

Congressional Oversight Roadmap

A Strategic Agenda for the Next Majority

Prepared by Public Citizen

2026

Executive Summary

Public Citizen is a national nonprofit consumer advocacy organization that uses research, litigation, lobbying, and public education to challenge corporate power and promote government accountability. We work at the federal, state, and local levels to advance equitable access to health care, protect consumers, strengthen democracy, defend workers' rights, promote climate justice, increase transparency, and support financial reform.

This document is intended to help inform a strong congressional oversight agenda for the next majority following the 2026 election. We craft this understanding that, while one or both chambers may flip, the need to use the next Congress's oversight tools to show that they can work for regular people remains essential. We must use these tools to expose corruption and corporate favoritism within this administration, building a public record that lays the groundwork for the policy reforms that will improve daily life.

This document outlines investigative priorities centered on accountability, transparency, affordability, and the protection of everyday Americans from abuses of power, corporate misconduct, and harmful public policy decisions. Recent actions by the Trump administration and aligned interests have raised serious concerns about corruption, weakened consumer protections, attacks on democratic safeguards, rising costs for families, and erosion of independent government institutions.

The recommendations are organized across major issue areas, including corruption and abuse of power, economic pressures facing families, health care affordability, financial and consumer protection, democratic accountability, climate and energy, artificial intelligence, and corporate concentration. They include proposals for hearings, investigations, subpoenas, reports, and legislative reforms designed to uncover misconduct, build a public record that can catch attention, and advance durable policy solutions.

Key priorities include examining conflicts of interest involving presidential financial ventures, misuse of taxpayer resources, politicized contracting, executive branch ethics loopholes, attacks on voting access, misuse of confidential taxpayer data, weakened consumer and financial protections, harmful health care rollbacks, anti-competitive corporate practices, and unchecked deployment of emerging technologies. The report also identifies opportunities to modernize ethics laws, strengthen public participation in rulemaking, reinforce scientific integrity, and restore trust in institutions relied upon by millions of Americans.

We intend this oversight agenda to be coupled with clear, early, and bold policy prescriptions, implemented through legislation, to demonstrate our commitment to unrigging our system, fighting corruption, and creating a progressive economic system that delivers for working families. We also hope it begins to lay the groundwork for the passage of this legislation in any future governing moment and creates a record of clear enforcement actions that an incoming administration can take.

This document is offered as a roadmap for a proactive oversight agenda that constituents will understand as a "fight" mentality and celebrate—centered on working families, democratic accountability, and the principle that no administration, corporation, or politically connected actor is above the law.

Table of Contents

Section I: Cost of Living, Affordability, and Corporate Greed

Section II: Health, Safety, and Public Protection

Section III: Democracy, Transparency, and Rule of Law

Section IV: Big Tech, AI, and the New Corporate Threats

Section V: Climate, Energy, and Environmental Accountability

Section VI: Corruption, Abuse of Power, and Government for Sale

Section I: Cost of Living, Affordability, and Corporate Greed

Families are paying more for food, health care, housing, utilities, and daily necessities while many corporations report strong profits and receive favorable treatment. Oversight should examine where and how policy choices shifted costs onto working Americans while rewarding wealthy interests.

1.1 Big Ugly Law: Subsidize the Rich While Stealing from Working Americans

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Congressional Republicans enacted the "Big Beautiful Bill" (OBBBA), delivering substantial tax cuts to corporations and high-income households while cutting core safety-net programs, including SNAP and Medicaid. These cuts are forcing states, providers, and food banks to absorb increased demand with fewer resources. Major corporate beneficiaries collectively worth more than $2 trillion received roughly $30 billion in tax benefits while cutting more than 45,000 jobs. Despite promises that these tax cuts would spur hiring, raise wages, and expand domestic investment, early evidence suggests many corporations are directing the financial gains toward executive compensation, shareholder distributions, and stock buybacks rather than investments that benefit workers or consumers.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open an investigation with state administrators, food bank leaders, health care providers, impacted individuals, labor representatives, economists, and executives from major corporate beneficiaries of OBBBA's tax provisions to examine: (1) the real-world impacts of SNAP and Medicaid cuts on working families and state budgets; (2) how corporations used the financial gains from OBBBA, including decisions related to layoffs, wages, hiring, domestic investment, executive compensation, stock buybacks, and shareholder distributions; and (3) whether the economic promises used to justify OBBBA—including job creation, wage growth, and business investment—have materialized. Subpoena executive compensation records, investor presentations, workforce data, stock buyback disclosures, shareholder distribution data, and internal corporate communications discussing the anticipated use of OBBBA tax benefits. Issue a report comparing corporate promises with actual outcomes.

Why It Matters: OBBBA represents a deliberate transfer of public resources from working families to corporations and wealthy households. Americans deserve to know whether those tax benefits produced the promised economic gains—or instead enriched executives and shareholders while families lost access to food assistance, health care, and economic security. If corporations receiving billions in tax benefits are cutting jobs, increasing executive pay, expanding stock buybacks, and rewarding shareholders instead of investing in workers, Congress has an obligation to expose that broken promise and ask a fundamental question: **Who is this economy really working for?**

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; Senate Finance

1.2 Trump's Pharma Pact: Secret Deals, Higher Prices, Same Old Scam

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The White House announced secretive deals with more than a dozen drug companies to supposedly lower drug prices, but the administration and drug companies refuse to make these deals transparent. The public doesn't know what pricing conditions are being required of companies in deals, which drugs are affected, or which health programs will have access to lower prices. We do not know how the secret-deal prices compare with prices already available through health programs like Medicaid. Patients can't afford to take this administration at its word.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold investigative hearings highlighting how drug companies entering deals with the White House continue to price gouge American patients. Investigations and subpoenas could seek details of these deals from the administration and expose them to the public. Reports could also highlight ongoing pricing abuses by companies party to secret deals and benefits granted by the administration to companies uncovered in an investigation.

Why It Matters: Four in 10 U.S. adults ration treatment because of cost. The administration is claiming to provide relief through secret deals with drug companies. People deserve to know what their elected officials are doing to lower drug prices for them, or if they're all talk and protecting drug companies' ability to price gouge.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Finance

1.3 Trump's Merger Machine: Favors for Friends, Costs for You

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has waived through a series of mergers or ended antitrust enforcement to benefit favored companies: Paramount-Skydance, Paramount-Warner Bros. (expected), Ticketmaster, Hewlett-Packard-Juniper, a host of Big Tech acquisitions. These mergers are concentrating economic and political power, driving up prices, and constricting consumer choices.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings that require testimony from Ticketmaster CEO Michael Rapino, Hewlett-Packard Enterprise CEO Antonio Neri, Paramount Global leadership, Warner Bros. Discovery CEO David Zaslav, and executives from other corporations that benefited from weakened or abandoned antitrust enforcement. As a case likely to remain unsettled through 2026 and into 2027, the proposed Paramount-Warner Bros. transaction should serve as a central case study, with testimony from Hollywood workers, writers, actors, independent creators, and consumer advocates regarding the effects of media consolidation on jobs, wages, local journalism, creative independence, and consumer choice. Subpoena testimony from current and former DOJ Antitrust Division officials, including personnel forced out or sidelined after refusing to rubber-stamp administration-favored mergers, as well as antitrust scholars and former enforcement officials who can explain how political interference distorted merger review and enforcement decisions.

Why It Matters: Media mergers are delivering media properties to Trump-affiliated companies, slanting news coverage and cultural outputs. Mergers are raising prices and costing jobs. Larger companies are gaining dangerous influence over the political process and using it to drive their agendas—including ever more concentration.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

1.4 The New Robber Barons: Corporate Welfare for Billionaires, Stagnant Wages for You

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The U.S. is experiencing historically extreme levels of wealth concentration driven not simply by market forces, but by deliberate policy choices that disproportionately benefited large corporations, dominant investors, and top executives. The Trump tax cuts and related corporate policies accelerated this trend by delivering substantial benefits to highly profitable corporations while weakening labor protections, undermining worker bargaining power, and reducing public investment. Billionaires including Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg, and Stephen Schwarzman now wield extraordinary economic and political influence, with some individuals possessing more wealth than tens of millions of Americans combined. Many corporations receiving major tax advantages subsequently reported record profits, increased executive compensation and shareholder payouts, expanded stock buybacks, and continued aggressive lobbying campaigns while workers faced rising costs, stagnant wages, layoffs, and growing economic insecurity. Private equity firms, major technology companies, fossil fuel corporations, and dominant retailers have further consolidated economic and political power, raising concerns that public policy increasingly serves concentrated wealth rather than working families.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings examining the mechanisms driving extreme wealth concentration and the role federal policy has played in accelerating it, including corporate tax breaks, stock buybacks, executive compensation practices, weakened labor protections, consolidation, and industry lobbying campaigns. Require testimony from ExxonMobil CEO Darren Woods, Amazon CEO Andy Jassy, Blackstone CEO Stephen Schwarzman, labor economists, tax policy experts, union representatives, and workers affected by layoffs, wage stagnation, rising costs, or reductions in benefits. Examine whether corporations that benefited substantially from Trump-era tax policies used those gains to increase executive compensation, shareholder payouts, and stock buybacks while continuing aggressive lobbying efforts against labor, tax, consumer protection, and antitrust reform. Subpoena lobbying disclosures, executive compensation records, stock buyback data, tax filings, investor communications, and internal corporate documents discussing the anticipated use of tax savings and political advocacy strategies

Why It Matters: The growth of the K-shaped economy is threatening American democracy and forcing tens of millions of Americans to scrape by on survival even as the new robber barons accumulate unimaginable wealth. This oversight effort can both recognize that people are struggling and begin to explain why.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; Senate Finance; House Education and Workforce; Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

1.5 Corporate Shrinkflation, Price Gouging and the Rip-Off of Everyday Americans

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Large corporations across food, consumer goods, travel, ticketing, banking, and delivery sectors have increased profits by charging more while giving consumers less through greedflation, junk fees, and opaque pricing practices. Many companies used inflation and supply chain disruptions as cover to raise prices beyond underlying costs, even while reporting strong earnings and expanded margins.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open investigations into whether dominant firms such as Amazon used inflationary conditions to engage in price gouging, fee extraction, or deceptive pricing. Subpoena internal pricing strategies, investor presentations, margin analyses, and communications discussing the use of inflation narratives to justify increases. Require testimony from major food manufacturers, airlines, ticketing companies, banks, hotel chains, and consumer advocates. Issue a report recommending stronger fee transparency, anti-price-gouging enforcement, and competition reforms.

Why It Matters: Families can absorb only so many hidden charges, smaller products, and unjustified price hikes before household budgets break. When corporations exploit crises to raise profits, Americans pay more for groceries, travel, banking, and daily necessities while executives and shareholders benefit. This is a direct affordability issue and a test of whether markets serve the public or merely extract from it.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation; House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

1.6 Medicare Advantage: Deny and Delay Care, Stick Seniors with the Bill

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: Medicare Advantage companies continue to profit by delaying and denying care. Medicare Advantage has never fulfilled its initial promise of providing care at a lower price than traditional Medicare. Instead, it has forced seniors to navigate narrow networks, jump through hoops to access needed care, and driven up premiums for traditional Medicare enrollees. Vertical and horizontal integration have led to concerning consolidation in the health care system, increasing prices and limiting access.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings, open investigations, and issue reports examining how deeply Medicare Advantage has failed to deliver on its promises and how much corporations have profited. Examine care denial rates, prior authorization practices, marketing to high-cost enrollees, and the financial relationships between plans, providers, and pharmacy benefit managers.

Why It Matters: Medicare Advantage is on course to cost the U.S. more than $1 trillion in excess payments over the next decade, while undermining seniors' access to care. Congress should expose Medicare Advantage as a failing system and use savings from reining in waste to improve and expand traditional Medicare.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; House Ways and Means; Senate Finance

1.7 Wall Street in Nursing Homes: Cutting Care, Boosting Profits

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: In December 2025, HHS and CMS rescinded the federal minimum staffing rule for nursing homes, eliminating the 24/7 registered nurse requirement and numeric staffing standards. This action occurred after nursing home executives and industry groups contributed approximately $4.8 million to a Trump-aligned super PAC. Large for-profit and private equity-linked operators, including Genesis HealthCare and HCR ManorCare, have faced longstanding scrutiny for staffing challenges and quality concerns, while HUD continues to insure billions in loans through its Section 232 program as defaults rise.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold a joint hearing with HHS, CMS, and HUD leadership, inspectors general, executives from private equity-owned or affiliated nursing home operators, and patient advocates to examine (1) the December 2025 staffing rule rescission, (2) the role of private equity ownership in staffing, quality, and financial practices, and (3) whether HUD is financing operators with poor performance or elevated default risk. Request communications between industry and administration officials, CMS quality data, and HUD loan and ownership data.

Why It Matters: The federal government lowered care standards and continues to finance the same operators. That raises a basic question: are federal policies protecting nursing home residents, or enabling private equity firms to cut staffing, extract profits, and shift the risk onto patients and taxpayers?

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Finance; House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

1.8 EV Tax Credit Repeal and the War on Consumers and American Manufacturing

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: With the repeal of EV tax credits and the elimination of programs supporting the green economy, the U.S. is falling further behind China and other countries in building a competitive clean energy industrial base. Manufacturing jobs have been lost, U.S. auto companies are less competitive, and Chinese automakers are already selling vehicles in the North American market.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings, open investigations, and issue reports examining how the loss of EV incentives has affected consumers, domestic manufacturers, and supply chains. Consider field hearings in districts that have experienced factory closures. Examine the national security implications of supply chain disruption, the impacts on working families facing high gas prices, and the downstream economic effects on Republican-leaning states that hosted clean energy investment.

Why It Matters: The U.S. must develop and implement a new industrial strategy following significant setbacks under the Trump administration. Congress should establish who has been harmed and what is needed to restore good, family-supporting manufacturing jobs, combat climate change, and deliver tangible benefits to local communities.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; House Ways and Means; Senate Finance

1.9 Climate Change, Sky-High Insurance, and the Squeeze on American Families

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: Climate change is driving up the cost of home insurance, with an estimated $30 billion per year in insured losses from climate-related disasters. Households are effectively required to subsidize continued fossil fuel development while the knock-on effects of rising insurance costs threaten to displace entire communities and destabilize housing markets.

Proposed Oversight Action: Commission a report further investigating the amount of insured losses attributable to climate change. Hold hearings pairing experts on rising costs with specialists who can speak to specific mitigation strategies. Examine the disproportionate impact on communities of color and the role of opaque private risk models in limiting consumer knowledge and driving up premiums.

Why It Matters: Rising insurance costs are a central—but often overlooked—part of an affordability agenda and an increasingly bipartisan concern. Debates about climate mitigation frequently focus on potential increases in gas prices while failing to account for already-skyrocketing insurance costs borne both by homeowners and indirectly by renters. Congress should force an honest accounting of who bears the true cost of climate inaction.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Section II: Health, Safety, and Public Protection

When watchdog agencies fail and safeguards are weakened, people can get hurt. Oversight in this section focuses on where and how government decisions and corporate bad actors increased risks to health, safety, financial security, and public well-being.

2.1 Corporate Crime and Trump's Get-Out-Of-Jail-Free Card for Corporate Crooks

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has canceled or frozen enforcement actions against more than 170 corporations, giving powerful companies a get-out-of-jail-free card for alleged misconduct involving consumer rip-offs, discrimination, union-busting, antitrust violations, financial fraud, crypto abuses, foreign bribery, workplace harms, and pollution. Companies benefiting from dropped, frozen, or weakened enforcement include Walmart and Branch Messenger, Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Toyota, Pfizer, Binance, Ripple, Coinbase, Amazon, Tesla, 7-Eleven, Morgan Stanley, PayPal, and Polymarket. These actions reflect both a broad retreat from corporate accountability and specific decisions that benefited companies with political, lobbying, donor, or insider ties to the administration. The result is a two-tiered justice system: aggressive punishment for ordinary people, but leniency for corporations accused of harming consumers, workers, investors, communities, and the environment.

Proposed Oversight Action: Conduct hearings and open an investigation into the Trump administration's pattern of weakening or abandoning enforcement actions involving politically connected corporations and high-risk financial actors. Focus particular attention on the administration's treatment of crypto firms, pharmaceutical companies, and politically sensitive prediction market platforms. Require testimony from Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla; Coinbase CEO Brian Armstrong; Ripple CEO Brad Garlinghouse; Binance founder Changpeng Zhao and current Binance leadership; and Polymarket CEO Shayne Coplan, along with DOJ, SEC, CFTC, CFPB, and FTC officials involved in decisions to delay, narrow, freeze, or abandon enforcement matters. Examine whether corporations or executives receiving favorable treatment engaged in lobbying, political spending, donor activity, or coordination with administration officials while enforcement actions were pending.

Why It Matters: These Trump policies are injuring consumers and workers across the country and are among the most egregious consequences of widespread Trump corruption. Additionally, the widespread leniency for corporate offenders puts the lie to the claim that Trump is "tough on crime."

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; House Financial Services; Senate Judiciary; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

2.2 Deadly Air: Corporate Pollution, Childhood Asthma, and the Cost of EPA Rollbacks

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has rolled back major clean air protections covering vehicles, power plants, refineries, and industrial facilities, often at the urging of fossil fuel and petrochemical interests with close ties to the administration. These rollbacks reduce compliance costs for major corporations while increasing pollution exposure for surrounding communities, particularly low-income communities and communities of color located near refineries, chemical plants, highways, and industrial corridors. Areas such as Baton Rouge and Louisiana's "Cancer Alley" already experience disproportionately high rates of cancer, asthma, and respiratory illness tied to industrial pollution, raising concerns that weakened enforcement and emissions standards will further worsen public health outcomes. Critics argue that the administration ignored scientific evidence and sidelined career experts in favor of policies benefiting politically connected industries.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open an investigation into the public health harms and political influence behind the Trump administration's clean air rollbacks. Require testimony from Dow CEO Jim Fitterling, Shell USA leadership, Formosa Plastics executives, former EPA officials, and fossil fuel industry lobbyists involved in advocating for weakened emissions standards and enforcement. Subpoena communications between EPA leadership, the White House, industry trade groups, and corporate lobbyists regarding rollback decisions and cost-benefit analyses. Pair corporate and administration witnesses with testimony from people living with cancer, parents of children with severe asthma, environmental justice advocates, physicians, and residents living near heavily polluted industrial corridors. Baton Rouge and Louisiana's "Cancer Alley," for example, would provide a strong case study and potential field hearing location to examine how weakened clean air protections disproportionately burden surrounding communities while major corporations benefit from reduced regulatory obligations.

Why It Matters: The science on these matters is conclusive. The rollbacks threaten thousands more American deaths every year, from asthma and lung disease, and will stunt the progress made in reducing children's exposure to mercury and neurotoxins. The Trump administration is ignoring the cost-benefit analysis that was once the preferred tool of polluters; that's because these measures impose huge monetary costs on America—well over $150 billion every year. The American people get it. Clean air is overwhelmingly positive.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Environment and Public Works

2.3 Trump's Deregulation: More Fees, Less Protection, Bigger Corporate Profits

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has pursued an aggressive deregulation agenda that weakened protections against junk fees, food safety risks, hidden corporate charges, and other practices that directly affect household finances and consumer well-being. These rollbacks did not occur in a vacuum. Banks, airlines, ticketing companies, food industry interests, and corporate trade associations spent years lobbying against rules designed to reduce fees, increase transparency, strengthen food safety oversight, and protect consumers from deceptive practices. The result has been a transfer of costs and risks from large corporations to working families, who face higher fees, less information, greater exposure to unsafe products, and fewer avenues for accountability when corporations engage in harmful conduct.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings examining how the Trump administration's deregulation agenda increased costs and risks for working families while benefiting large corporations. Require testimony from executives representing major banks, airline companies, ticketing firms, and food industry interests that benefited from weakened consumer protection rules and enforcement. Pair corporate witnesses with consumers harmed by excessive credit card fees, hidden airline and ticketing charges, foodborne illness outbreaks, unsafe products, and higher household costs tied to weakened efficiency standards. Invite testimony from consumer protection advocates, physicians, food safety experts, and former agency officials regarding the real-world impact of weakened safeguards. Subpoena records and communications related to the rollback of major consumer protection, food safety, and fee transparency regulations, including evidence showing which industries financially benefited from those decisions.

Why It Matters: Junk fees, weakened food safety rules, and hidden corporate charges are not abstract policy debates—they show up directly in the cost of a plane ticket, a bank statement, or a trip to the grocery store. When regulators roll back protections that industries spent years lobbying against, families lose the transparency and safeguards that let them make informed choices and hold companies accountable when something goes wrong. Congress has a responsibility to determine whether these rollbacks reflect a genuine judgment about costs and benefits, or reward the same corporate interests that pushed for weaker rules.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; House Financial Services; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

2.4 The War on Public Health: Politics Over Patients, Ideology Over Science

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: The Trump administration has gutted the nation's public health infrastructure. Robert Kennedy has led an overt and implicit attack on vaccines, but the problems extend far beyond that. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has seen an exodus of staff, and its recommendations are no longer widely followed. National Institutes of Health research and grantmaking are defined by ideological zealotry and chaos, with unavoidably long-term consequences for public health research, prevention, and cures.

Proposed Oversight Action: Conduct hearings and require testimony from former CDC, NIH, and FDA officials and/or public health researchers whose grants or programs were terminated, state and local public health leaders; hospital administrators; physicians; cancer researchers; and patients affected by disrupted research, delayed treatments, disease outbreaks, or weakened public health services. Highlight the impacts of staffing losses, grant cancellations, weakened scientific independence, vaccine policy disruptions, and reduced public health capacity on disease prevention, medical research, emergency preparedness, and patient outcomes.

Why It Matters: The American people would be exposed to President Trump and the GOP politicizing cancer research, disrupting medical research funding, weakening disease prevention efforts, and undermining the institutions responsible for developing future treatments and cures. These are not abstract policy debates—they involve diseases and health challenges that touch nearly every American family, including cancer, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, heart disease, and infectious diseases. The hearing would help establish a clear record of how political decisions made in Washington jeopardized medical progress, public health preparedness, and future breakthroughs that millions of Americans depend upon.

Committee/Jurisdiction: Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; House Energy and Commerce

2.5 Broken Promises, Corporate Deals: How Trump's Trade Agenda Failed American Workers

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Trump's second-term trade agenda—built on chaotic, sweeping tariffs—was sold as a plan to bring back U.S. manufacturing, but it has not delivered. The result is 66,000 manufacturing jobs lost and a $38 billion decline in factory construction spending in the last year. Real wages in manufacturing have seen virtually no gain, while CEO wages run 300 times the median worker's salary. Retaliatory tariffs have devastated farm communities, and farm bankruptcies increased 46% last year. Now the Trump administration is rushing to lock in a new generation of comprehensive trade agreements—announcing at least nine Agreements on Reciprocal Trade (ARTs), nine framework agreements, and 11 critical minerals MOUs recently—all at breakneck speed, in complete secrecy, without congressional authorization, without published drafts, without stakeholder consultation, and without enforceable labor standards or a Rapid Response Mechanism to protect workers in the U.S. or in partner countries.

Proposed Oversight Action: The House should convene joint hearings of the Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce Committees to subpoena the full texts of all ARTs and critical minerals MOUs, the withheld "Report to the President on the America First Trade Policy," and any labor, wage, and domestic industry impact analyses conducted before finalizing those agreements, to build an account of how Trump's trade agenda has failed American workers and farmers. Witnesses should include the BLS Commissioner, USTR Ambassador Greer, union leaders, and frontline workers impacted by trade.

Why It Matters: Trump's trade policy was enacted on the premise that it would benefit the economic security of workers. The evidence shows widespread betrayal, with thousands of jobs lost, wages stagnating, and communities devastated. At the same time, a new generation of secretive trade deals was rushed into place with no enforceable labor standards, no congressional authorization, and no mechanism to ensure that American workers are not directly undercut by supply chains built on child labor and forced labor abroad. These hearings should reveal whether this administration's trade policy was ever designed to benefit workers or was a corporation-first agenda dressed in blue-collar rhetoric.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; House Education and Workforce; Senate Finance; House Foreign Affairs; Senate Foreign Relations

2.6 Politics Over Patients: Weakening America's Drug Safety Watchdog

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Food and Drug Administration has faced significant staff losses, leadership instability, and mounting political pressure, which have weakened its ability to independently regulate drugs, vaccines, and medical devices. Reporting and public concern have focused on the influence of anti-vaccine narratives, inexperienced leadership, and industry-friendly fast-track pathways that may lower evidentiary standards.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with FDA Commissioner and senior agency officials regarding staffing losses, scientific integrity, and standards for approving drugs and devices. Open investigations into pharmaceutical and medical device industry access during administration "listening tours," user-fee reauthorization negotiations, and closed-door policymaking processes. Request Inspector General review of whether political or industry pressure has compromised FDA decision-making, hiring, or enforcement priorities.

Why It Matters: The FDA exists to protect the public, not to serve political agendas or industry profit-seeking. If scientific standards are weakened, Americans could be exposed to dangerous drugs, defective medical devices, false cures, and costly treatments that fail when people need them most. The result can mean preventable injuries, avoidable deaths, and a collapse of trust in the medicines families rely on every day.

Committee/Jurisdiction: Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; House Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health

2.7 Politics Over Cures: The War on Medical Research

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The National Institutes of Health has long been the nation's premier agency for supporting biomedical research, but funding decisions during the Trump administration have been driven more by politics than by scientific merit. Visible examples include political attacks falsely labeling transgenic mice research as "transgender mice" research, along with delays or cancellations of previously awarded grants, suspension of advisory committees, reductions in training programs, and pressure to cut indirect cost reimbursements that help universities sustain research staff.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with NIH Director Jay Bhattacharya and HHS officials, and outside scientific leaders regarding grant cancellations, stalled cancer and disease trials, suspended advisory councils, and politically driven funding decisions. Request Inspector General investigations into NIH and Department of Education actions affecting research institutions, STEM training pipelines, and grant administration. Obtain testimony from former NIH officials, researchers who lost funding, and patients affected by disrupted clinical trials.

Why It Matters: This is about whether the U.S. remains the global leader in medical discovery or allows politics to sabotage lifesaving science. When research grants are canceled, cancer trials halted, and young scientists pushed out of the pipeline, Americans lose future cures for Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes, and rare diseases.

Committee/Jurisdiction: Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; House Energy and Commerce

2.8 More Costs, Less Care: The Assault on American Health Care

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration and congressional Republicans have pursued policies that have worsened an already strained health care system by cutting Affordable Care Act protections, reducing Medicaid access, expanding prior-authorization barriers in Traditional Medicare, and undermining access to long-term care. Administrative actions through CMS and related agencies have further advanced policies that shift costs and burdens onto patients, seniors, people with disabilities, and working families.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings, investigations, and issue reports examining how these policies increased costs, reduced coverage, and delayed care for everyday Americans. Call patients, caregivers, providers, and health policy experts to testify on the real-world consequences of coverage losses, prior authorization denials, and long-term care barriers. Require testimony from CMS and CCIIO officials regarding demonstrations, waivers, and administrative actions used to weaken Medicaid, Medicare, and ACA protections.

Why It Matters: When coverage is cut and barriers to care rise, the result can be untreated illness, preventable deaths, financial ruin, and deeper insecurity for millions of households. Congress has a responsibility to expose policies that made Americans sicker, poorer, and less protected.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; House Ways and Means; Senate Finance

2.9 Dismantling the CFPB: More Corporate Abuse, Less Consumer Protection

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: In 2025 and 2026, the Trump administration took actions to weaken and effectively dismantle the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, including reducing enforcement activity, limiting rulemaking, and constraining the agency's operations. The CFPB was established by statute, and its mandate, funding structure, and core functions are set by law. Efforts to sideline or neutralize the bureau without congressional action raise serious legal concerns that the executive branch may be violating statutory requirements.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold a hearing with CFPB leadership, DOJ officials, inspectors general, consumer advocates, and state attorneys general to examine (1) actions taken to reduce the bureau's enforcement and regulatory capacity, (2) the legal authority for those actions, (3) whether those actions comply with the statute establishing the CFPB, and (4) the impact on enforcement activity, consumer complaints, and restitution. Request internal communications, enforcement data, staffing levels, and legal justifications.

Why It Matters: The CFPB is the primary federal agency protecting Americans from predatory lending, hidden fees, and abusive financial practices. If the executive branch can effectively dismantle a law-created agency, it raises a fundamental question about whether statutory protections for consumers can be ignored. It means fewer investigations, fewer penalties, and fewer protections for families dealing with mortgages, credit cards, student loans, and other financial products.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

2.10 Abandoning the Poor: U.S. Global Health Assistance After the Destruction of USAID

Oversight Type: Investigation and Report

Problem: Following the dismantling of USAID and the widespread disruption of U.S.-funded health programming, including PEPFAR, the Trump administration is restructuring foreign aid in the health arena, guided by the "America First Global Health Strategy." The administration's approach has lacked sufficient congressional oversight and meaningful stakeholder participation and has produced plans that contradict the administration's own stated health objectives, while representing overall cuts in many areas. Moreover, the administration has taken a coercive, transactional approach, in which short-term benefits tied to unrelated foreign policy objectives—like opening markets for U.S. companies and securing access to mineral resources—shift the focus away from health objectives that have historically guided U.S. health aid.

Proposed Oversight Action: Investigate the implementation of the America First Global Health Strategy and the administration's restructuring of U.S. global health assistance following the dismantling of USAID. Examine whether congressionally appropriated funds were withheld, redirected, delayed, or conditioned on objectives unrelated to public health, including commercial access, trade concessions, or critical minerals agreements. Review the administration's handling of PEPFAR, CDC-supported global health programs, and other major health initiatives to determine whether statutory requirements and congressional intent were followed. Commission a report documenting program disruptions, funding diversions, continuity-of-care failures, and the broader diplomatic, humanitarian, and national security consequences of the administration's actions.

Why It Matters: American global health assistance, including programs like PEPFAR, exists to prevent disease, respond to health crises, and support public health objectives that have guided U.S. policy for decades. When that assistance is restructured behind closed doors, tied to unrelated commercial and political demands, and cut without meaningful congressional or stakeholder input, the patients and health systems that depend on U.S. support are put at risk, and America's credibility as a reliable global health partner suffers. Congress has an obligation to determine whether these taxpayer-funded programs are being administered in a manner consistent with statutory requirements and congressional intent, or repurposed to serve objectives Congress never authorized.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Foreign Affairs; Senate Foreign Relations

Section III: Democracy, Transparency, and the Rule of Law

Democracy depends on transparency, fair elections, and checks on power. Oversight is necessary when institutions are weakened, records are concealed, and lawful accountability mechanisms are ignored.

3.1 The New Jim Crow? Voting Rights After *Callais*

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: The Supreme Court's *Callais* decision gutted the key remaining elements of the Voting Rights Act, effectively authorizing barely disguised racial gerrymandering, so long as it is labeled partisan. The decision led to immediate redistricting in Southern states in ways designed to strip voting power from Black voters and people of color communities.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings examining the impacts of the Supreme Court's Callais decision and subsequent redistricting efforts that reduced the voting strength of Black voters and other communities of color. Require testimony from governors, attorneys general, state legislators, election officials, civil rights advocates, voting rights litigators, local elected officials, and affected voters from states that adopted or defended maps previously challenged as racially discriminatory. Examine both the explicit and implicit role race played in post-Callais redistricting decisions and the practical effects on representation, electoral competition, and minority political participation. Conduct legislative hearings on the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act and related proposals to build a record supporting restoration of federal voting rights protections weakened by recent Supreme Court decisions.

Why It Matters: The American people would be exposed to how states used the Court's decision to redraw districts in ways that reduced the voting power of Black voters and other communities of color, often reversing gains secured through decades of voting rights enforcement. The hearings would establish a clear record of who made these decisions, who benefited from them, and how they affected representation in communities across the country, while laying the groundwork for legislative remedies.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

3.2 Big Money, Bought Politicians, and Broken Democracy

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: Big Money is dominating elections like never before. Outside spending overwhelms candidate spending and depends on just a handful of people—with the top 100 donors consistently responsible for 70% of Super PAC spending. Secret spending is at record levels. The world's richest person spent hundreds of millions in the last election, a mere drop in the bucket for him. And for the first time since *Citizens United* was decided, corporations are opening their treasuries and spending directly in elections, a trend sure to worsen dramatically in the years to come.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold oversight hearings into the surge in Big Money spending, using case studies from the cryptocurrency, pharmaceutical, and fossil fuel industries to examine how concentrated political spending translates into favorable policy outcomes. Require testimony from Coinbase CEO Brian Armstrong, Ripple CEO Brad Garlinghouse, Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla, Eli Lilly CEO David Ricks, ExxonMobil CEO Darren Woods, and Chevron CEO Mike Wirth regarding their political spending, lobbying activities, and policy priorities. Pair industry witnesses with campaign finance experts, former regulators, ethics officials, and advocates for election transparency. Couple the oversight hearings with legislative hearings on proposals to increase disclosure, end secret spending, support small-dollar financing of elections, and overturn *Citizens United* and related decisions.

Why It Matters: Americans will see that many of the most significant legislative, regulatory, and enforcement outcomes of recent years have effectively been bought and paid for by powerful interests capable of spending enormous sums to influence the political process. Americans correctly perceive that Big Money is rigging elections and influencing public policy.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

3.3 Department of Injustice: Protecting Friends, Punishing Enemies

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has transformed the Department of Justice into a political tool. Across the department, career civil servants have been forced out precisely because of their commitment to the rule of law. The Civil Rights Division has lost upwards of three-quarters of its staff and is now working to defend white people from purported discrimination. The Department of Justice has systematically weakened its offices charged with, and its commitment to, deterring and prosecuting fraud and corporate misconduct – including by gutting the Public Integrity Section, disbanding the Consumer Protection Branch, shrinking enforcement of overseas corporate bribery, reducing oversight of corporate lawbreakers, and firing the department's ethics adviser.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and require testimony from former DOJ attorneys, ethics officials, fraud prosecutors, Public Integrity Section personnel, Civil Rights Division attorneys, and other career officials who resigned, were reassigned, or were forced out after refusing to engage in unlawful, unethical, or politically motivated conduct. Pair those witnesses with consumers, workers, whistleblowers, civil rights complainants, and victims of corporate misconduct whose interests were harmed when the department abandoned or weakened enforcement actions. Also require testimony from individuals, organizations, and public officials who were subjected to politically motivated investigations, enforcement actions, threats, or other forms of retaliatory targeting.

Why It Matters: The American people would see how political interference within the Department of Justice allowed fraud, corruption, discrimination, and corporate misconduct to go unpunished while individuals, organizations, and public officials perceived as political opponents faced scrutiny, retaliation, or selective enforcement. The hearings would establish a clear record of who was protected, who was targeted, and the consequences of a politicized Department of Justice.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

3.4 The Revolving Door: Corporate Insiders Running Our Government

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: In the Trump administration, former energy company executives write energy policy, chemical industry lobbyists run the EPA's chemical program, AI executives draft AI policy, and a crypto-friendly management consultant runs the SEC. This and more follows from existing ethics rules governing movement into and out of executive branch service are weak, inconsistent, and often dependent on the preferences of the sitting president through executive orders rather than permanent law. Trump declined to impose the stronger ethics pledges used by some prior administrations, contributing to recurring concerns about lobbyist influence, conflicts of interest, and officials moving between public office and private gain.

Proposed Oversight Action: Direct a congressional report and hold hearings on failures in executive branch ethics enforcement, revolving door abuses, and conflicts tied to incoming and outgoing officials. Solicit testimony from former government employees who can explain that they left because of the conflicted priorities of revolving door officials. Demand testimony from former Trump officials who have cashed in with new positions as lobbyists and consultants, to explain their ongoing lines of influence. Advance legislation codifying a minimum two-year cooling-off period after leaving government, while requiring incoming officials to recuse themselves from matters involving former employers or clients. Strengthen the Office of Government Ethics by granting enforcement authority and providing its director a fixed term removable only for cause.

Why It Matters: Public service should not be a stepping stone to private enrichment or a vehicle for corporations to place insiders inside government. When officials regulate former clients, negotiate future jobs while in office, or face weak enforcement of ethics rules, public confidence collapses, and policy can be distorted in favor of special interests.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

3.5 What Are They Hiding? FOIA Denials, Government Secrecy, and Hidden Corruption

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Federal agencies experienced growing delays in responding to Freedom of Information Act requests during the Trump administration, resulting in rising backlogs and missed statutory deadlines. Workforce reductions have significantly impaired FOIA processing, with attorneys in multiple federal cases citing staffing cuts as a primary cause of delays. Watchdog organizations and requesters have increasingly turned to litigation to obtain records.

Proposed Oversight Action: Conduct a government-wide review and hold hearings with agency chief FOIA officers, DOJ officials, inspectors general, and transparency advocates to examine (1) FOIA processing times and backlog levels across agencies in 2025 and 2026, (2) the impact of staffing cuts on FOIA performance, (3) the increasing reliance on litigation to obtain records, and (4) whether agencies are complying with both the letter and spirit of FOIA. Request agency-level data on staffing, backlog size, response times, and use of exemptions.

Why It Matters: FOIA is one of the primary tools for uncovering corruption and holding the government accountable. When agencies delay responses, withhold records, or force requesters into court, it raises serious concerns about whether information is being concealed rather than disclosed. Congress must determine whether these delays reflect administrative failure or a broader effort to shield government activity from scrutiny.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Judiciary

3.6 Vote by Mail: Delayed Ballots, Disenfranchised Voters, and a Threat to Democracy

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: During the 2026 election year, the Trump administration took actions to undermine vote-by-mail, including Executive Order 14399, which directed the U.S. Postal Service to limit ballot delivery to pre-approved voter lists and required states to submit eligibility data in advance of elections. Public Citizen filed a motion, based on our previous 2020 settlement, on these illegal actions. These actions, combined with prior changes to mail delivery standards, raised concerns among election officials about whether ballots would be delivered and returned in time to be counted.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold a hearing with Postal Service leadership, DHS officials, state and local election administrators, and voting rights/postal service experts to examine (1) how federal actions affected mail ballot delivery and return rates during the 2026 election, (2) whether eligible voters experienced delays or barriers that prevented their ballots from being counted, and (3) whether federal agencies interfered with state election administration. Request postal delivery data, ballot rejection data, and internal communications related to the implementation of election-related directives.

Why It Matters: Vote-by-mail is a critical access point for millions of Americans, including rural voters, people with disabilities, seniors, and military voters. If federal actions delayed or restricted ballot delivery, eligible voters may have been prevented from participating in elections. Nothing is more essential to democracy than protecting the right to vote.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

3.7 Access Denied: Restricting Public Input on Federal Regulations

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: On August 8, 2025, the General Services Administration quietly turned off the POST API on Regulations.gov, a tool that allowed advocacy groups, trade associations, and other third parties to help members of the public submit comments to federal agencies. Notice-and-comment rulemaking is one of the few formal opportunities ordinary Americans and small businesses have to shape federal regulations, yet GSA provided no public notice or explanation for removing the tool during active comment periods.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open an investigation into the decision to remove the POST API, including whether OMB directed GSA to take the action and what justification was offered. Subpoena internal communications, policy memos, technical assessments, and correspondence between OMB, GSA, and outside stakeholders. Require agencies to explain whether comments were lost or disrupted and whether the API can be promptly restored.

Why It Matters: The POST API helped level the playing field by allowing the public to comment through simpler third-party tools. Removing it makes it harder for workers, consumers, community groups, and small businesses to participate, while benefiting well-connected corporations and lobbyists who can influence policy through private channels. When access to rulemaking is restricted, agencies lose valuable public input and democratic accountability suffers.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

3.8 401(k)s at Risk: SEC Weakens Investor Protections for Retirement Savers

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: In November 2025, SEC Chair Paul Atkins directed staff to limit the agency's role in reviewing shareholder proposals, allowing more than 100 public companies to exclude proposals from 2026 annual meetings. These proposals are often submitted by pension funds and institutional investors representing workers' retirement savings, and they focus on issues such as executive pay, corporate risk, and financial accountability. Reports indicate corporate lobbyists and business groups pushed for the shift.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold a hearing with SEC leadership, investor advocates, pension fund representatives, corporate governance experts, and business and lobbying groups to examine (1) the November 2025 change to the shareholder proposal process, (2) communications between SEC officials and corporate lobbyists, (3) the number and type of proposals excluded from 2026 corporate ballots, and (4) whether the SEC is meeting its obligation to protect investors. Request communications, internal guidance, and data on excluded proposals and affected investors.

Why It Matters: Millions of Americans rely on 401(k)s and pension funds for retirement security. Shareholder proposals are among the few ways investors can raise concerns and push companies to address risks to long-term value. If companies can block those proposals without meaningful oversight, it raises a basic question: are corporations accountable to their investors, or can they silence them when it is inconvenient?

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Section IV: Big Tech, AI, and the New Corporate Threats

New technologies can deliver innovation, but without guardrails they can also magnify monopoly power, surveillance, manipulation, and public harm. Oversight must ensure emerging technologies serve people rather than exploit them.

4.1 Big Tech Writes the Rules: Conflicts of Interest in AI Policy

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Under the influence of AI Czar David Sacks—an investor in hundreds of tech companies—the Trump administration immediately rescinded the forward-looking Biden AI Executive Order. In its place, it adopted a zero-regulation, permissive approach to AI, promoting Big Tech's interests in energy, data centers, trade, and more. Even a very modest EO addressing national security threats was watered down under Sacks's influence.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and conduct investigations examining the role of AI Czar David Sacks and other technology industry insiders in shaping federal AI policy. Require testimony from David Sacks regarding his financial interests, communications with administration officials, participation in policy deliberations, and role in rescinding or modifying AI-related executive actions and regulatory initiatives. Examine whether administration decisions regarding AI regulation, data centers, energy policy, trade policy, national security safeguards, and federal procurement disproportionately benefited companies in which Sacks or other administration advisers held financial interests.

Why It Matters: This hearing would expose the American people to the rampant corruption in this administration's AI policy. Moreover, powerful new AI technologies may remake society, changing the way we work, altering culture, determining how we learn and acquire information, and more. They pose immediate and long-term threats, from political deepfakes to cybersecurity to mass unemployment. Already, they are functioning to concentrate wealth. Americans are worried about these issues and want AI policy for people, not the Big Tech oligarchy.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; House Science, Space, and Technology; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

4.2 Preemption: Big Tech's Escape Hatch: Stopping States from Protecting Consumers

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: With virtually no federal regulation of AI, Big Tech companies are working on overdrive to win federal preemption of state AI regulation. On a bipartisan basis, states are taking the lead on commonsense regulations to address political deepfakes, unauthorized intimate deepfakes, emotionally entangling chatbots, misuse of AI in health insurance decisions, frontier model risks, and more.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and require testimony from the CEOs and senior executives of major AI and technology companies, along with witnesses with bipartisan state attorneys general, state legislators, consumer protection officials, civil rights advocates, and parents whose children or families were harmed by AI-enabled fraud, deepfakes, exploitation, discrimination, or other unsafe uses of emerging technologies.

Why It Matters: These hearings would clearly identify victims harmed by Big Tech and expose this industry's efforts to undermine consumer protection. Additionally, the Big Tech companies are racing to roll out AI technologies with very inadequate testing and safeguards, effectively conducting nonconsensual societal experiments. This is exactly what happened with social media, and it did not turn out well—and the stakes with AI are far higher. By overwhelming numbers, Americans favor strong AI regulation—something that federal preemption aims to prevent.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

4.3 Procurement of Grok: Unsafe AI, Unsafe Government

Oversight Type: Investigation

Problem: In 2025, the Trump administration approved the use of Grok, an AI system developed by xAI, for federal government applications including access to sensitive systems, despite documented safety risks. Reporting has highlighted that Grok and comparable AI systems have produced nonconsensual deepfake sexual images, generated harmful and misleading content, and remain vulnerable to manipulation through prompt injection and other exploits. Experts warned that Grok lacks sufficient safeguards relative to peer models, yet it was cleared for government use without transparent safety standards.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open an investigation into the procurement and approval of Grok across federal agencies, including subpoenas for internal communications, safety assessments, and risk determinations from GSA, OMB, and relevant agencies. The investigation should determine what safety criteria were applied, whether known risks were ignored or downplayed, and whether deployment complied with federal AI risk management guidance. Issue a formal report evaluating failures in the procurement process and recommending enforceable standards for high-risk AI systems.

Why It Matters: The federal government deployed an AI system with known capabilities for generating harmful content and documented security vulnerabilities, posing clear risks to national security, public safety, and government integrity. This sets a dangerous precedent that agencies can adopt powerful AI systems without meeting basic safety and security thresholds.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Science, Space, and Technology

4.4 Your Face, Their Database: Building America's Surveillance State

Oversight Type: Investigation

Problem: Since 2025, the Trump administration has expanded the federal government's collection and use of biometric data, including facial recognition, fingerprints, and other identifiers, across immigration enforcement, law enforcement, and public surveillance contexts. The federal government has relied on commercially purchased data from third-party brokers to obtain sensitive personal and location information without a warrant. Documented errors in facial recognition systems have already led to wrongful identifications and arrests.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open an investigation into the scope and legal basis of biometric data collection and third-party data purchases across DHS, DOJ, FBI, and intelligence agencies, including subpoenas for contracts with data brokers, internal policies governing biometric use, and records of how such data has been deployed. Issue a report outlining the scale of biometric surveillance and recommend statutory limits on the use and acquisition of biometric and commercially available personal data.

Why It Matters: The federal government is building a de facto national biometric surveillance system without clear legal guardrails. By purchasing data from third parties and deploying flawed facial recognition tools, agencies are effectively sidestepping the Fourth Amendment and exposing Americans to wrongful identification, tracking, and targeting. Once fully built, this infrastructure will be nearly impossible to unwind.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary; House Homeland Security; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

4.5 Addictive Algorithms and Big Tech Manipulation of Children

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Major technology companies, including Meta, have deliberately designed algorithms to maximize user engagement, even when it harms children and teens. Internal documents have shown these companies knew their platforms amplify addictive use, promote harmful content, and worsen youth mental health, yet prioritized growth and profits. In a landmark California case, a Los Angeles jury found Meta liable for harms caused by the addictive design of its platform, concluding its product was a substantial factor in causing mental health injury.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open an investigation into the design and deployment of addictive algorithms by major technology companies, including subpoenas for internal research, product design decisions, and communications demonstrating knowledge of harm. Hold high-profile hearings with executives from Meta, TikTok, and other platforms to examine how engagement algorithms are intentionally structured to drive compulsive use. Expand the investigation to AI-driven recommendation systems. Issue a report proposing enforceable product safety standards.

Why It Matters: Tech companies are actively engineering products to capture attention and drive dependency, especially among children. A California jury has already found that this design causes real-world harm. Without intervention, the same addictive design principles are being embedded into AI systems, scaling manipulation and harm even further.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

4.6 Robots at War: AI Targeting, Civilian Deaths, and Military Accountability

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: In 2026, reporting raised serious questions about whether AI-assisted targeting systems were used in U.S. military strikes in Iran, including the deadly bombing of a school in Minab that killed more than 150 civilians, many of them children. Investigations indicated that the site may have been misidentified as a military target due to outdated or flawed intelligence data. The Pentagon has been increasing reliance on AI-enabled targeting tools designed to accelerate strike decisions.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open an investigation into the Department of Defense's use of AI-assisted targeting systems in Iran and other theaters, including subpoenas for targeting protocols, human review requirements, vendor contracts, and after-action assessments related to civilian casualty incidents. Hold hearings with Pentagon officials, military commanders, and defense technology contractors to determine whether AI systems were used in the Minab strike, which safeguards failed, and whether current policy complies with the laws of armed conflict. Issue a report evaluating the risks of autonomous and semi-autonomous weapons systems.

Why It Matters: The future of warfare will increasingly involve AI, but speed cannot replace judgment. If flawed data or black-box systems are allowed to drive targeting decisions, civilians will die, and the U.S. risks violating international humanitarian norms. Congress must decide now whether lethal AI tools will operate under strict human accountability or become another unchecked weapon system.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Armed Services; Senate Armed Services; House Foreign Affairs; Senate Foreign Relations

4.7 AI Search: Controlling Information, Concentrating Power

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Major technology companies are rapidly replacing traditional search results with AI-generated summaries that answer questions directly and decide which sources users see, reducing the open-choice model that long defined the internet. Publishers and content creators fear that these systems scrape their work, summarize it without compensation, and keep users on dominant platforms, strengthening the market power of companies such as Google, OpenAI, Microsoft, and Anthropic while increasing the risk of hidden bias, factual errors, and large-scale disinformation.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open an investigation into the competitive, economic, and informational effects of AI search products, including subpoenas for internal documents on traffic impacts, source-ranking decisions, training data practices, and agreements with publishers or preferred content providers. Hold hearings with major AI and search executives, independent publishers, academics, and antitrust experts. Issue a report evaluating whether existing antitrust, consumer protection, and transparency laws are sufficient for the AI search era.

Why It Matters: A small number of AI companies can determine what information people see first, what sources survive economically, and which voices disappear. If AI search tools absorb web traffic while monetizing others' content, smaller websites, local journalism, and independent creators may become economically unsustainable. This is not only a competition issue—it is a democracy issue involving access to information, market concentration, and who controls knowledge online.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary; House Energy and Commerce; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

4.8 Algorithmic Rulemaking: Secret Software, Hidden Decisions, No Accountability

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has aggressively pursued an agenda to weaken public protections through executive order, while agencies and administration-aligned entities may be using AI tools to identify regulations for rescission, draft regulatory actions, and review public comments, including reported use of DOGE's "Sweet Rex" tool and DOT's use of Google Gemini. There is little public transparency regarding which large language models are used, what data they rely on, whether qualified officials review their outputs, or whether any legal, privacy, or ethical guardrails apply.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings on the use of AI in the federal regulatory process, with testimony from OMB, DOJ, DOT, agency rulemaking officials, outside vendors, and administrative law experts. Subpoena contracts, internal guidance, prompts, training materials, output logs, validation studies, and communications related to DOGE's Sweet Rex tool, Google Gemini, and comparable systems. Require a report identifying which agencies are using AI in rulemaking, for what purposes, under what safeguards, and whether such use complies with the Administrative Procedure Act.

Why It Matters: Deciding whether regulations protecting public health, worker safety, transportation safety, consumer rights, and financial stability should be repealed requires legal judgment, subject-matter expertise, and accountability that current AI systems lack. Americans deserve to know whether human experts or unaccountable software are driving decisions that affect their daily lives.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

4.9 Data Centers, Sky-High Bills: How Big Tech's Energy Hunger Is Draining American Families

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: The rapid build-out of data centers is compounding increasing electricity prices and energy burden on communities across the country, with some residents seeing increases of up to 250% in their energy bills. Simultaneously, data centers are exacerbating the climate crisis by locking in more fossil-fuel infrastructure, with over 50% relying on fossil fuels. Big Tech continues to expand without adequate federal oversight of community, environmental, or affordability impacts.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings, open investigations, and issue reports examining which data center operators are positioned to benefit from energy dominance programs and coal plant extensions, what the per-ratepayer cost of those extensions is in each affected state, and whether DOE conducted any cost-benefit analysis before eliminating emissions requirements from lending programs. Examine water use, light and noise pollution, and the erosion of the state and local tax base.

Why It Matters: Affordability, fossil fuel dependence, lack of transparency and community involvement, and the erosion of local tax bases are all legitimate public policy concerns. Congress should establish who is actually benefiting from current energy policy and who is paying for it.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; House Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

Section V: Climate, Energy, and Environmental Accountability

Americans should not face higher bills, dirtier air, and greater disaster risks because of favoritism toward powerful polluters. Oversight should determine whether this administration's public policy serves energy insiders over consumers and communities.

5.1 The Big Ugly Giveaway: Billions for Fossil Fuel Corporations, Higher Energy Costs for Everyone Else

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The OBBBA created several new tax incentives and expanded other fossil fuel giveaways, while slashing clean energy incentives that would reduce consumers' electricity bills. Fossil fuel companies already receive an estimated $35 billion in annual federal giveaways, with over $4 billion added by Trump and Republicans in 2025—more than double the levels from 2017.

Proposed Oversight Action: The House Oversight Committee, in conjunction with House Ways and Means and other relevant committees, should collect tax data, quarterly earnings, and earnings projections to inform an investigation and subsequent hearings regarding fossil fuel industry profits from the OBBBA. The investigation should examine specific companies positioned to benefit, the total value of new incentives, and how those gains compare with any commitments to jobs or domestic investment.

Why It Matters: As more Americans foot the bill for oil shareholders and executive paychecks, Congress should conduct a thorough investigation into the profits fossil fuel companies have made since the passage of OBBBA and what they could expect to make if no changes are made. This could also be expanded to broader corporate payout from OBBBA. The committees should expose for the American people how the administration's policies enrich fossil fuel corporations and billionaires while driving costs for households up, not down.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; House Energy and Commerce; House Natural Resources; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

5.2 The Grid Gamble: Fossil Fuel Bailouts for Corporations, Higher Energy Costs for Everyone Else

Oversight Type: Investigation

Problem: The OBBBA created a new "Energy Dominance Financing Program" that provides DOE loan guarantees for fossil-fuel infrastructure, replaces clean-energy grid investments with fossil-fuel-friendly alternatives, and removes emissions requirements from the Loan Programs Office. The Trump administration also issued executive orders keeping retired and retiring coal plants online, forcing ratepayers in Michigan and Pennsylvania to foot tens of millions in added electricity costs. Meanwhile, electricity demand is rising sharply due to data center growth.

Proposed Oversight Action: Investigate (1) which specific data center operators and fossil fuel companies are positioned to benefit from the Energy Dominance Financing Program and coal plant extensions; (2) what the per-ratepayer cost of those extensions is in each affected state; and (3) whether DOE conducted any cost-benefit analysis comparing fossil fuel grid investments against clean alternatives before eliminating the emissions requirement from the LPO. Request internal DOE communications and the financial terms of any loan guarantees issued under the new program.

Why It Matters: We are being told that fossil fuels are necessary for grid reliability, even as data centers—whose power needs primarily benefit large tech corporations—drive the surge in demand that justifies those investments. Congress should establish who is actually benefiting from this energy policy and who is paying for it.

Committee/Jurisdiction: Senate Environment and Public Works; House Energy and Commerce; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

5.3 Carbon Capture, Bigger Oil Profits: How the Big Ugly Law Turns Climate Policy Into Corporate Welfare

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The OBBBA modified the 45Q carbon capture tax credit to put enhanced oil recovery—pumping captured CO2 into the ground to extract more oil—on equal financial footing with permanent geologic carbon storage. This means the federal government is subsidizing a carbon capture method whose primary output is increased fossil fuel production. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates this provision alone could be worth $14.2 billion over ten years.

Proposed Oversight Action: Request all internal Treasury and DOE communications regarding the 45Q modification, including any industry lobbying records or communications with OBBBA drafters. Hold hearings examining (1) which specific companies are projected to claim the expanded 45Q credit for enhanced oil recovery; (2) how much additional oil production is projected to result; (3) what the net carbon accounting of the credit is when downstream combustion emissions from that additional oil are included; and (4) whether the credit as modified constitutes a net climate benefit or a net carbon increase.

Why It Matters: Congress is telling the public that carbon capture is a climate solution while simultaneously designing the federal subsidy for it to maximize oil extraction. A thorough public accounting of who benefits and what the actual emissions math looks like is essential to honest climate oversight—and to establishing the factual record for any future legislative correction.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; House Natural Resources; House Energy and Commerce; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

5.4 The War on Climate Science: Repealing the Endangerment Finding and Silencing EPA Experts

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: The Trump administration pushed to repeal the endangerment finding, the foundational rule originally required by the Supreme Court and finalized under Obama that serves as the basis for U.S. climate policy. The administration repealed the rule without scientific basis, and the repeal is currently in litigation. Additionally, Congress used the Congressional Review Act to nullify California's Clean Air waivers, raising questions about both the legality of that action and the process by which EPA and career staff were overruled.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open an investigation into how the scientific basis (or alleged lack thereof) was determined for the endangerment finding repeal, the process by which career staff may have been overruled, and the legal consequences of the repeal and waiver revocations. Require testimony from EPA scientists, former agency officials, state regulators, and independent environmental law experts. Commission a report on the expected public health consequences of these actions.

Why It Matters: Hearings should establish a factual record on how scientific consensus was disregarded, which career officials objected and how they were treated, and what the practical legal and regulatory consequences will be for states, industries, and communities that relied on settled climate policy.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Energy and Commerce; Senate Environment and Public Works

5.5 Critical Minerals, Critical Corruption: Political Favoritism Is Driving Billions in Mining Giveaways

Oversight Type: Investigation and Report

Problem: The Trump administration has used federal mining programs and new "critical minerals" initiatives to steer lucrative deals toward politically connected companies, while weakening environmental review and public disclosure. Current congressional proposals, such as the SECURE Minerals Act and the Finding ORE Act, would codify Trump's actions into law, and recent White House executive orders related to critical minerals and mine permitting have already directed agencies to deploy billions in taxpayer dollars for mining projects with little to no transparency or accountability. There is still no comprehensive public accounting of how much taxpayer money has been committed, who is benefiting, or how these projects are affecting communities, workers, and the environment.

Proposed Oversight Action: Congress should open a formal investigation and commission a public report to map which individuals and companies are receiving critical-minerals contracts, equity investments, and other forms of federal mining support, and under what terms. The inquiry should assess whether there are financial, political, or personal ties between recipients and administration officials, whether agencies have complied with environmental, labor, and community-impact requirements, and how proposed legislation like the SECURE Minerals Act and the Finding ORE Act would entrench or expand these preferential arrangements. The investigation should result in concrete legislative and regulatory recommendations to close loopholes, prevent self-dealing, and protect taxpayers going forward.

Why It Matters: Critical minerals are essential for the clean energy transition, advanced manufacturing, and national security, and global demand is projected to more than double by 2030. If politically connected firms and shell companies capture federal mining policy, the U.S. will become a playground for corruption and pollution, prioritizing short-term favors over long-term industrial resilience. Without robust oversight, politically favored firms can crowd out more responsible competitors, undermining market discipline and leaving taxpayers on the hook for risky or underperforming projects. Members across the political spectrum are interested in ensuring that federal mining support does not become a vehicle for self-dealing, pay-to-play schemes, or hidden liabilities that surface years after the current administration has left office.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Natural Resources; Senate Energy and Natural Resources; House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

5.6 The Climate Data Black Box: Private Risk Models, Rising Premiums, and Families Left in the Dark

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: As climate change drives up disaster costs and insured losses, insurance companies increasingly need access to extensive federal climate data and forward-looking risk projections. As Trump cuts to climate data infrastructure, that uncertainty will drive up costs as insurers hedge by raising premiums. The lack of historical federal investment in catastrophe modeling has left insurers relying on secretive private models, leaving households and local governments in the dark.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with climate scientists, insurance affordability experts, actuaries, and state regulators on the need for robust federal climate data infrastructure and the downstream household cost implications of data privatization. Commission a report examining the gap between federal investment in catastrophe modeling and the scale of climate-driven losses, and identifying federal steps to improve public transparency in risk modeling.

Why It Matters: The lack of historical federal investment in catastrophe modeling has left insurers relying on secretive private models. As Trump cuts funding for climate data infrastructure, that uncertainty will drive up costs as insurers hedge by raising premiums further, ultimately borne by American families.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Natural Resources; House Science, Space, and Technology; Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

5.7 Ignoring the Climate Risk: How Deregulation Leaves Banks Vulnerable and Families on the Hook

Oversight Type: Hearing

Problem: Since the start of the Trump administration, federal financial regulators, including the SEC, FDIC, OCC, and Federal Reserve, have gutted climate-related financial regulation. These actions are unrelated to reduced climate-related financial risk, which is actually increasing as climate change goes unmitigated and physical impacts worsen. The lack of climate-related regulation exposes the financial system and the economy to increased risks and vulnerabilities.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with federal financial regulators, independent economists, climate finance experts, and consumer advocates to examine what climate-related financial regulations have been rolled back, on what legal and analytical basis, and what the projected risk consequences are for financial institutions, households, and the broader economy. Request internal communications and analysis from the SEC, FDIC, OCC, and Federal Reserve on the basis for rollback decisions.

Why It Matters: Ignoring climate-related financial risks does not make them go away. No less than Jerome Powell, then-chair of the Federal Reserve, testified in February 2025 that, "If you fast forward 10 or 15 years, there will be regions of the country where you can't get a mortgage, there won't be ATMs, banks won't have branches and things like that." By abdicating their risk management role to do favors for the fossil fuel industry, financial regulators—who should operate independently of the executive branch—are putting the American economy at risk. It is working families that will pay the highest price if climate-driven financial risks materialize.

Committee/Jurisdiction: Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; House Financial Services

5.8 The War on Wind: Fossil Fuel Buyouts, Higher Energy Costs, and Communities Left Behind

Oversight Type: Investigation

Problem: Since January 2025, the Trump administration has issued executive orders and pressured energy developers to cancel wind projects and invest in fossil fuel infrastructure instead. In 2026, Trump's Interior Department agreed to pay several developers to abandon their offshore wind leases and redirect the money to other energy sources, such as new gas-fired power plants. Those buyouts included $1 billion for TotalEnergies, $765 million for Invenergy, and more. This aggressive anti-wind agenda blocks clean, cheap renewables that would lower Americans' electricity bills and cut climate-warming pollution.

Proposed Oversight Action: Investigate Trump's dirty deals with energy companies and expose how Trump's anti-renewables agenda is hurting Americans' pocketbooks while enriching the Trump administration and its fossil fuel billionaire cronies. Request, and subpoena if refused, the full settlement agreements, the legal memos authorizing them, and Interior and DOJ communications with the developers. Investigate who owns and profits from the pivot of renewable investments into fossil projects.

Why It Matters: The administration's anti-renewables agenda is making life more expensive for families, putting thousands of offshore wind jobs in jeopardy, and wasting taxpayer dollars on polluting industries that are driving the climate crisis.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; House Energy and Commerce; House Natural Resources; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

Section VI: Corruption, Abuse of Power, and Government for Sale

Public office should serve the public, not enrich insiders or reward political allies. Oversight is needed to determine whether government power was used for private gain, donor favoritism, or corporate influence rather than the public interest. In particular, a focus on the impacts of corruption and abuse of power on the economy and on the lives of regular Americans will be well received. Hearings focused on this topic should both identify clear villains and lay the groundwork for eventual legislative reforms that grapple with oligarchy and power imbalances.

6.1 Justice for Sale: The President's Personal Lawsuit, DOJ Resources, and the Taxpayer-Funded Slush Fund

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: President Trump filed suit against the IRS seeking damages after a contractor, Charles Littlejohn, leaked his tax returns to The New York Times. He originally sought $10 billion in damages under 26 U.S.C. § 7431, a provision that legal experts and members of Congress have noted would be unavailable to ordinary taxpayers under the same circumstances, given that Trump is pursuing the claim through the Department of Justice rather than private counsel. He chose instead to settle the matter with a $1.76 billion slush fund that could distribute taxpayer dollars to individuals alleging politically motivated targeting by the federal government.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with Department of Justice leadership, IRS officials, Treasury Department officials, and legal experts to examine whether DOJ resources are being used to pursue a personal claim that could result in taxpayer-funded payments or special protections for a sitting president, whether similar claims or settlement arrangements would be available to ordinary taxpayers, and whether the proposed "Anti-Weaponization Fund" constituted an improper use of taxpayer resources.

Why It Matters: This lawsuit raises broader concerns about whether a sitting president can use the machinery of the federal government to pursue personal financial or legal benefit. At a time when Americans are facing real affordability challenges, Congress should examine whether public resources are being used for private financial gain or settlement structures that would not be available to ordinary citizens.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

6.2 Crypto Cash and Foreign Influence: The Risks of Government-Linked Investors in Trump-Affiliated Deals

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: President Trump and individuals affiliated with his political and business network have been linked to cryptocurrency ventures that involve investors with significant legal and regulatory exposure, including Changpeng Zhao and Justin Sun. At the same time, foreign government-linked investors have made large-scale investments in Trump-affiliated crypto ventures, including a reported $2 billion deal backed by entities tied to the United Arab Emirates and a substantial ownership stake held by a UAE royal. These investments raise concerns that foreign actors may gain financial leverage or access to U.S. policymakers through crypto markets.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings with Treasury, SEC, and DOJ officials, financial crime experts, and executives from major crypto platforms and Trump-affiliated ventures to examine (1) foreign government-linked investment in U.S. political figures' financial ventures, (2) compliance with anti-money laundering and disclosure laws, (3) the role of high-risk or sanctioned actors in these markets, and (4) whether existing safeguards are sufficient to prevent foreign influence over U.S. policymakers. Request financial records, investor disclosures, and communications between crypto firms, foreign investors, and administration officials.

Why It Matters: Foreign government-linked investment in ventures tied to a sitting president represents a potential pathway to purchase influence with the U.S. government. If foreign actors can gain financial stakes in businesses connected to political power, it creates a direct risk to national security and public trust. Congress should determine whether gaps in oversight are allowing private financial interests and foreign governments to intersect with public power in ways that undermine accountability.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Financial Services; Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; House Foreign Affairs; Senate Foreign Relations

6.3 The Justice System Under Pressure: Political Prosecutions, Threats to Staff, and the Collapse of Independence

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: At the commencement of the administration, then Attorney General Pam Bondi told DOJ staff that their duty was to advocate zealously for Trump's agenda, not the rule of law—and threatened them with discipline or firing if they failed. That zealous advocacy has included bringing bad-faith criminal charges against the president's perceived political enemies, a preposterous prosecution against one of the nation's leading civil rights organizations, and the issuance of various memoranda that aim to treat political adversaries as domestic terrorists.

Proposed Oversight Action: Current and former DOJ officials should be subpoenaed to testify about their decisions regarding weaponization and their coordination with the White House. At hearings, DOJ staff, including U.S. attorneys, should be asked about instructions they received to prosecute political enemies and the responses they received when they argued against such bad-faith actions.

Why It Matters: A democracy cannot function in a climate of widespread political prosecutions or the threat of such prosecutions. Weaponization of the DOJ is perhaps the pinnacle of Trump's vindictiveness and authoritarian overreach.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

6.4 Pardons for Sale: How Trump's Pay-to-Play System Erased Penalties and Hurt Victims

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: President Trump abused the pardon power: He pardoned the January 6 insurrectionists. Outside the January 6 pardons, more than one-third of his pardons in the first year were granted to people convicted of fraud or fraud-adjacent charges. His pardons have led to the cancellation of $1.5 billion in fines and restitution, including more than $1 billion owed to victims. Pardons have been granted to those who have contributed to Trump-affiliated election committees or who have hired Trump-affiliated lobbyists. And Trump has suggested he will grant broad pardons to those serving in the current administration.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and require testimony from recipients of controversial pardons, along with those witnesses who are fraud victims, investors, consumers, law enforcement officers, and others harmed by the underlying crimes whose restitution, accountability, or legal remedies were diminished by pardon decisions.

Why It Matters: This would be an embarrassing hearing for any member defending people who attacked the Capitol or committed fraud against consumers and investors. Moreover, Trump's abuse of pardons drives the broad narrative about abuse of power, plus specific narratives that this administration is pro-fraud and that perks are available for sale, as well as reminds the public of Trump's embrace of the January 6 insurrection.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary

6.5 Illegal Impoundments: Depriving Communities, Trampling Separation of Powers

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: Through impoundments, grant cancellations, and budgetary maneuvers, the Trump administration has refused to make hundreds of billions of dollars of Congressionally authorized and mandated investments in communities. These have hurt education, health care, VA programs, road construction, overseas humanitarian missions, and more. Many of these measures are illegal and trample on Congress' spending power authority.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings featuring mayors, school superintendents, hospital and community health center leaders, veterans, infrastructure officials, nonprofit service providers, and other beneficiaries harmed by the withholding of congressionally appropriated funds. Pair those witnesses with former OMB officials, appropriations experts, GAO officials, and budget law scholars to examine the legality of the administration's actions and their impact on Congress's constitutional power of the purse. Issue a report documenting both the constitutional violations and the real-world consequences for communities denied funding that Congress had already approved.

Why It Matters: The Trump administration is thumbing its nose at Congress's spending power, instead picking and choosing what it prefers to fund, rather than following congressional directives. It is directing federal funds on a partisan basis, attacking core safety-net programs, failing to make crucial infrastructure investments, sabotaging renewable energy programs, and undermining humanitarian programs around the world. The stakes are high for the Constitutional separation of powers and the health and well-being of communities across the country.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

6.6 $20,000 to Rent a Horse? Neigh! How Noem Steered Massive Taxpayer-Funded Contracts to Help Themselves, Their Partners, and Their Friends

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Since its inception in February 2025, the $240 million DHS advertising and marketing campaign, branded "Stronger Borders, Stronger America," has raised immediate concerns due to its extraordinary size, questionable procurement process, politically connected recipients, and unclear public purpose. The contract later became central to bipartisan congressional scrutiny of DHS leadership, culminating in the March 2026 removal of Secretary Kristi Noem and the departures of senior officials amid allegations of self-dealing, favoritism, and financial conflicts of interest.

Proposed Oversight Action: Open a full investigation into the award and administration of the "Stronger Borders, Stronger America" contract, including how SAFE AMERICA MEDIA and PEOPLE WHO THINK were selected, the identity of all subcontractors, and how funds were spent. Subpoena financial records, procurement files, communications, invoices, deliverables, and conflict-of-interest disclosures for contractors, subcontractors, and involved DHS officials. Hold hearings requiring testimony under oath from former DHS leadership, contracting officers, inspectors general, and outside experts on whether political influence corrupted the procurement process.

Why It Matters: When government contracts are steered through corruption, taxpayers are cheated, legitimate work may go undone, and public services suffer. Honest businesses that compete fairly are punished while insiders profit from favoritism. Corruption in contracting is anti-competitive, wasteful, and corrosive to public trust.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Armed Services; Senate Armed Services

6.7 Isn't That Special? Exposing the Costly Abuse of the Special Government Employee Designation

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: During its first year, the Trump administration reportedly used the Special Government Employee (SGE) designation far beyond its intended purpose, rapidly placing politically connected individuals with potential conflicts of interest into influential government roles. Elon Musk is the number one example of this abuse of power. The SGE category was originally designed for limited, temporary service by outside experts, not as a pathway for high-level officials to exercise significant authority while avoiding stricter ethics, disclosure, and transparency requirements.

Proposed Oversight Action: Direct a congressional report on use and abuse of the SGE designation across the executive branch, including how many SGEs were appointed, what authority they exercised, what disclosures were required, and whether service limits were exceeded. Hold hearings requiring key SGEs and agency officials to testify regarding days worked, scope of duties, access to classified or procurement information, recusals, and compliance with ethics rules. Develop reforms that narrow SGE eligibility, strengthen disclosures, and limit its use in senior policymaking roles.

Why It Matters: Government service should not be structured to give insiders public power without public accountability. If politically connected individuals can enter government through loopholes, wield influence, and leave without meaningful transparency, conflicts of interest and self-dealing become far more likely.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

6.8 Graft Behind a Green Screen—Co-Opting the National Parks Department and Its Charities to Hide Pay-to-Play Deals and Launder Shady Money

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: Charitable organizations created to support America's national parks and public landmarks have reportedly been used as opaque fundraising vehicles tied to politically connected projects and donors seeking influence. In particular, President Trump's bombastic vanity projects, like his proposed Arch, have fallen into this category. Allegations involving the Trust for the National Mall and the National Park Foundation raise concerns that private funds intended for civic preservation may instead be used to finance favored initiatives, provide privileged access, or reward donors with business before the National Park Service.

Proposed Oversight Action: Issue subpoenas to the Trust for the National Mall and the National Park Foundation for records regarding fundraising, donor communications, expenditures, contracts, and project approvals tied to the White House Ballroom Project, Freedom 250, and similar initiatives. Hold hearings requiring testimony from organization leaders, major donors, fundraisers, lobbyists, Interior Department officials, and ethics experts regarding any promises of access, influence, or favorable treatment linked to donations.

Why It Matters: Tax-exempt charities established to support public lands and civic institutions should not become vehicles for presidential vanity projects, donor influence, or privileged access to public assets. When politically connected donors or corporations can route money through park-related nonprofits to secure contracts, approvals, or access to government officials, it raises serious concerns about pay-to-play arrangements and about whether public resources are being managed in the public interest.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Natural Resources; Senate Energy and Natural Resources

6.9 Investigate Corporate Influence, Cronyism, and Self-Dealing in Trump Trade and Tariff Policy

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: The Trump administration has used tariffs, exemptions, and closed-door trade negotiations in ways that raise serious concerns about favoritism toward politically connected industries and donors, including Big Tech, Big Pharma, and select manufacturers. Critics argue that tariff threats and secret trade deals were used to pressure foreign governments into weakening digital taxes, privacy protections, AI safeguards, drug-pricing measures, and competition rules, thereby reducing corporate profits. At the same time, selective exemptions may have rewarded favored companies.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open investigations into whether campaign contributions, donor access, lobbying pressure, or personal business interests shaped trade policy, tariff exemptions, and bilateral agreements. Subpoena records from USTR, Commerce, Treasury, and White House officials regarding trade negotiations, exemption decisions, donor contacts, and communications with corporate representatives. Issue a report identifying whether tariff and trade powers were used to enrich insiders or override congressional policy goals.

Why It Matters: Trade policy should protect workers, consumers, and the national interest—not serve as a tool for rewarding donors, punishing rivals, or advancing corporate agendas in secret. If politically connected companies can shape tariffs and trade deals for private gain, American workers face higher costs, small businesses lose fair competition, and public trust in government collapses.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Ways and Means; Senate Finance

6.10 Trojan Horse: Foreign Gifts and Influence in the Trump Administration

Oversight Type: Investigations, Hearings, and Report

Problem: Donald Trump has accepted a $400 million plane as a gift from Qatar. UAE investments in Trump family crypto ventures have enriched the family by nearly $200 million. The Trump family is pursuing real estate deals around the world. And Jared Kushner is seeking billions in investments from Saudi Arabia even as he serves as one of America's leading diplomats.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings to shine a light on each of the Trump foreign deals. Direct a congressional report examining this $400 million gift and the consequences of exempting the president and vice president from 18 U.S.C. § 208 and the unresolved scope of the Emoluments Clauses. Hold hearings with ethics experts, former executive branch lawyers, historians, and constitutional scholars. Advance legislation applying conflict-of-interest standards to future presidents and vice presidents, requiring divestment or qualified blind trusts, enhanced financial disclosures, and enforceable civil penalties.

Why It Matters: When presidents or vice presidents can hold conflicting financial interests while accepting benefits tied to public power, Americans cannot know whether decisions are being made for the country or for private gain. Trump's foreign entanglements are directly impacting U.S. policy decisions, from weapons transfers to the sale of high-end chips to war and peace.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; House Foreign Affairs; Senate Foreign Relations

6.11 Investigating DOGE Secrecy, Shadow Governance, and Agency Staffing Cuts

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: When in place at the start of the administration, the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) operated with extraordinary secrecy, wielding significant influence over agency staffing and spending decisions without meaningful public disclosure, congressional notification, or compliance with standard administrative law requirements. The immense number of staff cuts and the resulting loss of institutional knowledge across EPA, DOE, DOT, and other agencies will pose governance challenges for years, if not decades.

Proposed Oversight Action: Hold hearings and open investigations into DOGE's operations, including subpoenas for internal communications, staffing decisions, legal justifications, and records of contacts with agency heads. Investigate politically motivated staff cuts at EPA, DOE, DOT, and other agencies, including impacts on public health, safety, and regulatory capacity. Require testimony from DOGE leadership, affected agency heads, inspectors general, and career civil service officials.

Why It Matters: Decisions about which employees protect public health, safety, and financial security should be made transparently and within the law. Shadow governance structures that operate outside democratic accountability undermine Congress's oversight role and expose Americans to preventable risks from weakened regulatory capacity.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Oversight and Government Reform; Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

6.12 IRS Data Sharing with ICE

Oversight Type: Investigations and Hearings

Problem: On April 7, 2025, Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent and DHS Secretary Kristi Noem executed an unprecedented Memorandum of Understanding directing the IRS to share confidential taxpayer data, including names, addresses, and tax identification numbers, with ICE to support deportation efforts, despite IRS lawyers warning the deal likely violates federal privacy law. ICE subsequently requested more than one million taxpayer records, and the IRS disclosed tens of thousands of records, including home addresses, by August 2025. Acting IRS Commissioner Melanie Krause resigned in protest.

Proposed Oversight Action: Conduct a full investigation into the scope of data shared, the legal authority claimed, and whether the MOU violates 26 U.S.C. § 6103, the statute governing taxpayer data confidentiality. Hold hearings with Treasury officials, IRS leadership, inspectors general, and privacy law experts. Request all internal communications, legal memoranda, and data-sharing records.

Why It Matters: The IRS has long assured all taxpayers, including undocumented workers, that their information is strictly confidential, a promise that underpins voluntary tax compliance. Undocumented immigrants pay an estimated $90 billion in federal, state, and local taxes annually, and erosion of that trust risks billions in lost revenue. More broadly, if taxpayer data can be repurposed for immigration enforcement, it can be repurposed for other enforcement purposes, undermining the IRS's foundational role as a neutral tax authority.

Committee/Jurisdiction: House Ways and Means; Senate Finance; House Judiciary; Senate Judiciary