts this Report recommending that the House of Representatives find Hillary R. Clinton in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by this Committee. We will move the Report to the full House.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Rule IX, Clause (2)(1), I just ask that Members have the requisite two days to file with the clerk of the Committee any supplemental, additional, or minority, dissenting views for inclusion in the report.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, Committee Members shall have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee, supplemental, additional, minority, dissenting views within two days.

Without objection, so ordered.

Additionally, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the Report, ordered reported today, subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

If there is no further business before the Committee, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 3:31 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

