

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:  
MARK-UP OF H.R. 140 AND H.R. 1162**

---

COMMITTEE ON  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

FEBRUARY 28, 2023

---

**Serial No. CP:118-3**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



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

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

51-804 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

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

MARK MARIN, Staff Director  
JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel  
CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy Director  
LAUREN LOMBARDO, Senior Policy Analyst  
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk  
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074  
JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director  
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

---

# C O N T E N T S

---

Hearing held on February 28, 2023 .....	Page 1
---	-----------

## INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

---

- \* Emails, Twitter File; submitted by Rep. Armstrong.
- \* Article, *Miami Herald*, “Doctor Loses License, Must Have Psych Evaluation for COVID Falsehoods, Board Says”; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- \* Article, *Politico*, “Medical Boards Get Pushback as They Try to Punish Doctors for COVID Misinformation”; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- \* Article, CNN, “The Many Times Trump Has Praised China’s Handling of the Coronavirus Pandemic”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- \* Article, *The Wall Street Journal*, “The Right’s Wrong Attack on DirecTV Over Newsmax”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.

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



## **FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING: MARK-UP OF H.R. 140 AND H.R. 1162**

---

**Tuesday, February 28, 2023**

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

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:08 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

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

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 Chair recognizes himself to make an opening statement.

The Committee meets today pursuant to notice to consider three different items: H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from American Interference Act; H.R. 1162 by Mr. Perry, the Accountability for Government Censorship Act; and the Authorization and Oversight Plan of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability. As required by House rules, a copy of the legislative measures have been made available to Members and the public at least 24 hours in advance. I appreciate the Ranking Member working with me to finalize the 118th Congress Authorization and Oversight Plan for the Committee.

Today is this Committee's first markup of the 118th Congress. It is also the Committee's first legislative step in combating the Federal Government's abusive actions to censor the lawful speech of American citizens on private-sector internet platforms. We have important work to do this Congress to uncover and prevent government waste, fraud, and abuse, and we look forward to getting started on this important work today. With that, I yield to the distin-

guished Ranking Member for whatever opening statement he wishes to make.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, kindly, Mr. Chairman. It is a delight to be with you for these significant matters we meet for today. And I just want to let the Members know that I have delivered the promised copy of Common Sense for every Member of the Committee on the theory that what we need to succeed together in 118th Congress, it is just common sense in an Age of Reason, which was the other great book that Tom Paine wrote. He said, "You can't have common sense without an age of reason and age of reason without common sense," so I hope you all enjoy it. I look forward to talking to the Members about it, and I look forward to us getting into the details of today's legislation. I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right. Our first item for consideration as H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

The clerk will please report the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 140. H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

The clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Comer.

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.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for five minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

During our February 8 hearing on Protecting Speech from Government Interference and Social Media Bias, the Oversight Committee learned just how easy it was for the Federal Government to influence a private company to accomplish what it constitutionally cannot: limit the free exercise of speech. At the hearing, we heard hours of witness testimony that revealed the extent to which Federal employees have repeatedly and consistently communicated with social media platforms to censor and suppress the lawful speech of Americans. The hearing exposed just how much the Biden Administration have attempted to normalize a policy of Federal censorship.

Biden Administration officials have publicly called upon and privately coordinated with private sector social media companies to ban specific accounts viewed as politically inconvenient. During our February 8 hearing, one of our witnesses, Mr. Baker, called for Federal legislation that would reasonably and effectively limit government interactions with private sector platforms. I agree with him. It is inappropriate and dangerous for the Federal Government to decide what lawful speech is allowed on a private sector platform. My bill, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, makes this type of behavior an unlawful activity for Federal officials to engage in, subjecting those who attempt to censor the

lawful speech of Americans to disciplinary actions and monetary penalties.

The Federal Government should not be able to decide what lawful speech is allowed. We have the First Amendment for a very good reason. Federal officials, no matter their rank or resources, must be prohibited to coerce the private sector to suppress certain information or limit the ability of citizens to freely express their own views on a private sector internet platform. Former White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki, for example, should not have been free to use her official authority to openly call for Facebook or any other social media company to ban specific accounts or types of speech from its platform. That was not appropriate use of the authorities or resources of a senior executive branch official.

Further, Federal employees should not feel empowered to infringe on the independence of private entities by pressuring them to complicate or change their community guidelines and content modernization policies. If the Biden Administration needs to express its policy positions or political preferences, it has immense communication resources of its own through which to engage in the public square and offer its information and argument. If the Administration feels it is losing the policy argument or the public's confidence to stronger voices, the answer should never be to deploy the resources and power of the Federal Government to limit the speech of others.

The legislation before us today expands the current Federal employee political activity limitations of the Hatch Act to include a prohibition on Federal employees using their official authority to influence or coerce a private sector internet platform to censor lawful speech. This includes a prohibition on actions that would result in a private sector platform suppressing, restricting, or adding disclaimers or alerts to any lawful speech posted on its platform by a person or entity. Whether an ordinary citizen or an established media organization, all Americans have a right to utilize these new and powerful communication technology resources to share their views and opinions without Uncle Sam putting his thumb on the scale to tilt the debate in one direction. Americans know that the First Amendment protects them from this kind of government censorship—protects them from Federal officials who seek to use their positions, their influence, and their resources to censor lawful speech.

The only thing that has changed is that the public square has moved online with powerful new communication tools. We are discussing this legislation today because Americans know that something is wrong, and they have asked Congress to fix it. This bill is a targeted first step to address one clear part of the problem: the troubling development that the Federal officials in the U.S. Government view it as their role to censor the speech of Americans.

I thank Judiciary Committee Chairman Jim Jordan and Energy and Commerce Chair Cathy McMorris Rodgers for their early support in crafting this legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield to the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You know, there is something a bit presumptuous about legislation called the

Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, because that, of course, is the whole purpose and meaning of the First Amendment, which protects all private speech against government interference, censorship, and punishment. If our prideful ambition today is to improve upon the framers' handiwork crafting the First Amendment, we must be very careful to address actual real problems without creating numerous new problems and threats to free speech, democracy, and public safety along the way. Legislation should address real problems. The original flaw of this legislation is that it is based on the entirely false premise that government officials pressured or coerced Twitter to suppress the New York Post story about Hunter Biden's laptop for all of 24 hours.

At our last hearing, none of the three witnesses called by the GOP Majority supported that theory in any way. In fact, the hearing ended with the conclusion on February 8 that there was no governmental pressure or coercion involved in the private company's fleeting, independent decision to moderate access to the Hunter Biden laptop story for a day or two.

After that hearing failed to identify any government action in these sequence of events, the legislation conveniently moves to redefine "censorship" from meaning government suppression of private speech to meaning private entities regulating their own speech content and speech platforms. This move is radical indeed. We usually do not say the newspapers and TV networks censored themselves when they decide to put one thing on the air instead of another. Indeed, even with the recent shocking disclosure of internal conversation showing that Fox News anchors, like Tucker Carlson, completely knew that Sidney Powell, Rudy Giuliani, and Donald Trump were lying about their ridiculous 2020 election claims and called them behind the scenes insane, absurd, shockingly reckless, and dangerous as hell, but then credited those claims on air.

Nonetheless, it would still be strange to say that Fox News was censoring itself. I don't think it was. It just made one terribly bad decision, which, for certain plaintiffs, might end up being unlawful. But in any event, the basic point is that it is a fallacy, what the philosophers call a category error, to treat a private entity's decision not to publish something, or to hold a publication by day, as censorship under our system of government. Yet, the whole purpose and design of the legislation is to protect private speakers from being censored by private media entities because of prior communications they may have had with the government or information they may have received from the government.

But the receipt or collection of information from the government does not transform a private entity's editorial decisions into state action from the standpoint of the First Amendment. For example, the newspaper set to run an op-ed saying that the COVID vaccine is more dangerous to the public than COVID, for example, but then the CDC sends out a report completely debunking that claim, and so the editors decide not to run the op-ed. That is a private editorial decision entirely protected by the First Amendment. The disappointed op-ed writer has no First Amendment cause of action against the CDC or against the newspaper.

Social media companies have a First Amendment right to establish their own rules governing their own speech, including false

speech, and speech inciting violence, and race hate. Social media companies also have a right to use threat information shared by the government to enforce their rules and make private business decisions. But H.R. 140 now threatens the ability of law enforcement and other government agencies to share information that these companies want to get, such as information warning them of violence-inciting and violence-planning speech on their platforms that poses a serious threat to public safety and democratic institutions.

Based on the testimony of the Minority witness on February 8, Ms. Anika Collier Navaroli, in the Twitter files hearing, it is obvious that Twitter should be using every tool at its disposal to become far more attuned to the use of its platform for incitement and planning of insurrectionary violence, not less so. Then, as private actors, they can make their own decisions about how to respond within the law and their private policies.

Similarly, H.R. 140, as written, would interfere with the ability of national security and law enforcement agencies to contact online platform providers and tell them that Russia, China, or other malign foreign state or non-state actors are working to interfere with the integrity of an election, voting rights, or fear balloting on Election Day with propaganda techniques, disinformation, or direct tampering. In this sense, H.R. 140, would work as a Putin Protection Act, given his demonstrated propensity for spending tens of millions of dollars on his Internet Research Agency to pump propaganda and fake news directly into the bloodstream of American political campaigns. This is a serious danger created by this legislation, given the escalating global campaign by autocrats, theocrats, and communist bureaucrats to inject chaos and division in democratic societies.

Mr. Chairman, most people will recognize as absurd all the whining by election deniers, COVID deniers, white supremacists, and neo-Nazis, that they somehow have a God-given right to spout off on other people's private internet platforms. Give me a break. If you don't like rules against public health disinformation or racist incitement, then go set up your own social media platform. Most of us don't want to live in a world where government cannot relay truthful and factual information to private media entities. Most of us don't want to live in a world where a government withholds critical factual information from social media entities and then right-wing politicians heckle and harass them, to force them to host election deniers, Holocaust deniers, COVID-19 deniers, racist antisemites, and so on. Compelling social media to carry the propaganda of big liars cannot be the meaning of free speech in the 21st century.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to solve what we already established in our hearings was not a problem at all, but because of its selective nature, it would create numerous serious problems going forward for American democracy, while still allowing politicians to threaten private media entities over their content and editorial decisions. And we will have more to say about how much of that is really going on. I respectfully urge the Committee to reject H.R. 140, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Ms. Boebert for five minutes.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am in support of this bill. I just wanted to briefly comment on the Ranking Member's remarks. You know, he mentioned that we want to have a government that is able to put out truthful information. Well, we have experienced a government that has put out very, very false information that has harmed people in the past two years, and you are going after American citizens for asking questions. These are the people who were censored on social media platforms, and come to find out we were right about the origins of COVID. We were right about it being a lab leak, the American citizens who were questioning the efficacy of masks, and lockdowns, and vaccines, and boosters, and so on, and so on, and even all of the hospital—everything that happened in the hospitals to treat COVID-19. And even the number of patients who had COVID-19 and died of COVID-19, how that was inflated, all of these questions that the American people were asking, they were censored, they were shut down. They were removed from social media. They were suspended. They were banned.

And you want a government that just can put out truthful information? Well, how about allowing the real government, the people, to ask questions, seek answers and not be silenced in the process? While they are completely being lied to by their Federal Government, by the people who were put in these positions? And, this bill is addressing exactly that. Americans need to be able to ask these questions. They have the right to receive information about what is going on in our country and around the world, where things are coming from, how it is going to affect their children, their children's education, how it is going to affect their health, physically? This is what we are addressing. The American people were silenced for three years because of what China has done and because of our Federal Government colluding to cover up what China released into the globe.

So, we want American citizens to, yes, have a government put out truthful information, and also the people are the check on the government to say, hey, is that right? Is that accurate? Something seems off here. I have a question. Here is some information that I found out because, hey, Federal Government, maybe you don't know everything. Mr. Chairman, I yield, and I support the bill.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. Any other Member seek recognition?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SESSIONS. I move to strike the last word. Oh, excuse me.

Chairman COMER. Yes, Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Since we brought up COVID, I just want to respond and to remind the Majority that COVID did not start under the Biden Administration. It started under the Trump Administration, and it was Donald Trump who closed businesses. It was Donald Trump who closed schools. It was Donald Trump who mandated masks. It was Donald Trump who came up with the vaccine, which I don't have a problem with, but if you have a problem with it, it was Donald Trump's vaccine.

And so, when we bring up COVID, we seem to have amnesia of when COVID started, who it started under, right? You guys don't like Dr. Fauci, but it was Donald Trump who listened to Dr. Fauci. And so, at the end of the day, you guys want to complain about things that happened under the last two years. You are allowed to have valid complaints, but what I would love to hear from the Majority is the criticism of the Trump Administration, and Donald Trump, and the decisions that were made during that Administration, which you guys use as talking points to hit the President of the United States over, Joe Biden, but he was not in charge when those decisions were made. I yield back.

Ms. BOEBERT. Would the gentleman yield? I will respond. You want to hear a response from the Majority? I would be happy to respond.

Chairman COMER. The Chair—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Sure. Sure, Mr. Chair, I will.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognize—

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you very much. You are right. President Trump was in office when the COVID virus was released from a lab in China, from the Wuhan lab, and he tried to make that very clear that this came from China, and reporters regularly dismissed that. They called him a xenophobe because he was just saying where the virus came from. He did not mandate masks, your President did. Joe Biden did. We were on airplanes, all masked up, forced to be in masks, shut down our businesses, shut down our schools, Governors shut down our businesses, and our schools. President Trump was very much in favor of federalism and saying let the states choose. He didn't make any Federal mandates. And there are plenty of vaccine mandates that came from Joe Biden. Ask our service members who have been wrongfully discharged, have not been reinstated, have not received back pay, and now what? If they want to continue to not serve, will they have an honorable discharge? We don't know because even in the previous NDAA, that language was not strong enough. And so, that is another fight that we still have to have.

What about all of our medical workers who were forced to have vaccines? That is the problem with the vaccine, not that it exists? Great. It was created. It is your choice, if you want to get the vaccine, if you want to get the booster. It was forced on millions of Americans, and that is where the problem lies.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes, I yield.

Chairman COMER. Yes. Well, he has asked, yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Thank you very much, and thank you for yielding, Mr. Moskowitz. I appreciate the gentlelady's passion. There are true facts that she should perhaps be alerted to. One is that Donald Trump on more than 20 different occasions defended the performance of the Chinese Government, and specifically President Xi in terms of his treatment of COVID-19, and said he was doing a wonderful job and a great job, and they were working closely and they were constantly in touch. So, if there is a problem with the Chinese Government unleashing the virus, which has not been proven anywhere, but it certainly could be true, you would have to

pin that on your favorite President, Donald Trump, not on Joe Biden.

The second thing is President Trump's own special adviser on COVID-19, Deborah Birx, I am sure you are aware, and I am sure you have read her book, said that the lethal recklessness of Donald Trump's policies about COVID-19 cost Americans hundreds of thousands of lives. So, you don't have to believe anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle. That is Donald Trump's own special adviser on COVID-19. Thank you for yielding, and I happily yield back.

Chairman COMER. I will now recognize Mr. Moskowitz for final 56 seconds.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will just close with this. Again, I don't have a problem having the conversation with the Majority on what decisions that were made during an emergency, that now that the lights are back on and we are no longer in the emergency, that they want to criticize, but that criticism needs to go both ways. It can't just be that COVID started only in the Biden Administration and those decisions were made only in the Biden Administration. I will have you know, and maybe you are not aware, but that the White House and the President called Governors around the country, and the President himself instructed them to close. How do I know that? I was in the room. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member seek—the Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs for five minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate this piece of legislation, and I think as somewhat have an understanding of the concern of the Ranking Member, but I want to point out a few things as well. No. 1, the recent Wall Street Journal report regarding COVID with the DOE has known and suggested that there was an actual leak at the Wuhan lab, and that they knew about it for a couple of years. That is interesting because when some of us suggested that two years ago, my colleagues across the aisle said we were conspiracy theorists, we were nuts, we were xenophobic, all sorts of ridiculous complaints. I was censored, I was bumped, I was shadow banned, all types of things because they said it was COVID misinformation.

Joe Biden stood up and said 'I think social media should do more censoring of COVID misinformation.' Turns out that was not COVID misinformation. When I stood up and said I have on my desk two meta studies which encompass over 100 studies on masking and masks simply don't work unless you have a special, fitted, unique N95 mask—"misinformation." Taken down. Those were medical studies, scientific studies, peer reviewed studies. Now, we got the piece here where Lancet recognizes natural immunity, three years late. When we started talking about natural immunity and I brought in doctors and scientists, and I did podcast with them, we were censored. That is what this bill gets at. Who is driving the censorship?

Well, you want to know who is driving censorship? How about what we had testified to just a couple of weeks ago, regular meetings between CIA, FBI, and Twitter officials, calling out and saying, hey, check out these accounts. We don't think they follow your

private standards. That kind of pressure tantamount to coercion, to deny it is actually just leaves me speechless. How about this, out of the lawsuit that is coming via Missouri and Louisiana and the AGs there? We have one Facebook official sending to the Surgeon General, again dealing with COVID stuff. He says, "I know our teams." This is a quote from an email. "I know our teams met today to better understand the scope of what the White House expects from us."

You know, you can have a violation of First Amendment if the government, just like if the government violates and gets a private actor, an Agent, to violate someone's Fourth Amendment or Fifth Amendment. I would tell you, you can do the same with First Amendment. That is what was going on here. That is fascistic when you have the government, enlisting the private sector to censor, not just enlisting them, but coercing them.

This bill tries to get at that. You may not like the fineness of it. Maybe there are some nuances that you think should be there, but the reality is that is what was going on, is a huge problem, in my mind, having been a victim of it. If you are a conservative voice and you were out early, like I was, talking about these issues and constantly being labeled and attacked by social media companies, then you say, hey, yes, why is that happening, because the government was actually putting pressure and coercion on the social media.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentlemen yield for this line of question?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, I would. Yes, yes.

Mr. RASKIN. You make some interesting points. The people who I am aware of or were taken down from any social media entity over COVID disinformation were people who were either saying the vaccine will kill you, or the vaccine doesn't work, or you use Clorox or whatever. So, I am just wondering, are you aware of anybody who was taken down from social media because they said that there was a lab origin for the virus, because I didn't see any of those.

Mr. BIGGS. I don't know about the Wuhan lab. I know that I was labeled because of that.

Mr. RASKIN. But the labelling is part of the—

Mr. BIGGS. I am taking it back. But I do know doctors who were taken down and banned for making statements from research and science. My time has expired. But, yes, I do know examples.

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much. You know, as I was reading the bills that were put forward today for us to vote on, there is one word that has continued to go through my mind, and that is the word "gaslighting." You know, the definition of "gaslighting" is to manipulate someone, and in this case, the American public, using methods to question their own powers of reasoning and their own sanity by those who are in a position of authority.

When I read the bill that we are discussing here, this concept is really in the forefront of my mind because when we talk about the facts, what we are talking about is we held a hearing just a couple of weeks ago, on February 8, where former executives of Twitter

were hauled before this Committee to talk about a decision that was made within a private company—not by a government entity, a private company—after they had been briefed by American law enforcement about the potential of the use of disinformation by foreign adversaries, namely Russia and China, to potentially impact our election outcome.

Now, the story at hand, that was the actual basis for this hearing, was actually a story that was planted in the media by Donald Trump's own campaign for the purpose of being an October surprise in his 2020 election. It was flagged within Twitter as a potential disinformation. And the executives who came and testified under oath said that they agreed that in hindsight, after examining the evidence, that they would have handled the situation differently. Let's be clear on the facts. This was a private company with a private platform that was acting after they had been briefed by Homeland Security, the FBI, and other American law enforcement officials while Donald Trump was President and sitting in a position of power, after they refused to amplify a campaign-planted story in the media.

And so here presenting a bill, the Majority is presenting a bill and an amendment to that bill today, that would literally hamstring the ability of American law enforcement to prevent election interference and to ensure that we are protecting our democracy. And it is being done under the guise of ensuring that we are protecting the First Amendment rights of Americans to speak their minds. This is not about the First Amendment. This is gaslighting. This is literally the definition of gaslighting because what this bill would do, if you read this bill in the amendment, is actually tie the hands of our public officials to exercise their First Amendment rights and their ability to actually exercise their law enforcement duties as they take the oath to do in office.

So, I think it is very important, as we undertake a hearing of these bills today and take a vote, that the American public understand that the arguments that are being stated here in this Committee today are not factual. They are gaslighting. This is not about the First Amendment, and this is really about undermining our basic ability to protect our democracy and the homeland. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sessions for five minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge and thank the Ranking Member for the book that we have now, *Common Sense*, that was placed in each Member's chair, and while I have not read it since probably my junior year of college, I do remember the essence of much of it, and it was actually Thomas Paine writing about the power of the crown, the king, to make decisions. Perhaps, we now have presidents instead of the crown. But the bottom line is on page 22, second paragraph, “The nearer any government approaches to the public, the less business there is for a king.”

We have been accused of gaslighting, but that is not even factually correct because the examples that we use came from a pontificator, not even the professional person who represented policy. We are not trying to stop policy. We are trying to stop those that pon-

tificate political views. And for someone to say that our young chairman is trying to gaslight so that we can avoid the truth or law enforcement, that is not even close to the facts. It is when we have a king or a President that uses official public resources and the public's goodwill for them to come and utilize what is political statements.

I would like to think that elected officials probably have that ability. They can hold a press conference. But when you take the oath of office to work on behalf of, let's say, Article II, the executive branch, your statements must be more disciplined and must align itself with actual policy, not politics. So, I think that what I view as what this Chairman Comer has done, is good for the goose and good for the gander.

We seem to want to throw things at each other, and at one point, President Trump was in. Now President Biden is in. We are trying to get, I think, to a level playing field where we avoid anyone that works for the government espousing, especially from the podium at the White House, these political views that we believe are not well guided and lack common sense. So, I would like for our colleagues and the American people to see we are trying to do things that are away from the crown, the king, or an executive, like we call a President, utilizing their bully pulpit. That should be facts and facts, the case, and balance as opposed to politics. So, I would really like to have the gentlewoman rethink actually what the intent is because I believe the intent that I have always tried to align myself with is, it is good for one, it is good for the other, but it is also good for common sense of the American public. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. For what purpose does the Ranking Member seek recognition?

Mr. RASKIN. For the purpose of introducing an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chairman, are we already going to the amendments already?

Chairman COMER. I am sorry?

Mr. DONALDS. I didn't know we were going to the amendments already. I thought we—

Mr. RASKIN. Amendments can be moved at any time.

Chairman COMER. If it is OK. All right. I apologize. I recognize Mr. Donalds to speak up.

Mr. RASKIN. As a friendly point of order, just so people are aware, you can make an amendment at any point, and you can speak on the bill at any point as well.

Mr. DONALDS. Fair enough. Fair point. Real quick on—

Chairman COMER. Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the Ranking Member as well. I appreciate that. A couple of quick things. It was raised already in this debate what doctors were censored. Dr. Robert Malone, specialist mRNA technology, one of the forefathers of that tech that actually created the vaccines, he was censored on Twitter. Another one, Jay Bhattacharya, of Stanford, professor of health, economics, and medicine, he was censored

on Twitter through information that might have come from some area of our Federal Government.

I think it is important for the Members to understand that this bill is very clear. Let's go to the actual text. It does prohibit any employee from not using the employee's official authority to censor any private party, including outside of normal duty hours and while such employee is away from the employee's normal duty posts, and then we go to all the elements of that. We cannot have elements of our government using the power of their offices to push narratives or to censor narratives amongst the American people. The American people, of their own volition, choose to do with their own mind, their own thought, their own reason, their own logic, their own information set, whatever the case might be, we cannot allow for that. It is wrong. It is censorship. It is a violation of the First Amendment, and that is what H.R. 140 seeks to address.

I think it is something where we are going to have to rampant debate about it, but this is bigger than "R" / "D". It is bigger than who is sitting in the White House. This is the very nature of public debate amongst the American people. We should never tolerate medical professionals being silenced. Never. Regardless of their views, we should never tolerate one newspaper being silenced in regard to another newspaper's point of view when they are all members of the press. Let the American people decide these things through dialog, through debate that is in the public's interests. And that is why in my view, Members, and I know we are going to go through amendments—it is going to be a pretty long markup as I can see already—we should be in support of H.R. 140. I yield.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Would the gentleman yield for a question, over here?

Mr. DONALDS. Sure.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Those doctors that you referenced who you say were censored, was that done because of government intervention, or was that done by the private social media companies?

Mr. DONALDS. Well, I am glad that the gentleman that raised that question because one of the things that the Twitter files already suggested, and this is with respect to the Hunter Biden story, is that FBI was in constant contact with Twitter through that entire saga. The Twitter executives could say whatever they want about how well we made the final decision, and, of course, in all likelihood, they made the final decision. But it is crystal clear that there were elements of the Federal Government that were in Twitter's ear. That is not even something that is under conjecture. We see the email chains. The contact existed. Twitter executives talked about that amongst themselves within the operations of the company. That has continued under the current Administration with respect to COVID-19, from CDC and other elements of the government, HHS.

So, if you are going to say that Twitter was taking information from FBI during the Hunter Biden situation with his laptop, it is only common sense to assume that CDC was also using that position to basically push their narratives into Twitter, which led to the silencing of Jay Bhattacharya, of Robert Malone. Marty Makary was silenced as well, et cetera.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield for a follow-up question? Would you say that Twitter should be forced to carry those doctors on the air, or on their platform, regardless of whether or not there had been FBI or CIA contact? You were saying before no doctor should be taken down for any reason. Should Twitter be forced to take them even if there were no claim that the government was involved?

Mr. DONALDS. Well, in answer to that question, I think one thing is clear. I think if we are going to talk about reforms to Section 230, I think that is another question for another day about what the platform and how they should manage that. I think as for the purpose of H.R. 140, what we should be discussing is whether it is acceptable for elements of our government to be using their position to push narratives, or to silence dissent, or to silence opposing views, whether that is a medical professional with their criteria and the qualifications of Jay Bhattacharya, or whether it is the Ranking Member himself, or whether it is me, or any other citizen of the United States?

If you are going to have the platform available for public use, which is the very basis of Twitter and Facebook and all the rest of them, they want the users, they want people in there, of course, they sell ads, and they use them. I get all of that. But if it is going to become the public square, which is what it has become, the Federal Government must, and I stress “must,” be very, very hands off with respect to manipulating, censoring, positioning viewpoints of the American people on these platforms. I am going to yield back because actually I have got to run to another hearing real quick, and we are over time.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Well, I would just, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask a question?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman, the Chair will recognize you for five minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. I would just want to respond briefly to what my colleague from Florida said. We had a hearing on this exact issue from Twitter related to the Hunter Biden story. The witnesses were asked whether the Federal Government intervened in any way to limit the proliferation of the New York Post story. The witnesses said that that was not a direction from the FBI. So, I understand that my colleague from Florida doesn’t like what the actual facts and the evidence are, but just the fact that he says it does not make it so and, in fact, there is no evidence that the FBI or the Federal Government had any impact on Twitter’s decision. And I only respond to that because that is the example that he raised, and that gets to the larger point of these two bills, which purport to stop censorship of protected speech under the First Amendment.

Essentially, what we have here is a solution without a problem, but I have found the problem. The problem is that there is no evidence, there is no factual support for the need for these bills. My Republican colleagues have not demonstrated any protected speech that was prohibited by the Federal Government. So, we can repeat the conclusion over and over and over, but that doesn’t make it so when we have people who have no firsthand knowledge and no evi-

dence to actually back it up. The evidence is what makes it so, the facts are what makes it so, and we have neither of those.

Now, of course, we all agree that the government cannot prohibit lawful speech. That is already the law of the land. It is called the First Amendment. We don't need a bill that says that the government cannot prohibit lawful speech, but that, of course, is not what these bills are designed to do. They are designed to allow conspiracy theories and election interference to run rampant online. They are designed to allow foreign countries, like Russia did in 2016, to have unfettered access to our social media websites in order to spread disinformation and interfere in our elections. We know as a fact, supported by evidence, that Russia did interfere in the 2016 election. And we know as a fact, supported by evidence, that the Trump campaign welcomed that foreign interference, used that foreign interference in their messaging, and ultimately benefited from the foreign interference.

So, I am sure we are going to hear now that my Republican colleagues are aghast at the suggestion that that is what we are here for, but that is what the impact of this bill would be. It is not actually to change the law in order to protect or in order to prohibit any censorship or interference of protected speech, because that is the law. What this is truly designed to do, and it will have the impact of doing, is allowing for all sorts of unprotected speech to be distributed, unfettered throughout our social media world online because how this will have an impact is that the Federal Government officials who are charged with making sure that our laws are not violated, that crimes are not committed, are going to be nervous. They are going to be deterred from doing their jobs because we must remember, notwithstanding what you may hear on the other side of the aisle, any speech is not necessarily protected speech.

There are many forms of speech that are not protected by the First Amendment. The First Amendment does not protect speech in furtherance of crimes. And that is what this is all about, is that the Federal Government has been trying to stamp out foreign interference, stamp out disinformation that either has a public health impact or is in furtherance of a crime. So, we don't need this bill because our laws already solved for the actual problem we have, and what we are talking about here is a solution without a problem. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Armstrong for five minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I may have an interesting, maybe, disagreement with what evidence is. We have an email from an FBI special agent to Twitter asking them to take down emails based on their terms and services. Not the First Amendment, not the Constitution to which that FBI agent, special agent-in-charge, swore an oath to uphold. Twitter is a private company. They can particularly have whatever terms and services they wish to have.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman kindly yield for a second?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Sure.

Mr. RASKIN. Just that I have heard a lot about that email, but I have never seen it. Can you share that with us?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, I can get it.

Mr. RASKIN. Is it available with the Committee?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, I can grab that.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, if you could distribute that because we have heard a lot about that email, but I have never seen it. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I actually think it is in the record last week, but we will pull it again. And so, we can talk about all of those things all day long, but if you can't do it forward facing, you should not be able to do it behind the scenes as well. And an email from a special agent-in-charge asking Twitter to look at their own tweets based on their own terms and services is a very different conversation than what is protected speech. This isn't about anything private companies are doing. I think we will have a lot of debates on that in other committees that actually have that jurisdiction. 230 has been a very interesting conversation for my entire time in Congress. But an FBI agent, a special agent-in-charge, did not swear an oath to Twitter's terms and services. They swore an oath to the U.S. Constitution. And if we are going to end-round it, they should stand up in front of the American people and tell them why and not do it outside of the view of the American people. And then with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member seek recognition? Mr. Langworthy? I know he will still want to debate on the bill. I know we can debate—

Mr. RASKIN. However you want to do it.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Langworthy for five minutes, and then we will get into amendments if everybody is OK with that.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of free speech and government interference in Big Tech is one of the most important topics of our time. Free speech is essential to the functioning of any democracy. It allows us to express our opinions, share information, and engage in meaningful dialog, and without it, we cannot hold our governments accountable, challenge injustice or promote any progress. Unfortunately, in recent years, there have been a justified and growing concerns over the influence of Big Tech companies on free speech. And millions of Americans have felt Big Tech's wrath, and many others have witnessed the overwhelming power and control that these companies hold.

Only a few weeks ago, we heard in this very room from Twitter executives, who were not just willing, but eager, to follow the demands of government officials and censor fact-based New York Post reporting. We heard Twitter executives admit that they took orders from officials to censor speech, remove high profile accounts, and actively violate the American people's right to free speech. The eagerness of government officials and Big Tech executives to come together and to alter the course of what should have been a free and fair election in 2020 is obscene and can no longer be tolerated.

And as it stands, Federal Government has all of the power in the world to demand that Big Tech censor voices it does not support. New Yorkers and Americans from every corner of our country are demanding oversight and accountability over the Federal Govern-

ment's blatant collusion with Big Tech to censor the voices of Americans. Free speech is the cornerstone of any democracy, and we must protect it at all costs, whether it is threatened by Big Tech, government interference, or the two colluding together.

The current Administration under President Biden has been accused of undermining the First Amendment rights of Americans by using its influence to pressure social media companies, to censor specific viewpoints on their platforms. Government officials have worked hand-in-hand with Big Tech to label factual information as disinformation and to urge social media platforms to remove that content.

To safeguard the First Amendment, the Oversight Committee will evaluate proposed legislation that both prohibits the Federal Government from exerting overwhelming pressure on social media companies to silence individuals expressing their opinions online. This legislation is long overdue, and I am proud to be working with my colleagues to end censorship of the American people. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members seek recognition before we get to amendments?

Ms. MACE. Yes.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace for five minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As was asked earlier, my colleagues across the aisle, what evidence is there? The evidence is very clear. It is black and white. It has already been made public. Matt Taibbi, a journalist, in December 16 of last year revealed that you can go online and see the evidence here, any links to it, but Twitter's contact with the FBI was constant and pervasive as if it were a subsidiary, and I am quoting Matt Taibbi in this. Between January 2020 and November 2022, there were over 150 emails between the FBI and former Twitter employees, one in particular, Yoel Roth, who was already here and testified before us. But there were a number of requests by the FBI for Twitter to take action on misinformation. They even tried to ban accounts that were telling jokes.

I mean, this is the ridiculous nature of agents of the Federal Government. And some of it wasn't just Republicans. There were Democrats, too, that were targeted. So, some of this is bipartisan targeting on both sides of the aisle. Whether it was this Administration or last Administration, this really should be a bipartisan conversation.

What Matt Taibbi also stated was that in the Twitter files, it was not just the FBI. It was DHS. It was DNI. It was other agencies participating in this, including elected officials, we found out just a few weeks ago, including a U.S. senator who tried to have constituents banned on Twitter because they said something criticizing him. And so, you know, this is a huge issue, I think, and we are not talking about, as my colleague said earlier, about terms and services of Twitter or other private social media companies. We are talking about agents, representatives of the Federal Government being involved here, and the evidence is very clear.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me, we can reenter into the record again some of these tweets that expose the FBI, and DHS,

and DNI. I would like to enter into the record, with unanimous consent, these tweets that show that Federal agencies were involved with manipulating content, censoring content, and moderating content at their whim. Thank you, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. Any further Members? OK. The Chair recognizes Ms. Luna for five minutes.

Ms. LUNA. I just wanted to piggyback off of what Representative Mace had said. So, we know that up until recently, a lot of people focused on conservatives being censored. But the fact is, is that it is centrist and also to people on the other side of the aisle that might not necessarily fit into the stereotype of what the progressive left wants them to think and talk.

Young Turks was famously censored on Facebook, and according to an organization—I think it is Foundation for Freedom Online, you know, what DHS was doing and something that we tried to expose was that our own Federal Government in working with CISA, and then also to some of these fact-checking organizations, these tech companies like YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, they actually were coordinating to censor people.

So, I think that it is important to remember that this is not just about our speech, but everyone's speech. Regardless of party affiliation, it is dangerous to have, for argument sakes, anyone demand, controlling what you are saying and thinking. And we are at a time, at least in our generation, where future generations are impacted directly by this because we consume a majority of our information on these social media platforms, and so I think that this is a step forward in the right direction. With that, I support this, and, again, this is not just for Republican or conservative speech. It is for everyone's protected free speech.

Mr. BIGGS. I would love to take your time.

Ms. LUNA. I yield my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields—

Ms. LUNA. Mr. Biggs, please.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Her remaining three-and-a-half minutes to Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you for yielding. So, I want to help, if I can, because I think some of the questions that were asked by the Ranking Member are prescient and need to be responded to. So, let us take a look at some examples of connection. Besides the hearing, besides the documents that are coming in, and what Ms. Mace and others have brought forward, our White House contacts Twitter and asked them to censor Robert Kennedy, Jr., because he was a critic of the White House's COVID-19 narrative. The White House directed Facebook to shut down Tucker Carlson and Tomi Lahren. That is from the White House.

The White House Digital Director Flaherty scolds Facebook, says that he couldn't care less about products unless they are having measurable impact at suppressing speech. Digital Director Flaherty informs Facebook that misinformation around the vaccine "is a concern shared at the highest, and I mean the highest, level of the White House." Flaherty then demands that Facebook step up its operation of "removing bad information" on vaccines. In regard to anti-vax posts, Flaherty tells Facebook that, "Slowing it down

seems reasonable.” Facebook assures Flaherty that, “In addition to removing vaccine misinformation, we have been focused on reducing the virality of content discouraging vaccines that does not contain actionable misinformation.”

The reason I bring these up, and there is still time, so I have got more, I will just read more. He then—Flaherty again—he is the White House Digital Director putting pressure on Twitter. He says that, “If your product is appending misinformation toward tweets, that seems like a pretty fundamental issue.” Then Facebook responds that they are “removing claims that public health authorities tell us had been debunked or unsupported by evidence.” Flaherty, then accuses Twitter of total Calvinball and bending over backward to tolerate disfavored speech. In other words, the White House is putting pressure. They are coercing. They are attempting to use the power of their political position to influence private social media companies.

How about some of this? Biden Administration worked in tandem with social media giants to censor statements that they deemed were misinformation. So, let’s get to some of those. First of all, we start with Jen Psaki, White House press secretary. She admitted publicly at a press conference—I remember that press conference—that her colleagues were “flagging problematic posts for Facebook that spread disinformation.” And oddly enough, that so-called disinformation turned out to be correct information. Then she also added, “It is important to take faster action against harmful posts, and Facebook needs to move more quickly to remove harmful vindictive posts,” or, excuse me, “violative posts.”

The point is that in a Fourth Amendment case would be enough to indicate that somebody was acting as an agent of the government in order to get evidence suppressed, when it was wrongfully or illegitimately obtained and that is what the law is, and I will yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. For what purpose does the Ranking Member seek recognition?

Mr. RASKIN. I rise to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Raskin of Maryland.

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

Chairman COMER. The Ranking Member is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I feel like our dialog is getting somewhere. I was very moved by the comments of Ms. Mace and the comments that followed hers, but I think the burden of their statements was simply that politicians try to get the media to do their will all the time, and I cheerfully concede to that proposition.

In fact, we proved that in the last hearing when we showed that Donald Trump on numerous occasions tried to get Twitter to take down people’s material that he considered offensive. A famous actress called him a PAB. I will not spell it out in the interest of modesty, but he did not like that, and then the White House repeatedly called Twitter to say take it down. He tried to get Disney

to take down the comments and to admonish and castigate certain late-night comedians who he did not like.

So, if the point is, as my friend from South Carolina was saying, well, this goes way beyond Twitter and Facebook, certainly it does. This problem goes way beyond it. And that is why the Majority needs to think long and hard about going down this road because determined efforts by politicians and state actors to influence the entire media system, which is what we are talking about now, sweep far more broadly than just Twitter and Facebook. And if we are going to confront this problem of people using their public offices and state power to try to intimidate, then let's do it in a comprehensive way.

Let's take an example, Mr. Chairman, that you will recognize immediately. Over the weekend, you appeared on Newsmax and you boasted that you had told AT&T, a private company, that they needed to restore Newsmax to carrying DirecTV or face the consequences. To quote you verbatim: "I am very upset that DirecTV does not have Newsmax on there. I have been in constant communication with the leadership of AT&T and DirecTV. I have strongly encouraged them to meet with your CEO, Mr. Ruddy, to get this worked out or else." Or else.

Now, I have no opinion about whether or not AT&T should carry Newsmax. Apparently, it was purely a business decision according to *The Wall Street Journal*. And I will ask unanimous consent to introduce this editorial by *The Wall Street Journal* called, "The Right's Wrong Attack on DirecTV over Newsmax: A Commercial Dispute is Not About Censoring Conservatives."

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Mr. RASKIN. So, we can submit that. There was also a letter written by 42 of our colleagues, including the Chairman, directly to AT&T demanding that they carry Newsmax, and the premise of it was there some kind of left-wing conspiracy or so on. And *The Wall Street Journal* completely debunked that saying political coercion of business is as distasteful from the right as it is from the left.

But if threatening official discourse through pressure like this, "follow our orders or else," applied against not just private social media entities, which is what they are proposing in this bill, but against any media entity, it would transform politics in America in the meaning of the First Amendment. But if we are going to do it, let's do it. And the First Amendment says if this is going to apply to the internet, if it is going to protect Twitter, arguably, which is the conceit or pretense of this bill, it should also protect AT&T against getting coerced into making a deal it does not want to make and spending millions of dollars it does not want to spend with Newsmax.

It is hard to see why, if you actually believe this bill is improving the First Amendment, we should not block all government officials, not just executive branch, but us, too—legislative branch—not just with respect to the internet, but with respect to all media from trying to force private media entities, whether it is Twitter or it is AT&T, to include a particular speaker or, indeed, to exclude a particular speaker. Mr. Chairman, that logic is partially echoed in your bill, which sets the policy of the Congress that employees acting in their official capacity should not promote the censorship of

any lawful speech or presumably the compelled speech of private actors. But your amendment in the nature of a substitute rolls back the scope of the original bill so that the actual prohibition would only apply to online social platforms. I would like to take it back so it applies to all forms of media content, and AT&T will get the same protection that Twitter would get punitively under this legislation.

That is my amendment and I submit it to the Committee for its consideration. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes himself for five minutes. I feel compelled to respond to that. What I encouraged was for Newsmax, AT&T, and DirecTV to work it out or else there is going to be a big backlash among Americans against AT&T and DirecTV. If we could have them in for a hearing, I would have already had them in for a hearing.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, Mr. Chairman, if you yield for a second. The letter that you signed on January 20, 2023, said Congress intends to conduct extensive oversight on the extent to which House Democrats, and officials, and Federal officers colluded with private companies to limit, restrict, and circumvent First Amendment rights—implying that that is what they had done—these investigations will not be limited to a social media companies.

Chairman COMER. Well, we have been looking into that, that is correct, because there is a concern about censorship. That is why we have this bill. We are producing the email that Mr. Goldman recognized. I love it when Mr. Goldman talks because we take clips of that, and we save it because it is going to be valuable when we get into the investigative portion of what we do.

Now, I am not a member of the executive branch. I cannot bring the full weight of the FBI and the rest of the Federal law enforcement apparatus to bear on a company like the executive branch. We can encourage private companies to work it out. We are not going to have a hearing like, I do not know, with three hearings with the Washington Commanders, on a private company.

But there is a concern about censorship. There is a concern about government officials using their position to force social media companies into banning stuff that they say is disinformation. The whole purpose of the first hearing, honestly, was to see whether or not the laptop was legitimate because that is all we heard, especially on the left-wing media outlets, was that the laptop was Russian disinformation. And I think that narrative stuck with a lot of people, so people discounted the contents of the laptop.

Now, we heard Twitter executives testify under oath that that was a mistake. They know, in fact, that the laptop was real. We have seen CBS do a forensic audit to prove that the laptop has not been altered. And that is important because the contents of the laptop pose a huge problem for this White House, and we will be getting into those investigations very soon, hopefully, but that is important. It is important to start out to understand that the contents of that laptop are real. They are not Russian disinformation as those 51 former intelligence officials tried to imply, as the FBI tried to imply to Twitter. So, this is a problem when the government tries to force social media companies into saying that stuff is disinformation when in fact it is not.

Now, this amendment, offered by Ranking Member Raskin is unnecessary. It is an unnecessary distraction and a potentially dangerous precedent to introduce. Media organizations have editorial boards and are not immune from liability for the content they publish, examples being slander, libel, or other information they choose to publish, unlike interactive computer services or internet platforms, which are the target of H.R. 140. That is the target of H.R. 140, internet platforms. Internet platforms carry the speech of Americans and other media organizations. The focus of our bill, H.R. 140, is on Federal censorship activities that target internet platforms that carry the speech of Americans and other organizations, including media organizations.

We should not introduce this amendment. It is a dangerous precedent that would prohibit traditional Federal press engagement with media organizations that have journalistic independence and editorial discretion. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Does any other Member seek recognition? The Chair recognizes Ms. Balint.

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

Chairman COMER. The clerk will—

Voice. Well, we will get through—

Chairman COMER. Yes, yes. If it is OK, we are going to vote on this amendment, then we will recognize you for the next, yes.

Ms. BALINT. OK.

Chairman COMER. The question on the amendment, offered by the Ranking Member. No, wait. We have, let's see here.

Voice. Ms. Stansbury.

Chairman COMER. Yes, Ms. Stansbury. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury for discussion on Raskin's Amendment Number 1—

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. For five minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask you a direct question, Mr. Chairman, if it is OK, taking the argument to its logical conclusion here. You know, the stated purpose of the ANS, which, Mr. Chairman, you have introduced and which this amendment would modify, is to prevent government officials who either sitting in their official duty station or away from their duty station might seek to influence the way in which a social media platform was carrying information. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. It expands the Hatch Act, yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. So, you know, one of the things that we learned in this hearing on February 8 is that one of the top offenders in this realm was actually the sitting President at the time, Mr. Donald Trump. And so, my question to you, Mr. Chairman, is, do you renounce former President Donald Trump's actions in contacting Twitter and asking Twitter to take down the content of private citizens who were expressing their First Amendment rights about their beliefs about his performance as President?

Chairman COMER. I think the government, to answer your question, the government employees should not be allowed to censor free speech, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, whether that be Donald Trump or Joe Biden or the next president.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, Mr. Chairman—

Chairman COMER. And I think this should be a good bipartisan bill. I yield back.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you would agree that the President at the time was a government employee, and he was using his influence as a sitting President to try to influence a private social media company to take down private citizen speech. Is that correct?

Chairman COMER. The legislation does not apply to the President. It is an expansion of the Hatch Act, but, again, this is something that should be bipartisan. Who is to say the next Administration does not come in, get a whole new FBI, and start censoring liberal speech? I mean, this should be a bipartisan issue.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that in your un-answer to the question, it is clear that the offenses that this bill is supposedly trying to address are primarily actually coming from the standard bearer of the GOP's own party. So this is part of why, during my comments earlier on this bill, I pointed to the definition of gaslighting because here we are, the Majority is introducing a bill that would actually limit speech under the guise that it protects speech when, in fact, the No. 1 abuser of the very thing that the bill would try to sanction is the standard bearer of the Majority party itself. So, Mr. Chairman, I find this very deeply troubling, and I support the amendment from our Ranking Member.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs for five minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regrettably oppose the Ranking Member's amendment. I just wanted to make a quick comment on regard to the last statement that somehow this bill, the underlying bill itself, is a Trojan horse to limit speech. I do not think that is the case at all. I think what it does is trying to limit what the government does to interfere with speech. And I appreciate the argument that has been made, but we have the First Amendment. One of the most prodigious canons or areas of constitutional law is how you interpret the First Amendment. So, for us to come in and say that we are going to refine not the First Amendment, but the Hatch Act, to further direct limitation of the Federal Government's interference with speech, I think that is the real motive here. And I hope we are not impugning some other motive because that is not the case.

And I would just remind you that it was shortly after Ms. Jen Psaki's statements when she was the White House Press Director that the very next day the President came out and said Facebook is not doing enough. People are dying because Facebook is not censoring enough. The President intimated that. That is not a direct quote. I am not going to give you a direct quote because I do not have it in front of me, but that is what he said the very next day.

I think that this bill goes a long way to try to curb and restrict the interference of government into speech, not unlike what the Hatch Act does. This is an expansion of the Hatch Act, and, thus, I do not see it as curbing an individual's speech. I think my colleagues across the aisle, they are coming back and saying, well, you know, it is a private sector. That is what has been the focus of your arguments so far, is that this is a private sector issue, and you are

curbing that. And I think we have effectively rebutted that by showing that in many cases when government takes action, it uses third parties to take action.

I mean, for instance, in a contract case, the government can be held liable if there has not been a protection just in the contract to limit liability. Similarly, government can be held liable and evidence suppressed in a Fourth Amendment case because the informant or because the agent on behalf of the government has been tainted somehow. Similarly, you have the same issue here. You have the government that is attempting to influence, and the language that is used here is "coerce." It is attempting to coerce action on the part of private sector to suppress information. That imputes government action. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I——

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield for question——

Mr. BIGGS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Because I am interested in your line of thinking about it. But I am racking my brains to think of a single Supreme Court decision that stands for that proposition. I know in the Fourth Amendment field, certainly the police cannot pay a private actor who goes in and violates the prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure. But do you have a case that stands for that in the First Amendment field that a government official who talks to someone, a newspaper editor, a TV editor, an internet editor or whatever, and that person decides not to run an article, that that constitutes government discrimination and censorship?

Mr. BIGGS. I think that case is pending and working its way up to the Supreme Court, and that would be the Missouri Biden case that is floating out there, Missouri and Louisiana. And I think that so far, the discovery has indicated pretty clearly that there was an effort on the part of the Biden Administration, and I am just reclaiming my time, the Biden Administration to actually censor what the Biden Administration was deeming to be COVID misinformation. You may be right. It may be a case of first impression, but that case is being litigated as you and I debate today.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, would you indulge in one more question just because I admire the way you are thinking about this?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. So, when Elon Musk took Twitter over in December, he removed six journalists' accounts because he did not like the stuff they had been writing about him.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. That was clearly censorship in the spirit that you guys are using it today.

Mr. BIGGS. No, I would disagree with that.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I want to know what your position is. Did he have the right to do that?

Mr. BIGGS. We are over time, Mr. Chairman. I would need someone to yield time to——

Chairman COMER. The time has expired, but answer his question if you want, yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. When I look at that, that was purely private action, was it not, by the new owner of Twitter?

Mr. RASKIN. So, you support that? That is fine?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, that is private action.

Mr. RASKIN. OK.

Mr. BIGGS. Totally private action. I think that is the distinction that I think you are trying to make, and it is the same distinction I am trying to make. We just may not agree on how you get to that distinction and how that cuts. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch for five minutes.

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

Voice. We have to vote on this one first.

Mr. LYNCH. Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry. We are still on this.

Chairman COMER. We are still on the amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Armstrong for five minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I actually do not agree with their decision to pull out opposing viewpoints. I like to consider myself a free speech or First Amendment absolutist, but I think the distinction between this amendment and the underlying bill is very much that. The 230 protections that allow companies to not have editorial control over their platforms is significantly different than *The Wall Street Journal*, The Daily Beast, your local newspaper, and fighting with editorial boards who might have an unflattering comment or portrayal of a politician is as old as time.

But the distinction between the Ranking Member's amendment, I think, and the underlying bill is the entire regulatory framework that we have created surrounding 230, an absolute liability, or absolute immunity from liability, that exists, and they are a very different universe, whether I agree with it or not. The distinction here is we have a long and storied history with traditional media, who also has a long and storied history of at least potentially being legally liable for the types of conduct that none of these online platforms are exposed to.

And so, with that, I would oppose the amendment just because I think while we may agree at a personal level about what we were talking about, what should or should not be taken down, again, this gets into 230, and the reforms, and all of the different conversations that are going to exist, quite frankly, in different committees. The reality is, is every single one of the legacy media and traditional media, people that we deal with on a daily basis are at least exposed to liability, that the tech platforms and the misinformation and all of those different issues just simply are not exposed to the same liabilities. So, I think while the amendment and the spirit of it might have some merit, the reality is we as a governing body treat them significantly differently, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. If I may, Mr. Ranking Member, we have copies of two emails from Elvis Chan, FBI agent out of the San Francisco office, to Twitter, encouraging—you can read the emails for yourself—basically what we said, and this is the purpose of the bill. So, there is evidence like that has been released in the Twitter files, just like Elon Musk told me personally. I ask that these emails be entered into the record.

Chairman COMER. Well, before we do that, we will give everybody a copy of the emails.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, could we get a copy of those?

Chairman COMER. I'll pass them out, and you all can digest these emails. It may be a difference in this being a unanimous vote or not. So, any other Member seeks recognition?

Mr. LYNCH. Just a point of order, are we getting those——

Chairman COMER. Yes, we are handing them out right now.

Mr. LYNCH. OK.

Chairman COMER. Any other debate on the Raskin's amendment? [No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question on the amendment, offered by Mr. Raskin.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Can we have a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman?

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch.

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

Chairman COMER. Will the clerk report the amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts.

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

Chairman COMER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the former chairman of our Subcommittee on National Security, I offer this amendment to better ensure that the underlying bill does not eliminate or compromise the ability of Federal employees from protecting America's national security. To this end, the amendment is very simple. This commonsense amendment would simply add a national and full—excuse me—an express and full spectrum national security exception to the general prohibition on Federal employee activity included in H.R. 140.

In its current form, H.R. 140 broadly prohibits Federal employees from taking any official action to engage in the censorship of a private entity. While the bill includes limited exceptions for so-called law enforcement functions, such as activities to combat human trafficking or prevent dissemination of classified information, H.R. 140 does not expressly exempt actions that our Federal employees must take in the interest of the security of our country and the American people.

The most recent worldwide Annual Threat Assessment released by the U.S. intelligence community underscored that Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and other authoritarian regimes have more than demonstrated their continuing intent to conduct foreign malign influence operations targeting critical U.S. infrastructure, public services, and elections, all while seeking to amplify discord and undermine fundamental democratic institutions. Our intelligence community has also reported that global transnational criminal organizations and other non-state actors are similarly penetrating and perpetrating malign influence operations to the

detiment of U.S. national security. As evidenced by our own recent National Security Subcommittee investigation to review the security of U.S. elections, public-private sector cooperation is critical to addressing the relentless threat of foreign malign influence operations.

During a key Subcommittee hearing that followed the unanimous assessment by America's intelligence agencies that Russian President, Vladimir Putin, ordered an influence campaign aimed at the 2016 Presidential election, executives from Twitter, Facebook, and Google all testified that substantive coordination between the private sector and the government is vital to disrupting the evolving influence tactics and strategies employed by America's adversaries. Absent a robust national security exception, H.R. 140 will significantly deter Federal employees from taking actions within their official duties to work with social media platforms and other relevant private sector entities to address the myriad national security threats stemming from ongoing foreign malign influence operations. So in closing, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Thank you for raising this point, Mr. Lynch. However, this amendment creates an unnecessary and overly broad loophole for all kinds of censorship that may be mischaracterized as national security information. My staff is closely coordinating with HPSCI and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence on this legislation to ensure that they are familiar with and comfortable with the text. The intelligence community has not raised concerns that would require a blanket national security exemption at this point. I am happy to loop your staff in those conversations in the future and pledge to work with you to make sure any identified concerns are addressed. As drafted, this amendment creates an unnecessary loophole and I encourage my colleagues to vote no.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to rise to strongly endorse Mr. Lynch's amendment, and I want to thank him for his wisdom and insight in bringing this forward. Everybody should understand precisely what we are talking about here. There is an exception explicit in the bill for law enforcement functions confined to child pornography, human trafficking, and dealing of drugs, but not a national security exception, which is what the gentleman from Massachusetts is advancing here.

Now, why does he bring it up? Well, we know that in 2016, according to 17 national security agencies of our own, according to a bipartisan report from the U.S. Senate, that Vladimir Putin and Russia spent tens of millions of dollars on their so-called Internet Research Agency to promote electoral propaganda not just in American elections, but in elections in other parts of the world, as well, to undermine our elections, and engaged in cyber sabotage and cyber surveillance of particular campaigns of the DNC, of Hillary Clinton, and so on. Now, that might not have been your candidate, but I would think that as Americans all of us should stand up for the integrity of our electoral process against subversion by malign foreign actors, whether it is Russia, or China, or whomever it is.

And all the amendment is saying, that Mr. Lynch brings forward, is we should not be tying the hands of our national security agencies in being able to tell relevant internet companies that there may have even been thousands, but certainly hundreds of counterfeit websites set up, counterfeit Twitter handles set up by state actors and the people that they pay from all over the world.

Democracy on earth is under siege by Putin and Russia, Xi in China, Orban in Hungary, Marcos in the Philippines, you name it, Erdogan in Turkey. The enemies of democracy have found each other, and they cannot beat us in the realm of ideas, and they cannot beat us in the realm of economy, and they cannot beat us in the realm of our political system. But what do they have? They have got the internet where you can go and pretend to be anybody, and you can spread any kind of hate propaganda or incitement that you want.

And we saw that also on January 6. And I do not know whether or not his amendment on national security would cover threats to the Congress of the United States and the Vice President of United of States. I hope that it would. Maybe we need a separate amendment on protecting the democratic and electoral process. But come on. Are we really going to lie down and let these people roll all over us and disarm ourselves online against foreign malign actors? If we are going to pass this thing, I would hope that every single member of this Committee would agree that national security should be a basis just like child pornography for allowing law enforcement to do their job. And I am happy to yield to Mr. Lynch if he has got anything else to say.

Mr. LYNCH. I do, and I thank the gentleman. Look, the bill is poorly drafted, and I share the concerns that the Ranking Member has raised previously, but think about this. So, in drafting this, you said if it is classified information, it is not subject to this bill. There is an exemption there for it, but there are reams and reams of information that are not classified. Look, you are banning Federal employees. You are talking about all of our national intelligence personnel in 17 agencies. You are talking about every single Federal employee in the Department of Defense, both military and civilian. You are talking about every State Department person, every Department of the Homeland Security, all Federal employees, that they may not stop a communication unless has been deemed classified in the classification process.

So, all of the privileged communication between agencies is subject to this bill, 140. So, you have to let all this information go out into the public even though it may be a national security threat. That is the problem with your bill. It is far too broad, and to try to create this bill, you have created a bigger problem than existed previously.

Mr. RASKIN. Reclaiming my time for a second. If we do not add this amendment, this legislation becomes the Putin Protection Act of 2023. I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Any further discussion on the amendment? The Chair recognizes Mrs. McClain for five minutes.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the spirited debate, and I want to go back to the origination of the bill. I mean, I understand the bill prohibits censorship of lawful speech

on private sector platforms. I agree with this goal and hope this is an important first step in evaluating the public benefit these private sector companies receive. But I think herein lies the problem, is we have to be careful because we are on a very slippery slope with different rules for different companies.

So, I want to make sure I heard this right because I listened for the past hour that Twitter is a private company, private company, private company. Then if Twitter is a private company, we need to treat them like a private company. And they need to enjoy all of the benefits and negatives that all other private companies enjoy.

My question is, it seems to me that Twitter is a private company, but it is a private company with an asterisk, and at some point in time, that is the root of the cause, if we had private companies who all had to play by the same rules other than the special private companies with asterisks. I realize this is not our jurisdiction, but I think this is an immensely important topic that we use to our advantage when it fits our narrative.

So, we need to go back to, I think, even the beginning of are you a private company or not? And I think a lot of these issues would solve themselves. But we cannot continue as lawmakers to talk out of both sides of our mouth, because the American people are sick of it, and quite frankly, it is deafening to them. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. The Chair recognizes Ms. Norton for five minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. I thank the gentlelady. The gentlelady raises a fair point, but the operative sections of this bill operate against Federal employees. That is the important thing to remember here, and it does address unlawful speech. However, that speech does not become unlawful until it is classified and, therefore, made unlawful to communicate. What I am talking about is all of the communications between the 17 national intelligence agencies, DoD, State Department, Homeland Security, internal-external, if it gets communicated, it is subject to the penalties under this bill, and that is problematic.

If you are a Federal employee, that, in the practice of your information you have a responsibility to protect information that is necessary and important to our national security, that is your job to do. That is part of your job, to protect national security, and to comply with this bill, would require you to stop doing your job.

Mr. DONALDS. Would the gentleman yield to a question, Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Sure, I would.

Mr. DONALDS. It is not a one of our usual questions in this Committee where I am doing something to set you up to gotcha. It is really about clarification. I really want to understand. If information from the intelligence community is not marked classified, then how can you then still treat it as an issue of national security if the intelligence community itself has not marked that information as classified information?

Mr. LYNCH. It is a very narrow band of information that actually goes through the classification process. Other information is regarded as privileged. It has national security import. However, it

has not been categorized as classified—it is still very sensitive national security information, but has not gone through that classification process, and that is most of the information. It is a rare exercise when information is codified and gathered that actually it gets a classification. And so, there is a clear bright line prohibition against communicating that unless a person has that security clearance. And there are, as you know, several different levels of security clearance.

So, this amendment would just take a broad approach to materials that any of these Federal employees regard as sensitive to national security. There would be an exemption for them to basically do their jobs, and that is what we are asking for.

Ms. STANSBURY. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Ms. STANSBURY. One question I have for the gentleman, which I think builds on the previous question, is, would you consider the protection of election integrity a national security function?

Mr. LYNCH. It could be, obviously.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. That is an existential threat—

Ms. STANSBURY. Right.

Mr. LYNCH [continuing]. To our election and to our democracy.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, I want to just point out the Majority finally, after weeks, provided us with a copy of the supposed smoking gun regarding the communications between the FBI and Twitter. And the actual communication as it reads, as was just distributed to us here in this Committee, is that the FBI contacted Twitter to say that it appears that several Twitter handles and tweets that appear on the platform “provide misleading information on time, place, and manner of voting in the upcoming election.” So, the supposed smoking gun about our Federal law enforcement contacting a social media platform—

Chairman COMER. I want to remind the lady. This was on the poster board during—

Mr. LYNCH. Reclaiming my time.

Chairman COMER. Gentlelady, you may proceed.

Ms. STANSBURY. Is claiming that it was an inappropriate contact with a private social media company which actually threatened election integrity. In fact, it was misinformation that was intended to tell voters to go somewhere else at a different time and place of when to vote. And so, I think the point of this amendment is to make clear that part of our Federal law enforcement’s duty is to not only protect the homeland from foreign adversaries, but also to protect our elections. This is a function of protecting the homeland and national security, and with that, I yield back.

Mr. LYNCH. My time has expired. I yield.

Chairman COMER. Wow. Any other discussion?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Higgins for five minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just say to my distinguished colleagues across the aisle that this bill is born out of concern for national security, a national security that is built upon the cornerstones of freedom. Our fellow man across the world

that have free will and they were born free, but they do not have freedom if they live in an oppressive society. And let me say that this bill, the underlying bill, is precisely concerned about the oppression of freedoms in the United States of America.

This is a trust that has been betrayed. Having been extended for generations to our Federal Government, that trust has been betrayed. And Congress, as the legislative body of our republic, we must respond. We have to put some bit in the mouth of the Federal Government. It is precisely because we are concerned about our national security, our national security reflective of our freedoms, for what good is it for a man of China to have security in his home without freedom, without the freedom of expression? Where is our national security if an agent of the Federal Government can restrict the dissemination of data amongst its citizenry? This bill is born out of a love for country. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Seeing no further requests to speak, the question is on the amendment, offered by Mr. Lynch.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

Mr. RASKIN. A request for a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

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

For what purpose does Ms. Balint seek recognition?

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

Chairman COMER. The clerk will report.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Ms. Balint of Vermont.

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

Chairman COMER. Ms. Balint is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Ms. BALINT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment today is simple. Nothing that this Committee does should endanger LGBTQ people or protect misinformation that is intended to incite violence, and my amendment would do two things. First, it would clarify that nothing in this bill would prohibit a Federal employee from addressing harassment or from enforcing non-discrimination laws. My amendment would ensure that this bill does not undermine our foundational civil rights laws, which protect against discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, and other factors. As a gay American and as a Member of this Committee, it is particularly important to me to elevate non-discrimination protections in this markup today.

I'm also deeply concerned that this bill would have far reaching unintended consequences. We know that social media platforms can be vehicles for illegal discrimination. Just last year, the Justice Department reached a settlement with Meta related to allegations that Facebook illegally targeted ads in violation of the Fair Housing Act. Preventing illegal discrimination in housing sounds exactly

like the type of thing I want Federal employees working on. My amendment would also clarify that this bill does not prohibit any Federal employee from addressing misinformation that would incite violence. We know, all too well, that online speech can have serious consequences. It can lead to real world violence. In fact, it has. It has led to real world violence.

As Ranking Member Raskin and his colleagues on the January 6th Select Committee made plain, there was a direct line between Former President Trump's online statements and the violence at the Capitol on January 6. My amendment would clarify that misinformation that is intended to incite violence is not protected by this bill. We should not be in the business of protecting misinformation that incites violence, and I would hope that we could all agree on this and that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would stand with me.

Before I yield back, I would like to thank Ranking Member Raskin and my colleague, Sean Casten, for their collaboration on this amendment. I am grateful for your leadership on these important issues, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I oppose this misguided amendment. This amendment creates a carve-out that allows the Federal Government to censor lawful speech that it identifies as misinformation intended to incite violence. My question here is, what is misinformation? How is that defined by the Federal Government because that is a problem we have here. The Washington Post and New York Times reported a few days ago that the Energy Department now believes that the COVID-19 virus was caused by a lab leak. That was misinformation just a little while ago. As some of my colleagues have already noted today, this carve-out represents a dangerous view about the role of government controlling lawful speech, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield just for a question?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. Before this hardens into an ironclad dogma, whoever declared the particular origins of COVID-19 to be a matter of misinformation or disinformation, because I certainly never saw any government pronouncement to that effect.

Chairman COMER. There were. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RASKIN. It is an honest question. If it happened—

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, thanks for yielding to me. I read, I think, 10 different examples earlier. I will try get copies of those to submit those to the record. And—

Mr. RASKIN. There are official pronouncements of this being a form of disinformation? What I am responding to is—

Mr. BIGGS. So maybe I am misunderstanding your question. I thought you said—

Mr. RASKIN. Has the government ever said that that is disinformation?

Mr. BIGGS. Joe Biden did when he was President of the United States. Jen Psaki did as White House Press Director. And Flaherty,

or whatever the guy's name is, who was the Digital Director of the White House, repeatedly said that, and they put that out. Fauci said it, whatever his official role was. Deborah Birx said it also. And then, even within the COVID-19 Working Group, you had those who dissented from that, who were suppressed by Fauci and Birx. So yes, there were official pronouncements saying that.

Mr. RASKIN. I mean, I know about President Trump's pronouncements.

Chairman COMER. Reclaiming my time. Thank you. All right. Any further discussion on the amendment?

[No response.]

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

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Seeking a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

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

For what purpose does Ms. Porter seek recognition?

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

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Ms. Porter of California.

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

Chairman COMER. The lady from California is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Ms. PORTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a mom of three, I do a lot of shopping at the grocery store, and when I shop, nearly every food or product I see has nutrition facts and other disclaimers that I have the freedom to read. That is because a government official provided health and safety information in the course of their work and ensured it got added to the product. So, at the store, I know I have a choice about which products to buy and I can make those decisions based on the disclaimer labels, or I can ignore the labels and make the decisions based on price, marketing. It is up to me, but either way, I am glad that I have a lot of access to information.

As a consumer of social media, I find that a lot of the same rules apply. When I see content disclaimers based on scientific or technical information, I have the option to make a more informed choice about whether to consume that content, or, just like in the grocery store, I can ignore the disclaimers and do whatever I want. I have never found a disclaimer to restrict what information I can consider or what decisions I can make. It just gives me more information. Whether it is the grocery store or online, having a marketplace of speech gives us more freedom to consider more free speech. That is a great outcome for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this all brings me to one of my biggest concerns with today's bill. The bill defines government officials contributing to disclaimers or other social media alerts as censorship. Just like the experts at the FDA exercise their free speech, making food and

drug labels, disclaimers and alerts are the way for many government scientists to communicate facts and findings with the public. Calling factual disclaimers and alerts censorship really targets the specific way that scientists can share their findings. Without clarification, this provision could really just censor the free speech of a narrow class of people, and that the intent of the bill is to stop censorship, I am hopeful that silencing scientists is not what Republicans want. In fact, I think Republicans have picked up on this concern. You guys worked through the weekend. You released updated bill texts that now clarifies that Federal employees can still communicate policy positions and relevant information to the public, but I do not think that change is specific enough, and I do not think it will give scientists the peace of mind that they need.

According to a government executive article published just last week, about a quarter or 26 percent of scientists already said that they had to omit certain words in their work out of fear of being politically controversial, and 16 percent were told to avoid some science-based topics altogether. Fear of government censorship is already standing in the way of scientists producing innovation. We cannot afford to have a bill that does to scientists what they fear most: getting censored and punished for doing their jobs. As a representative of California, a national leader in science and innovation, I will not let this happen on my watch.

My amendment here is very simple. It adds an exception to the bill that ensures that scientific and technical information will not be blocked under this bill as censorship. And that is the kind of specificity we need to ensure that this bill does not target the free speech of scientists and experts. If this bill is just trying to prevent political interference, but still allow scientists to share their findings, we should be able to agree on this amendment as a simple clarification. If Republicans vote this down, then it is plain what I think we are really trying to do, which is censor science, and I hope that is not the case. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and fix this issue, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I oppose this amendment. This amendment defines facilitating the distribution of scientific and technical information as a legitimate law enforcement function. This is a broad expansion of legitimate law enforcement functions and represents a dangerous view about the role of government in censoring or dictating speech.

When I think about my friends on the other side of the aisle constantly defending the science for censoring things on platform, we all go back to the numerous examples of people in the science community labeling Donald Trump a racist for saying that the virus came from the Wuhan lab. And the emails that our staff unearthed between Fauci and Collins were they were disturbed early on that there were people insinuating that this was a lab leak. Dr. Fauci said, "Well, that is just a shiny object," in an email to Dr. Collins. "That is just a shiny object. It will go away, these conspiracy theories," blah, blah. They were our leading scientists. So, I encourage my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Does any Member seek comment? The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first thing I want to do is to ask unanimous consent to introduce an article from CNN dated May 19, 2020, titled, "The Many Times Donald Trump Has Praised China's Handling of the Coronavirus Pandemic," and my colleagues should all be aware of this. There are dozens of times when Donald Trump defended President Xi and the Chinese Communist Party and said everything was under control, they have a great relationship, and so on.

So, speaking as someone who has a completely open mind about all of the factual evidence about where the coronavirus came from, although I do believe there was lots of disinformation and misinformation that Donald Trump engineered in our attempt to deal with the disease when he said you could solve it with Clorox and take this and take that, that is just wrong. Disinformation and misinformation exists, Mr. Chairman. They are real, and politicians are part of the problem. And the private media entities have to have the right to publish what they want to publish and to not publish disinformation that is dangerous to the public health. And it is the role of government, as the author of this amendment is urging, to promote science and promote the best understanding we have of how it works against pseudo-scientific propaganda and anti-science disinformation.

So, I am in very strong support of the gentlelady's amendment. I think it is critical that we move it forward because the effect of this legislation otherwise will really be to hamstring the ability of government employees and officials to do their job, and especially when it comes to matters of public health and science. So, I am happy to yield back to Ms. Porter if she needs the time.

Ms. PORTER. I would just add that this bill allows additional speech—so, the purpose of the amendment is to allow additional speech. It is to allow government to put a warning or a disclaimer. It does not silence other views. It gives Americans more information, and they can then decide whether they want to rely on that content disclaimer or they want to go ahead and read whatever is being posted. But we have to make sure that our scientists have the ability to get factual information out there and to flag things that are contrary to well-established scientific processes and findings, and that is a limitation of this amendment. It does not apply to anything any government official wants to say. It applies to scientists, public health officials, and others putting out information that has been found to be factual by a well-established scientific process.

And what it simply does is let them add that disclaimer, and at that point, people are free in the marketplace of ideas to make a decision about what to make of whatever content has the disclaimer on it. It does not silence anybody, and I think the intent of the bill could go the other way without this amendment and actually censor and silence our scientists.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mrs. Boebert for five minutes.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think our biggest issue with many of these amendments are that there is no clear definition of what these items are, and we are waiting on for some bureaucrat to define what these things mean. If it is up to the Fed-

eral Government, up to bureaucrats to define things, then we end up with terms like “extremists,” “domestic terrorists,” and they end up targeting conservatives. I mean, if we were wanting to have an additional disclaimer from the government, well, the Vice President of the United States just said the energy rates are down, that people’s electric bills are lower, and they are able to afford vacations. No, energy is very expensive right now and continues to rise because of the policies implemented by my colleagues on the left and enforced through the stroke of a pen by Joe Biden.

And so, to have a government disclaimer on something, I do not think is very helpful because it is whatever political narrative they are trying to promote at that time. And I think it is interesting. The gentlewoman, Ms. Porter, just aligned this with grocery shopping and with the nutritional facts because there are also issues there. Well, that is a government regulation to have these nutritional facts on the foods that we consume. Well, do you know that if we get beef from Brazil and it is packaged in America, well, you could put a sticker on that says that its country of origin is America? Well, that is disinformation because the cow was raised in Brazil and brought to America but just put in a box or in a different box in America, and now, we get to put that sticker on there.

I mean, we have all seen the arguments with cage free. That is a government regulation to have these things on here. Well, your chicken is cage free? Well, that just means it is not a battery cage. It is still in an enclosure and probably a really tight one, too. These are not just free-range chickens on 40 acres, 50 acres. They are still in enclosures. Sugar free. Fat free. You can go through all of these things, and these are from government regulations.

So, I think with all of this, you can say that government ruins nearly everything, so why have government receive more power to restrict Americans to give their own definitions depending on who is in power at that time? And that is the issue that my colleagues over here are having with most of these amendments. It is not the context of the amendments. It is just how broad they are, and we do not want them later defined. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. I just have a quick question. Under this bill—you just have an issue as to who defines “misinformation,” “disinformation”—who is going to define “lawful speech?”

Mrs. BOEBERT. Well, I think lawful speech is something that is already out there, and free speech is lawful speech. We have free speech here in America.

Mr. GOLDMAN. You do not think that—

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mrs. Boebert.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Thank you. When you are throwing these amendments out and you have them very vague and broad, then that is where we have an issue, and we need to have a clear definition before we can consider these things, but lawful speech is already determined. We have freedom of speech, and the Federal Government interfering in that, colluding with Big Tech. That is the problem that we have. That is the premise that we are facing, where American citizens have their First Amendment rights completely infringed by the Federal Government colluding with Big Tech. Thank you, and I yield.

Chairman COMER. Yes. The gentlelady's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds for five minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and real quick, two articles to submit for the record. Article No. 1 from Politico, dated February 1, 2022: "Medical Boards Get Pushed Back as They Try to Punish Doctors For COVID Misinformation."

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Mr. DONALDS. Second article, Mr. Chairman, Miami Herald, February 8, 2022: "Doctor Loses License. Must Have Psych Evaluation For COVID Falsehoods, a Board Says." I think—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I think to the gentlelady's comments on her amendment about having science or technical information be suppressed from the public square, we have already experienced that. 2021 and 2022, 2020 for that matter, have been replete with suppression of scientific information because it wasn't viewed by CDC or HHS, or whatever alphabet soup agency you choose to reference as "truthful information." That is crystal clear with some of the media reports in the last couple of years, comparing them to the media reports that are coming out right now. You can even go to whether it is Twitter or Facebook or anywhere else. If you even had a different viewpoint on how to treat COVID-19, you are immediately labeled on your post that this is COVID misinformation before anybody else could even actually go to view said post.

Conversely, some of the stuff that CDC was coming out with at the time was viewed as appropriate information that every consumer should follow. And we have now come to know that some of that was actually misleading and/or wrong, or certain elements of the studies that were used were not followed completely to provide the public with full information, perfect information.

I want to bring it back to the subject of the bill at hand. What the bill is expressly saying is that government actors cannot use their position to impress upon the social media companies what is accurate versus misleading information. They cannot use their office to do that. Through public dialog and debate, the public can see where the information lays or it doesn't lay. If you have enough dialog and enough competition of ideas, that is the very purpose of debate and democracy. So, I don't think that the gentlelady's amendment is needed because the whole purpose of debating these ideas is to actually allow for the public to see that debate in real time, to make their own purchasing decisions or acting decisions in real time based upon all the relevant information available at that time. When you have government actors step in and start to label information one way or the other, that is when we have this issue.

To relate it off of COVID, bringing back to our previous hearing, we had 51 intelligence experts tell us that the Hunter Biden story was a Russian plant. Well, guess what? Those 51 intelligence experts, they are wrong, too. So this is what H.R. 140 is seeking to stop, is government actors putting their own thought processes on, short circuiting the process of legitimate debate and open conversation amongst the American people, so that the people, whether it is voting or consuming, can make an educated decision on the totality of the debate, not having the debate short-circuited by Members

of our government who have their own thought processes, politics, et cetera. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The question is on the amendment, offered by Ms. Porter.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

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

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

Does any Member seek recognition? Mr. Goldman?

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

Chairman COMER. The clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment Number 1 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Goldman of New York.

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

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The bill that we are focusing on today is purported to be modeled after the Hatch Act, which currently prohibits government officials from using their official positions for partisan political purposes. In the last Administration, the Hatch Act proved to be a toothless exercise against those who were intent on violating it. The Office of the Special Counsel, which is different than the special counsel within the Department of Justice, found that 13 members of the Trump Administration violated the Hatch Act—13—and there were no consequences for them.

The poster child for this blatant disregard for the law was Kellyanne Conway, who violated the Hatch Act more than 60 times and showed absolutely no remorse. As a repeat offender who had shown such disregard for the law, the Office of Special Counsel recommended that she be fired. The Office of Special Counsel said, “Ms. Conway’s violations, if left unpunished, would send a message to all Federal employees that they need not abide by the Hatch Act’s restrictions. Her actions thus erode the principal foundation of our democratic system, the rule of law.” The OSC concluded that her actions, as a repeat offender, who had shown disregard for the law, were so egregious that she should be fired.

Now, not surprisingly, President Trump never took her Hatch Act violation seriously and never fired her, but you know what Ms. Conway’s response to her serial violations of the Hatch Act were? She said, “If you are trying to silence me through the Hatch Act, it is not going to work. Let me know when the jail sentence starts.”

Mr. Sessions said earlier today that the purpose of H.R. 140 is to try to stop anyone from using the White House for political purposes. And so, in that vein, today, I am offering the Kellyanne Conway amendment that will allow for prison sentences under criminal violations of the law for knowing and intentional violations of the Hatch Act. This amendment will add a criminal provi-

sion to the Hatch Act to prevent the kind of blatant disregard for the law demonstrated by Ms. Conway and her colleagues in the Trump Administration. Unlike the bill that we are marking up today, which is a solution without a problem, the Hatch Act violations are a problem that needs a solution. So, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, which, unlike today's bills, addresses an actual problem that the government and this Congress should solve. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I will recognize myself for five minutes. Before I do, I would ask unanimous consent now since hopefully everyone has had time to review the two emails from Mr. Chan. I ask unanimous consent that they be entered into the record.

Mr. RASKIN. Enthusiastically, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Chairman COMER. This amendment is outside the scope and unrelated to the discussion of our bill today. This legislation deals with expanding the U.S. Office of Special Counsel civil enforcement of the Hatch Act. The proposed amendment here does not amend our bill, but rather amends the Hatch Act's law criminal enforcement. Criminal enforcement is not something done by the U.S. Office of Special Counsel in the Hatch Act context. However, it appears that we do share a common concern of Hatch Act penalties, and that is why this bill increases the civil enforcement fine up to \$10,000 for senior officials.

So, if my colleague is looking for stiffer civil enforcement penalties, this is the way to do it, in the legislation being discussed today. For that reason, I look forward to my colleague on the other side of the aisle to possibly supporting this bill. This amendment amends an unrelated bill that is not up for markup today. If my colleagues would like to explore Hatch Act reform, I am very open to having those conversations, but I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Does a Member seek recognition? The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I just want to enthusiastically rise in support of Mr. Goldman's amendment. We saw massive sweeping breaches of the Hatch Act in the last administration where the White House was used to stage political events, and they essentially dared anybody to do anything about it. Ms. Conway is a great example of one of the employees who was very happy to repeatedly make partisan political statements from the White House. And so that wall of separation between what is official and what is partisan was bulldozed during the last administration, and this is a great first step. I am delighted to hear, Mr. Chairman, that you are interested in doing some work on toughening up the Hatch Act. That is something that we should put on a serious legislative work that, you know, lies before us. But I think this is a great, good start that the gentleman from New York has offered us, and if he needs any more time, I am happy to yield it to him. Otherwise—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Raskin. I would point out in response to the Chairman's comments, that if this bill that we are addressing today is purportedly designed to prevent the govern-

ment officials from engaging what the Majority alleges to be partisan political censorship of speech, then we ought to include the whole panoply of laws that addresses the misuse of government power and authority to have an influence on partisan politics. The Hatch Act was the original example of this, which is why, clearly, H.R. 140 is modeled after it.

And so, you know, I understand it is a technicality that H.R. 140 is not actually included in the Hatch Act, but it is effectively the same structure for the same purpose. And if we are going to go down this road of trying to prevent the government officials from using their official offices for partisan political purposes, then we ought to make sure that we do that. And what was clear under the former Administration under President Trump, is that there was no regard for the violation of the Hatch Act and for using government offices for political purposes. And so, we ought to ensure, we ought to take the threat, or perhaps, I would say the chutzpah of Ms. Conway to only abide by the Hatch Act if there was the threat of a prison sentence, and we ought to do something about it. I am sure we can all agree that we should not be allowing government officials to be completely abusing the law with no consequence and no resource, and that is why this amendment is so important, is to actually put some teeth behind the purported purpose that H.R. 140 is supposed to adhere to. I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. In all regards for this Committee and our future work with respect to bipartisanship, there is a willingness on our side to talk about expanding the Hatch Act and reforming the Hatch Act. I think that is an opportunity for bipartisanship moving forward, as well as what Chairman Raskin and I have had discussions about, reform within the National Archives on how documents leave, you know, that has been a problem for many Administrations. We need to fix the problem to ensure that there is an orderly process for how documents leave the office of President and Vice President and follow them into the private sector.

And then, of course, I think there will be a great opportunity at some point in the next two years to talk about influence peddling, and to make it clear where the line is to significantly amend the ethics laws, and significantly increase the disclosure laws for family members of high-level members of political office and what they do, what they can do with respect to doing business with adversaries in foreign country. So, I think there are opportunities for bipartisanship in this Committee, and expanding the Hatch Act, at some point in time, I think, would be another opportunity.

Does any Member seek recognition? Mr. Raskin.

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

Chairman COMER. I am sorry. What?

Mr. RASKIN. We haven't voted yet on that.

Chairman COMER. Oh, yes, OK. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. Right there.

Chairman COMER. Yes, right here. The question is on the amendment, offered by Mr. Goldman.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Recorded vote please, Mr. Chairman.

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. I have an amendment at the desk, denominated Raskin Number 2.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Oh, I am sorry?

Chairman COMER. I am sorry?

Voice. Do we have the updated text?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. OK.

Chairman COMER. Oh, the Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman COMER. Do you have an amendment at the desk?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Moskowitz of Florida. Page 1, line 8, strike "and"; page 3—

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

Chairman COMER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, thank you. You know, after the last Oversight Committee hearing, I posted on my official government Twitter account a video of myself pointing out the rise of antisemitism found on Twitter, Mr. Chairman, after, you know, we were talking a lot about Nazis in that last hearing. Once the video was posted, the reply section of my post of the video from the hearing was flooded with hateful, antisemitic comments and images from Nazis and antisemites. I received over 200 such comments from Nazis and Nazi sympathizers.

You know, these incidents are actually proving my point from the last hearing, Mr. Chairman, that I made in that this hateful rhetoric is running rampant without any consideration of the real and dangerous consequences these hateful posts have to the Jewish community. And so, because of the hateful rhetoric goes beyond free speech, because there is hateful rhetoric that incites violence, it becomes harassment, and, you know, I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that we do something about it.

You know, I heard earlier that, you know, some of these amendments we are putting forward are too vague. They are not narrow. And so, I am going forward, Mr. Chairman, with a very narrow, not vague amendment to make clear that speech from Nazis that incite violence is dangerous, and it should be an exception to this bill because I think the bill that the Majority is putting forward itself right now is casting too wide a net. And so, you know, if we are willing to make carve-outs in this bill—and there are specific carve-outs in the bill—it should be an absolute no brainer. We should be able to agree on a bipartisan basis that Federal Government employees can work with, whether it is social media or other news

outlets where Nazis are trying to incite violence. That is something that we should allow Federal employees to try to curtail, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment and stand against neo-Nazis. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself. I oppose this misguided amendment. This amendment argues that Federal employees across the government should be allowed to make a determination on what violent speech is instead of relying on the actual law. This is worrisome given that this Administration has a broad and political interpretation of what the “incitement” of violence is. Federal employees should be required to uphold the First Amendment-protected speech, not determine for themselves what is lawful. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Mr. Goldman for five minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, you just said that you oppose this amendment because it would allow the Federal Government to determine what violent speech is, but the entire premise of this bill, it allows somebody, we don’t yet know who, to interpret what lawful speech is. I think everyone will agree that the First Amendment does not protect against any speech. There are clear violations of the First Amendment through speech. So, the notion that we should not prohibit neo-Nazis from inciting violence on social media networks because the government would have to define what that violent speech is flies in the face of this entire bill because the government is going to have to determine what is lawful speech and what is not, so your rationale makes no sense. If it is true that you support the underlying bill, which requires the government to determine what is lawful speech and what is not. I don’t understand why it is OK for the government to be required to determine lawful speech, but it is not OK for the government to determine what is violent speech. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I don’t think anybody disagrees that incitement to violence, legitimate incitement to violence definable in some—most states have criminal codes that define what incitement is. Federal law enforcement does as well. But I do think that this kind of language is covered in the language in the bill itself. I do think there is a problem, for instance, with the term “neo-Nazi.” Why didn’t you just include the term “Nazi?” You know, “neo-Nazi,” what are you referring to as neo-Nazi? You haven’t defined that here.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIGGS. Not just yet. If I get some time, I will yield to you. So, you haven’t defined that. How about the KKK or the neo-KKK? How about a communist or a neo-communist movement, which all exist, all incite to violence. For those of us who we have a faith, we belong to a faith where we have been targeted and persecuted, how about your anti-Mormon language? There has been violence incited against Mormons. How about BLM inciting violence against Federal Government? How about Antifa?

The point is you could list any number of groups that have been victimized, but the reality is that is covered under the terms and definitions here of lawful language. If you are inciting to violence,

you are violating the law, at least under most state laws. Maybe I shouldn't even say state laws. I can tell you in Arizona, if I incite to violence, there is law that hinders that. What you are doing is you are trying to carve out your own exception for your own purpose when the entire bill actually covers what you are trying to protect, and so I am going to oppose that. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Would the gentleman yield?

Ms. STANSBURY. Does the—

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, I don't mind yielding.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you know, my intent wasn't to start debating what a Nazi is. I mean, I didn't know that there is a disagreement over what a Nazi is—

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, reclaiming my time. Nobody is saying that we don't know what a Nazi is, but when you use the term neo-Nazi, that becomes something different, perhaps. You didn't define that, and so that would be the point, and you are actually taking the point beyond where it went. The point I was trying to make is this. Your amendment is covered in the language of the bill as proposed, as your category is. Other groups that have been persecuted and maligned and attacked, they are also protected without specifically iterating who they are. That is why your amendment, in my opinion, is superfluous.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK—

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, so I yield back so you can—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Sure. So, the term "neo-Nazi" is a term that is used to differentiate between today's Nazis and the Nazis of World War II. That is where "neo-Nazi" comes from. Again, I don't think anyone debates what that term refers to, and that is why that term was used. Of course, we could include other groups, but I wanted to make a very narrow, very tailored, so that we didn't talk about, you know, what about this, what about that. And I think it is pretty clear when neo-Nazi groups online are inciting violence. This is not about speech.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I am going to just take it back for a second so I can respond to that. Just a moment ago, I believe your colleague said that—didn't want to let the government determine what that was, but you just said it is clearly defined when someone cites. I agree with you. There is always going to be some gray area because prosecutorial or, in this case, whoever is adjudicating this, they are going to make some determinations. But I would also tell you that by narrowing and tailoring this to neo-Nazis, you are excluding, for some unknown reason, other groups that purvey hate and incite violence, and I am focusing on inciting violence, because that is what you are getting at.

And as one who has received the incitement when I was called an insurrectionist repeatedly from the left, people threatening me and my family with harm, and calling for it on social media, do I go after the individuals who I sit with in this Committee now? No. But my point is, you have it covered in this law, with this bill, as proposed. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on the amendment, offered by the gentleman.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Goldman.

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

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment Number 2 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, offered by Mr. Goldman of New York. Page 2—

Chairman COMER. Yes, without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman is recognized for five minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 140 creates several law enforcement exceptions to the prohibition on, any government speech on, I guess, computer services. I am not exactly sure what the new term is in the ANS. Those exceptions include child pornography and exploitation, human trafficking, drug trafficking, and the safeguarding of classified national security information. Interestingly, the law enforcement exceptions in the ANS, as drafted in this bill, as drafted, does not include foreign interference in our elections. And yet, we know, once again, based on the facts and the evidence from the Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, that Russia interfered in the 2016 election through the use of speech on our social media platforms, which is purportedly exactly what this bill is designed to prohibit.

So, this amendment is a commonsense amendment that addresses a recent problem that we are all familiar with of Russia, a foreign country, interfering in our elections by adding a law enforcement exception for defending the integrity of our elections, from interference from the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, or any other malign foreign state or non-state actor. I am not quite clear why this exception was not included in the original bill. But unless we are going to deny the facts and the evidence that has been unequivocally established that Russia did use the exact same conduct that this bill is designed to protect in order to interfere in our elections, and, as we learned in our hearing a couple of weeks ago, continues to try to do so. I expect that we will get full bipartisan support to add this exception for foreign interference in our elections.

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes, I yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. I wanted to thank the gentleman for his excellent amendment, which is obviously needed and something that should be of total bipartisan commitment. At this point, certainly if there is an exception for child pornography and there is an exception for drug trafficking, there has got to be an exception for malign foreign interference to subvert American democratic elections. And if not, what this legislation is saying is that we are going to stop the U.S. Government and its employees from rendering factual information to social media entities, but we are going to allow malign foreign actors to run free over the internet. And this really does, at that point, become the Putin Protection Act and the Xi Protection Act.

So, I am happy to yield back, but thank you for introducing this critical amendment.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. This bill already provides an exception for legitimate law enforcement functions. This exception ensures that nothing in this Act will interfere with any lawful action taken by an agency to defend the integrity of elections. If an agency has a legitimate ability to take such an action, the agency is able and may properly to do so. While I share Representative Goldman's desire to safeguard our elections, H.R. 140 will not interfere with an agency's ability to carry out its mission. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz, and I will remind everyone the votes have been ordered. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I will be quick, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. So, I think what we are just trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is we are just trying to tighten the bill to a point by adding these exceptions into the bill so that you don't cast such a wide net. I mean, I think we should be able to agree that we don't want to see Russian propaganda or Russian misinformation in our elections. I think we would also agree that we don't want to see, you know, Nazis inciting violence. We want our Federal Government to be able to respond to that. But yet, for some reason, the Majority seems hesitant to define where this bill can and can't go, what Federal employees can work on and can't work on. It basically wants to pull back any protection that we have from misinformation or Russian propaganda or Nazis inciting violence online.

And so, I support this amendment. I think it is crystal clear what the intent is here. I urge the Majority to show that, while they want to protect free speech, they also understand Russian propaganda and Nazis inciting violence should have limitations. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The question is on the amendment, offered by Mr. Goldman.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. I will go as quickly as I can because I know we got votes, Mr. Chairman. Well, again, having participated now for several hours, it is clear to me what the legislation is really about. It is not about Hunter Biden's laptop because we determined at the February 8 hearing that there was no coercive pressure being brought down on Twitter by the FBI, or the Department of Justice, or anybody else. All of the Majority's own witnesses testified to that effect. So, what is this really about?

Well, it is about how right-wing politics operates today, and I don't want to tar everybody with the same brush. Some people have stayed away from Donald Trump in the GOP, which is why

I am not talking about Republicans. But I am talking about right-wing politics and it operates on the basis of propaganda, disinformation, and Big Lies. And I don't want to take the time to go through all of them, but let's start with the paradigm Big Lie. The big lie that Donald Trump actually won the Presidential election in 2020 when Joe Biden beat him by seven million votes, 306 to 232, in the Electoral College, and so that has spread all over the internet.

Now, there are a lot of people, including me, who wished that Twitter, and Facebook, and other social media had acted to take down the Big Lie long before they did, but they did not do it. They waited until January 6, when the Big Lie exploded into a violent insurrection unlike anything we have seen in American history before, a President inciting a violent insurrection against his own Vice President, against the Congress of the United States. And after 150 of our police officers were wounded, injured, came back with broken noses, broken arms, broken legs, broken fingers, heart attack, strokes, and so on. In the meantime, please call up my amendment if we could, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. I was just trying to go fast there.

The CLERK. Amendment Number 2 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 140, as offered by Mr. Raskin of Maryland—

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

Chairman COMER. Mr. Raskin is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. So, to complete the thought, it took the violent insurrection itself before Twitter decided to take down Donald Trump's account for incitement and glorification of violence, OK?

Now, what is this hearing really about? It is about the fact that whenever someone gets taken down, way too late from my standpoint, but gets taken down for something like inciting a violent insurrection or glorifying violence, then there is a huge movement to say censorship. Twitter just censored Donald Trump, and they say, well, he violated our terms of service. We are a private entity. They say it is censorship, and then a big campaign is waged to force them to put him back on. And we have seen that with respect to people who lie about a whole bunch of different things across the board.

This amendment is very simple. All it does is to say that we have a rule of construction, clarifying that nothing in the bill shall be construed to restrict or amend the right of any private entity to develop, maintain, or enforce its own terms of service, and that could include them enforcing their terms of service, as they see it. Lots of my colleagues have said today, oh, well, that is just private speech. When I asked several of them directly, well, Elon Musk is now just removing journalists from their Twitter accounts since he purchased the platform because he disagrees with them. Well, they are fine with that because that is private. Well then, let's be clear across the board that private media entities, internet, social media entities, have the right to develop and enforce their own terms of

service. That is the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope we can move it quickly.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself. I oppose the amendment proposed by Ranking Member Raskin to add an additional rule of construction to this bill. Our concern here is with government censorship. This legislation is focused on Federal employees and government agencies coercing private sector companies into taking away First Amendment rights. This legislation is tightly drafted to focus on government activity. There is nothing in this bill that hints at anything broader, so this amendment is unnecessary.

The question is on the amendment, offered by Mr. Raskin.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, this is a quick question of procedural order for the Committee, which is I understand there is a 3:00 Roundtable. Is it a 2:00 Roundtable? So that is just problematic because I think a bunch of Members are supposed to be in both places, and I thought we didn't do that.

Chairman COMER. What I would like to do is come back and reconvene at 3:15 for votes. I just want to note, a Roundtable is not a hearing or an official meeting. We are not in violation of the Committee rules.

Mr. RASKIN. I appreciate that this time, Mr. Chairman. I hope in the future we won't schedule even Roundtables opposite hearings that we could predict to go for a few hours.

Chairman COMER. Again, it is a Roundtable, so if we get this next amendment in, we will reconvene at 3:15 to take up the vote. Do you have time for the next amendment or not?

Mr. RASKIN. No, we should go.

Chairman COMER. OK. At this time, we stand in recess until 3:15.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. We will reconvene the markup for the Oversight Committee.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. In light of your expression of your desire for a good-faith effort to revise the Hatch Act, I would seek for unanimous consent to withdraw the request for a recorded vote to Goldman Amendment Number 1.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered. Thank you.

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 1162, the Accountability for Government Censorship Act.

The clerk will please report.

The CLERK. H.R. 1162, a bill to require the Office of Management and Budget to report to Congress on actions taken by executive branch employees to censor lawful speech, and for other purposes.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

The clerk, please report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1162, 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.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott Perry, is recognized for five minutes for a statement on the bill.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to you and your staff for working with me to include the Accountability for Government Censorship Act in today's markup. Thanks to your leadership, much-needed light was shed on government-led censorship and suppression at this month's hearing on Twitter's role in suppressing the Biden laptop story. On that note, I think we all agree that we have barely scratched the surface of this subject, so I hope we continue this important work in many future hearings including hearings with government witnesses.

Now, this bill will build on that work by requiring a single comprehensive report on agency activities to censor lawful speech on social media platforms. Specifically, it will require agencies to report to Congress on each instance the agency has communicated with a social media platform for the purpose of removing, adding a disclaimer to, or suppressing lawful speech. It also requires important information from agencies, including the employees involved, the platforms involved, and any legal authority for the action. Agency compliance will be assessed by their respective inspector general. Here is the bottom line. The American people deserve to know how and why their taxpayer dollars are being used to censor their very own speech, and this bill would do just that. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield the balance.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member for five minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much. I thank Mr. Perry for the legislation. I have to say, I taught constitutional law and the First Amendment for 25 years, and it never occurred to me that we needed a bill called the Government Censorship Act because that is what the First Amendment does. The First Amendment blocks and prevents government censorship. So, we know something else is going on here, and we continue to oppose this very strange attack on free speech, good government, and the privacy and security of dedicated Federal employees. The erroneous assumption of the bill is, again, that Federal employees are coordinating with tech companies to suppress speech, a claim for which there is no factual basis was made abundantly clear at the February 8 hearing with respect to Twitter and the trumped-up claims about Federal Government officials trying to censor news of Hunter Biden's laptop story.

The only real evidence we could find, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, was about Donald Trump. He did not like somebody on Twit-

ter calling him a PAB. I am using the acronym there out of deference to our national audience. And he got White House officials to call Twitter to tell them to take it down. I still have not heard a single word from anyone on your side of the aisle denouncing that. There are numerous other examples. President Trump was so upset by a joke made by Jimmy Kimmel that he directed, again, White House personnel to call up the Disney Corporation, executives there, to complain and demand that action be taken against apparently disloyal comedians, and at least a couple of phone calls were made in that direction.

So, this does happen, there is no doubt, but for some reason, none of the focus is on the actual events where we know this did take place. The only known serial official violator of the rights of the social media companies to be free of governing speech reprisal, Donald Trump, happens to be their hero, and he is no longer in office. So their bill in pursuit of the fantasy conspiracy to oppress right-wing speech would turn the Federal Government upside down now with a series of wasteful bureaucratic paperwork assignments for no reason at all, requiring every agency to submit a report to the OMB listing every instance during the past five years in which an employee of an agency communicated with the internet computer service on something completely lawful, on something totally within the course of their work. All of this has got to be reported.

And if that is not enough, the bill also requires agencies to complete these reviews within 90 days, so even without speaking to the agencies, they would need to implement it. My colleagues should know that this is simply not feasible, and this is just an attempt to impose gratuitous and unnecessary paperwork on the work force. The bill should really be called the Targeting Public Servants for Doing Their Jobs Act. And one of the most disturbing parts of it, is the requirement that OMB submit a report to this Committee and to the Senate, listing the names and the positions of every Federal employee and their supervisors who interacted with any internet computer service, as well as the names and positions of any internet computer service employee that the Federal employee interacted with.

But the bill generally ignores the fact that there is a need, as we have been discussing all day, for the Federal Government to do its job, not just in the areas where our friends concede there is a need to, with respect to drug trafficking, and child pornography, and human trafficking, but also with respect to the national security of the country, with respect to the protection of our elections, with respect to the protection of our environment, of our rivers, of our mountains, and so on.

Information sharing between government agencies and social media companies is not censorship. It is essential to protecting the effectiveness of government. And the First Amendment is there to stifle anybody like Donald Trump, who would try to trample on the free speech rights of anybody, whether it is at Twitter, or AT&T, or any private media entity that exists. That is what the First Amendment is for. And, you know, forgive me for saying so, but I do not think that we in our collective wisdom today in America are smarter than the framers in terms of the formation of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

So, my friends, this bill really does nothing but create a lot more mischief and a lot more bureaucratic paperwork, and we would urge a rejection for the same reasons we reject the prior bill. I go back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes myself for five minutes.

I want to thank Mr. Perry for working to draft this targeted and timely legislation. H.R. 1162 is directly responsive to the primary question I had coming out of our February 8 hearing on protecting speech from government interference and social media bias. That is, how much more pervasive than we thought is this problem and the Federal Government's attempt to censor the lawful speech of Americans?

This activity is not always as blatant as former Press Secretary Jen Psaki's development of the powerful influence of the White House bully pulpit to call for Americans to be de-platformed or have their speech suppressed. It is sad, as we have learned from the Twitter files, the Federal Government's collusion with social media companies is often far more deliberately coordinated behind the scenes. Such activity has masked the real extent and impact of the troubling trend of government censorship. It has made transparency into the problem difficult and accountability nearly impossible.

Mr. Perry's bill recognizes this oversight challenge. The Accountability for Government Censorship Act simply requires transparency for Congress to understand the full extent of the problem. This bill would require every Federal agency to review the past five years of its communications with external internet platforms and report to Congress each instance in which it can engage in an attempt to limit speech on an internet platform. Whether the activity can ultimately be justified or not, the appropriate congressional committees need to evaluate these activities and determine the proper policy reforms going forward. This will help us uncover the extent to which the Federal Government has censored lawful speech, and where it has blatantly crossed the line.

Congressman Perry's legislation will equip Congress to understand which agencies have engaged in censorship activities and for what reasons. And the bill looks back into the prior Presidential administration so we can have a fair evaluation of how such activity has come to be in the Federal Government. Surely my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can appreciate this balanced transparency. This bill provides us with the information necessary to carry out this Committee's oversight agenda. It will help the 118th Congress deliver on key promises to the American people to ensure a government that is accountable and a future built on freedom. I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward transparency bill.

Do any other Members wish to be heard?

Voice. Mr. Moskowitz.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz for five minutes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, thank you. You know, I actually think, you know, you guys listened in the last hearing, and I applaud you in this bill going back five years. I think that we can

now find out what the Messiah Donald Trump did in 2019 when he reached out to Twitter to limit free speech when he was called a PAB, which we heard in the last meeting that, you know, that got under his orange skin, so we can find out now exactly who he called. Not only who he called, and maybe it was not the President, but did Jared call someone at Twitter? If it was not Jared, who in the Administration reached out to Twitter to take down free speech because he was called a name that he disagreed with. And was that the only instance in which that happened in 2019? Did it happen in 2020? You know, these are questions that I think the American people deserve to know because it came out in the last hearing that the previous Administration was going after free speech.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, it has come out, not just with Twitter, but it has come out that Donald Trump had White House staff call the Disney Corporation to try and censor Jimmy Kimmel because the former President did not like his jokes. And to quote Jimmy Kimmel, Jimmy Kimmel has responded to this saying that "President Karen demanded to speak to my manager in order to censor my free speech through corporate ownership." Additionally, you know, not dealing with government censorship, but it has also come out, Mr. Chairman, that during the last campaign, Fox News provided Trump's son-in-law confidential information about President Biden's ads and President Biden's debate strategy, trying to put their finger on the pulse of the election.

And so, listen, you know, I applaud you guys for going back five years because we are going to find out that President Snowflake, through calling Twitter and calling Disney, was trying to hurt people's free speech because, you know, it upset him. He did not like being called names. And so, you guys deserve credit that you want to get to the bottom of who did Donald Trump call, who did Jared Kushner call, who did the chiefs of staff in the Trump Administration call to take down Americans' free speech, not just on social media, but also on television. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Before we go to the vote, I just want to relay something that was just stated during the Roundtable. Dr. Makary just said today at the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic Roundtable, the following: "The greatest perpetrator of misinformation during the pandemic was the U.S. Government," which again, is why we are having the markup today.

The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you for telling us that. I do not know who Dr. Makary is, and had we not been countered scheduled against the Roundtable, we could be there to listen to that, and see the full context, and whether anybody responded. So, I do look forward to being able to read through the whole transcript or us ending as quickly as possible. As I said, several of us have withdrawn amendments, so we can finish as quickly as possible so we can get to the Roundtable.

Chairman COMER. Who is asking to yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield back.

Voice. Yes, can you yield?

Chairman COMER. If she will yield.

Mr. RASKIN. I am happy to yield to Mr. Moskowitz.

Chairman COMER. I will have to recognize her to yield to you, if that is OK. Are you good with yielding him, too? OK. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, based on those comments, I, too, would like to get more information. I mean, was that person specifically talking about the misinformation that President Trump put out about maybe putting light into the body could get rid of COVID or maybe using a horse tranquilizer to get rid of COVID? Was he talking about the misinformation about maybe we can do, like, a cleaning of the body, you know, as misinformation? And so, you know, I would like to find out the misinformation that was put out, you know, COVID is going to go away in, like, a couple of months, that misinformation. You know, there was a lot of misinformation that was put out, and so I would love—maybe hold a hearing on that, Mr. Chairman. I think that would be fantastic. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Did anyone else seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is on the amendment. Actually, there is no—

Voice. No, on the bill.

Chairman COMER. Yes, on the bill. Yes, there is no amendment.

Voice. It is on the bill.

Chairman COMER. Right. OK. It is on the bill. The question is on the bill. The question is on the bill, offered by Mr.—

Voice. You have the ANS.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. The ANS, offered by Mr. Perry. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the ANS is agreed to.

So, the question is now on the full bill, H.R. 1162, offered by Scott Perry.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

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

Mr. RASKIN: I am seeking recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

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

Now, pursuant to notice in Clause 2(d)(1) of House Rule X, I now call up the Committee on Oversight and Accountability's Authorization and Oversight Plan for the 118th Congress, copies of which were distributed in advance.

The clerk will please report the plan.

The CLERK. Authorization and Oversight Plan for the Committee on Oversight and Accountability for the 118th Congress.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for a brief explanatory statement. We have important work to do this Congress to uncover and to prevent government waste, fraud, and abuse. The topics list-

ed in this plan provide a roadmap where the Committee will focus its resources to best serve the American people. Once again, I appreciate Ranking Member Raskin working with me to finalize this plan.

Is there any further discussion or amendments on the plan? I recognize Ranking Member Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. You know, I am of two minds about the whole thing. As I have expressed to you, I supported you when you said at the beginning of the Congress to *The Wall Street Journal* that we were planning to conduct credible oversight, identify problems, and propose reforms. To the extent that the oversight plan embodies these values, I am happy to vote for it. As I have expressed to you, it is my real desire to work with you in conducting commonsense and bipartisan oversight in this Congress and the topics identified in the plan falls squarely within our shared charge to make the government work efficiently and effectively.

But I am troubled that the Committee's work has already strayed so dramatically from this promise. For example, at our first hearing on COVID relief programs, I had hoped that we would pick up from the work of the 117th Congress where the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus literally stopped tens of millions of dollars in rip-offs from taking place by blowing the whistle on particular scams across the country, and I hoped that we could continue to work with you on reforming the legislation to guarantee more structural efficiency. But instead, we got a series of attacks, false attacks on Democrats, saying we did not have any hearings on it, which I suppose is true about the Oversight Committee generally, but we had a whole select subcommittee, which had seven hearings on corruption and fraud in COVID-19 relief, and we saved at least tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars to the people.

And I was, you know, similarly disheartened at the Twitter hearing, for example, when instead of working together on common problems relating to Twitter or what I think is the major problem, which is that, as the whistleblower said, Twitter did nothing when it was told there were people planning for violent insurrection against the government, planning for race war, planning to attack the Vice President, planning to attack Congress—nothing happened on Twitter until after it was over when they started taking down accounts.

Instead, we got, you know, the Hunter Biden laptop story, although it did allow us to debunk it because none of the witnesses called by the Majority supported with any evidence the idea that Federal Government officials coerced or tried to coerce Twitter into making its totally independent, sovereign, private decision on how to manage its own business, which should be really of no consequence to us. They did not run that stupid story or create that stupid link for 24 hours. Big deal. And yet, here we are on a continuing wild goose chase about it.

So, you know, I am of two minds, Mr. Chair. I like, you know, your are setting forth of these different priorities, which do not include any of these scandals du jour and all of the wild goose chase stuff. But, at the same time, when I look at generally what is hap-

pening in Congress, I have to tell you, I am disenchanted. I am disenchanted by what I have seen from Mr. Jordan and his new committee, and I saw Mr. Jordan do an interview at the CPAC conference where he said that this Congress, he would be investigating Hunter Biden to, “frame up the 2024 race when I hope and I think President Trump is going to run again, and we need to make sure that he wins.” And that is the whole thing. The sum and substance of every one of these hearings is we need to make sure that Donald Trump is restored to office, because we do not have a king in America, but we got something close to it, and that is Donald Trump.

Look, I am basically willing to listen to you, Mr. Chairman. If you are telling me that we are really going to stick to what is in that text and we are going to follow that, then I am very willing to vote for that plan. But if it is just going to be a series of wild goose chases and political vendettas, count me out. I do not want to be part of it. And so, I know that you are a man of goodwill and good faith, and so, but please just reassure me that this is what we are going to be working on. I am happy to yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The question is now in favorably reporting the Committee's oversight plan.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the plan is ordered favorably reported.

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

We are going to take a brief recess for 10 minutes to gather everyone up, and then we will have the, as quickly as we can, the votes for all the amendments and the two bills.

So, we stand in recess for 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Ranking Member Raskin, the Raskin Amendment 1.

The clerk will now call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes no.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.  
Mr. Sessions?  
[No response.]  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Chairman COMER. How is Ms. Mace recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Mace is not recorded.

Ms. MACE. Ms. Mace votes no.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Chairman, LaTurner votes no.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. LaTurner recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner was not previously recorded.

Mr. LATURNER. LaTurner votes no.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Sessions recorded?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recorded as a no vote.

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Sessions recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions was not previously recorded.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to be recorded as a no vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?

Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Mfume recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Mfume is not recorded.

Mr. MFUME. I vote aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.

Chairman COMER. And how am I recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. I vote no.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Mr. GOMEZ. How am I recorded?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Gomez.

The CLERK. Mr. Gomez is not previously recorded.

Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez is aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chairman, how is Ms. Ocasio-Cortez recorded? I was just saying hey. Sorry.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. If you are curious, you can just ask me.

Chairman COMER. Has everybody been recorded?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, for this vote, the ayes are 19. The nays are 22.

Chairman COMER. The amendment fails.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Mr. Lynch.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Mr. Palmer?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?  
Mr. HIGGINS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.  
Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. McCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.

Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes have 19. The nays have 22.  
Chairman COMER. The amendment is not agreed to.  
The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Ms. Balint.  
The clerk will call the roll.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Mr. Palmer?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Nay.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Chairman COMER. How is Ms. Foxx recorded?  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx is not previously recorded.  
Ms. FOXX. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Gosar recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar is not previously recorded.  
Mr. GOSAR. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. I vote aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 19. The nays are 22.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Ms. Porter from California.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.

Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
Chairman COMER. How is Ms. Foxx recorded?  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx is not previously recorded.  
Ms. Foxx. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Grothman recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman is not previously recorded.  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. And Mr. Sessions, how is he recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions is not previously recorded.  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Chairman COMER. And Mr. Biggs? And how is Mr. Biggs recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs has not been recorded.  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, for this vote, the ayes are 20. They nays are 21.

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

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Mr. Moskowitz from Florida.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes no.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.

Ms. Mace?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner?

[No response.]

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.

Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.

Ms. Greene?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mr. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?

Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Sessions recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions is not previously recorded.  
Chairman COMER. And how is Ms. Mace recorder?  
Mr. SESSIONS. I want to be recorded as a no vote.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Chairman COMER. And Ms. Mace?  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace is not previously recorded.  
Ms. MACE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. LaTurner recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is not recorded.  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 21.  
Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.  
The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by Mr. Goldman from New York.  
The clerk will call the roll.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Mr. Palmer?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.

Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Jordan recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan is not previously recorded.  
Mr. JORDAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes no.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. Does the clerk have the tally?  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 22.  
Chairman COMER. The nays have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.  
The question is now on the previously postponed amendment, offered by the gentleman—the Ranking Member. This is Raskin's Amendment Number 2.  
The clerk will call the roll.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
Mr. JORDAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes no.  
Mr. Turner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes no.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes no.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the tally.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 22.  
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 H.R. 140.  
All those in favor signify by saying aye.  
All those opposed signify by saying no.  
In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute H.R. 140 is agreed to.  
The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 140.  
The clerk will call the roll.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes yes.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.  
Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes yes.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.  
Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Yes.  
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes yes.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes no.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Jordan recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan is not previously recorded.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.  
Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. Palmer—  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes.  
Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. Palmer recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer is recorded as aye.  
Chairman COMER. Good job.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
Chairman COMER. The clerk will report the tally.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, for this vote, the ayes are 24. The nays are 20.  
Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably as reported.  
Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.  
The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 1162.  
The clerk will call the roll.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
Mr. JORDAN. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes.  
Mr. Turner?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Foxx votes yes.  
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.  
Mr. Grothman?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
Mr. DONALDS. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.  
Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Yes.  
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes yes.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Yes.  
The CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Nay.  
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Nay.  
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes nay.  
Mr. Mfume?

Mr. MFUME. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Nay.  
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes nay.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, no.  
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
Ms. Balint?  
Ms. BALINT. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Balint votes no.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.  
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Grothman recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman is not previously recorded.  
Mr. GROTHMAN. I vote yes.  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, how is Mr. Mfume recorded?  
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume is voted no.  
Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I vote nay.  
Mr. CONNOLLY. That is what I thought.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote yes.  
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
Chairman COMER. And does the clerk have the tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 24. The nays are 20.

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

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

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, I ask that Committee Members have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee supplemental additional Minority and dissenting views.

Without objection.

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

Without objection, so ordered.

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

[Whereupon, at 4:41 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

