

We invite all Members of the House to join us at this tremendous expo that celebrates Pennsylvania's rich history and the agriculture industry. We will tour the show and visit various exhibits. Pennsylvania Agriculture Secretary Russell Redding will also join us.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania and generates nearly \$6.9 billion in agricultural cash receipts. Almost half a million jobs are tied to this industry in the Commonwealth. This show has been widely attended for generations. In fact, this year marks the 101st show.

Come join us Saturday in Harrisburg as we celebrate the prominence of the agriculture industry in Pennsylvania and its importance to this Nation. We hope to see you there.

#### SNOWDROP FOUNDATION FIGHTS CHILDHOOD CANCER

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, everything is bigger in Texas. But as any Texan knows, the biggest, most grand thing is the heart of a Texan. The best example of these hearts are my two dear friends, Kevin and Trish Kline. Their huge Texas hearts want to end childhood cancer, so they started the Snowdrop Foundation. They have raised over \$1 million in less than 10 years to stop cancer.

They do this for kids like Ana. When Ana was 14, she was told she had acute leukemia. She wondered: Will my soul be taken away? Who will take care of my younger brother? Am I going to die?

After nearly a decade of fear, with Snowdrop's help, Ana now says: Cancer, been there, beat that.

God bless Ana, Snowdrop, Kevin, and Trish.

#### CONGRATULATING PLEASANT VALLEY VIKINGS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out the pride of Chico, California, and the First District. The Pleasant Valley High School Vikings became State champions of football just a few weeks ago.

It was a very exciting game. They traveled south to Long Beach for it, to beat St. Anthony. The resiliency of the Vikings was amazing. I didn't get to go to the game myself, but I was texting back and forth with a good friend down there. After a 17-13 halftime score, it ended up 50-49.

The Vikings were back and forth, up and down. With just 1½ minutes left in the game, after a late interception by the other team, they were down by 8 points. But with about 1½ minutes to

go, they drove the field, scored a touchdown, got the 2-pointer and tied. They went into overtime. After giving up a touchdown to the other team in overtime, they came back, drove the field once again, scored a touchdown, and went for two and became division champions for the State of California by a score of 50-49.

Congratulations, Pleasant Valley Vikings. Well done. You showed a lot of heart.

□ 1700

#### DOUBLE STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to get to come into this hallowed Hall and to have a chance to address our peers.

It was a rather enjoyable day yesterday, even with all the vitriol, but I was reminded and couldn't help but reminisce a bit and walk a bit down memory lane yesterday as we heard from Members of the House on the other side of the aisle expressing repeatedly a desire to have open debate and not shut off debate.

The reminiscing took me back to a time last year when, as far as we could find, the only time in American history one party in the United States Congress physically prevented another party from coming to the floor and going into session and trying to begin debate and trying to discuss the business of the day. We can't find that any party ever staged such a sit-in.

We know there are House rules about not eating on the House floor and about not having things to drink on the House floor other than water, and yet our friends across the aisle were eating and drinking. It is actually a violation of the House rules to sing on the House floor. Every now and then, people look the other way from the violation, but certainly not to take pictures and broadcast.

I approached the Sergeant at Arms and asked him why this wasn't stopped.

I was told: Well, they won't stop; we have told them repeatedly.

I said: Well, you won't let Republicans get away with this kind of conduct. They are preventing debate. They are preventing a session from starting timely. This has been going on for hours.

I was told: Well, Congressman, when we tell you Republicans that you are violating a rule, you stop and you follow the rules. We have told them repeatedly, and they will not stop violating the rules. They will not stop preventing you from going into session, so we don't know what else to do.

Mr. Speaker, I had issues like that when I was a felony judge, and they didn't last long because we had bailiffs

who would drag people out to stop such inappropriate conduct. It just seemed that, in this potentially last bastion of civility where we can use words and debate issues, it is rather ironic, to say the least, to be preached to repeatedly about the desire for open debate and the desire to not be shut down from speaking when that is exactly what happened last year by the very people who were standing up, and some of them were reading a script pointing out how offended they were by being prevented by the rules under which we have been proceeding from going forward and debating. So it is rather ironic and rather incredible actually.

I also recall back when we were debating ObamaCare and some of us wanted to get amendments into ObamaCare. Of course, some of us remember the fact that John Dingell was chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that had jurisdiction over the healthcare debate and the healthcare bill. He has been working for a healthcare bill, something like what passed, for all of his time, as I am aware of, in the House.

I was told by someone that his father may have worked for the same bill for years. So that was something that was going to be a crowning glory for an incredibly honorable man. We see differently on many issues, but I know him to be an honest and honorable man. His word has always been good. When he has given it, it was always the way it is. I have great respect for him.

Anyway, he understood that the cap-and-trade bill that was being pushed here in the House by then-Speaker PELOSI was going to unduly harm the Nation's poor more than anybody else in the country. If you are very rich, if you are on Wall Street, you are friends of the Obama administration, and you have gotten \$656 million in grants to open a non-carbon-based energy facility, you are not worried about the price of anything because your friends in the Obama administration were giving you millions and billions of dollars that you could fritter away as you wished.

But for our Nation's middle class, lower middle class, and poor that don't have the ability to absorb increasing energy costs, the cap-and-trade bill would have been devastating. That is why, when John Dingell was asked about the cap-and-trade bill, he responded something to the effect that it is not only a tax, it is a great big tax, it will unfairly hit the poor, and he was not going to bring that bill out of committee. So Speaker PELOSI, at that time, took whatever actions were required to remove him as chair and replace him with Henry Waxman.

Chairman Waxman made clear: We don't need your votes; we don't want your input; so we don't care what you want in the healthcare bill.

JOE BARTON, the longest serving Texan in the House right now, had indicated, as a former chair of that same committee, that it is interesting if

John Dingell—the consummate professional and honorable man that he is—had been allowed to remain as chairman of that committee, he would have instinctively gotten Republican input into that bill and included things in the bill that Republicans would have had a hard time voting against. If he had been allowed to remain as chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, John Dingell would have probably been able to get a bill through that would not even be taken up by this body to be repealed and ripped out by its roots.

Hopefully that is what we are going to be able to do with the extremely partisan bill. There were groups that were telling Republicans: Look, of course we are negotiating with the Obama administration. We have got to have a seat at the table.

I would tell them: Not when you are on the menu.

But there were groups like the Big Pharma, like the American Hospital Association, the AMA, and some of the health insurance businesses that ended up getting behind it. Of course, AARP totally sold out retired folks because they were going to make hundreds of millions—billions perhaps—more than they would have without ObamaCare being passed. They had no interest in supporting a bill like I proposed that would have ended any need for a senior citizen to ever have to pay for supplemental insurance on top of Medicare; they would have been totally covered.

But I didn't realize, at the time I asked them to support it in 2009, that the year before they had made, I think, over \$400 million or so in profit as a nonprofit organization on getting their members to buy their insurance that they had sponsored and put their mark of approval on.

So anyway, there were people that were going to make a lot of money. But I could see that in the end it would probably spell the doom of the pharmaceutical industry. Yes, it would be years down the road; yes, there would be executives at pharmaceutical companies who would see massive billions of dollars come in more than would have otherwise; and, yes, they would likely take their golden parachutes and their millions in severance in retirement and be gone before they were relegated to perhaps producing medications without getting reimbursement for research and development. This is the way this whole ObamaCare thing would have eventually played out, and still they got on board with ObamaCare because they were going to make short-term extra billions of dollars.

So having all of that in mind, as it has all appeared to me, it had just been astounding to be here yesterday and hear all the comments about the inability to have open debate.

I have talked to numerous friends across the aisle who were greatly troubled over the last 6 years. Actually, the Office of Congressional Ethics was started by Speaker PELOSI. You are al-

lowed to file complaints without anybody knowing who filed the complaint. The OCE is then able to go after a Member of Congress and start demanding things that they could not possibly be entitled to under the Constitution if a Member of Congress were getting due process.

I haven't been run through the ringer like so many have. But when you set up a process like that, and you have the Office of Congressional Ethics set up, they have no one at all to whom they are accountable—no one—and they are encouraged, even if they filed the complaints themselves, to enable them to continue to grow from the little office they had over here in the Longworth Building. I am told they have a massive amount of space in one of the big Federal buildings now, and they continue to grow. So apparently, they were offended that their budget was cut and they were put under the Ethics Committee so that they would have some accountability. There were an awful lot of great people—good friends—across the country that did not know about how unconstitutionally they had been acting—I mean more abusive even than the IRS at times from the reports of some of my colleagues to me of what they have been through.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, as a judge who has had to look people in the eye and sentence them to death—something that is never taken lightly. I may be the only person here in Congress who has ever looked someone in the eye and sentenced them to death and been appointed as counsel against my wishes to represent an indigent defendant on appeal from a capital murder conviction under sentence of death and was able, appropriately, to have his case reversed and to save his life as the law should have been. So I feel rather strongly that, yes, people should be accountable, but they must have due process, and that is not what is provided for by the OCE.

□ 1715

Wonderful people, including our incoming President, were not aware of just how crazy the abuses have been. One of the Members was telling me yesterday that he was out about half a million dollars in attorney's fees responding to ridiculous demands and still never got to know who the accuser was. You don't get to necessarily even see what the specific complaint is.

So we didn't do a good job of educating people of how grossly unfair the OCE process was, could be, but everybody in Congress, the judiciary, and executive branch needs someone to whom they are accountable, and that would include the OCE.

We have got to do something about this, but we do need to go about it in an appropriate way to make sure that, once again, justice is done. But when you hear "ethics watchdog group," then immediately you think, Gee, they are going to stop an ethics watchdog

group? That is outrageous. That is what I would think if I didn't know all the background.

So it made for an interesting day yesterday, but I have been amazed, though, that some who have told me that they wanted to eliminate the OCE who stand up on the other side of the aisle and preach about ethics, apparently referring to the effort to place OCE and make them accountable under somebody for a change—in this case, under the Ethics Committee—and would demagogue the issue, in essence, when they have been mistreated by the OCE, according to what I have been told by them in the past.

So I think if we can just set the politics aside and work together for appropriate due process, we can have a bipartisan group that could work out something that would create due process and would make people accountable so that when you have somebody with \$90,000 of cold, hard cash in their freezer, there is accountability. In that case, it was a crime and it needed to be addressed. So there does need to be accountability.

I know we have friends here. I saw my friend, STEVE KING, at the back just a moment ago. We feel strongly that when a Federal judge intentionally refuses to go along with what they know the Constitution says, that ought to be an impeachable offense. They are not keeping their oath, and that is as offensive as anything is when it comes from a judge. They ought to be able to impeach a judge like that.

I don't think we have done enough removal, impeachment of judges who have violated their oath. Yes, we were removing a judge who had committed sexual assault. Well, that should have been a no-brainer, but that took literally an act of Congress to eventually get that done.

For another judge, it was not until we actually impeached him for his terribly inappropriate actions of suppressing information when he was being investigated for being a Federal judge, but from his days as a State judge. Apparently, as a State judge, he didn't have a problem, if tuition was due for his son, to just send the secretary or somebody to one of the law offices which he often appoints and then have them fill up the envelope with a bunch of cash and use that to pay his son's tuition. That didn't seem to be a problem for that judge. Those are all things that should have been appropriately taken into account before he was ever made a Federal judge.

I see my friend here on the floor. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I was listening to the gentleman's remarks on a couple of these topics here that are very important.

He led off with the situation that occurred with the sit-in that occurred here on this House floor last year, some months ago, and I found that to be very appalling for the decorum, for

the honor, for the history, for all the things that are important about conducting ourselves in a society where order is needed in order to conduct business.

This House floor was not treated with that respect that is necessary to have order, to have an honest debate, and a debate that is constructive when you have a sit-in like that where basically the folks on the other side of the aisle—some of them—decided to take over the entire building outside of session, outside of the rules. As Mr. GOHMERT mentioned, many rules were violated.

I had the appalling experience of walking on the floor just a few minutes after they concluded their sit-in and, honestly, the garbage that was laying on the floor. I saw food crumbs, old newspapers, magazines, a couple of blankets. They didn't even pick up after themselves. They expected the staff of the building to pick it up and haul it off for them because their Occupy Wall Street moment was over with. This is not the sixties. This is not the hippy era. This is the United States House of Representatives.

This week, rules were proposed that say, when you violate rules in such a fashion where videotaping or Periscoping, as they call it, is occurring—sending these speeches during a nonofficial, non-session time, basically bootlegging them to the American public via C-SPAN; and I am a little annoyed with C-SPAN actually playing along with the violation of House rules of piping this out the way they did.

If you want to have a protest out on the front lawn, fine. That is within the rights of free speech, the First Amendment, and all that. You don't do it in violation of the rules of a fairly, some might say, sacred place—this House floor—the way that happened then. For them to be piping it out live that way, I found it to be completely wrong.

There are those folks that might say: Well, this is all First Amendment rights, not in violation of the decorum of the House rules. So I am glad Mr. GOHMERT brought that up. Rules are put in place this week to address people that are going to violate the very House rules that help us keep order and do business of the American public. We lost part of, I think, three session days that we could have been grinding out the important business that the people expect of this country.

We lost that session time and, indeed, had to come in here and the Speaker or whoever was introducing legislation that day had to yell over the process here to do things in order for the House. I find that appalling. It isn't very mature. I think with some of the penalties that are put in place by the rules this week, there will be a little more accountability for that.

Mr. GOHMERT. I recall being told when that was going on and after it happened that Republicans should not respond, and that we were assured that people who violated the rules back

then would be punished. Well, adopting rules now, specific penalties, don't really punish people that violated those very rules last year.

So I am surprised that there is any complaint at all since basically it means people who violated the rule with such abandon would complain about inserting a specific penalty now, meaning they got a free one. They didn't even get probation. They got nothing. They got pardoned, basically.

Perhaps it is not too late for those that feel like putting a penalty in place now is unfair. I don't think it is too late. It is not unusual to have punishment assessed in a felony case 6 months or more after an event. Perhaps if they think it is unfair, then we ought to have ethics hearings on what happened back then.

I haven't heard of the OCE, by the way, taking any action on such widespread abuse that didn't require investigation. All you needed was footage that was being streamed out from the very violators of the rules. So it should have been an easy thing to pursue, if OCE were really that interested in making sure our rules were not violated.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. It wouldn't be inappropriate since OCE is a hot topic this week.

The accountability goes both directions. So we have heard our colleagues talk about unjust charges that can be brought from anywhere, out of the blue, against a Member of the House without justification, without even a due process for that Member to have a chance to address directly what that charge is, and then have their name run through the newspaper, giant headlines, and maybe a year's worth of investigation.

When you see it, Congressman being investigated, well, that is an ugly headline. It can be used to manipulate it for political purpose when it might be a trumped-up charge, something that has no merit, and many times talking to my colleagues that have faced this, hundreds of thousands of dollars of cost to them for attorney's fees, their reputation besmirched by this, when, really, there is an investigative process that is open, with oversight.

Now we didn't have the perfect piece of legislation in the rule this week. No. We probably need a little more time for it to be aired out and a little more widely. It was withdrawn after at least getting the idea out on the table.

So I am proud of my colleagues who are going to take this up and work in a bipartisan fashion and get the input to make some needed reforms to the OCE so that we have an ethics process that is fair to the Members, but obviously enforces ethics for this House that are needed and clearly demanded by the public and us.

We are talking here tonight about a decorum, a code, a process that our House is to be conducted by. So that

sit-in is one extreme. The other one is charges that are, in many cases, absolved months later without giant headlines but are not even sometimes an oops or I am sorry for trumped-up charges being brought up against somebody that would affect them negatively in their ability to serve their districts or to fend off the huge costs of legal matters that they have to go through.

So many of my colleagues here strongly care and want to have a strong ethical process in this place, but there needs to be accountability and balance to it. That is what we are all looking forward to, is accountability with OCE and our Ethics Committee who, in a bipartisan fashion, can weed through all these processes.

I think we will get to that. For those that are concerned around this country that some here want to get rid of that ethics process, that absolutely couldn't be further from the truth. We all demand that with the code of conduct of this House, on the floor and off, of our Members.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Mr. LAMALFA for great insights. Such truth.

I also was just advised this afternoon that the EPA, apparently in accordance with some frenzied effort to have this administration put as problematic regulations in place to stifle the economy, stifle and skyrocket further costs of energy, has apparently given notice to all gas operators that they have 60 days to comply.

One such operator in Texas was saying the date on the notice says it was received December 15, but he was out of the country. Somebody in the building accepted it. The date for the 60-day compliance kicks in January 18, 2 days before President-elect Donald Trump would be able to strike such an arbitrary and capricious regulation down.

□ 1730

Apparently, they must have backdated the 60-day compliance before they ever got notice saying you have got until January 18 to comply. So what we have heard from so many small-business owners, they get notices like this: You have all of a sudden got to comply. You have got to give us all these records, those records.

It has cost them a fortune. It has stifled their ability to expand their business and hire more people and give more people opportunity and give more people opportunity to make more money than they had been making. Those have been so completely stifled by this administration. I understand there was a political article glorifying the great efforts of the Obama administration in helping the economy, and to justify that, took one quarter out of, I guess—four times eight—32 quarters and said, "Look what they did in this one quarter," when actually, as I understood, if you take the whole term that we have numbers on and adjust the growth for inflation, President Obama's administration, his policies,

his crony capitalism, helping people with no-bid contracts like IBM, giving \$1.6 billion to this company to create mirrors to heat water and however much it was, hundreds of millions for Solyndra—there are just so many companies. They have squandered so much money. And yet, with all the money squandered, the economy grew, when adjusted for inflation, at about half the growth rate during the Jimmy Carter administration.

Now, I understand this administration is extremely proud of what they accomplished, but I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, if your policies cause the economy to grow at half the rate of the Jimmy Carter administration, you have done more damage to the American people and the American economy than you have done good, and that is for sure. And that is at a time when, scientifically, we were having such breakthroughs that we found out we could actually be totally energy independent if this administration had not been spending so much money on too expensive of sources of energy and all the other things this administration supported.

We had a hearing in Chairman ROB BISHOP's Committee on Natural Resources in our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, a hearing on some of the abuses. I know there are legitimate groups and businesses that have invested in this idea of having this fantastic carbon-free energy production out in California, and, yes, it took a massive amount of acreage. I believe it was Federal land that they were allowed to use. I believe. I am not certain.

I was intrigued, they were going to create all these mirrors that would reflect the Sun's light in concentrated amounts towards three different towers, and the towers would then be superheated, superheat the water, turn the water to steam. The steam would turn turbines that would produce electricity. If I recall correctly, they got \$1.6 billion in government loan; and to help them make their loan payment, they got over \$600 million in grants.

When I asked over this period of time that they have been operating how much of their \$1.6 billion in government loan was paid back, I believe he said \$6 million had been paid back from, it may have been, \$656 million that they had given to them by this administration.

But we also came to find out that apparently there have been problems. One of the towers got super-superheated and was totaled, was destroyed because of the massive sunlight reflected and damaged to where it wouldn't function. Because, apparently, they had squandered so much of their money, they had to find a cheap source, an extremely cheap source of energy because they had contracts to supply a certain amount of electricity. With the third tower not in operation, they were not able to supply over 30 percent of the energy they had contracted to provide.

They very quickly, cheaply, efficiently built a natural gas electricity production plant, and, wow, apparently it is working great. Of course, anybody that studies natural gas understands, if they know what they are doing, that natural gas is an amazingly clean form of energy.

Anyway, now about a third of the energy is being produced using natural gas, when the whole purpose of the massive \$1.6 billion in the government-backed loan and the \$656 million or so that was given to them was because it was not going to be carbon based at all.

But it is not just the one problem, apparently, of the tower. This is out in an arid area where there is not much water. Well, they didn't need much water other than what they had in the towers, really; but what they didn't anticipate was something that I am told operators, others in the area refer to as flammers.

Flammers, as I was given to understand, those are birds, perhaps some of them endangered species, that make the mistake of flying through the superheated beam of sunlight and immediately explode or burst into flame. Apparently, if you are a bird that gets superheated and explodes, bursts into flame, then masses of fluid keep covering the mirrors, which need to be kept clean.

Normally, you would figure out in a desert or an arid area, you are not going to need to clean those mirrors very often, so you are not going to need much water. But then when it turns out you have got all these flammers that supercoat the mirrors so they are constantly having to be cleaned, those poor birds that our nature-loving friends are exploding, it is running up the water bill as well because, gee, it is just not healthy to be exploding birds that fly through this superheated beam of sunlight.

So 8 years of misguided policies have made, probably, a lot of Democratic millionaires, but the American public has suffered; and when adjusted for inflation, the American people are, on average, worse off.

I was surprised to see a video where the President actually admitted, he had actually acknowledged, that in his administration, for the first time we are aware of in the history of the United States, 95 percent of the income in America went to the top 1 percent of the income earners. I have read articles since then about, actually, even that 1 percent that was making 95 percent of the Nation's income, they still weren't making, many of them, quite as much as they had before, because that is what happens when you hurt and throttle down an economy, as has happened. We haven't really adjusted.

Of course, we have had the Fed that has had interest rates down to basically nothing, and it was clear they were doing everything they could to try to help the Obama administration's economy look better than it was. Now that people have started having hope

because we have President-elect Trump and the policies are going to change dramatically, we are going to hopefully be completely rid of, or as completely as possible, the crony capitalism. I know my colleagues here in the House, actually on both sides of the aisle, have made clear we want to stop crony capitalism, and I am looking forward to that stopping once we get out from under this administration.

So the economy is showing great signs. I have got people back home telling me they are starting to hire again just based on the hope and the promise. President Obama was supposed to bring hope and change, but all my constituents tell me so many of them are left with, after he has been President, a little change left from what they had when he took office.

But there is real hope, and people are gearing up to grow, and the economy should take off, and we should get energy independent. I expect President-elect Trump to keep his promises. He assured me personally he was going to. So I am expecting great things. But just on that, the economy has started going up, on the assurance that President Obama would not be around any longer than January 20, and as a result now, the Fed finally has started increasing interest rates because they don't have to artificially try to protect President Obama's reputation and his poor economy.

So just the fact that the EPA would send out regulations in such a capricious manner as they have, demanding that well operators start monitoring all their emissions, something to that effect, I am looking forward to getting into it and just seeing how abusive the EPA has been as these oligarchs. Not to give a chance for true input into an arbitrary and capricious rule, not to give businesses a chance to get ready and to adjust, I mean, this is the kind of thing that has stifled so much growth and has sent so many high school and college graduates to their parents' home.

I think there are a lot of people who voted for President Obama and were excited. I think it is unfortunate that so many people expressed that they voted for a President because of his skin color—and I am not talking about Donald Trump—that they made a racist vote to vote for a man who was not White so they could feel good about voting for someone who was not White, where some of us—and it is one of the things for which I love Alveda King, Martin Luther King's niece. I mean, she believes in his dream, and the Americans that voted for Donald Trump, they believe that skin color should not matter. It is racist to vote for a candidate because of what his race is.

Let's look at the character. Let's look at the qualifications. What have you built that you actually built that someone else didn't build for you? Let's look at those things and then make a determination rather than voting for

someone just because of his race. Let's do as Martin Luther King, Jr., was so profound in saying in looking forward to the day when people were judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin. I am looking forward to that day. That day has been set back tremendously.

It was a highlight for me back at the end of the fall to go back to my hometown of Mount Pleasant, Texas. I had mentioned to a reporter sometime back, though I didn't vote for President Obama, I had hopes that he would do for America what Coach Willie Williams did for our football team. Actually, I didn't say "football team." I said "our team."

□ 1745

Liberals immediately put up an article saying that I said my basketball coach, my favorite coach, was African American. Apparently, liberals think, if you are African American, you must be a coach of basketball because of your race. When actually, it was the year before I went to the varsity, I was on the junior varsity, and I enjoyed playing for Coach Williams more than any coach I had ever played for.

And unfortunately, Coach Williams' memory is still intact. I haven't seen him in decades. But I was asked to come give a motivational talk for the team I played for—the Mount Pleasant Tigers. It was such a treat being with those players that morning. It had a rough year to that point. I got to be with them on the field during the game. It was such a treat. Those young people were just inspirational. They fought hard, and some say it was the best game of the year. They won singlehandedly against a team from a bigger town than Mount Pleasant. They even gave me the game ball.

And as much as that meant to me, the real highlight was, as we went into halftime, somebody told me that my old coach, back from over 40 years ago, was up in the press box, and I got to go up. I was so thrilled to see him. We hugged and smiled big as ever. I was so elated in seeing him and talking to him. Somebody said when I got back here—when I said: I finally got to see Coach Williams after all these years. It was wonderful.

Well, did you get a picture?

I didn't even think about a picture. That is not a very good politician. But I didn't think about a picture. But it is a shame.

His memory is so good because he remembered. We didn't have a lot of talent on that team. We didn't. He made us so cohesive. We played well together. We didn't have any outstanding talent, but we had a winning season. And it was a fun season because Coach Williams made it that way. He inspired us together. Everybody got treated just the same. Nobody got special treatment. Nobody got treated more harshly than anybody else. And we came together as a team.

He remembered. He said: Yeah, you guys didn't have much talent on your

team, but you played so well together. Well, that was because of him. He brought us together.

And I so hoped that President Obama would do that for America. I didn't vote for him, but I thought it will be awesome if he can bring us even closer together. And now at the end of his administration, it is so grievous that America seems more divided than ever.

I see an article here about more police officers again being shot in our U.S. cities. I heard the former police chief, I believe, in Chicago this week saying that Black Lives Matter was supposedly organized to try to stop killings of Black, especially young, men. And yet, what Black Lives Matter has done is actually increase the number of people being shot.

I was absolutely astounded to hear a quote from the President. A speech, apparently, he was making. I heard it on the radio. Maybe he was giving an interview. But he was saying that we know that cities that have more gun control laws just have less violence. That is called gaslighting. That is called creating a fiction and trying to push it across and make somebody who knows the truth think that they are crazy and that this alternate truth is really what is going on.

The fact is that cities with the most gun control laws, like Chicago, for heaven's sakes—I mean, the hundreds of precious Black lives that have been taken, been killed, the massive gun control laws have not helped Chicago. They have got a massive number of gun control laws there than we do in any city in east Texas, and yet nowhere in east Texas has that kind of violence at that percentage rate. It is insane.

It is time to quit trying to gaslight the American people, convince them they are going crazy, and that what they know to be true is fiction. It is time to just have a truthful assessment of where we are. We need to follow the law. We need to have enforcement of our borders.

We will continue to be the most generous Nation in the world, not just in giving funds to help others, not just in giving lives of our citizens to help freedom for other countries like nowhere else in history, but also most generous in the number of visas and the number of people that we allow to come into the United States and visit. Yet, that generosity has been abused. As the border patrol has said, every time we hear somebody in the government in Washington say anything about legalizing anything, or anybody that is here illegally, it is like a shiny object that draws even greater numbers illegally through our borders.

And what is our border patrol ordered to do? Don't turn them back and prevent them from entering the United States. Oh, no. Let them step foot on American soil, then in-process them, and we will ship them around different places. Although, I saw an article last week where there were some aliens illegally here who were just dropped off at a bus stop.

I have an article from Julia Edwards Ainsley, January 3, from Reuters: "Trump Team Seeks Agency Records on Border Barriers Surveillance." It is fantastic. I mean, here they are trying to gear up, yet they want to know information. They don't want to be gaslighted. They want to know what is the truth so that they can start making hard preparations for taking office on January 20.

An article, December 30, from Paul Bedard from the Washington Examiner says that the Department of Homeland Security says 94 percent of deportations are people illegally here, terror threats, or gang bangers. The CBP—border patrol—reports assaults on border agents have skyrocketed 231 percent in 2017.

So not only has this President's rules of engagement gotten about four times more Americans killed, our military members killed in Afghanistan, in the same amount of time as Commander in Chief George W. Bush had, in addition to the rules of engagement getting our people killed four times faster than under Commander in Chief Bush, but also the assaults on our own agents have gone up 231 percent just in this year—in 1 year. We are getting our border patrol harmed.

Another article by Chris Tomlinson in Breitbart: "600 'Underage' Migrants Turn Out to Be Adults." I mean, I have seen that in the middle of the night down on the border. People coming in, switching off Xeroxed indications they were going to use for their identification: This is who I am. For whatever reason, they would look at their thing and switch out as to who was going to be who. They weren't able to vet those people, but they were still ordered to in-process them anyway.

This article from Michael Patrick Leahy, December 7, reported that Somalia refugees were arriving in the United States at the highest rate ever in the first two months of fiscal year 2017, which would be October and November. So just astounding when America was making very clear we need to protect American citizens. It is not just the people in this room, as we did yesterday, who take that oath, but the President takes that oath. You have got cabinet members that take the oath, yet they are not doing their jobs. People are getting killed. 85,000 refugees under Obama, but less than 10 to the District of Columbia. So, apparently, let's put those refugees in your backyard. We certainly don't want them in Washington, D.C.'s backyard, apparently, according to this administration.

Then it is pretty amazing, but just 10 States resettled more than half of recent refugees to the United States. Naturally, way more than anywhere else was California and Texas. The Daily Caller reported that the "State Department claims no one used sham visas from fake embassy." Yet, we have seen hundreds and hundreds of people that—the report showed—had been

given citizenship by mistake when they were supposed to have been deported. It doesn't seem like a very innocent mistake when it is that egregious.

Back in December, The Washington Times reported that the "Obama administration fails to check immigrants against FBI databases, approves citizenship" anyway.

The Afghan refugee program has not been totally successful. A report here, Afghan refugee in December was arrested for rape and murder of a top EU official's daughter. So, apparently, that was not working out so well. But that was in the country of Germany where you have a like-minded leader in Angela Merkel, who wants to defeat terrorism, as our President does, with love and compassion. Well, love is a stronger emotion than hate. Love can overcome evil.

But when people are religiously dedicated to wiping another group of people off the planet for what they deem to be their holy god, those are people that have to be defeated. They are at war with you. You defeat them militarily. That puts radical Islam back in a box until some other well-meaning fool like former President Carter—a fine man, just a foolish President—not demeaning his character, but he was just very foolish—in citing the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace, as he was so welcoming in the Ayatollah Khomeini taking over Iran. That released radical Islam out of the box, gave them control of a major country, major country military, and thousands and thousands and thousands of people continue to die because of that mistake.

We know going back to the early days of the United States when so much of the Federal Treasury was used to pay ransom to get our sailors back who were being captured by radical Islamists in North Africa, and Jefferson couldn't understand why they kept attacking American boats.

□ 1800

He asked the Islamist whom he was negotiating with why they kept attacking American ships. We are not a threat to you. We don't even have a Navy.

Reportedly, the response was, in essence: Look, if we die, in attacking someone like you, we go straight to paradise.

Jefferson was amazed. He couldn't believe there was a world religion—or even people's interpretation of a world religion—that advocated that you could go to paradise for killing innocent people. Of course, they maintained they are not innocent because they don't believe exactly like the radical Islamists believe.

President Obama basically did the same thing with Libya. Qadhafi was not a good man; but, since 2003, the reports were clear, as others in North Africa and the Middle East reported, that he was about the best friend that the United States had in helping to fight terrorism in that area; yet this admin-

istration took him out. There were times on this floor that I and others were begging the administration not to take out Qadhafi, not to keep helping the rebels, not to keep bombing Qadhafi's troops until we knew how extensive al Qaeda was. We knew that at least a part of the people fighting were radical Islamists, but the administration went on and turned the country into chaos.

Thank God America is going to have a new administration before we completely go to chaos ourselves.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 5, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Promotion [FNS-2016-0028] (RIN: 0584-AE44) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-93; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 8] received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Privacy Training [FAC 2005-94; FAR Case 2010-013; Item I; Docket No.: 2010-0013; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM06) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulations; Payment of Subcontractors [FAC 2005-94; FAR Case 2014-004; Item II; Docket No.: 2014-0004; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM98) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-94; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 8] received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8. A letter from the President and CEO, National Safety Council, transmitting the Council's Audit Report, in accordance with their Federal Charter, 36 U.S.C. 152502; Public Law 105-225; (112 Stat. 1415); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-1). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 238. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 239. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 240. A bill to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS