

would eliminate the estate tax, which would generate massive tax savings for President Trump and his family. If his assets, reportedly valued at \$2.86 billion, were transferred after his death under today's rules, his estate would be taxed at around the 40 percent level, still leaving his heirs with more than \$1 billion.

Repealing the Federal estate tax, which they propose to do, would save his family \$1.1 billion, at least, in estate tax costs.

Why would we do this?

The Founders of our country were passionately opposed to hereditary wealth, just like they were passionately opposed to hereditary government. They thought it was dangerous to have the intergenerational transmission of wealth and great fortunes like that. They said that it would cause idleness and irresponsibility in the heirs to great wealth, and they would be able to convert their wealth not just into bigger estates, bigger land purchases, bigger houses, but actually in the public offices. They had a very profound democratic critique of that kind of intergenerational wealth inequality, because, at a certain point, you have bought enough houses, you have bought enough jets, and now you want a governorship, you want the Presidency, you want a Senate seat. In a democracy, we need to have much reduced levels of inequality that are being proposed under this idea of abolishing the estate tax.

They also are proposing to abolish the alternative minimum tax, which is the only reason that President Trump paid any taxes in the one year over the last two decades that we know he paid taxes in, in 2005. Remember, somebody mysteriously leaked information about that year to the Rachel Maddow show, and it turned out that the President paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax which says that you can't push a good joke too far, you can only use all of your deductions and allowances, and so on, up to a certain point. If you are at a certain place, in terms of your wealth, you have got to pay something.

Well, The New York Times now estimates that the GOP tax plan to repeal the alternative minimum tax would save the President at least \$31.3 million. He would not have had to pay in that one year that we know where he paid taxes, and we don't know about the rest because he has refused to release it.

And let's just look at one more provision, which would change the treatment of pass-through business income. According to The New York Times, President Trump could save as much as \$6.2 million on business income and \$9.8 million on income from real estate and other kinds of partnerships under changes to the taxation of pass-through income.

Now, look, Madam Speaker, nobody likes paying taxes, nobody loves it, especially when we know that there are

billions of dollars being wasted, for example, at the Department of Defense in boondoggles, fraud, and abuse taking place, according to a hearing that we had just this session in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. So people don't love the experience.

But just as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, that he didn't mind paying his taxes because he understood that they were the price of civilization. It is what we all put in, in order to have roads and highways and airports and schools and universities. That is what it means to be a citizen. People don't mind, as long as there is a basic sense in the public that everybody is participating and we are not getting ripped off.

And I am terrified that if they succeed in barreling this plan through Congress, that it is going to spread more cynicism and more disenchantment and more negativity about the tax system and about the government, and we can't afford it. Because of the escalating crises of climate change, which are all around us, our people are suffering. We have millions of people in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands tonight who have no access to power, no access to electricity or clean water. We have people in Florida and Texas and Mississippi and Louisiana who are still recovering from the last hurricanes. We have Californians, many of whom have died already, who are struggling against the forest fires out of control.

Now is a point when we need a tax system that brings our people together, that says that wealthier people can pay more because they are wealthy, but everybody is going to pay their share, and we are all going to participate together. That is the tax system we should be looking for, a tax system where we get rid of all of the special interest inflected deductions and allowances and loopholes and rip-offs that are built into the system, where it is simplified.

In the European countries, you can pay your taxes in about 10 or 15 minutes, and you don't have to go to the multibillion-dollar tax preparation industry, or go find a law firm to do it. We can simplify our taxes if we decide to get rid of all of the special interest loopholes. And wealthy people can pay more because they get more out of being part of this society, and they use more of the infrastructure of the country, instead of paying less than everybody else, instead of trying to rip off the system by paying nothing.

Madam Speaker, now is the time when we need the wisest and most principled leadership to get us through the accumulating crises of the time. This tax plan is totally irresponsible. I hope that it will be withdrawn and we can work together across the aisle on a bipartisan plan that will represent the best values of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his thoughtful points and comments on the President's tax policy.

I have a few other points before we conclude. The President has said that we can't afford foreign aid given our deficits, but the President thinks that the average American doesn't know math. Mr. President, the average American can do math.

The deficit is \$20 trillion. Our foreign aid every year is no more than \$30 billion to \$40 billion. Your proposal would increase the deficit between \$200 billion to \$500 billion. So this red herring that somehow foreign aid is responsible for the deficit is just false.

What is responsible for the deficit is the massive tax cuts that you are proposing that would add, according to conservative economists, between \$2 trillion to \$5 trillion more to our deficit, and it is all to finance the corporate interests, all to finance the investor class.

We have, on the Democratic side, on the progressive side, proposed an alternative, and that alternative is based on the view that we need to encourage job creation and raise wages for mainstream America, that we need to invest in the people actually doing the work. It is based on the thinking of people who used to be Republicans and people like Jack Kemp, who said: Let us invest in areas that don't have jobs and economic growth and have heavy investment for training on the technologies of the future. That used to be the thinking on the other side of the aisle. We used to have differences, but there used to be creativity and a sense of what is actually going to invest in people to grow the economy.

And now, under this President, it is just a mantra of tax cuts for the very wealthy, tax cuts for the people who need it least, tax cuts for corporations, no sense of actually investing in new industries, investing in the training and skills of the 21st century, investing in bringing capital to places that need them. I hope and believe that as people in good faith will look at the two contrasting proposals, one that says tax cuts for corporations, the other that says let's invest in American workers, let's invest in American communities, that they will conclude that the way to actually raise wages, the way to actually create jobs, the way to actually grow our economy is by bottom-up economics by investing in the American workers and in those Americans who are part of the middle class.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

(Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting number of days here this week. We continue to have hearings and fight for good legislation, and we continue to hear from people back home that we simply must at least work on our promises to repeal ObamaCare and bring their health insurance into a realm that is affordable.

They realize they were lied to. They will never get the insurance they liked back. They would like to try to get their doctors back.

One of the interesting things about the design of the devious architect of ObamaCare is the guy who bragged later: Yeah, we knew you couldn't keep your insurance, you couldn't keep your doctor, but we had to say that to sell it.

They actually incentivized the handful of remaining insurance companies not to put the best cancer healthcare providers in their network. ObamaCare actually incentivizes insurance companies not putting the best heart healthcare providers or, in fact, any chronic, expensive disease that the insurance companies, because of the design of ObamaCare—and I think it was intentional—basically were penalized if they put the very best cancer treaters, heart treaters in their network. So there actually are indications that insurance companies, they could see what the administration was encouraging them to do.

For example, I had read that MD Anderson was not in those networks as a cancer provider. Some would argue it is the best cancer treatment facility. That certainly can be debated. I think it still comes down to the effort to get to the point where government is completely in charge of every American's healthcare.

ObamaCare was a good start, but obviously if you design a system so that the insurance companies, they just get down to a handful of monopolies and they are having record years, and that same bill even allows those insurance companies to get what are called bailouts after they have had record profits, well, most people are going to end up hating the insurance companies. And we have seen that.

What would happen, of course, is eventually people get so outraged with premiums going up, whether it is 10 percent or 70 percent—I have heard of it being doubled, being tripled since the last 7 years. I have heard all kinds of horror stories from people in east Texas. Around other places I have visited, it is the same thing happening. They can't afford their policy, yet they can't afford to pay an extra tax for not having a policy that the government says they have to have; and yet if they pay for their policy, the deductible is so high, they are still not going to get any benefit out of it.

So it is easy to see, when you start looking at the way in which

ObamaCare was created, the rules in place for it, the day would come when people got so outraged at how expensive their health insurance was that they would scream: Look, I just can't stand it anymore. I never wanted the government to be in charge of my personal life, but anything's got to be better than the current system. Just let the government take it over.

Then, there you are, government controlling everybody's body, everybody's personal life.

Of course, we have got this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau out there created during the Obama years by the Democrats. We were not helpful in that. We thought, sure, we want to help people who are being taken advantage of by unscrupulous lenders, but we don't need a Bureau to monitor everybody's debit and credit card transactions. There were those who argued: Yeah, but this way, they can monitor and they can tell if somebody's being taken advantage of.

There was a time, as a felony judge in Texas, that, if someone wanted your bank records, under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, we are supposed to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, and that includes anyone's bank records. So people would come to me as a judge, they would have affidavits, and they hoped that would prove under oath probable cause that a crime had been committed and that this person committed it, and if so, I could sign the warrant that allowed them to go get bank records.

We used to care about the Fourth Amendment. I know my friends across the aisle, our Democratic friends, they cared greatly, because I have heard over and over in Judiciary Committee arguments about the protections against unreasonable searches, and yet when they set up a Bureau that violates that, says: Just give us all your information.

Well, sure, if somebody is being taken advantage of by an unscrupulous lender, then the remedy is they go complain to the appropriate government law enforcement or the SEC, whoever it is, and then they come to a judge like I was, get the warrant, get the records, and then make the determination if there is probable cause. We just lost so much of our privacy.

Several years ago, we said, well, since ObamaCare is going to allow the mass gathering of people's medical records and our Democratic friends set up this consumer protection racket here in Washington, we could conceivably have a day—and if we don't do something about ObamaCare and the CFPB, then it is closer than I imagined—when you get your mail, Madam Speaker, and you see: Oh, I have got a letter from the government here. And you open it, and it says: We noticed, when you were at Brookshire's grocery store the other day, that you bought a pound of bacon; and we also noticed, from your healthcare records, that your cholesterol rate is at this certain

level, and so, therefore, since we control your healthcare now and we monitor your debit and credit purchases, here is the deal: you are either going to join a health club and start working out once a week and stop buying bacon, or we are going to have to raise the amount you pay in each month.

I mean, this is where it goes when you have the Orwellian Big Brother that was advanced more through ObamaCare than anything that has ever occurred in U.S. history. It has got to be repealed.

I want to applaud and thank President Trump for taking steps today through executive order. He shouldn't have had to do that. I am very, very grateful he did. God bless him for doing it. But we should have already taken care of that stuff. That is our job.

What do we do here in the House? It was contentious. The first bill was a disaster, but we got it to where it actually was going to bring premiums down for the middle class in America. It was going to make their premiums cheaper. It was going to make their deductibles lower. Then we had people in the Senate who got elected on the promise of repealing ObamaCare that voted "no." We still have to do something.

I loved seeing the President's interview with our good friend, Sean Hannity, last night. I love this about President Trump. I think it is why he got elected. When Sean asked him about, basically, is this over, he gets this smile and says: No. We are not giving up, not giving up.

The truth is we cannot give up. People are counting on us. They don't know what to do.

There are small-business employers like the one in Tyler who told me that a few years ago he was paying \$50,000 for his employees' health insurance. He has the same number of employees, and this year it is \$153,000, and he is going to have to start letting people go or drop their insurance. It just cannot continue. People are already taking losses. It can't continue.

Well, with the proper President in place, and here in Congress we have taken some steps to ameliorate some of the damage to jobs in America, things seem to be turning around some. But we actually have to keep our promise, and I think we do that by putting a lot more heat on the Senate as the House body, House Republicans. We have got to put pressure on the Senate. Like the President said, this fight cannot be over.

Normally, I have been told since my freshman term, you can't do big things in an election year. But I am beginning to wonder, if America makes it clear to the Republicans in the Senate that you either will keep your promise on ObamaCare, you will keep your promise on tax reform or you will not be back in the Senate, then I think we could buck tradition in this place.

The idea was that we were told back in 2006, in January: Okay. Well, we didn't keep any of our promises last

year as the Republican majority, but now, you veterans know we are into an even-numbered year. That means it is an election year, so we can't do any of those big things, because everybody knows you just can't do big things in an election year or you might lose.

Well, it would have been a lot better if we had already done those things, if we had repealed ObamaCare and put a system in place that was affordable, that gave people the healthcare they needed and with actual insurance and encouraged, instead of spending \$700, \$800, \$900, sending it to the insurance company, how about putting \$700, \$800 in your own medical health savings account you control, debit-card coded where it can only be spent on healthcare, whether it is crutches, medicine, doctor visits, hospital stays, whatever, and you could have a high deductible. We could have a day where \$700 goes to your account, \$200 goes for catastrophic coverage. That is the kind of thing that we should have been pushing for and gone to, but, instead, we are pouring that money into health insurance companies.

Just in case, Madam Speaker, there are those who are already wondering, "Maybe we should just let the government take over everything; that has got to be better," I heard on the news again today another horror story. Just when you thought the VA was being cleaned up, here comes another horror story.

Some doctor at the VA was allowed to do 80-some-odd surgeries that were unnecessary, inappropriate, or terribly done, even surgeries not even needed at all, on the wrong person, but it had been covered up for some time. Well, when the government is in charge of your healthcare, you can't expect any more than the lowest common denominator in the government.

I am very, very grateful we do have some good doctors, some good nurses in the VA, but I have also talked to good doctors and nurses in the VA who are so frustrated with such an albatross of a system.

□ 1700

Why not just let people—if you want to go to the VA clinic, here is your card, you go.

We thought we were doing a good thing, and I think it was a step in the right direction when we were going to allow veterans to go to a civilian clinic, hospital, healthcare provider if there was not one within a minimum number of miles. I believe it was 40, but I have heard horror stories about how people have been jerked around and not been allowed to utilize the program as it was designed. Here, again, we come back to what you get when the government is in charge. We have got to do that.

Stuart Varney was asking today again about tax reform. We promised it. We have got to deliver on that. These rumors I hear emanating from people at the Senate side of this build-

ing that: Yeah, well, the House can do the reform. They did their ObamaCare repeal and we didn't pass that, so maybe we won't do their tax reform package like we are working on.

It takes a lot of work to pass a major reform like we did on ObamaCare. It takes even more work, perhaps, to do a significant tax reform package where it becomes simplified, people pay less tax, the economy explodes. You would think it would be a no-brainer, but apparently there are too many people up here with no brains and it is not getting done. We do have to do that. We promised we would. We have got to do it for the sake of the economy that will make people's lives so much better.

But in the meantime, if we are going to be an effective Congress, we have got to make sure that we maintain proper systems in place that we can do our business without inappropriate outside influence, whether it is coming from Russia or Pakistan. Wherever it is coming from, we need to know and we need to protect ourselves.

That is why this Taxed Enough Already Caucus meeting we had, we invited people in the tradition of my friend Tim Huelskamp, the former chair of that caucus from Kansas. Just a great guy, a great American. It was great to talk to him recently. Tim started with this caucus having representatives of outside groups with important information we should share coming in and having Members of Congress come in and share information, figure out how we can help get the Nation's business done.

We have been concerned about articles we continue to read, especially by Luke Rosiak of The Daily Caller. No one has done more investigation on the issue of the Awan family cohorts that were working here on Capitol Hill for House Members. They happened to be Democratic House Members. I think the same thing could happen where one Republican could say, "Oh, these folks are great," and before you know it, you have dozens of people having the same IT computer workers working part time. People are allowed to do that, hire somebody part time so it doesn't overwhelm your budget. Others can hire them part time, but under no circumstances can anybody working on the Hill make more than around \$160,000.

We found out this week from the lead investigator, oh, not law enforcement, oh, no. FBI, apparently they are not getting anything done, and I will explain why in a moment. But as he has gone around and investigated and asked witnesses questions that have direct information about what is going on, Luke Rosiak would also ask: Has anyone from the FBI talked to you, or has any law enforcement talked to you?

He said 80 percent of the time the answer is no. No one from the FBI has talked to me. No one from any law enforcement has talked to me. Staggering.

I hear rumors that there are people from the FBI telling the Department of Justice: Yeah, we have looked into it. There is nothing there.

Yeah, just the way the FBI looked into the notice from Russia that the Tsarnaev older brother had been radicalized.

What do they do?

I know because I have asked Director Mueller after he had run off thousands of years of our best experienced FBI agents, done more damage to the FBI than anybody since Hoover. He has got plenty of young aggressive people without enough experience to call him out when he was making mistakes, as he made many.

They send out an FBI agent to talk to the older Tsarnaev after the second notice from Russian agents that this guy has been radicalized. He is going to be a threat. But because Director Mueller—now Special Counsel Mueller, who is hiring lawyers and investigators right and left—built up a beautiful, comfortable nest for himself, that same Mueller, as Director of the FBI, had the FBI training materials on radical Islamists purged of anything that might offend radical Islamists.

Yes, he was more concerned about the little lunches and dinners he had with CAIR—or the Council of American-Islamic Relations—than he was about people being killed in Boston, because if he had, he would have made sure that the Tsarnaev brothers were properly investigated after they got two heads-up.

If they had bothered to look, they would have seen where the older Tsarnaev went and would have known he went to a hotbed of radicalism. They would have known to investigate: What has he been reading? What scriptures from the Koran has he been reading? What has he talked about? Is he doing more memorization? What is his appearance looking like now? Who is he hanging out with?

But no. Because he was too concerned about what he called the outreach program to Islamic Americans, he didn't want to offend anybody. He was more worried about offending somebody than saving the lives and limbs of Bostonians.

He created a massive problem at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and now we are turning special counsel over to this man?

We heard from Mr. Comey himself that he talked to Mueller even before his testimony before Congress. We heard from he himself that he leaked information that was clearly FBI information that should not have been leaked.

So there is a question of did he commit a crime, or did he just commit a breach of FBI ethics? What action should be taken?

Oh, no. We have got FBI Director Mueller on the case, and if you go back and look at the Washingtonian back in 2013, they did a big exposé on how wonderful Mr. Comey was; and they point

out in there that, gee, basically if the whole world were on fire, Comey knew there would be one person that would still be standing with him there to protect him, Mr. Mueller; the same guy that is protecting him instead of investigating the leaks that have come from the FBI that appear to have gone through the exact same person through whom he leaked what he admitted. But, no, we have got Mueller, the same man who is going to be there through thick and thin to protect Comey; he is the one investigating.

If Jeff Sessions as Attorney General cannot investigate Mr. Comey and his violations, potential breaches of the law, then we need another special counsel, and it sure ain't going to come from Mr. Rosenstein, that is for sure.

We need a special counsel. I think the Attorney General could do it, but I am not sure the extent to which he has recused himself. But this has to be investigated. Unfortunately, because of the damage done to the FBI, I still have questions arise on things they investigate because I know the damage that Mueller did to their training materials, to their ability. As one of our intelligence agents explained, we have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemies.

But don't worry, the guy that was the biggest blinder is now the special counsel growing his little bureaucracy. And I am sure, knowing how vengeful he is, when he hears what I have had to say, then he probably will open an investigation on me. That is just how vengeful this man has been.

But the truth is the truth. He damaged the FBI, running off thousands of years of experienced people. He purged the training materials that would have—and Michele Bachmann and I went through these, and another Congressman from Georgia went through some, and there were some things, sure; cartoon stuff, sure; take them out, fine. But there were some things in there very clearly that every FBI agent needs to know to help them spot a radical Islamist, and Mueller blinded them of the opportunity to do that.

I will never forget, at one of our hearings, after it was so clear that he was more concerned about offending CAIR than he was of protecting Boston, and he was so defensive, I said: You didn't even go to the mosque where Tsarnaev went to see if he had been radicalized.

After fumbling around, I finally got him to tell me how he thought that was wrong, and he said: We did go to the mosque.

And I didn't hear it at first. Unfortunately, I didn't hear it until I had it played on the video.

He said: We did go to that mosque in our outreach program.

Oh, the outreach program. Yeah, you didn't go to investigate Tsarnaev to find out if he had been radicalized by asking questions in the mosque where he worshipped to find out if he was now acting like a radical. And there are

clear indications. That is why we don't have to worry about most Muslims, but you sure need to know what you are looking for.

For those that want to call people like me an Islamophobe, well, it is another lie. But there are plenty of lies around Washington. I have got enough Muslim friends in the Middle East and Afghanistan and other countries. They know they don't want radicals. I am so proud of the President of Egypt, el-Sisi, a man who would stand before imams and tell them: We have got to get our religion back from the radicals.

That is a courageous great man. We owe him a lot of help.

So what do we have here on Capitol Hill?

We had guys that apparently never had a background search. And as we found out from the investigator for The Daily Caller, there were actually three or more months of the year when Imran Awan would be in Pakistan doing his job, supposedly making sure Capitol Hill computers were secured. We find out that there was suspicion when they saw this Imran Awan clan. His wife got involved. As we heard, when they would get up to the maximum amount one person could make on Capitol Hill, they would add another family member, and then they would get up to \$160,000; add another family member, get them up; add another family member. And apparently all of these people didn't work.

□ 1715

The people that had a lot of experience working at McDonalds probably didn't have that much experience on computers, but he was still making \$160,000 or so a year and, we find out—I had no idea, just this week found out—they were able to gain \$6 million to \$7 million from the House of Representatives' budget.

And we find out, gee, one of them, had gotten \$100,000 from an individual with known ties to Hezbollah, and we don't know for what reason, but clearly never came to Capitol Hill. He was put on the payroll of the U.S. House of Representatives, the guy that was owed \$100,000 with ties to Hezbollah, and made over \$200,000 or so before he was taken off the payroll.

That is a good way to pay back a loan, isn't it?

So we had Imran Awan; Hina Alvi, his wife; Abid Awan; Jamal Awan; Rao Abbas; and possibly a couple of others we found out—just incredible that this kind of thing could happen.

But the suspicion grew when he was supposed to be working on the computer system of Congressman, now attorney general in California, Becerra. No indication Becerra knew anything was wrong, but people here on the Hill watching this saw there have been 5,700 accesses to his computer system and 5,400, at least, were not from people who should have been getting into his computer system.

Then we find out, actually, he downloaded other Members of Con-

gress' servers completely onto Becerra's server, and, actually, he had 2 terabytes of information that he said was for their child's homework—a little child's homework taking 2 terabytes.

But we also know, apparently, from what came out this week, he was downloading dozens of Members' computers onto one server so that anybody he wanted to could access any of that information.

Now, there is no indication that classified information was revealed through the access to all these computer systems by people who were not hired by that Member of Congress. But we also know—I mean, General Petraeus, I read somewhere that it was actually a calendar that he gave to the lady who was to do a book, that he was having an affair with, that had some stuff that was considered classified.

Well, on every Member's computer system, you get their calendar, you get all their email, you get all their appointments, things that are going on in the office, you get reactions to people who come in over different bills, you get reaction to different things that have been learned in the intelligence community. There are all kinds of things that people would pay a lot of money for.

Then we find out, you had a bankruptcy in the Awan history, you had domestic violence in the history, and now we find out this week, newly reported, that his wife is now upset. We can maybe get some answers now that she is upset because, now, she has found out that not only was he being corrupt to the banks here in the United States and on Capitol Hill, but he also, without his wife's knowledge, married another lady. So that may help bring his first wife around to giving us more information about just how bad things got.

But the report was, this week, investigators with the IG's office here on Capitol Hill have been quietly tracking the five IT workers—that is, the Awan group—their digital footprints for months. They were alarmed by what they saw.

The employees, the Awans, appeared to be accessing congressional servers without authorization, an indication that they "could be reading and/or removing information," according to the documents distributed at the previously unreported private briefings.

So I know that there are people who have reported here on Capitol Hill, well, it is being looked into, but there is no evidence of crime. Really?

Because we have also learned that there may have been hundreds of vouchers filed falsely for, say, an \$800 iPad. But if you say that it is under \$500, then it doesn't go in the inventory, and it is easier to steal and sell, for example, hypothetically, in Pakistan, where there are reports that he sent technological systems and sold them to make extra money.

We know that he was not truthful and honest in his financial disclosures.

That can be a crime. But just one voucher where you claim something only cost \$490 and the server system cost \$310 when you know that item actually cost \$800 and should go into the inventory, that could be a crime. It appears that happened countless times, but we need to be trying to count anyway.

We know that there were many pieces of computer equipment found at his home after FBI agents said his wife appeared to be fleeing, to not come back, even though she had a trip back. We don't know what representations have been made to get her to come back, but we know that the tenants who leased the house where they fled from had been threatened by Imran Awan's lawyer for allowing law enforcement to have access to that computer equipment that was there at his house. Hard drives appeared to be destroyed so they could not be properly investigated.

We got a report that one of the group appeared to be home most of the time and was not here in Washington, D.C. But what a great gig, when you can make \$160,000 a year for servicing computer equipment. And it appears all of these five, six, seven people in this group didn't have competence to do computer or IT work, yet they were sure making a good living doing it.

But for those who continue to say "we just don't think there is much there," all that should tell you is the report by Luke Rosiak, of all the witnesses to this whole sordid matter, only about 20 percent of them have ever been interviewed by FBI or law enforcement. It tells you somebody around here in this town, this Hill, somebody does not want to get to the bottom of this. If law enforcement wants to get to the bottom of this, they will get to the bottom of it.

Kind of like Benghazi, if we really wanted to get to the bottom of it, we would do like Judicial Watch and be relentless till we got to the bottom of it. We haven't gotten there yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that needs to be investigated, a lot that needs to be done. We need—somebody, sounds like, needs to be investigating Mr. Mueller, but certainly needs to be investigating the various leaks that appear to have come from Mr. Comey through the same sources as the one he admitted. That has got to be investigated. And Mueller can't do it and, apparently, the current Attorney General can't. We have got to have somebody appointed to get to the bottom of what was happening at the DOJ during last year when an election was going on.

We need to have an investigation to thoroughly get into this matter of having a U.N.—our representative to the U.N. is unmasking American information. We were assured that kind of thing would not happen if we would just reauthorize that program: Oh, no, no. If there are Americans who happen to be incidentally picked up by the

monitors, the wiretap, by listening in on conversations, look, if there is an American, we mask the name. You can't just get that. You are protected. It is minimized.

Well, we find out that wasn't true, that anybody that wants to go skipping and looking into any political opponents can do that if you are corrupt enough. And if you are corrupt enough and you have corrupted other people, then it won't be investigated.

Maybe there are things other people around here don't want found out, but it is time we cleaned up the mess that has been left here, we clean up the wiretapping capability. It is coming up for reauthorization here. It has got to be done before the end of December, and I still need a lot of answers before I could even consider doing that.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have got to help the American people by keeping our promises.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN PAKISTAN AND SINDH

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding me 30 minutes, more than enough time to deliver three separate speeches that I have prepared for presentation. The first two are informed, or two of these speeches are informed. The first and the third are informed by my 20 years of experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the second speech I will deliver is informed by 40 years as a CPA in the world of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee and the founder of the Sindh Caucus. In those two roles, I have focused on human rights and the rule of law in Pakistan, and particularly in its perhaps largest province, Sindh, comprising most of southern Pakistan.

We have dedicated ourselves in the Sindh Caucus to efforts to preserve the culture and the language of the Sindhi people, and particularly their dedication to religious tolerance. Unfortunately, the human rights picture in Pakistan and in Sindh are not good.

I would like to say a few words about the disappearance of Punhal Sario, the leader of the Voice for Missing Persons of Sindh movement, and about the very serious problem of disappearances in Sindh in southern Pakistan.

Just this past summer, Punhal Sario led a march between Sindh's two major cities, Hyderabad to Karachi, demanding accountability for Sindhi activists who have been abducted by Pakistani security forces or simply disappeared.

Where is Punhal now? It appears that he, too, has fallen victim to the very serious forces that he marched against.

□ 1730

Punhal's case is hardly an isolated one. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan reported that over 700 people disappeared, were kidnapped, and never heard of again in Pakistan in the year 2016 alone.

In the past year, the United Nations Human Rights Committee, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the State Department's own Report on Human Rights have all noted serious concerns about extrajudicial and targeted killings and disappearances in Pakistan and, particularly, in Sindh.

Elements of the government or military see an opportunity to simply make their opponents disappear. Here are a few particulars. In 2016, Amnesty International reported that the Pakistani security forces had, and these are their words, "committed human rights violations with almost total impunity."

While Human Rights Watch observed that, "law enforcement and security agencies remained unaccountable for human rights violations."

The State Department itself noted in Pakistan, "the most serious human rights problems were extrajudicial and targeted killings, disappearances, torture, the lack of the rule of law."

Two years ago, in 2015, Sindhi leader Dr. Anwar Laghari was brutally murdered in Pakistan. Days before his death, he had sent a memorandum to President Barack Obama about human rights violations by the Pakistani military and its ISI, the Inter-Services Intelligence, agency, an important part of the Pakistani military.

I attended a memorial service for Dr. Laghari here in Washington and have come to know of his work for human rights for the Sindhi people of southern Pakistan. The Pakistani Government has not been responsive to numerous inquiries into the reason for Dr. Laghari's death and for why his perpetrators have not been brought to justice.

Two months ago, on August 18, I sent a letter to the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs and the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan expressing strong concerns about human rights violations of the Pakistani Government in Sindh. Six of my House colleagues—three Democrats and three Republicans—joined me in that effort.

There are other human rights concerns in Pakistan that I should also bring to the attention of this House. The people of Sindh face religious extremist attacks. ISIS, for example, claimed responsibility for an attack on a Sufi shrine in Sindh that killed 80 people. Yet the government has not acted to protect religious minorities and, in general, has not acted to protect the people of Sindh from Islamic extremism.

In addition, in Sindh, there are forced conversions of Sindhi girls belonging to minority communities.