

training and safety in our skies every day. It gives private contractors access to classified data.

Let's go back to what we were talking about with Edward Snowden with the leaks that we are seeing out of the intelligence services these days. Where is that coming from? It is coming from the private contractors. It goes lateral.

Do you think it is going to be any different because we here in Congress say: Oh, no, no, no? Hey, it is going to be great. This is going to be—rest assured, and I can already predict what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. The disasters will strike. We will sit in Oversight and Government Reform with bony fingers and red faces going: How did you let this happen? And all we have to do is look in the mirror, because we are much like dogs lapping up antifreeze, to lick up something that smells good, tastes good, with drastic consequences.

If we want to maintain the safest and best airspace in the world, we have to prevent the passage of H.R. 2997. Now, this is hard for me to do. Why? Because I don't like opposing my own party. I don't like opposing my friends. I have done some terrible things in my life as a soldier. I don't like conflict anymore. I try to stay as far away from that as I can, and there are two veterans over here giving me thumbs up—combat veterans themselves.

But I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I am not saying if you support this bill you are unconstitutional, or that you don't love your country, or that you don't want to protect the Republic. I am not suggesting that at all. I have too many friends who have a counterview to mine. But it is my responsibility to expose what is in this bill and why it is dangerous, and why we can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to call on the American public and have them contact their Members of Congress and tell them to oppose H.R. 2997, to not let privatization of our air traffic control system happen; to keep it into the role that, like Abraham Lincoln said, sometimes things that we can't do ourselves, we need to do collectively, and the government has a role in that. Mr. Lincoln obviously knew what he was talking about.

Modernization, we can all agree on that. Let's work on that. I applaud the President for bringing this issue to the fore. We need to deliver that win for him.

But breaching national security of our airspace and risking our safety on an unproven system is not a win. Mr. Speaker, it is not something that we need to support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DONALD TRUMP, JR.'S, EMAILS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEG. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, Donald Trump, Jr., released a series of emails regarding his meeting with a Russian Government lawyer and an individual associated with Russian intelligence.

Don Trump, Jr.'s, emails are a smoking gun. They prove that the Trump campaign was not only aware of the Russian Government's efforts to meddle in our elections, they were enthusiastic about accepting Russia's support.

What follows are the contents of those emails. They painted a disturbing picture of a campaign, and now an administration willing to break the law and sell out to an adversary of the United States in order to advance their own petty interests.

Our hope is that the American people will carefully consider the content of these messages and what they say about the fitness of Donald Trump and his senior advisers to hold high office.

We will begin. There was a comment posted by Donald Trump, Jr., on Twitter on July 11, 2017. "To everyone, in order to be totally transparent"—which we now know he wasn't even in this email—"I am releasing the entire email chain of my emails with Rob Goldstone about the meeting on June 9, 2016. The first email on June 3, 2016 was from Rob, who was relating a request from Emin, a person I knew from the 2013 Ms. Universe Pageant near Moscow. Emin and his father have a very highly respected company in Moscow. The information they suggested they had about Hillary Clinton I thought was Political Opposition Research. I first wanted to just have a phone call but when that didn't work out, they said the woman would be in New York and asked if I would meet. I decided to take the meeting. The woman, as she has said publicly, was not a government official. And, as we have said, she had no information to provide and wanted to talk about adoption policy and the Magnitsky Act. To put this in context, this occurred before the current Russian fever was in vogue. As Rob Goldstone said just today in the press, the entire meeting was 'the most inane nonsense I ever heard. And I was actually agitated by it.'"

End of email.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be reading the email portions of Rob Goldstone to Donald Trump, Jr. On June 3, 2016, at 10:36 a.m., Rob Goldstone wrote to Donald Trump, Jr., the following:

"Good morning.

"Emin just called and asked me to contact you with something very interesting.

"The Crown prosecutor of Russia met with his father Aras this morning and in their meeting offered to provide the

Trump campaign with some official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary and her dealings with Russia and would be very useful to your father.

"This is obviously very high level and sensitive information but is part of Russia and its government's support for Mr. Trump—helped along by Aras and Emin.

"What do you think is the best way to handle this information and would you be able to speak to Emin about it directly?

"I can also send this info to your father via Rhona, but it is ultra sensitive so wanted to send to you first.

"Best.

"Rob Goldstone."

Mr. GALLEG. On June 3, 2016, at 10:53 a.m., less than 20 minutes after that email, Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back:

"Thanks, Rob, I appreciate that. I am on the road at the moment but perhaps I just speak to Emin first. Seems we have some time, and if it's what you say, I love it especially later in the summer. Could we do a call first thing next week when I am back?"

"Best, Don."

Mr. Speaker, "I love it." His response was: "I love it." I worked in politics for a long time. I have never been approached with information from a foreign government. But if I were, my response would not be: "I love it."

My response would be: "This is completely inappropriate." My response would be: "Don't ever contact me again." My response would be: "I am calling the FBI."

In this email, Donald Trump, Jr., showed his true colors. This email proves that he lacks basic integrity. The willingness of Jared Kushner to attend that meeting proves that he, too, is no patriot.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, after we finish reading these emails into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we are going to discuss why it is a straight-up violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

On Monday, June 6, 2016, Rob Goldstone writes back to Donald Trump, Jr., in an email at 12:40 p.m., with a subject heading: "Russia—Clinton—private and confidential."

□ 1300

"Hi, Don.

"Let me know when you are free to talk with Emin by phone about this Hillary info—you had mentioned early this week so wanted to try to schedule a time and day.

"Best to you and family.

"Rob Goldstone."

On June 6, 2016, at 3:03 p.m., Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back:

"Rob, could we speak now?

"D."

Then Rob Goldstone replies to Donald Trump, Jr., that same day at 3:37 p.m.:

"Let me track him down in Moscow.

"What number he could call?"

By the way, any email where someone says tracking someone down in Moscow might just raise some red flags.

Mr. GALLEGGO. On June 6, 2016, at 3:38 p.m., Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back:

“My cell”—we have omitted that cell number. Unlike Donald Trump, we do not give out individual cell numbers.

“Thanks.

“D.”

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Then Rob Goldstone replies: “Okay. He is on stage in Moscow but should be off within 20 minutes so I am sure can call.

“Rob.”

Mr. GALLEGGO. On June 6, 2016, just a few minutes after receiving this email, Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back: “Rob, thanks for the help.”

From Moscow thanks for the help, he should have said.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. The next day, on June 7, 2016, at 4:20 p.m., Rob Goldstone writes:

“Don.

“Hope all is well.

“Emin asked that I schedule a meeting with you and the Russian Government attorney who is flying over from Moscow for this Thursday.

“I believe you are aware of the meeting—and so wondered if 3 p.m. or later on Thursday works for you?

“I assume it would be at your office.

“Best.

“Rob Goldstone.”

Mr. GALLEGGO. On June 7, 2016, at 5:16 p.m., Donald Trump, Jr., writes:

“How about 3 at our offices? Thanks; Rob, appreciate you helping set it up?”

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Later that same day, on June 7, 2016, Rob Goldstone wrote back to Donald Trump, Jr.:

“Perfect won’t sit in on the meeting, but will bring them at 3 p.m. and introduce you, et cetera?”

“I will send the names of the two people meeting with you for security when I have them later today.

“Best.

“Rob.”

By the way, we now know today that one of those names just happens to be a Soviet counterintelligence officer.

Mr. GALLEGGO. On June 7, 2016, at 6:14 p.m., Donald Trump, Jr., writes:

“Great. It will likely be Paul Manafort, campaign boss, my brother-in-law”—Jared Kushner—“and me, 725 Fifth Avenue, 25th floor” which is Trump Tower?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On June 8, the next day, at 10:34 a.m., Rob Goldstone writes back to Donald Trump, Jr.:

“Good morning.

“Would it be possible to move tomorrow meeting to 4 p.m. as the Russian attorney is in court until 3, I was just informed?

“Best.

“Rob.”

Mr. GALLEGGO. On June 8, 2016, at 11:15, Donald Trump, Jr., writes:

“Yes, Rob, I could do that unless they wanted to do 3 today instead. Just

let me know and I will lock it in either way.”

That is some eagerness that this man has for this information.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On Wednesday, June 8, 2016, at 11:18 a.m., Rob Goldstone writes back:

“They can’t do today as she hasn’t landed yet from Moscow, 4 p.m. is great tomorrow.

“Best.

“Rob.”

Mr. GALLEGGO. This email is from Donald Trump, Jr., sent Wednesday, June 8, 2016, at 12:03 p.m., to Jared Kushner and Paul Manafort. Subject, forward, Russia—Clinton—private and confidential.

“Meeting got moved to 4 tomorrow at my offices.

“Best.

“Don.”

Mr. TED LIEU of California. So that completes the email chain.

Under Federal law, under the Federal Election Campaign Act, you cannot solicit or accept any contribution from a foreign national or foreign country. The law defines a contribution not as just a monetary donation but anything of value, an in-kind donation, opposition research, anything of value violates the law.

In this case, we absolutely have conspiracy to violate the Federal Election Campaign Act.

I am a former prosecutor. I know it is very easy to prove a charge of conspiracy. You just have to have the person take one act in furtherance of the conspiracy. So in this case, when Donald Trump, Jr., replies back to the offer of this incriminating information, Hillary Clinton, and says, “I love it,” that is one act. He then proceeds to set up a meeting. That is another act. He then shows up at the meeting with Jared Kushner and Paul Manafort. That is a third act. That more than completes a crime conspiracy. We have in black and white right here a violation of Federal law.

Mr. GALLEGGO. The other thing that we have to consider is this: right now, there is a person who is in the White House who has lied on their security clearance—a security clearance that we use to determine whether we shall trust somebody with this top secret information for this country.

Jared Kushner was in a meeting with a foreign agent. Now we know that he was in a meeting not just with a foreign agent but a former—“former” Soviet counterintelligence officer. Let me tell you something. There is no such thing as former counterintelligence officers if you ever work with the Soviets. Once you are in the KGB, you are always in the KGB.

Why was that person in that room? It was not to talk about adoption. He certainly wasn’t there to talk about anything else. But, if anything, he was there to pass information. The fact that Jared Kushner lied in his clearance, lied and omitted it until finally revealed today, really calls into ques-

tion whether that man should be in the White House right now and trusted with this type of sensitive information.

TED, you and I were in the military. We both had security clearances. If we had this type of omission in our security clearance, what would have been our punishments?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Our security clearances would have been suspended immediately. An investigation would have been opened.

I am glad you mentioned Jared Kushner because many of us are wondering, why does he still have a security clearance? Why is he even in the White House?

Let’s just sort of walk through a little bit of what happened with his security clearance. On the very first security clearance form, known as an SF-86 form, he lied on it. He did not disclose a single meeting with the Russians.

If you read the form, it says: if you make a false statement or omit material facts, you can be imprisoned.

He omitted all that information. He is then confronted, and what does he do? He revises it. So then he submits a second security clearance form.

Now, it turns out he lied on that one, too, because he did not disclose this latest meeting that happened to be with a Russian counterintelligence officer. So then he had to submit a third form. When you look at his explanation, according to media reports, he said that his staff hit the send button too soon.

Well, both Representative GALLEGGO and I know that that is not how you submit the security clearance form. It is a pretty involved, elaborate process. You have to do this certification. Not only do you have to send it electronically, then you have to sign the paper and submit that with your signature on it—very elaborate.

So now he is lying about the process in which he lied on the three security clearance forms. We don’t know why he has a security clearance. We don’t know why he is even in the White House.

Mr. GALLEGGO. What is the motivation for omitting this meeting? There are clearly emails, there are clearly pointed emails, saying: Why are you going to be attending this meeting?

There is a subject line that says, Clinton emails. There is a subject line that has to do with a Russian agent, a crown prosecutor. Now we know there is a former Soviet counterintelligence agent who just happens to be there, and Jared Kushner omits it from his security clearance. That is not an accident. That is a criminal act, a criminal act that any other citizen in this country, any other soldier, sailor, marine, airman, if we ever did that, we would be quickly prosecuted under the UCMJ.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GALLEGGO. No.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Would the other gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GALLEGGO. I am controlling time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. So let me follow up what Representative GALLEGUO said. We have a person in the White House now with a security clearance even though he has lied on at least two of those forms. So there actually needs to be an investigation. That security clearance needs to be suspended immediately.

But, also, for any intelligence official watching this or reading about this, how can you trust Jared Kushner when he lied on these security clearance forms and makes a mockery of the process?

Keep in mind this is the same person who suggested setting up a secret back channel with the Russians at the Russian Embassy. So the only reason you would want to use Russian equipment at the Russian Embassy is to hide information from U.S. intelligence. So even if his security clearance is not suspended, I really hope that people working for him do not trust him.

Mr. GALLEGUO. If you start seeing and putting it all together, we now know that there is a clear narrative of Jared Kushner's involvements with the Russians.

First, he tries to set up a back channel. Then he omits his conversations and meetings in a security clearance. He continues to lie even though he is continuously brought forth as being untruthful. Now we find ourselves in the situation where there is basically zero trust that this man in the White House with top secret clearance is not compromised.

In conclusion, let me close with this. You just heard emails after emails. Imagine this conversation happening the opposite way. Imagine a conversation happening with a Democrat or the Clintons saying, I have information, and the word Moscow is said probably four or five times altogether.

Imagine the idea that you are meeting in private, and then imagine all the follow-up lies that happened.

What would be occurring right now? What would be occurring is what we saw last year: consistent oversight. But there is none. There is no oversight right now. PAUL RYAN has not taken the helm and has not done any type of oversight. The House Republicans have abdicated their responsibility and have allowed Donald Trump and all those other members of his family and the administration who have been compromised to continue being a threat to our national security in the White House.

This should not be the way. Partisanship should never be above patriotism. But what we are seeing right now is naked partisanship being exposed and pushed as far as possible in the hopes of protecting a faulty President, his administration, and his family.

That is not American. That is not what any of us ever signed up for. We swore—whether it was in the Armed Services Committee, whether it was when we were in the armed services, or whether it is when we came here to

Congress—to uphold the Constitution of the United States and protect it.

Right now we can honestly say that that is not occurring. There is an absolute abdication happening right now of leadership from House Republicans.

TED, please close.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Let me conclude by saying that the President said that most people would have taken this meeting. That is just not true.

Again, under the Federal Election Campaign Act, if you solicit, or conspire to solicit, or show up at a meeting where you expect to get opposition research from a foreign national, that is a violation of the Federal law. So, in fact, most people would not have taken this meeting unless they were crooked.

We have an example here of what happened when the Al Gore campaign got information. They were sent anonymously briefing notes and things that then Bush was being briefed on and so on. They took that package, and they turned it over to the FBI. That is what should have happened in this case.

In conclusion, this is a pretty big deal. We have people in the White House who believe they are above the law. The lesson in Watergate is that no one is above the law.

Mr. GALLEGUO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair and to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

#### DOUBLE STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my two colleagues refused to yield any time when they are talking, especially when they are using phrases like naked partisanship. That is very interesting, isn't it? We could have had a nice dialog here. I was asking for a chance to go into a dialogue so the American people could understand what was being said rather than this incredible naked partisanship of people who disagree, but I won't yield my time to have a dialogue about it.

I am afraid that doesn't cut it. This is yet another example of what we have seen of people using sinister-sounding descriptions in order to basically distract us from some of the corruption and, I might add, questionable activities of their own Presidential candidate in the last election who was defeated because the American people did not trust that candidate.

By the way, I would like to have asked—I am sorry that my friends have left and wouldn't yield any time for a question—whether or not they believe that Hillary Clinton's activities in Russia while she was a government official, was she involved in money rais-

ing from Russian oligarchs to the tune of millions—tens of millions—of dollars?

Was her husband involved in raising this money while she was Secretary of State or while she was a candidate for President of the United States over in Russia, millions of dollars to the Clinton Foundation? I understand even hundreds of thousands of dollars were put in her husband's pocket for a speech that he gave in Russia.

□ 1315

These things need to be looked at. Instead, what we are hearing about is sinister-sounding words about a meeting where someone said they had some information that would help, yes, the campaign, but the reason it would help the campaign is there was supposedly information that showed that Hillary Clinton was involved in some activity that was contrary to the interests of the United States or contrary to the law.

Yes, if someone says to you that they want to give you information, there is nothing wrong with that. In fact, I would hope that my colleagues who just said what is happening on our side of the aisle is naked partisanship, I wonder if the Democratic Party and my other colleagues in this body are calling for Hillary to release all of her emails and to make sure that we have under oath an explanation of these transactions to the Clinton Foundation. Instead, we are hearing all sorts of sinister descriptions of a meeting that was going to give information.

I will tell you right now, everybody in this body, if they think that there could be information that is important for our country to know from any foreigner, we should talk to them and find out what it is. It is not illegal to receive information from someone, especially if you are engaged in an activity that is aimed at trying to secure understanding for policies that you plan to implement as a leader in the United States as an elected leader. There absolutely is nothing wrong.

By the way, I am the chairman of the Europe, Eurasia and Emerging Threats Subcommittee. Russia is in my jurisdiction. Should I ever turn down a chance to talk to somebody who has information for me, negative or positive, about Russia?

No, I shouldn't. And neither should the Trump campaign have ignored any community to receive more information about what was being done by Hillary, perhaps, and the raising of the millions of dollars for the foundation.

So that was a legitimate thing to ask. Then you determine: Is the information accurate or is it not accurate? If it is not accurate, you don't want to touch it.

But many people were disturbed that there had been a release of emails during the campaign, and a lot of the questions about this whole Russia issue is whether Russia or somebody else actually hacked into the system and released those emails.