

trade without serious human rights conditionality.

Indeed, President Clinton delinked human rights in trade on May 26, 1994. I went up there and gave a press conference. I was joined by a few others saying how serious that was to give up on human rights and allow profits to trump human rights.

We have seen the brutal nature of the Communist regime, especially under Xi Jinping, and the Chinese Communist Party's ultimate desire to seek hegemony.

Over the years, I have chaired 76 congressional hearings on China and authored several pieces of legislation, including the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, and was the Republican sponsor of JIM MCGOVERN'S Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act. We now have to make sure those laws are being faithfully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago when China became a member of the WTO, most Members of Congress, and certainly in the business and community on foreign policy establishment, bought into what James Mann rightfully called "the China fantasy."

In other words, if you just trade more with a dictatorship, somehow they will matriculate into a democracy.

That fantasy has been shown to be demonstrably naive, at best. The CCP has become more powerful because of the trade and dual use items that have accrued over there that are now being used by their military and by their police.

I would note, parenthetically, I chaired two hearings on why China should not be invited into the WTO and no one—no one—listened.

The record is clear, Mr. Speaker. As predicted, we have become more like them. Thankfully, that is changing, but many in our corporate establishment, as we saw with the Olympics, were standing right by Beijing and the CCP and Xi Jinping and wouldn't utter a word, including Coca-Cola and others, about the terrible killing of the Uyghurs and the use of forced labor camps.

We have stood by as the Chinese embassy and the Ministry of State Security have harassed people of Chinese heritage and nationality living lawfully in the United States.

We have not done all that we can do for the people of Hong Kong, Tibet, and the Uyghur people in the autonomous region.

But today, thankfully, we are turning a page, and I applaud our Speaker for pushing hard for this select committee. Hopefully, it will make a difference.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this select committee has the potential to do some substantive work, and there is a bipartisan group here in this House that for years has been focused on holding China accountable and upholding a high standard of human rights.

I don't want to close without acknowledging the incredible leadership of Speaker PELOSI in all of this. I traveled with Speaker PELOSI to China a few years back, and she insisted that we visit Tibet, a place that was blocked off for congressional visits for many years.

She refused to take no for an answer, and we went to Tibet. Under her leadership, the legislation that I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks was passed, the most consequential legislation to hold China accountable passed in this Congress in history.

The potential that this select committee has really is contingent on making sure that the words that were expressed by Speaker MCCARTHY and by incoming Chair GALLAGHER are actually upheld. The concern that you hear on our side really is concern that this devolves into something that is about promoting conspiracy theories and that tolerates racist language.

We say that because we have been through all of this. The use of the words that the former President chose to employ resulted in hate crimes against Asian Americans in this country. It is unconscionable.

If this committee goes in that direction, I assure you that the Democrats on that committee will push back forcefully.

We want this committee to be effective. In theory, this is a committee that we should all get behind, and I hope that it is successful. I hope that it is bipartisan. I hope that it is all that we have been promised here today.

As I said, I am going to vote for this because I think it is the right thing to do, and I have faith that our Members on both sides will do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience. I am going to vote "yes" on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I begin by thanking my friend for the debate and for his tremendous work in holding China accountable in the human rights area.

I am certainly confident the Speaker will do as he said, and we will have a committee both sides can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution creating a Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.

It is beyond dispute that Communist China poses an urgent generational threat to the United States' interests and values. America has become far too economically dependent on China in recent decades, and as a result, our supply chains have become dangerously fragile. We must urgently take steps to secure our supply chains and bring them home.

The Chinese Communist Party continues to push the envelope, both in the United States and abroad. They steal American intellectual property.

They build spy networks and propaganda machines on American soil. They threaten our allies in Asia and the South China Sea. They have spread their influence throughout the developing world, seeking to ensnare vulnerable developing countries in debt-trap diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the House of Representatives to take a comprehensive look at Communist China. We must build on the excellent work done by the China Task Force in 2019 and 2020. We must investigate China's actions and respond appropriately to ensure America confronts this very grave threat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

#### SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, as the designee of the majority leader, pursuant to House Resolution 5, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 12) establishing a Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government as a select investigative subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 12

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT; COMPOSITION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established for the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress a select investigative subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary called the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government (hereinafter referred to as the "select subcommittee").

(2) COMPOSITION.—

(A) The select subcommittee shall be composed of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with not more than 13 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 5 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader. The Speaker shall designate one member of the

select subcommittee as its chair. Any vacancy in the select subcommittee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(B) Each member appointed to the select subcommittee shall be treated as though a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for purposes of the select subcommittee.

(b) INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTIONS AND AUTHORITY.—

(1) INVESTIGATIVE FUNCTIONS.—The select subcommittee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study and, not later than January 2, 2025, issue a final report to the House of its findings (and such interim reports as it may deem necessary) regarding—

(A) the expansive role of article II authority vested in the executive branch to collect information on or otherwise investigate citizens of the United States, including ongoing criminal investigations;

(B) how executive branch agencies work with, obtain information from, and provide information to the private sector, non-profit entities, or other government agencies to facilitate action against American citizens, including the extent, if any, to which illegal or improper, unconstitutional, or unethical activities were engaged in by the executive branch or private sector against citizens of the United States;

(C) how executive branch agencies collect, compile, analyze, use, or disseminate information about citizens of the United States, including any unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical activities committed against citizens of the United States;

(D) the laws, programs, and activities of the executive branch as they relate to the collection of information on citizens of the United States and the sources and methods used for the collection of information on citizens of the United States;

(E) any other issues related to the violation of the civil liberties of citizens of the United States; and

(F) any other matter relating to information collected pursuant to the investigation conducted under this paragraph at any time during the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress.

(2) AUTHORITY.—

(A) The select subcommittee may report to the House or any committee of the House from time to time the results of its investigations and studies, together with such detailed findings and legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable.

(B) Any markup of legislation shall be held at the full Committee level consistent with clause 1(l) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) PROCEDURE.—

(1) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary shall apply to the select subcommittee in the same manner as a subcommittee except as follows:

(A) The chair of the select subcommittee may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, recognize—

(i) members of the select subcommittee to question a witness for periods longer than five minutes as though pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(B) of such rule XI; and

(ii) staff of the select subcommittee to question a witness as though pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(C) of such rule XI.

(B) The Committee on the Judiciary (or the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, if acting in accordance with clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of rule XI) may authorize and issue subpoenas to be returned at the select subcommittee.

(C) With regard to the full scope of investigative authority under subsection (b)(1), the select subcommittee shall be authorized

to receive information available to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, consistent with congressional reporting requirements for intelligence and intelligence-related activities, and any such information received shall be subject to the terms and conditions applicable under clause 11 of rule X.

(2) The provisions of this resolution shall govern the proceedings of the select subcommittee in the event of any conflict with the rules of the House or of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(d) SERVICE.—Service on the select subcommittee shall not count against the limitations in clause 5(b)(2)(A) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) SUCCESSOR.—The Committee on the Judiciary is the “successor in interest” to the select subcommittee for purposes of clause 8(c) of rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(f) SUNSET.—The select subcommittee shall cease to exist 30 days after filing the final report required under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 12, a resolution establishing the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government.

This select subcommittee is modeled on the famous Church Committee, which investigated the American intelligence community in the 1970s and uncovered and exposed a wide variety of abuses, including many directed against American citizens.

Similar to the situation that confronted America in the 1970s, in recent years we have witnessed abuses of the civil liberties of American citizens committed by the executive branch.

The select subcommittee will operate as a select investigative subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and will be tasked with studying and reporting on the executive branch’s authority to collect information on or otherwise investigate citizens of the United States.

It will investigate how executive branch agencies work with and exchange information with the private sector and other government agencies to facilitate action against American citizens; how executive branch agencies collect, compile, analyze, use, or

disseminate information about citizens of the United States; the laws, programs, and activities of the executive branch as they relate to the collection of information on citizens of the United States; and any other issues related to the violation of the civil liberties of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that, in recent years, the executive branch of the Federal Government has abused its authority and violated the civil liberties of American citizens, often for political purposes. There are many examples to point to, ranging from a father being labeled a “domestic terrorist” for confronting a school board over the sexual assault of his daughter, to the Federal Government’s role in suppressing information on Twitter, to the Department of Homeland Security’s plans to create a Disinformation Governance Board, and to the revelations regarding the FBI’s abuse of its Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act authority.

All these examples and many more demonstrate how prevalent such abusive actions have become.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have confidence in their government. They deserve to know that the broad powers granted through the Federal Government to the FBI, to the Department of Homeland Security, and to the intelligence agencies are not being abused. They deserve to know that the executive branch is not positioning itself as the final arbiter of what constitutes truth. They deserve to know that they will not be labeled a domestic terrorist for advocating for their children in front of a school board.

Mr. Speaker, it was Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis who stated that “sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.” At the end of the day, that is the purpose of the select subcommittee. It will bring abuses by the Federal Government into the light for the American people and ensure that Congress, as their elected representatives, can take appropriate action to remedy them.

I have confidence that this select subcommittee will accomplish that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we will consider the creation of a new subcommittee here in the House that Republicans call the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government. I call it the McCarthy committee, and I am not talking about Kevin. I am talking about Joe.

Mr. Speaker, this committee is nothing more than a deranged ploy by the MAGA extremists who have hijacked the Republican Party and now want to use taxpayer money to push their far-right conspiracy nonsense.

Let’s start with the subcommittee’s mandate, which is recklessly broad.

Speaker MCCARTHY is essentially handing Mr. JORDAN the power to target anyone and anything he doesn't like, anything and anyone he deems unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical.

Who decides what is unconstitutional, illegal, or unethical? Mr. JORDAN does.

□ 1330

Why don't we just be blunt here? Republicans claim to care about law enforcement, but this new committee is about attacking law enforcement. It is about going after people. It is about destroying people's careers and lives. It is about undermining the Department of Justice, defunding the police, and settling scores on behalf of the twice-impeached and disgraced former occupant of the Oval Office.

The MAGA extremist fringe of the Republican Party will use this committee to push QAnon conspiracy theories and lies from Truth Social. They are going to use it to gin up fake investigations into nonexistent scandals. I think we need to just start calling this the tinfoil hat committee.

Speaker MCCARTHY even changed the language at the last minute to provide unprecedented authority for the subcommittee to interfere in ongoing criminal investigations.

Let me repeat: The Republican Party, the party that claims to care about law and order, has created a committee not just to defund the police based on their wacky conspiracy theories, but to actually try to shut down ongoing investigations, including into domestic terrorists, phony electors, insurrectionists, people who are on trial for sedition because they tried to overthrow the government, and even disgraced former President Donald Trump.

This is outrageous. We are a country of laws, but this committee seeks to undermine the law, undermine the police, and make a complete mockery of the investigative and oversight powers of the House.

As seen on this week's Sunday shows, some sitting Republicans being investigated right now by the FBI and the Department of Justice want to serve on this committee.

I mean, what? I mean, come on. Give me a break. I know my Republican friends have some ethically challenged members who asked for pardons from the former President, but this is beyond the pale. This is unconscionable. This is a conflict of interest.

First, they gut the Office of Congressional Ethics. Now, they give Members of Congress the ability to investigate and to try to shut down criminal investigations that they are subjects in. One set of rules for the American people, another set of rules for Republican Members of Congress. It is incredibly offensive.

On their first real week in the majority, this is what my Republican friends are pushing through? Not a bill to fight inflation. Not a bill to raise wages for

people. A bill for Republican Members of Congress to shut down investigations into their own wrongdoings. What is wrong with these people?

On top of all of that, this subcommittee expects to use the power of the subpoena to advance their delusional QAnon conspiracy theories and harass Federal law enforcement agents.

I would say it is almost comical if it wasn't so disturbing that Speaker MCCARTHY and Mr. JORDAN refused to comply with bipartisan subpoenas issued by the January 6th Committee. So I guess for them, it is do as I say, not as I do.

In my mind, it speaks volumes that House Republicans are choosing to prioritize this kind of dangerous partisan garbage instead of actually trying to help everyday Americans.

Whatever happened to Republicans' commitment to America? They promised to tackle inflation, end the opioid crisis, reduce the national debt, and more. None of those issues are addressed in their first 12 bills.

In fact, the very first bill they passed last night doesn't reduce the deficit, it adds \$114 billion to the deficit by making it easier for billionaires to cheat on their taxes.

This is where we are week 2 of the 118th Congress, and we are creating a witch-hunt committee where Republicans plan to air their grievances and further incite crazy fringe conspiracy theories from the internet at the taxpayers' expense.

Senator Joseph McCarthy would be very proud of what Republicans are doing today. Putting their own personal power and partisan politics over the needs of the American people. Just like Senator McCarthy looking for imaginary communists, they are going to find QAnon conspiracies everywhere they look because that is what they want to find.

Just like the McCarthy committee, this will become another shameful, disgraceful moment for the Congress of the United States.

This has nothing to do with the rule of law, nothing to do with proper oversight of government. It is simply about revenge. It is about disrupting and destroying rather than collaborating and creating. It is about putting politics over people instead of putting people over politics to build a better future for America.

This subcommittee is an awful idea, and I urge my colleagues, in the strongest possible terms, to vote "no" on this monstrosity that will further empower the extremists at the expense of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is my very good friend and the distinguished incoming chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

A ploy? It is not a ploy when the Department of Justice treats parents as

terrorists; moms and dads who are simply showing up at a school board meeting to advocate for their son or daughter. It is not a ploy when the FBI pays Twitter \$3 million, not 1, not 2, \$3 million to censor American citizens.

It is not a ploy when the Department of Homeland Security tries to set up a disinformation governance board because we all know that the Department of Homeland Security can tell what is good speech and what is bad speech. You have got to be kidding me.

I will tell you what, dozens of whistleblowers who have come and talked to Republican staff on the Judiciary Committee don't think this is a ploy. That is why they came to talk to us. They know how serious this is.

The former Democrat chair of the Judiciary Committee is in the press today saying we are going to fight this tooth and nail. This is political. Meanwhile, the former Democrat chair of the Intelligence Committee pressured Twitter to censor a journalist. You have got to be kidding me.

This is about the First Amendment, something you guys used to care about. I had actually hoped we could get bipartisan agreement on protecting the First Amendment, the five rights we enjoy as Americans under the First Amendment: Your right to practice your faith, your right to assemble, your right to petition the government, freedom of press, freedom of speech. Every single one has been attacked in the last 2 years.

The Government was telling people they couldn't go to church just a few years ago; your right to assemble. Your right to petition the Government. The Democrats kept the Capitol closed. You couldn't, as a citizen, come to your Capitol that you pay for to address your Member of Congress to redress your grievances because NANCY PELOSI wouldn't let you in.

Freedom of the press. I just told you what the head of the Intel Committee tried to do to a journalist. The most important right we have, though, is your right to talk. Because if you can't talk, you can't practice your faith, you can't share your faith, you can't petition your government. The right to speak is the most important, and that is what they are going after. That is why we have had dozens of whistleblowers come talk to us. We want to focus on that because we want it all to stop. We want the double standard to stop. This idea that, oh, if you are a pro-life activist, you are going to get your door kicked in and you are going to get arrested and handcuffed in front of your seven kids and your spouse for simply praying in front of abortion clinic, and telling the guy who was harassing your son to knock it off you are going to have the FBI raid your home; but the protests that went on at Supreme Court Justices' homes in the aftermath of the leak of the Dobbs opinion, oh, no problem there. Americans are sick and tired of it.

We don't want to go after anyone. We just want it to stop. We want to respect

the First Amendment to the Constitution that the greatest country in the world has. That is what this committee is all about, and that is what we are going to focus on. That is what we are going to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "January 6 panel names six House GOP lawmakers who asked for pardons."

[From The Hill, June 23, 2022]

JAN. 6 PANEL NAMES SIX HOUSE GOP  
LAWMAKERS WHO ASKED FOR PARDONS

(By Mychael Schnell and Emily Brooks)

The Jan. 6 committee investigating the attack on the Capitol revealed Thursday that at least a half-dozen Republican lawmakers asked for presidential pardons for their role in voting to overturn election results in certain states on Jan. 6, 2021, according to testimony from former Trump aides.

Testimony from Trump aides named Reps. Matt Gaetz (Fla.), Mo Brooks (Ala.), Louie Gohmert (Texas), Andy Biggs (Ariz.), and Scott Perry (Pa.) as seeking pardons.

An aide also said that Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (Ga.) contacted the White House Counsel's office seeking a pardon.

Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.), a member of the panel who played an elevated role in Thursday's proceedings, presented an email from Brooks, dated Jan. 11, 2021, in which the congressman asked for presidential pardons for himself, Gaetz, and lawmakers who objected to the Electoral College vote for Arizona and Pennsylvania.

"President Trump asked me to send you this letter. This letter is also pursuant to a request from Matt Gaetz," the email reads.

"As such, I recommend that President give general (all purpose) pardons to the following groups of people," the email adds. "Every Congressman and Senator who voted to reject the electoral vote submission of Arizona and Pennsylvania."

A spokesman for Brooks forwarded a full copy of the email, which included a concern that Democrats would "abuse America's judicial system by targeting numerous Republicans with sham charges."

"The email request says it all. There was a concern Democrats would abuse the judicial system by prosecuting and jailing Republicans who acted pursuant to their Constitutional or statutory duties under 3 USC 15," Brooks said in a statement. "Fortunately, with time passage, more rational forces took over and no one was persecuted for performing their lawful duties, which means a pardon was unnecessary after all."

The panel also showed a video of former special assistant to the president Cassidy Hutchinson, saying Gaetz and Brooks "both advocated for there to be a blanket pardon" for members of Congress involved with a meeting that took place on Dec. 21, 2020, presumably the huddle at the White House that focused on overturning the 2020 presidential election.

She also said Gaetz and Brooks advocated for a blanket pardon for "a handful of other members that weren't at the Dec. 21 meeting." Those were meant to be "preemptive pardons," she noted.

Additionally, Hutchinson said "Gaetz was personally pushing for a pardon, and he was doing so since early December," but said she did not know why.

Gaetz reached out to Hutchinson asking for a meeting with Meadows "about receiving a presidential pardon," according to her closed-door testimony presented at Thursday's hearing.

Hutchinson said Biggs, Gohmert and Perry also asked for pardons, but did not reveal more details.

And she said Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), a fierce defender of Trump, "talked about congressional pardons, but he never asked me for one," noting that he was largely inquiring about whether or not the White House was going to grant the lawmaker pardons.

Brooks, Biggs, Perry and Jordan were all issued subpoenas by the select committee in May.

Perry previously denied that he asked for a pardon, and stood by that in light of new testimony.

"I stand by my statement that I never sought a Presidential pardon for myself or other Members of Congress. At no time did I speak with Miss Hutchinson, a White House scheduler, nor any White House staff about a pardon for myself or any other Member of Congress—this never happened," Perry said in a statement.

A spokesman for Perry previously denied that he asked for a pardon, calling it "laughable, ludicrous, and a thoroughly soulless lie."

In a statement Thursday night, Gohmert said he requested pardons for U.S. service members and military contractors—not himself.

He called the claim that he requested a pardon for himself "malicious, despicable and unfit for a U.S. Congressional hearing."

"I requested pardons for brave U.S. service members and military contractors who were railroaded by the justice system due to superiors playing politics, as well as a civilian leader who was also wronged by a despicable injustice," Gohmert said. "These requests were all far prior to, and completely unrelated to January 6."

Biggs also objected to the committee's assertion that he sought a pardon, writing in a statement Thursday night that Hutchinson "is mistaken."

He said the testimony of Hutchinson discussing the pardons was "deceptively edited to make it appear as if I personally asked for her a presidential pardon."

Greene, Hutchinson said, did not contact her directly, but she said she had heard that Greene contacted the White House Counsel's office for a pardon.

Greene pushed back on the testimony in a tweet, but did not directly deny asking for a pardon.

"Saying 'I heard' means you don't know," Greene said. "Spreading gossip and lies is exactly what the January 6th Witch Hunt Committee is all about."

Eric Herschmann, a former Trump White House attorney, was also asked by the Jan. 6 committee in a deposition if Gaetz was seeking a pardon.

"Believe so," Herschmann said in a video presented at the hearing. "The general tone was, 'we may get prosecuted because we were defensive of, you know, the President's positions on these things.'"

Herschmann said that Gaetz's pardon request was "for any and all things," and that Gaetz had mentioned former President Richard Nixon's pardon. Herschmann said that Nixon's pardon was not that broad.

Trump adviser John McEntee also testified that Gaetz told him he asked Meadows for a pardon.

A spokesman for Gaetz responded to testimony about the pardon request by pointing to a tweet from Gaetz calling the committee a "political sideshow."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there were at least six House Members who sought pardons from President Trump following the January 6 insurrection, and many of them would like to be on this committee, we are told.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which appears designed to launch a dangerous and unprecedented attack on our law enforcement agencies.

Last week, Americans across the country watched the Republican Party melt down the moment it encountered its first test. For days, the extremist wing of the party held the rest of their caucus hostage as they demanded a steep price for their support. Today, we have the first of their many demands on display, an open-ended investigation into whatever conspiracy theories may be headlining the rightwing echo chamber at the moment, with unchecked authority to undermine ongoing criminal and intelligence investigations.

For example, the select committee can use its expansive authorities to protect Donald Trump, those who perpetrated fake elector schemes to overturn the 2020 Presidential election, insurrectionists facing trials for their crimes, and other domestic terrorists.

It aims to undermine the safeguards of our democracy and to embolden MAGA extremists who would rather see our institutions fail than to see Democrats and President Biden succeed.

Make no mistake, the destroy democracy subcommittee will enable the House Republicans to interfere with the free operation of businesses they do not like, to inhibit the fight against domestic terrorism, and to settle political scores on behalf of Donald Trump.

The Judiciary Committee has serious work to do. But rather than trying to solve the problems of the American people, this new subcommittee will expend untold time and money undermining our Nation's law enforcement agencies, our justice system and our intelligence community, all for a political stunt catering to the extremist wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), my very good friend, the incoming chairman of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the creation of the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government exists to serve the American people, administer the law impartially, and protect our cherished freedoms enshrined in the Constitution.

However, some unelected, unaccountable Federal bureaucrats have abused their positions of power. The other side of the aisle likes to talk about "threats to democracy," but they refuse to do any congressional oversight as the Federal Government weaponized its authority, influence, and power to target American groups and citizens based on their political and ideological views.

Just yesterday, we learned that classified documents from Joe Biden's time

as Vice President were stashed in an unsecured closet. The National Archives knew about these documents several months ago, before the election, but the American people were just informed yesterday, thanks to some investigative reporting.

Meanwhile, the FBI conducted a raid on former President Trump's Mar-a-Lago residence for the same violation. Why has President Biden, who has repeatedly kept classified materials in an unsecured location for years, never faced a raid? Is it because we have a two-tier system of justice?

The left also continues to push for an expanded IRS, even though the agency has a history of targeting conservative political groups. They have pushed for more audits of middle-class Americans instead of better customer service. In another example, at President Biden's direction, the Department of Homeland Security formed a dystopian disinformation board tasked with policing American speech online.

While this board has been disbanded, we continue to learn more almost every day about how the Biden administration pressures big tech to censor and oppress Americans' views online that are contrary to their political narrative.

The Biden administration's Justice Department also actively targeted parents concerned about woke curricula in their children's schools and labeled many as domestic terrorists. The American people have made it clear that they want accountability for these abuses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, we cannot delay accountability any longer. We need to get to work now. We must expose the abuses committed by the unelected, unaccountable Federal bureaucracy and enact solutions to prevent similar abuses from happening in the future.

I look forward, as chairman of the House Oversight Committee, to work closely with this new select committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a CNN article titled: "There are clear distinctions between Trump and Biden's two cases."

[From CNN Politics, Jan. 10, 2023]

THERE ARE CLEAR DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN TRUMP AND BIDEN'S TWO CASES

(By Stephen Collinson)

Republicans seized on revelations that several classified documents from Joe Biden's time as vice president were found in his former private office to create cover for former President Donald Trump's hoarding of secret records.

The disclosures Monday about the material found last fall spun up an immediate political storm at a time when Trump is in increasing legal peril. The new GOP House majority is meanwhile rushing to undermine investigations against him and unleashing a wave of counter investigations against the current president.

But there are clear distinctions between the two cases.

The new controversy so far appears to be on a smaller scale than the more than 100 classified documents—some bearing the highest designations of government secrecy—taken from Trump's resort at Mar-a-Lago after a court-approved search by FBI agents. And Biden appears to be cooperating with the National Archives and the Justice Department in a way that Trump failed to do and unlike the former president he is not being investigated for possible obstruction of justice.

But Trump, who brands attempts to make him face accountability for his conduct in office and afterward as political victimization, sought to capitalize on Biden's discomfort over the documents in a post on his Truth Social network.

"When is the FBI going to raid the many homes of Joe Biden, perhaps even the White House? These documents were definitely not declassified," he wrote.

New House Oversight Chairman James Comer told CNN: "This is (a) further concern that there is a two-tiered justice system."

New House Speaker Kevin McCarthy also moved quickly to respond to the discovery of the documents in an office used by Biden after he left the vice presidency.

"Oh, really? They just now found them after all these years," he told CNN. "What has he said about the other president having classified documents?"

Attorney General Merrick Garland has asked the US attorney in Chicago to review the material, some of which bore the marking "sensitive compartmentalized information"—showing that it came from intelligence sources.

#### QUESTIONS BIDEN MUST FACE

Fairness and respect for the law dictate that Biden should answer many of the same questions that Trump is facing, regarding whether he was entitled to the records, why they were not previously turned over, whether they were securely stored and how they ended up in his office in the first place.

Critics will also wonder why Biden didn't immediately disclose the discovery of less than a dozen documents last fall to the public, given the huge sensitivity of the Justice Department probe of Trump on a similar question. And the president will be sure to face accusations of hypocrisy given his sharp criticisms that Trump did not take the proper steps to secure classified documents at Mar-a-Lago.

Still, even if there are adequate answers to these issues, any distinctions in the severity of the Biden and Trump documents will be obliterated in the political torrent that is already stirring and with conservative media likely to draw false equivalencies between the two cases.

The report offers an immediate opening for Trump as he seeks to dodge culpability for his behavior and claims he's a victim of persecution to thwart his 2024 campaign. The former president is a master at turning one incident into an entire campaign narrative—as he did with former Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton's emails in 2016.

And the report will give the new Republican House majority fresh material as it unleashes a multi-front investigative assault against the White House. And while there so far appear to be clear differences in the magnitude of the cases, the report—first carried by CBS—about Biden will inevitably raise political pressure on Special Counsel Jack Smith's investigation into Trump's retention of classified material.

Smith is also now reaching even deeper into the ex-president's inner circle by subpoenaing his former lawyer Rudy Giuliani as

part of a federal grand jury probe looking at Trump's fund raising, among other issues related to the 2020 election.

#### GARLAND'S DILEMMA

The Biden document disclosures will also deepen the already intense political headache facing Garland as he contemplates an eventual decision on whether to charge Trump, whose status as an ex-president and an active 2024 candidate carries huge political implications.

Garland insists that investigations will go where the evidence and the law demands as he seeks to stress the independence of the Justice Department—which was perpetually in question when Trump was president. But now, inevitably and however the Biden vice presidential documents issue is resolved, a decision to charge Trump over the classified documents case but not to take the same action against Biden would incite political uproar among conservatives who would be sure to allege double standards.

The former president's legal team issued a temperate response to the Biden report that sought to broaden openings that could shield their client. One lawyer said that the Biden story was "indicative of a larger problem with trying to keep track of classified information in the offices of the President and the VP. There is an over classification problem, and at the end of an Administration, things get packed up and moved and it's hard to keep track."

The lawyer also warned that if Trump were to be charged, his representatives would demand all communications between the National Archives and Biden's team on the matter.

#### THE BIDEN DISCOVERY

Biden's attorneys found the documents in a locked closet in a private office in Washington the future president used as a visiting professor with the University of Pennsylvania. The White House Counsel's office notified the National Archives and officials at the agency took control of the documents the morning after they were found. Biden wasn't aware the documents were in the office until his personal lawyers reported their existence and remains in the dark of the content of the material, a source familiar with the matter told CNN. Federal office holders are required by law to relinquish official documents and classified documents when their government service ends.

Unlike in Trump's case, Biden doesn't appear to have tried to assert ownership of the files, to obstruct their handover or make outlandish claims that he had previously declassified them based on an undisclosed private thought.

Trump is being investigated by Smith to see whether he infringed the Espionage Act by keeping classified material and for the possible obstruction of justice.

#### REPUBLICANS MUSTER FOR INVESTIGATIVE ASSAULT ON WHITE HOUSE

The Biden documents case will intensify the showdown already emerging between the new Republican House majority and the White House.

For two years, Trump has been rocked by blow-after-blow from congressional and criminal probes over his conduct during and after his presidency that have nudged him ever closer to accountability.

But help is on the way.

The new Republican majority in the House is ready to unleash a vast investigative machine apparently designed to discredit and distract from Trump's alleged transgressions and to wound Biden's nascent reelection race.

Such an offensive was always coming, given the extent to which the deeply conservative House GOP remains in thrall to the



ex-president. But the intensity, scope and financial muscle of the investigations was bolstered by the concessions offered by McCarthy as he caved to right-wing hardliners in order to win his speakership last week. And it represents a fast-expanding challenge for the White House, which has already spent months preparing its defense.

A new House rules package passed on Monday for instance will set up probes into alleged political bias in agencies like the FBI and the Justice Department and what Republicans see as political weaponization of such agencies.

The move cements the GOP's sharp turn away from the FBI, once seen as one of the most conservative agencies in the US government following Trump's repeated claims he was illegally targeted by investigations and his failure to enlist the bureau as a weapon to advance his political grievances.

Rigorous scrutiny and oversight are inevitable and desirable as part of the constitutional duty of Congress and responsibility to ensure accountability with taxpayer money. And in the first two years of the Biden administration, there are multiple questions that merit further investigation and over which the public deserves more clarity.

This includes the chaotic management of the withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2021, the way that Covid-19 mitigation funds were spent or the administration's unwillingness at least until recently to consider the rising numbers of migrants crossing the southern border as a crisis. Proper oversight can avoid the repeat of errors and inform better policy in future.

But as always in Congress, there are questions over when genuine oversight stops and hyper-partisan politically motivated witch hunts begin, especially in the case of key Republicans who have a long record of crossing over the line.

Incoming House Judiciary Chairman Rep Jim Jordan, for instance, was a leading player in a previous investigation by a GOP House into the death of US ambassador to Libya Chris Stevens and three other Americans who were killed by Islamic militants in Benghazi in 2012.

The two-year GOP-run House probe found a perfect storm of bureaucratic inertia, rapidly worsening security in Libya and inadequate resources led up to the killings. But Jordan was not satisfied when the final report did not bear out conservative attacks on the conduct of Hillary Clinton—who was Secretary of State at the time of the deaths.

The Ohio lawmaker released his own far more critical report, along with then Rep. Mike Pompeo, who later became Secretary of State himself. And at the time, McCarthy boasted that the investigation harmed Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign, apparently revealing partisan motivations behind the probe.

As well as the building storm over classified documents, a key focus of the new GOP House majority will be to investigate the House Select Committee in the previous Democratic-run House that painted a damning picture of Trump's behavior following the 2020 election and before the Capitol insurrection.

The fact that many of the current members of the House voted to deny certification of Biden's election victory based on lies about electoral fraud Trump was using to try to steal power underscores why many observers are raising new questions about the partisan nature of Republican investigations.

But after the revelations about documents found in Biden's office, Republicans know a political gift when they see it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the difference is clear. Unlike in Trump's case, Biden doesn't appear to have tried to assert ownership of the files to obstruct their handover or make unhinged claims that he had previously declassified them through his thinking. Trump is being investigated to see whether he infringed the Espionage Act by keeping classified material and for the possible obstruction of justice.

I would just say to my colleague who spoke before, the American people also have expectations of elected officials, such as respecting the Constitution and respecting free and fair elections and not trying to overturn free and fair elections. Unfortunately, a majority of my friends on the other side of the aisle chose to ignore that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

□ 1345

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make something crystal clear: The primary purpose of this special subcommittee is to interfere with the special counsel's ongoing investigation into a conspiracy to overturn the 2020 election.

This is a shocking abuse of power, but it is not just the usual efforts by Members on the other side of the aisle to, once again, do Donald Trump's dirty work. This time they are trying to protect themselves.

One of them, a Member from Pennsylvania, had his cell phone seized pursuant to a court order finding probable cause that he committed a crime. Yet, he has indicated that he wants to be on this subcommittee so that he can undermine a criminal investigation into himself.

My Republican counterparts can dress up the subcommittee with a menacing name, but let's call it what it really is: the Republican committee to obstruct justice.

The American people don't want that. They don't want yet another front of the Republican war on democracy and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" and urge everyone to do so.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), my very good friend and the distinguished incoming chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, I served as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. Chairman JORDAN and I have already been working to ensure that the intelligence community and the Department of Justice, including the FBI, are not violating the civil rights of law-abiding Americans.

Sadly, we already have very troubling evidence to begin our investigation to ensure that our intelligence community and law enforcement agencies are not violating Americans' constitutional rights. Some of this information is similar to what has been

publicly disclosed by the Twitter files, which is a small portion of the information that we have that is gravely concerning about the improper use of government authority that this committee will be focusing on.

This subcommittee is about protecting rights, a task that everyone in this body just took an oath to protect last week. Our committee will be assisting this subcommittee. We look forward to working with Chairman JORDAN on this important issue, and we know that this is important to the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Guardian titled: "It's going to be dirty": Republicans gear up for attack on Hunter Biden," and an article from Politico titled: "It's not just Hunter Biden: Prepare for a 2023 packed with House GOP investigations."

[From the Guardian, Jan. 8, 2023]

'IT'S GOING TO BE DIRTY': REPUBLICANS GEAR UP FOR ATTACK ON HUNTER BIDEN

(By David Smith)

When Borat—alias British actor Sacha Baron Cohen—told risqué jokes about Donald Trump and antisemitism at last month's Kennedy Center Honors in Washington, Joe Biden was not the only one laughing in a red velvet-lined balcony.

Sitting behind the US president was Hunter Biden wearing black tie and broad smile that mirrored those of his father.

The image captured the intimacy between the men but also the sometimes awkward status of Hunter as both private citizen and privileged son of a president. It is a dichotomy likely to come under a harsh public glare this year as congressional Republicans set about making Hunter a household name and staple of the news cycle.

"The right wing is licking its chops at the chance to go after him," said Joshua Kendall, author of *First Dads: Parenting and Politics from George Washington to Barack Obama*. "The level of venom is going to be over the top and really, really dirty. The Republicans' rhetoric might get so heated that it detracts from some of the actual behaviour."

Republicans have been waiting a long time for this moment. After regaining control of the House of Representatives in last November's midterm elections, they used their first press conference to promise to investigate the Biden administration and, in particular, the president's allegedly errant son.

Hunter has long faced questions about whether he traded on his father's political career for profit, including efforts to strike deals in China and reported references in his emails to the "big guy".

Hunter joined the board of the Ukrainian gas company Burisma in 2014, around the time that Joe Biden, then vice-president, was helping conduct Barack Obama's foreign policy with Ukraine. Hunter earned more than \$50,000 a month over a five-year period.

Senate Republicans claim that his appointment may have posed a conflict of interest. Last year more than 30 of them called for a prosecutor to be given special counsel authority to carry out an investigation into alleged "tax fraud, money laundering, and foreign-lobbying violations". But they have not produced evidence that it influenced US policy or that Joe Biden engaged in wrongdoing.

House Republicans and their staff have been studying messages and financial transactions found on a now notorious laptop that

belonged to Hunter. Having gained the majority, they now have the power to issue congressional subpoenas to foreign entities that did business with him.

Richard Painter, who was chief White House ethics lawyer in the George W. Bush administration, believes that Joe Biden should have recused himself from matters relating to Ukraine. “The Ukrainian gas company wanted to curry favour with Joe Biden so they put his son on the board,” he said.

“It’s pretty clear what’s going on there but the missing link the Republicans are looking for—but I don’t think they’re going to find—is any kind of a quid pro quo, Joe Biden for the Ukrainian gas company. Still, it would have been better if Joe Biden had said: ‘Look, my son is going to be on this board, maybe the secretary of state or somebody else could handle Ukraine,’ and he’d step aside.”

Hunter’s taxes and foreign business work are already under federal investigation with a grand jury in Delaware hearing testimony in recent months. There are no indications that this involves the president, who insists that he has never spoken to Hunter about his foreign business arrangements.

Republicans are pulling at another strand. Ethics experts have accused Hunter of cashing in on his father’s name as he pursues a career as an artist. He is represented by the Georges Bergès Gallery in New York, which reportedly struck an agreement with the White House to set the prices of the art and not reveal who bid on or bought it.

Bergès said in an Instagram post in November that Republicans on the House oversight committee had written to him with “certain requests” and subsequently got into a Twitter debate with Painter about money and influence in art. Bergès wrote: “If you’re going to scrutinize a profession then scrutinize all of them and every position that children of Congress take in DC and elsewhere.”

Painter said in an interview: “I don’t think there’s anything corrupt about the White House or anything corrupt about President Biden. But keeping the identities of the art buyers secret was a bad idea. It leads to suspicion that people are passing money under the table. It’s hard to keep who buys the art secret in the close-knit world of Hunter Biden’s friends or Hunter Biden himself so the secrecy was a bad idea.”

Fox News and other rightwing media may relish an opportunity to demonise the president’s son ahead of an election in 2024. But Republicans are in danger of overreach. Trump’s attempt to get Ukraine to examine Hunter’s business dealings led to his first impeachment. His efforts to weaponise Hunter’s troubles in the 2020 presidential election fizzled.

David Brock, a veteran political operative and president of Facts First USA, a new group set up to combat the congressional investigations, said: “What we’re going to see in the hearings is a recycling and a rehash of old discredited stories and conspiracy theories. They’re doing it for political reasons. [Congressman] Jim Jordan is on the record saying that the investigations are all about 2024 and electing Donald Trump again. That’s his own words, not mine.”

Hunter’s 2021 memoir, *Beautiful Things*, generated sympathy in some quarters for a man who 50 years ago last month survived a car crash that killed his mother and sister and who has been honest about his struggle with alcoholism and drug abuse. Brock believes that a fresh Republican onslaught will backfire.

“Going after someone who has an addiction and has had mental health issues is sadistic politics and I don’t think it will work with the American people,” he added. “There are so many people who have family mem-

bers who’ve suffered in one way or another and will identify with Hunter; they won’t identify with the attackers. The Hunter-hating narrative has been out there for three years. It hasn’t really gained any traction outside of the far right and I don’t think it will.”

Republicans could also lose credibility by focusing on Hunter and other retreats of the past instead of advancing a plan for domestic issues such as inflation, jobs and taxes.

Kurt Bardella, a Democratic strategist who served as a senior adviser for Republicans on the House oversight committee from 2009 to 2013, said: “For all the talk about Republicans saying they want to return to regular order, they want to have better stewardship over taxpayer dollars, they want to act more responsibly with legislative power, well, OK, but how does investigating Hunter Biden do anything to help the American people?”

[From Politico, July 19, 2022]

IT’S NOT JUST HUNTER BIDEN: PREPARE FOR A 2023 PACKED WITH HOUSE GOP INVESTIGATIONS  
(By Jordain Carney)

House Republicans are planning to bombard Joe Biden’s administration with investigations next year, from Hunter Biden to the border to the chaotic U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan.

As the GOP prepares for a likely takeover of the chamber next year, committee chairs-in-waiting have laid out a lengthy list of oversight goals that goes beyond Biden’s White House—including Democrats’ formation of the Jan. 6 select committee. But the party’s highest-profile targets are those with the potential to politically bruise the president ahead of 2024: his son’s business dealings, Afghanistan, the origins of the coronavirus, inflation causes and the U.S.–Mexico border.

Months before the midterms, Republican lawmakers are already working behind the scenes to divvy up which committee gets which piece of the investigative action next year. That includes talks with Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy and other conference leaders, plus member-on-member discussions.

“I’ve been really impressed with leadership—both from [Rep.] Jim [Jordan], from [Rep.] Jamie Comer, from Kevin’s office—in already starting to talk about that,” said Rep. Kelly Armstrong (R–N.D.).

Republicans view executive-branch oversight as a significant piece of their 2023 agenda, driven in part by the reality that divided government would leave no path for most of their legislative priorities. Investigations also give the House GOP high-profile chances to lob subpoenas and tough questions at Biden officials heading into 2024, when it hopes to take the Senate and White House too.

Republicans still need to nail down the timelines and other specifics for each investigation, but they’ve already taken initial steps such as document preservation requests. Those have already hit the Jan. 6 panel, administration officials involved in the Afghanistan withdrawal and Twitter over its legally challenged sale to Elon Musk, among other recipients.

After four years in the House minority, Republicans have a backlogged wish list of topics to dig into. Their real challenge, GOP lawmakers predict, won’t be finding areas to investigate but rather winnowing down their focus.

“It’s not something where we’re having to drum up, ‘OK, what are we going to do?’ It’s more of a limiting factor of, we only have 50 weeks a year,” said Rep. Michael Cloud (R–Texas).

Much of the investigative churn will spin out of the Oversight Committee, a legislative octopus with jurisdictional tentacles that can reach into several parts of the administration.

Jamie Comer, the Kentucky Republican who is expected to lead the panel should Republicans take the majority, said that he was trying to lay the groundwork now so that he and his members could start right away in January.

Republicans on the committee plan to hold high-profile probes into Hunter Biden’s dealings with overseas clients, but they also want to hone in on eliminating wasteful government spending in an effort to align the panel with the GOP’s broader agenda. They’re also expected to probe the infant formula shortage and the Food and Drug Administration, which regulates formula.

“We’re going to spend a lot of time in the first three, four months having investigation hearings and then we’re going to be very active in the subcommittee process, focused on substantive waste, fraud and abuse type issues. . . . I’m going to bring the Oversight Committee back to what its original intent was,” Comer said in a brief interview.

Comer said he’s already having conversations with the expected chairs of other committees to avoid duplicating investigative work, adding that his panel is “so broad, sometimes you ruffle feathers with other chairs.”

The U.S.–Mexico border, for example, is expected to be a hot point for several committees.

Jim Jordan, the Ohio Republican and House Freedom Caucus founding member who is line to chair the Judiciary Committee, immediately pointed to Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas and the border as a focus for his panel in 2023.

“We certainly need to dig into more of the terrible way Mayorkas has run—I think intentionally—the way he has the Department of Homeland Security,” Jordan said.

Jordan pointed to two potential areas he wanted to probe: border enforcement and the creation of a DHS “disinformation” board, which the department subsequently paused after a flood of GOP criticism. Jordan has also been communicating with Senate Republicans who are brainstorming their own investigative plans if they are able to flip the upper chamber this fall.

Republicans are still sorting out how they will probe the Jan. 6 panel and Capitol security, an area of particular interest within the conference. Illinois Rep. Rodney Davis, the current top Republican on the House Administration Committee, had pledged to use his panel as an investigative springboard into the select committee next year but recently lost his primary to Rep. Mary Miller (R–Ill.).

And some conservatives in the conference are pushing for investigations into debunked 2020 election fraud claims, underscoring how embedded former President Donald Trump’s baseless claims to that end have become within the party.

Beyond the headline-grabbing probes, Republicans are prepping more bread-and-butter oversight hearings that will give nearly every committee a pathway to dive into government agencies.

“Oversight is going to be significant. And we’ll have significant oversight of the Securities and Exchange Commission, as well as the [Consumer Financial Protection Bureau],” said Rep. Patrick McHenry (R–N.C.), who hopes to chair the Financial Services Committee.

And while Republicans’ legislative dreams would have to clear a high bar—given Biden’s ability to veto anything for the next two years—they see their oversight goals

dovetailing with their legislative agenda, giving them another lane to pressure Biden and congressional Democrats. Investigations have a longer political half-life, spanning weeks and months beyond a one-time floor vote.

Armstrong pointed to a border security and immigration reform bill, a decades-long legislative white whale, as a springboard for Republicans holding oversight hearings on related areas like fentanyl—potentially building pressure on Democrats heading into 2024.

“If you can’t get to 60 in the Senate, you can make it a real issue . . . going into the next election,” he said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, Mr. JORDAN will use this subcommittee to go after people MAGA extremists see as their opponents. All the MAGA Republicans seem to want to do is create a forum for settling scores and pushing conspiracy theories. They are not interested in governing.

They want to go on FOX. They want to investigate Hunter Biden’s laptop. They want to try to steal elections. They want to shut down the government if they don’t get their way.

We are at a very dangerous moment in this country, and it is one of the reasons why many of us were so stunned that the new Speaker gave away so much of his authority to a group of extremists in the Republican Conference who have spent their entire careers trying to blow this place up.

The bottom line is this committee is basically an assurance that we are going to see these very partisan, political, MAGA-driven investigations go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

As Ranking Member NADLER from the Judiciary Committee said, H. Res. 12 is a dangerous government attempt to interject extremist politics into our justice system and shield MAGA extremists from legal consequences for their actions, including January 6 and the follow-up and investigations that are ongoing now. He is right about that Republican strategy. H. Res. 12 is both political cover and a political weapon.

Like any legislation, H. Res. 12 is driven by the motivation of its sponsors, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives. For example, legislative action on climate change is motivated by urgency and our collective health and life, but H. Res. 12 is intended to intimidate, scare, and ultimately cower our public institutions into standing down as our descent into division and fascism continues.

Power for the sake of power is truly dangerous. H. Res. 12 is just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), my very good friend and a distinguished veteran who served the United States in a variety of capacities, in and out of uniform.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a select committee to investigate the weaponization of the Federal Government, something I have a lot of experience with firsthand.

I proudly served as the 52nd Secretary of the Interior. Despite the deep state’s repeated attempts to stop me, I stand before you as a duly elected Member of the United States Congress and tell you that a deep state exists and is perhaps the strongest covert weapon the left has against the American people.

There is no doubt the Federal Government deep state coordinates with liberal activists and uses politicians and willing media to carry their water.

The deep state runs secret messaging campaigns with one goal in mind: to increase its power to censor and persuade the American people.

Dark money groups funded by liberal billionaires and foreign investors funnel money to shell organizations and repeatedly attempt to destroy the American West. In many cases, they want to wipe out the American cowboy completely, remove public access to our lands, and turn Montana into a national park. They want to control our land and our lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two parts of a five-part series of investigative articles by the Capital Research Center titled: “Arabella’s Long War: Web of ‘Pop-Up’ Groups” and “Arabella’s Long War: ‘Keep it in the Ground.’”

[From the Capital Research Center, Nov. 12, 2021]

ARABELLA’S LONG WAR: WEB OF “POP-UP” GROUPS—HOW LEFTIST “DARK MONEY” ACTIVISTS BROUGHT DOWN TRUMP’S SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR AND PAVED THE WAY FOR BIDEN’S RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISTS

(By Hayden Ludmig)

A WEB OF “POP-UP” GROUPS

Enter Arabella Advisors, a consulting firm based in Washington, DC, that quietly runs arguably the most powerful activist and lobbying network in politics. Arabella manages four in-house nonprofits collectively called the “sisters,” each of which controls a small army of activists and a legion of “pop-up” groups. And each pop-up group is made to look like a slick, stand-alone website. These pop-ups target virtually every issue in politics—control of the courts, abortion access, gun control, and voter registration and mobilization, even the Trump-Russia collusion hoax—pushing left-wing policies in every corner. What makes Arabella so powerful is how these “pop-ups” deceive individuals into believing they represent genuine local grassroots interests, such as one pop-up in Alaska created to oppose creation of the Pebble Mine run from Arabella’s plush offices in DC.

Arabella’s network is extraordinarily well-funded. In 2019 alone, the four “sisters” reported total revenues exceeding \$730 million and poured out \$648 million. Between the network’s creation in 2006 and its Form 990 filing for 2019 (the latest available), Arabella’s empire has received more than \$3 billion and spent nearly \$2.5 billion. Most of that funding was directed to the network’s flagship 501(c)(3) nonprofit, the New Venture Fund, whose largest known donors include the Gates, Ford, Hewlett, Packard, and Buffett Foundations.

Beginning in 2017, Arabella turned its guns on Trump’s Department of the Interior using a pop-up pair: Western Values Project (WVP) and its “sister,” Western Values Project Action (WVPA).

According to their websites, WVP and WVPA were created in 2013 in Helena, Montana, to expose corrupt corporate lobbyists preying on public lands in the West. In reality, WVP is run by the 501(c)(3) New Venture Fund while WVPA is run by the 501(c)(4) Sixteen Thirty Fund, Arabella’s in-house lobbying shop. Whatever staff the groups actually have would have been paid by one of Arabella’s nonprofits or possibly by Arabella Advisors itself; we’ll likely never know. But in its 2018 Form 990, New Venture Fund revealed that it is the “paymaster” for Sixteen Thirty Fund (which reported zero employees on its own 2018 Form 990) and “pays the salary and immediately invoices Sixteen Thirty Fund, which reimburses the full amount.”

It’s common for groups to use both kinds of nonprofit to maximize their ability to lobby through the 501(c)(4) and raise non-lobbying funds through the 501(c)(3), since donors may deduct donations to the 501(c)(3) from their taxes. But Arabella takes that tactic to another level, using pop-up fronts for its nonprofits that can take advantage of the New Venture and Sixteen Thirty Fund’s respective tax advantages without disclosing their relationship to one another. Donations to WVP and WVPA in fact benefitted the Arabella-run nonprofits behind the projects, as an archived version of WVP’s website from October 2019 reveals.

Until late 2019 the website for WVP and WVPA revealed a handful of staffers, including Chris Saeger, ex-communications director for the Montana Democratic Party and former Service Employees International Union (SEIU) staffer; Jayson O’Neill, a Democratic staffer for Montana’s legislature and Gov. Brian Schweitzer (D); and Yetta Stein, a staffer for the left-wing political action committee End Citizens United and staffer for the 2018 reelection campaign Sen. Jon Tester (D-MT). The archived website also showed a small advisory board consisting of:

Kjersten Forseth, a former chief of state for Colorado State Senate Democrats, former director of the left-wing strategy group ProgressNow Colorado, political director for the Colorado AFL-CIO, and chief political strategist for Rocky Mountain Voter Outreach, a Denver-based get-out-the-vote and ballot initiative firm.

Kent Salazar, an environmental health manager for Albuquerque, New Mexico, former New Mexico State game commissioner for Gov. Bill Richardson (D), and a board member for the left-wing National Wildlife Federation.

Pat Smith, a lawyer representing Indian tribes in Montana, member of the 2010 Montana Redistricting Commission, and appointee of Montana Gov. Steve Bullock (D) to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

WVP’s advisory board also included Caroline Ciccone, who in 2019 was executive director of the New Venture Fund pop-up and anti-Trump “oversight” group Restore Public Trust. Ciccone is a former communications director for the Democratic National Committee (DNC), Obama appointee to the U.S. Small Business Administration, and Democratic strategist. From 2014 to 2017 she led Americans United for Change (AUFCh), a top left-wing strategy group whose national field director Scott Foval was recorded in late 2016 by undercover journalists from Project Veritas bragging that AUFCh had paid mentally ill and homeless people to instigate violence at Trump campaign rallies. “We know that Trump’s people will [tend to]



freak the f— out,” Foval said in the video. “It is not hard to get some of these a----- to ‘pop off.’” The scandal ultimately led back to Robert Creamer, co-founder of the powerful consulting firm Democracy Partners and a former general consultant to AUFEC who directed parts of a vast network of advocacy groups all aligned in support of Hillary Clinton’s presidential bid. This led to speculation that his firm helped Clinton’s campaign violate collusion laws. Foval described Creamer’s role in the scandal as the “kingpin” who is “diabolical, and I love him for it.” Within days of the video’s release Creamer resigned, and Foval was fired.

Also present was Kyle Herrig, a New Venture Fund board member who sat on the advisory boards of at least five New Venture Fund projects, including American Oversight, a judicial activist and litigation group; Allied Progress, which attacked Trump cabinet officials; and the Ciccone-run Restore Public Trust.

In early 2020 it was announced that Western Values Project and these three Arabella “pop-ups” were being rolled into a new organization: Accountable.US, itself a former New Venture Fund project fully established as an independent nonprofit sometime later that year, headed by president Kyle Herrig and executive director Caroline Ciccone. (It appears that Western Values Project Action remains a project of Sixteen Thirty Fund, but that remains unclear as of writing.)

This reveals that Western Values Project, far from being a grassroots group, is enmeshed in a deeply networked, highly coordinated cabal of professional activists—and it always was.

[From the Capital Research Center, Nov. 12, 2021]

ARABELLA’S LONG WAR: “KEEP IT IN THE GROUND”—HOW LEFTIST “DARK MONEY” ACTIVISTS BROUGHT DOWN TRUMP’S SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR AND PAVED THE WAY FOR BIDEN’S RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISTS

(By Hayden Ludwig)

Summary: For years “dark money” activists ran a coordinated campaign to sabotage and undermine the Trump administration from the offices of Arabella Advisors in Washington, DC. The campaign culminated in the most extreme environmentalist regime in American history under President Joseph Biden. This report goes inside that campaign to destroy Trump’s Department of the Interior and promote the Left’s war on affordable energy.

In 2019, the Capital Research Center’s groundbreaking report on Arabella Advisors exposed the half-billion-dollar network for the first time, dragging Arabella into the limelight as the posterchild of the Left’s “dark money.” Since then we’ve continued to uncover this now \$730 million activist empire, tracing its shadowy campaigns on everything from abortion on demand to packing the Supreme Court to its war on the Trump administration.

This report on the Arabella network examines the professional Left’s years-long campaign to undermine President Donald Trump’s Department of the Interior, laying the groundwork for the Biden administration’s crusade against oil and the most radical environmentalist policies in American history.

“KEEP IT IN THE GROUND”

The U.S. Department of the Interior is primarily responsible for managing roughly 450 million acres of federal land and conservation of their natural resources, most critically the nation’s vast reserves of oil and natural gas. It manages hundreds of dams

and reservoirs, regulates drilling on public lands, runs the National Park Service, and maintains public monuments, including dozens attacked by radical Black Lives Matter activists in 2020.

The department also plays a role in foreign diplomacy and national security. Under President Trump that included international wildlife trafficking bans, encouraging trade of precious metals and rare earths, and promoting his Indo-Pacific security and economic strategy.

But the department’s openness to expanding oil and gas production brought the sharpest attacks from the Left. Since the department is entirely under the president’s purview, halting all drilling on public land is far easier than attempting to halt private oil and gas production nationwide—the radical Left’s ultimate goal.

“The natural place to start phasing out supply is on our public lands and oceans where a ban on new leasing will keep up to 450 billion tons of carbon pollution in the ground,” Center for Biological Diversity director Kieran Suckling said in 2015. Bill McKibben, founder of the ultra-leftist 350.org, has also stated that “public lands are one of the easiest places for us to control the flow of carbon into the atmosphere.”

Unsurprisingly, that’s been the policy of Democratic presidents and their activist allies for years. President Barack Obama canceled lease sales in the Arctic and Atlantic offshore sites and banned the leasing of coal on federal lands. Phasing down “extraction of fossil fuels from our public lands” was in the Democratic Party’s 2016 platform. That same year a 350.org activist asked Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton what she meant by “extraction on public lands is a done deal?” Clinton replied, “That’s where [President Obama] is moving: No future extraction. I agree with that.” Her running mate, Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine, later assured another 350.org activist that “I actually am now in that position.”

But even “phasing down” is too conservative for today’s “keep it in the ground” Left. No less than 20 Democratic presidential hopefuls vowed to ban drilling on public lands outright during their party’s 2020 primary. Ever the pawn of the radical Left, on January 27, 2021—exactly one week after his inauguration—President Biden indefinitely suspended development of new oil and gas wells on public lands, which the left-leaning San Francisco Chronicle cheered as “a first step to halting the granting of federal drilling leases permanently.”

Why does this matter? Federal lands account for roughly 24 percent of America’s oil, natural gas, and coal production. In 2019, total crude oil production reached an all-time high of 4.471 billion barrels, with a significant chunk of that growth coming from oil drilled on federal lands. Biden’s ban blocks future development of these key resources, removing them from the supply stream and hampering the energy independence the United States struggled to achieve in recent years. This means higher gasoline and household electricity prices, an estimated \$11.3 billion in lost federal royalties and rental fees, and the destruction of hundreds of thousands of jobs across the economy.

With a single executive order, the Left could advance its crusade to “keep it in the ground” for years in the name of global warming. The stakes couldn’t be higher—all that stood in its way was the Trump administration.

Mr. ZINKE. We all knew politics was ugly, but we need to investigate and uncover corruption no matter where it lies. It is time to bring light to the

shadows of the deep state and do our duty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this critical piece of oversight investigations.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, here is a curious thing. The legislation that creates this select committee, we were first given this on January 2. Then, it changed on January 6, and we didn’t get that until 10 p.m. on January 6, after 13 Speaker votes.

What changed in this legislation—and this is really curious—is they expanded the select committee’s authority to investigate ongoing criminal investigations—think about that—in an unprecedented way.

I don’t know how many votes that got, but clearly, it was important enough because we went through 13 Speaker votes before we got to this.

The reason why this is included, and I am sad to say this, is because we have Members in this Chamber who themselves may be subjects of investigation. There are ongoing investigations against the former President. So, this was added.

Why was this added? To try to frustrate those investigations.

When we talk about corruption, when we talk about undermining the rule of law, let’s understand what just occurred here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican select subcommittee to investigate deep state conspiracy theories.

If you had any doubt about what this committee is really about, about its true focus, my colleague from Montana just confirmed this is all about deep state nonsense.

Republicans claim, without merit, that this subcommittee will investigate the so-called weaponization of the Federal Government. What it is really intended to do is to undermine the legitimate investigation of President Trump’s incitement of a violent attack on this building, on this Capitol, on this citadel of democracy, an investigation that implicates some of the very Members of this body who want to sit on that committee.

Make no mistake, this investigation, this investigate the investigators committee, will do deep damage to our national security and only breed distrust with our national security professionals, who will be reluctant to share with Congress the information policymakers need to protect our country.

The committee will also seek to discredit law enforcement like the FBI, who are so important in the fight against domestic violent extremism.

Republicans in Congress just don’t care. The greatest terrorist threat to our country comes from violent, right-wing militia groups and their sympathizers, and Republicans in Congress just don’t care.

The last time Republicans were in charge of the House, KEVIN MCCARTHY

pushed to form another bogus select committee, that one on Benghazi. He did so, as he admitted, to tear down Hillary Clinton's numbers, a patently political exercise.

Now, MCCARTHY is at it again, pushed into forming this bogus subcommittee by the QAnon members of his own Conference.

He sacrificed a lot in his bid for Speaker. That was his choice. Now, the American people are going to pay the price in the form of a body blow to our national security.

Vote "no" on this ill-considered measure. This is no Church Committee, not a bipartisan effort to reform government, but a partisan effort to tear it down, damn the consequences. Vote "no."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), my very good friend.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the blue anon rhetoric, I rise in favor of H. Res. 12 to establish a subcommittee on the weaponization of the Federal Government.

The authoritarian left has used the full might and authority of the Federal Government to force its agenda on the American people. The Federal Government has been weaponized to pressure private companies to censor conservatives; target parents as domestic terrorists simply for caring about their children and their education; manipulate the American people by declaring Hunter Biden's laptop as Russian disinformation; even failing to inform American citizens about classified documents that a former Vice President had in his possession; and launch an unwarranted investigation into President Trump's Presidential campaign.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution is a contract with the American people and our government. That contract is designed to produce maximum freedom and minimum tyranny for this great country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Sadly, the FBI and the DOJ, and many other agencies, are violating this contract and working to make the American people subjects rather than free citizens.

This committee is essential, and I encourage its creation and the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 12, the insurrection protection committee, which Speaker MCCARTHY, the 21st century McCarthyism, had to agree to last week in order to gain the Speakership.

MAGA extremist Republicans forced, as a consequence of getting their vote,

the Speaker to promise to create this select committee. Donald Trump had his hands in it. Donald Trump had his hands in it last week. During this circular firing squad, he was calling the shots, and this will benefit him.

This insurrection protection committee is set up to insulate the ex-President, along with various MAGA Republicans who are still serving here in the House and who are under investigation. It is here to protect them from that investigation. It is here to disrupt the flow of justice in this country.

This is a dangerous, extreme committee that is put in the hands of a group of people who even defied congressional subpoenas and refused to come to testify before the January 6th Committee.

□ 1400

Now they are trying to interfere with the Justice Department deliberations on whether or not they should be accused and charged with committing criminal offenses in the lead up to, on January 6, and thereafter. This is a very dangerous piece of legislation.

MAGA Republicans are behind it, led by the head election denier in this country, who, by the way, instituted something down in Brazil this weekend. It is a worldwide affair. This is dangerous. We must stop it. Vote "no" on H. Res. 12.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with great power comes great responsibility. We entrust our Department of Justice, FBI, and intelligence community with great power to keep us safe. And yet, as long as these agencies have existed, they have violated everyday Americans' civil rights.

The security state believes itself to be above the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress, or perhaps the belief is only tacit. It is aware only of power, not authority—power.

The FBI spied on Frank Sinatra, John Lennon, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Muhammad Ali because they were national security threats—celebrities, but everyday Americans as to their constitutional rights.

The intelligence community abused their power to spy on Presidential candidates, a sitting President, and Members of Congress and their staffs.

The FBI continuously coordinated with social media companies to moderate social content, the public square. So contemptuous and out of touch are they that when confronted with this just weeks ago, they said: We were merely engaging with our community partners.

Leading up to the 2020 election, the FBI worked hand in hand with Twitter and Facebook to silence the Hunter Biden laptop story. Concealment from everyday Americans. They have continued to censor in silence criticism of COVID policies and vaccine mandates to the harm of everyday Americans.

In 2013, the former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, lied to Congress about the NSA collecting data on millions of Americans. Yet, he has escaped a reckoning.

The NSA spied on groups, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and other NGOs. FBI contractors conducted thousands of searches on NSA databases. The intelligence community spied on journalists and political opponents in clear violation of the First Amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. That is not just all illegal, it is un-American, and it cannot continue. The government's massive surveillance apparatus is well-documented, but there is still much more that we do not know. We owe it to the American people to reveal the rot within our Federal Government and cut it out so that it can no longer harm everyday Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today we are putting the deep state on notice: We are coming for you on behalf of everyday Americans.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I remember after 9/11 when we all worked together to ensure the protection of the American people through the Patriot Act and dealing with the FISA courts, we worked together because truth is important.

I just want to simply be on the floor today to speak about truth. I work with school boards across my district. I know that there is not one school board that does not welcome a parent to hear their voices because obviously they are partners in the education of our precious children.

In September 2021, the National School Board Association sent Mr. Biden a letter pointing to a trend of violence and threats against school officials. It included a brief reference to Mr. Smith's arrest incident and a long list of examples with a footnote to a news account that mentioned the arrest in passing but without details, like his daughter's assault.

The point is that this came about because there were threats against school board members.

So can we have truth here?

That is what I rise to bring to the attention of this body as relates to this committee and this select committee.

Is there going to be truth finding? Is this going to be a committee that is going to collect information or otherwise investigate citizens of the United States and give the most right-wing Members who may have an ax to grind the ability to participate or is it going to be fair?

Is it going to be a gross misuse of power with dangerous implications, unintended consequences, and potentially

expose general operations of our national security infrastructure, which will put American lives at risk?

Let me be very clear. Russia is one of our most dangerous adversaries. We are in the middle of a national quagmire, and to undermine that through investigations of the FBI and Central Intelligence is going to be extremely dangerous.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this resolution would also give MAGA Republicans the ability to interfere in ongoing criminal investigations, including those investigating that day that some declared was just a bunch of tourists on January 6, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with my friends on the other side of the aisle. I have worked with Mr. ROY.

But is this a question of truth?

That is the issue that we stand here discussing today.

In this country, no one is above the law, and to suggest that some people should be because they don't agree with the force of law being applied to their activities is contrary to the very fabric of fairness, justice, and equality that America was founded on.

Let me, as an aside, indicate that we know what has been in the headlines—10 documents found in a locked closet that Mr. Biden may have had. Well, you know what, Mr. Speaker, the process of the law is proceeding. The call was made. The documents were surrendered, if you will. The process goes forward under the laws of this land. No one denied it. No one rejected it. No one did not in any way come to say anything other than: Follow the law. On the other hand, in Mar-a-Lago no law was found.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to consider the truth and vote against this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 12, a dangerous resolution whose passage would Establish a Select Committee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government or, more accurately, a subcommittee that would threaten our nations safety, security, and freedom.

MAGA Republicans love to hide behind the idea that they are pushing an agenda that would help the American people, but let's see this for what it truly is, a blatant assault on our democracy, our law enforcement agencies, our justice system, and our intelligence community, and an attempt to shield the twice-impeached former president from ongoing investigations being conducted by the Department of Justice.

The establishment of this subcommittee would give Republicans the ability to investigate any agency that "can collect information or otherwise investigate citizens of the United States" and gives the most right-wing members of the Republican party access to confidential documents solely intended for the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

This gross misuse of power will have dangerous implications and unintended consequences and could potentially expose general operations of our national security infrastructure which will put American lives at risk.

The passage of this resolution would also give MAGA Republicans the ability to interfere in ongoing criminal investigations including those investigating the extremist insurrectionists who lead the brutal attack on this institution two years ago.

In this country, no one is above the law, and to suggest that some people should be, because they don't agree with the force of the law being applied to their activities, is contrary to the very fabric of fairness, justice and equality that America was founded on.

This is a blatant attempt by House GOP members to stifle the federal government's investigatory powers, claiming that conservatives are being prosecuted and silenced.

The new Select Subcommittee comes as federal agencies such as the Department of Justice are investigating the GOP and its allies in multiple criminal investigations.

Members of the Republican party have been on press tours announcing this new subcommittee and have laid out their agenda, but how would this subcommittee help the American people in any way?

For a party that claims to be pro-law enforcement, the Republican party is now getting ready to undermine the hard work of our law enforcement and surveillance agencies.

Mr. Speaker what really is the intent here? I can tell you what I think it is. It is a back door effort to handcuff the current administration in their normal and usual course of operations?

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this dangerous and a completely irresponsible Resolution that will put the lives of Americans at risk and is a political stunt to further advance their dangerous conspiracy theories.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The New York Times titled: "Republicans Preparing Broad Inquiry Into F.B.I. and Security Agencies."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 8, 2023]

HOUSE REPUBLICANS PREPARING BROAD INQUIRY INTO F.B.I. AND SECURITY AGENCIES  
(By Charlie Savage and Luke Broadwater)

Newly empowered House Republicans are preparing a wide-ranging investigation into law enforcement and national security agencies, raising the prospect of politically charged fights with the Eiden administration over access to sensitive information like highly classified intelligence and the details of continuing criminal inquiries by the Justice Department.

The House plans to vote this week on a resolution to create a special Judiciary subcommittee on what it calls the "weaponization of the federal government," a topic that Republicans have signaled could include reviewing investigations into former President Donald J. Trump.

The panel would be overseen by Representative Jim Jordan, Republican of Ohio, who is also poised to become the Judiciary Committee's chairman. It remains to be seen who else Speaker Kevin McCarthy, who made numerous concessions to a far-right faction of his party to win the speakership, will put on it.

In a Fox News interview on Friday evening, Representative Chip Roy of Texas, a

lead negotiator for hard-right lawmakers who pushed Mr. McCarthy's team for concessions, portrayed the panel as part of the agreement they struck for their support. He said Mr. McCarthy had committed to giving the subcommittee at least as much funding and staffing as the House special committee in the last Congress that investigated the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the Capitol.

"So we got more resources, more specificity, more power to go after this recalcitrant Eiden administration," Mr. Roy said. "That's really important."

A spokesman for Mr. Jordan did not reply to a request for comment, but both he and Mr. McCarthy have spoken for months about their desire for such an investigation and pledged to voters during the 2022 campaign to carry one out.

"We will hold the swamp accountable, from the withdrawal of Afghanistan, to the origins of Covid and to the weaponization of the F.B.I.," Mr. McCarthy said in his first remarks as speaker early Saturday. "Let me be very clear: We will use the power of the purse and the power of the subpoena to get the job done."

The text of the resolution establishing the subcommittee would give the panel essentially open-ended jurisdiction to scrutinize any issue related to civil liberties or to examine how any agency of the federal government has collected, analyzed and used information about Americans including "ongoing criminal investigations."

The Justice Department has traditionally resisted making information about open criminal investigations available to Congress, suggesting that legal and political fights over subpoenas and executive privilege are most likely looming.

Republicans are promoting Mr. Jordan's panel as a new "Church Committee," referring to a 1970s investigation by Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, that uncovered decades of intelligence and civil liberties abuses by presidents of both parties.

But in an environment in which Mr. Trump has been the subject of multiple criminal investigations for years—including continuing inquiries into his attempts to overturn the 2020 election results and his hoarding of sensitive documents—Democrats predicted the new investigative subcommittee was likely to adopt a more partisan edge.

Representative Jerrold Nadler of New York, the top Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, said the Church Committee had been "a serious and bipartisan attempt to reform the conduct of the intelligence community, based on hard and verifiable evidence." By contrast, he said that "this new thing, fueled by conspiracy theories and slated to be run by the most extreme members of the MAGA caucus," was likely to be more similar to the notorious House Un-American Activities Committee of the mid-20th century.

Mr. Jordan is a staunch ally of Mr. Trump. Late last year, as the top Republican on the Judiciary Committee when his party was still in the minority, he oversaw a 1,000-page staff report that claimed that the F.B.I. had "spied on President Trump's campaign and ridiculed conservative Americans" and that the "rot within the F.B.I. festers in and proceeds from Washington."

The resolution appears to give him authority to subpoena the Justice Department for information about the special counsel inquiry into Mr. Trump's attempts to overturn the 2020 election and his handling of classified documents, along with other politically charged matters like an open tax investigation into President Biden's son, Hunter Biden.

The text of the resolution would also grant Mr. Jordan's panel the power to receive the same highly classified information that intelligence agencies make available to their

oversight committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Intelligence Committee members have access to some of the most sensitive secrets in the government, including information about covert actions, which are not shared with other lawmakers. Traditionally, House leaders tend to place on the intelligence panel members of their party they think are especially trustworthy not to disclose classified information.

While Mr. Jordan's investigative unit will be housed within the Judiciary Committee, its 13 members—eight of whom would be Republicans—will not be limited to lawmakers on that panel.

It is not clear, for example, whether Republican leaders would select hard-right members, such as Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene, the Georgia Republican who was stripped of her committee assignments in 2021 for making a series of violent and conspiratorial social media posts before she was elected. Mr. McCarthy has already promised her a spot on the House Oversight Committee, and she broke with other far-right members to support his speakership bid from the first ballot, as did Mr. Jordan.

Such a situation could result in lawmakers trying to scrutinize a Justice Department investigation as that inquiry potentially examines some of those same lawmakers' conduct concerning the events of Jan. 6.

In an interview on ABC's "This Week" on Sunday, Representative Scott Perry, Republican of Pennsylvania, rejected a suggestion that he should pledge not to serve on Mr. Jordan's subcommittee because it may scrutinize the Jan. 6 investigation and as a witness in that inquiry, he had a conflict of interest. Mr. Perry, who played an important role in Mr. Trump's attempt to overturn the results of the 2020 election, had his cellphone seized by the F.B.I.

"Why should I be limited—why should anybody be limited just because someone has made an accusation?" Mr. Perry said, adding: "I get accused of all kinds of things every single day, as does every member that serves in the public eye. But that doesn't stop you from doing your job. It is our duty and it is my duty."

Some Republicans also seem to see the panel as an opportunity to raise culture-war issues and promote conspiracy theories. In his interview with Fox, Mr. Roy described the subcommittee's mission as going "after the weaponization of the government, the F.B.I., the intel agencies, D.H.S., all of them that have been, you know, labeling Scott Smith a domestic terrorist."

In fact, no agency labeled Mr. Smith a domestic terrorist. Mr. Smith, whose daughter was sexually assaulted in a high school bathroom in Virginia, was arrested after he lunged at someone at a school board meeting during a tense and chaotic debate over bathroom policy for transgender students. He was convicted of disorderly conduct.

In September 2021, the National School Boards Association sent Mr. Biden a letter pointing to a trend of violence and threats against school officials. It included a brief reference to Mr. Smith's arrest incident amid a long list of examples, with a footnote to a news account of the meeting that mentioned the arrest in passing but without details like his daughter's assault. The letter also said acts of violence and threats against school officials could be classified as "equivalent to a form of domestic terrorism and hate crimes," and asked for federal help.

A few days later, Attorney General Merrick B. Garland issued a memorandum directing U.S. attorneys and the F.B.I. to convene meetings across the country with local officials to discuss "strategies for addressing threats" against school officials and

teachers. His memo did not call anyone a domestic terrorist, and it specifically distinguished spirited debate, which it stressed was constitutionally protected, from acts of violence and threats.

But voices on the right have made Mr. Smith a cause célèbre, falsely telling their viewers and readers that the Biden-era Justice Department and the F.B.I. consider parents who disagree with liberal school board policies to be domestic terrorists.

The subcommittee investigation proposed by Mr. Jordan is just one of a number of inquiries House Republicans plan to approve this week.

Included in a separate rules package scheduled to come up for a vote on Monday is a wide-ranging inquiry into the coronavirus pandemic, including the origins of the virus, so-called gain-of-function research, the production of vaccines and the conduct of Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, Mr. Biden's former chief medical adviser, whom Republicans have pledged to haul before them for questioning.

Republicans are also planning to form a special committee to investigate the Chinese government's "economic, technological and security progress, and its competition with the United States."

Both the China investigation and the investigation into law enforcement are scheduled for a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my friend.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague from Texas as she recounted some of the realities when talking about school boards. Well, I have come to know Scott Smith of Loudoun County. I consider him a friend. I have been talking to him since the actions against his family—in response to his daring to go to the school board to question the abuse of his daughter—resulted in his name being put out as the poster child for the weaponization of government against parents who dare question school boards.

And, yes, in fact, the National School Board Association sent a letter. But what became increasingly clear is that it was in collusion with the White House seeking the letter. That has become readily clear from the emails that we have gotten through Freedom of Information Act requests, that the Biden White House was seeking the National School Board Association to have that kind of a letter request in order that they, the Biden administration, be able to target Scott Smith and other parents around this country.

Every American should shudder at the power of the government, the Federal Government, being targeted at parents for daring to stand up and defend a daughter who was abused in a bathroom in the Loudoun County Public Schools.

By the way, the superintendent in Loudoun County has been indicted. This is the truth. Yet, this administration wanted to make Scott Smith the bad guy—not the rapist, not the school board that allowed this to occur in the schools in Loudoun County. It is not just parents.

What about Bunni Pounds in the Christians Engaged organization? The

IRS was targeting their nonprofit status because they happened to be religious. This is the power of the IRS.

How about the power of our public health elite who made decisions and put out misinformation that undermined the ability of Americans to stand up and to continue their jobs and continue to go to school?

Instead, they were masked and had needles put in their arms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Now we want to know the truth. Not the origins, but the truth. This committee is critically important, and we are going to find the truth. We are going to defend the American people against the weaponization of government.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in response to that that there are oversight committees that are equipped and ready to look into all the issues that the gentleman just raised, and into all the conspiracy theories that they want to raise. But they went ahead and created this additional committee, and there is a reason for it.

This new committee they are creating has the authority to basically investigate ongoing criminal investigations. It is unprecedented.

In any event, I would remind the gentleman, you have oversight committees. You are in charge now; you can do whatever you want to do.

But there is a reason for this committee and there is a reason why after 13 roll call votes for Speakership they added an additional line giving this committee the authority to look into ongoing investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my very good friend, who served the country in and out of uniform.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise because Americans are completely fed up. They are fed up with being targeted. And the assertion that I just heard that MAGA Republicans are domestic terrorists, the assertion that this is happening throughout the country, I must tell my 90-year-old grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, this assertion has been made time and time again that MAGA Republicans will blow something up, that MAGA Republicans are terrorists. Listen, we have seen censorship and meddling by former intelligence community experts and current Federal law enforcement agencies against Republicans and preventing media stories from actually coming to light. This is a fact.

My friend from Texas just talked about the IRS and other agencies that have done this. We are not standing idly by, and it is time that the truth

comes out. When we say things like MAGA Republicans, I think we should all be very careful and not be disingenuous because there are plenty of good Americans and patriots that are willing to stand up to get the truth out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, it is important that free speech be upheld—protected free speech be upheld. Not libel, not slander, and not any sort of assertion that all MAGA Republicans are bad because we know that that is not true. In fact, there are many good Americans that are standing up for their rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just got up and made all kinds of assertions that things were just said that weren't said. I don't know what the hell he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I will, again, urge my colleagues to vote "no" against the creation of that committee because this is unprecedented. This is a witch hunt. This is a committee designed basically to protect those who, quite frankly, are under investigation right now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who is my very good friend.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in order to enforce our laws, we give terrifying powers to such agencies as the FBI, the IRS, and the CIA, among others. The misuse of these powers to effect political outcomes would be fatal to freedom, and it is the hallmark of any dictatorship. This, our Constitution, was written to prevent whoever is in power.

Now, in recent years we have watched the IRS target individuals because of their political beliefs. We have seen a glaring double standard in the enforcement of our laws by our Justice Department based on the political beliefs of their targets. We have seen their powers used to intimidate citizens into silence, whether the Tea Party or parents questioning their school boards.

Most alarmingly, we have seen the use of the FBI and our intelligence agencies to suppress political viewpoints disagreeable to those in power or to manufacture or propagate one of the greatest scandals in American history: the Russian collusion hoax.

Now, when a government can interfere with the elections that govern it and when agencies can act independently of the outcome of these elections, then democracy will die.

This select committee is designed to get to the bottom of these alarming allegations, and I would hope the Democrats would be just as eager to sort this

out as the Republicans. After all, it was not that long ago that these powers were turned against the left and could be again if we do nothing.

As Madison warned: Democracy alone is not enough to protect our liberty, for in a pure democracy, 51 percent of the people can vote any time to throw the other 49 percent in jail. That is why we have a Constitution which limits the powers of government through checks and balances like this Congress and like our Bill of Rights, and it is why each of us takes an oath to support and defend it.

Let us all honor that oath today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make this clear for my colleague. A change was made in this legislation, and it was not just to allow the committee to investigate ongoing criminal investigations which is quite nefarious in and of itself.

Originally it was only supposed to be able to have investigative authority over the Department of Justice, DHS, and the FBI; the CIA and the IRS were added. This was all done after 13 Speaker votes at 10 o'clock at night clearly in an attempt to win more votes.

The people who are asking for these changes are the same people who want to investigate the people who are investigating them.

This is really, really unprecedented. I don't know what the hell is going on here, but this isn't right. This isn't openness, and this isn't transparency.

My friends talk about corruption. This is corruption. This is unacceptable. The American people ought to know it, and reasonable colleagues on the Republican side ought to say no to this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are so concerned all the time about civil rights, having the majority for the last few years, they are not interested. They are not interested in what the American people or the little guy has been enduring every day when he comes home from a hard day's work. He watches the TV, and asks: How many more times do I have to say, huh, I told you so?

We just had Social Security numbers of the targets of the so-called J6 investigation released to the public.

Huh, I told you so. No surprise there.

What about the school board association working in collaboration with the White House, working in collaboration with the White House and the Department of Justice to intimidate American citizens.

Thirty miles from here, just a little drive from here, a young lady was

raped. A schoolgirl was raped, and her father was concerned about her safety and had the gall to question the school board.

And what does he get?

Persecution and intimidation by his own Federal Government.

I told you so. We all told you so.

People on important committees in this institution lie on national TV over and over and over again with no consequence. They come home and say: Yeah, I told you so. That is not a big surprise here.

The Federal Government is collaborating with Big Tech to silence Americans' voices.

Where are their civil liberties?

The Federal Government is collaborating with Big Tech and the health agencies to silence information that concerns the health of every single American citizen.

Yeah, I told you so.

How many more times?

I ask the minority: How many more times do we have to say "I told you so" before you will recognize the overwhelming power and the abuse of power by this Federal Government? Will you ever do anything about it?

Do you know when you want to do something about it?

When you think you have the Presidency in 2024 and you try and regain this House, then you are going to be all into it investigating all your enemies.

That is not what the Federal Government is supposed to be for. It is supposed to protect our civil rights, so we don't serve it but so that it serves us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would say what the gentleman just said is terrible, but this committee has absolutely nothing to do with that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the very words expressed by those opposed to this committee demonstrate the dire need for this committee. We have gone 4 years without oversight, and to quote Shakespeare, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks."

Those who argue against transparency may have something to hide. So I listened very closely when I heard the former chairman of the Intelligence Committee give the reason that maybe we shouldn't ask for this information from the intelligence community.

He said that the intelligence community after this committee may be reluctant to share information with Congress and that Congress needs to craft legislation.

I would suggest if they are reluctant, then they are disqualified from holding



these positions. If they have grown so big that they are no longer accountable to the branch of government that created them, that funds them, and that is responsible for their oversight, then they need to be hemmed in.

I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to populate this committee with serious Democrats. I know there are some over there. I have worked with them. We have cosponsored amendments on privacy over the past decade. Some of them have passed.

Please populate it with serious Members.

Please, to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, give us the resources we need to do this job.

If I may rebut one thing that man said on the other side of the aisle about ongoing criminal investigations, he said that it is unprecedented that Congress would engage in an investigation that involves an ongoing criminal investigation.

What was the January 6 Committee? This is not unprecedented. It is what you wasted millions of dollars on over the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule and support for the committee that it will create.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say in response to the gentleman who said that he hopes that we populate this select committee with serious Democrats that he populate the committee with Republicans who did not ask for a pardon and who did not have their phones seized by the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Last week, as I fought as one of the 20 conservative Members to secure victories for the American people by dismantling this institution's broken system and restoring this people's House as it should be, part of the status quo here in Washington, which we fought to change, is politicians making empty promises of government accountability.

But believe me in this, Mr. Speaker, when we vowed accountability is coming, we meant it. Establishing the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government hands the House a powerful tool to uncover the two-tiered justice system that is rotting our Republic.

It is no secret that alphabet agencies have been dangerously weaponized against the American people. As an alarming example, the FBI has coerced citizens to relinquish their Second Amendment rights and has used Big Tech companies as private-sector proxies to silence Americans' free speech.

It is time to thoroughly investigate our Government agencies' atrocious behavior and abuse of power in disregarding and destroying America's

precious freedoms, and this select subcommittee will have the teeth to do just that.

I thank Speaker MCCARTHY and Chairman COLE for their invaluable support in bringing this resolution to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution so we may deliver transparency, answers, and, yes, accountability to the American people as we have promised.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "Perry won't agree to stay off new House committee investigating January 6 probes."

[From The Hill, Jan. 8, 2023]

PERRY WON'T AGREE TO STAY OFF NEW HOUSE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING JAN. 6 PROBES

(By Julia Mueller)

Rep. Scott Perry (R-Pa.) on Sunday wouldn't pledge to stay off the possible new House committee that would investigate probes into the Jan. 6, 2021, attack at the U.S. Capitol despite being a subject of a Department of Justice (DOJ) inquiry into the matter.

"Why should I be limited—why should anybody be limited—just because someone has made an accusation? Everybody in America is innocent until proven guilty," Perry said on ABC's "This Week."

Host George Stephanopoulos pressed Perry, asking, "Doesn't that pose a conflict to you, since you're also part of the investigation?"

"So, should everybody in Congress that disagrees with somebody be barred from doing the oversight and investigative powers that Congress has? That's our charge. And again, that's appropriate for every single member, regardless of what accusations are made. I get accused of things every single day, as does every member that serves in the public eye," Perry countered.

Newly elected Speaker Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.) has indicated the Republican majority just sworn in plans to review the work of the House select committee that last year probed Jan. 6 and look into the federal investigations.

DOJ investigations seized Perry's phone in connection with the rioting, and obtained email exchanges between Perry and former Trump attorney John Eastman, among others.

Perry also introduced former President Trump to Jeffrey Clark, whom Trump considered appointing as attorney general in order to propagate his claims of election fraud during the 2020 presidential contest.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend that I am prepared to close whenever he is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to roll up our sleeves and get to work. They want us to make progress and deliver results that help them in their day-to-day lives.

They don't need Congress to bend and break to the will of MAGA extremists, and they definitely don't need us to push crazy conspiracy theories and go on witch hunts to settle political scores.

My friends in their rules package gutted the Office of Congressional Ethics, and here they are with this new subcommittee which threatens our safety, our security, and our freedom.

It is an unprecedented attack on our Nation's law enforcement agencies, our justice system, and our intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues who spoke before about the intelligence oversight, we have an entire Select Committee on Intelligence that has oversight responsibilities on those matters. I am sorry the gentleman who spoke doesn't have confidence in whom the Republicans are going to propose as chair.

This committee is deranged. It is a bad idea, and it will go down in history as one of the worst committees that a Congress has ever put forward. It will be in the same category as the Joseph McCarthy Committee on Un-American Activities or the Benghazi Committee which now Speaker MCCARTHY admitted was an attempt to try to take down Secretary Clinton.

But here is the deal, and here is what it is all about: There are six on the other side of the aisle who asked for a pardon from President Trump. They did his dirty work, but Trump left them hanging. He did not give them a pardon. So now they are effectively trying to pardon themselves with the creation of this select committee.

This is unconscionable. It is so blatant. Again, the changes that were made to give them the ability to pardon themselves were done after the 13th Speaker vote in the dead of night to try to win their votes over.

This is not the way this Congress should run. This is not the way Republicans or Democrats, or any majority should behave. People should be ashamed of themselves that this is in the rules package and that this is what my friends are pushing right now.

We are better than this. We should not be going down this road. My friends said that they want to combat inflation and that they want to make the lives of the American people better. Let's focus on those things. Let's focus on areas that actually improve the lives of the American people. This is a colossal waste of time. But even worse, it is to me the epitome of what corruption is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution creating the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government.

In the 1970s it was apparent from revelations in the popular press that the American intelligence community had committed abuses as part of their activities. In response, Congress created the Church Committee which investigated these abuses and brought them into the light.

Today, it is again apparent that the Federal Government has been weaponized for political purposes. Like the Church Committee—which this subcommittee is modeled on—the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government will investigate the abuse of Americans’ civil liberties and bring them into the light. I am confident that this subcommittee will do the American people a great service. They deserve to have confidence in their government, and that confidence starts with ensuring that the vast powers of the executive branch are not abused.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote “yes” on the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 12, a dangerous resolution whose passage would Establish a Select Committee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government or, more accurately, a subcommittee that would threaten our nations safety, security, and freedom.

MAGA Republicans love to hide behind the idea that they are pushing an agenda that would help the American people, but let’s see this for what it truly is, a blatant assault on our democracy, our law enforcement agencies, our justice system, and our intelligence community, and an attempt to shield the twice-impeached former president from ongoing investigations being conducted by the Department of Justice.

The establishment of this subcommittee would give Republicans the ability to investigate any agency that “can collect information or otherwise investigate citizens of the United States” and gives the most right-wing members of the Republican party access to confidential documents solely intended for the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

This gross misuse of power will have dangerous implications and unintended consequences and could potentially expose general operations of our national security infrastructure which will put American lives at risk.

The passage of this resolution would also give MAGA Republicans the ability to interfere in ongoing criminal investigations including those investigating the extremist insurrectionists who lead the brutal attack on this institution two years ago.

In this country, no one is above the law, and to suggest that some people should be, because they don’t agree with the force of the law being applied to their activities, is contrary to the very fabric of fairness, justice and equality that America was founded on.

This is a blatant attempt by House GOP members to stifle the federal government’s investigatory powers, claiming that conservatives are being prosecuted and silenced.

The new Select Subcommittee comes as federal agencies such as the Department of Justice are investigating the GOP and its allies in multiple criminal investigations.

Members of the Republican party have been on press tours announcing this new subcommittee and have laid out their agenda, but how would this subcommittee help the American people in anyway?

For a party that claims to be pro-law enforcement, the Republican party is now getting

ready to undermine the hard work of our law enforcement and surveillance agencies.

Mr. Speaker what really is the intent here? I can tell you what I think it is. It is a back door effort to handcuff the current administration in their normal and usual course of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this dangerous and a completely irresponsible Resolution that will put the lives of Americans at risk and is a political stunt to further advance their dangerous conspiracy theories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 p.m.

SWEARING IN OF RESIDENT COMMISSIONER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Resident Commissioner-elect please present herself in the well.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a member of the 118th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Agreeing to House Resolution 11; and

Agreeing to House Resolution 12.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 11) establishing the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 65, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]  
YEAS—365

Adams	Cicilline	Franklin, C.
Aderholt	Ciscomani	Scott
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Fry
Alford	Cleaver	Fulcher
Allen	Cline	Gaetz
Allred	Cloud	Gallagher
Amodei	Clyburn	Gallego
Armstrong	Clyde	Garamendi
Arrington	Cohen	Garbarino
Auchincloss	Cole	Garcia (TX)
Babin	Collins	Garcia, Mike
Bacon	Comer	Jimenez
Baird	Correa	Golden (ME)
Balderson	Costa	Gonzales, Tony
Banks	Courtney	Gonzalez,
Barr	Craig	Vicente
Bean (FL)	Crane	Good (VA)
Beatty	Crawford	Gooden (TX)
Bentz	Crow	Gosar
Bera	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Bergman	Curtis	Granger
Beyer	D’Esposito	Graves (LA)
Bice	Dauids (KS)	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Davidson	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Davis (NC)	Green (TX)
Bishop (GA)	De La Cruz	Greene (GA)
Bishop (NC)	Dean (PA)	Griffith
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Grijalva
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Grothman
Boebert	Deluzio	Guest
Bost	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Boyle (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Hageman
Brecheen	Dingell	Harder (CA)
Brownley	Doggett	Harris
Buchanan	Duarte	Harshbarger
Buck	Duncan	Hayes
Bucshon	Dunn (FL)	Hern
Budzinski	Edwards	Higgins (LA)
Burchett	Ellzey	Higgins (NY)
Burgess	Emmer	Hill
Burlison	Eshoo	Himes
Calvert	Españillat	Hinson
Cammack	Estes	Horsford
Caraveo	Ezell	Houchin
Carbajal	Fallon	Houlihan
Cárdenas	Feenstra	Hoyer
Carey	Ferguson	Hoyle (OR)
Carl	Finstad	Hudson
Carson	Fischbach	Huizenga
Carter (GA)	Fitzgerald	Hunt
Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Cartwright	Fleischmann	Jackson (NC)
Case	Fletcher	Jackson (TX)
Casten	Flood	Jacobs
Castor (FL)	Foster	James
Castro (TX)	Fox	Jeffries
Chavez-DeRemer		Johnson (LA)