

election after Richard Nixon's close Presidential win. The seat was open but there were some divisions in the Democrat ranks, particularly for the U.S. Senate race where a liberal challenger, Rev. Joseph Duffy challenged a wounded incumbent Thomas Dodd, the latter who ran as an independent candidate. The 1968 riots had scared many Connecticut cities, frightening suburban voters while the Vietnam War had divided Bailey Democrats from the growing Left.

Gaffney got the word out that Congressman Meskill would be willing to run for the top job and started beating the drums. But there was strong competition in State Senate Minority Leader Wallace "Wally" Barnes of Bristol and state Sen. T. Clark Hull of Danbury. Meskill won the convention, watched the well-oiled delegates pick Hull as his running mate and avoided a primary.

Bailey called Meskill "Tough Tommy" a moniker any Republican at that time would gratefully accept. If Meskill was the champ, Gaffney his corner man, fixing the cuts, wiping the sweat and telling his man to get back in and finish it. Meskill recruited and attracted a deep bench of young, eager Republican operatives—known as the Kiddie Corps—including two who themselves would become state Party chairmen, legislators, power brokers, lobbyists and gifted players at the game. They were hungry and eager—and Gaffney put them to work.

The Corps organized at the local level while Gaffney cajoled local GOP leaders, kept Meskill on a Conservative message of smaller government, less spending and business-friendly policies. In those days, patronage wasn't an obscenity and he used it appropriately as an effective incentive. Nixon and Vice President Spiro Agnew made personal appearances, including a famous parade through the streets of Hartford.

After Meskill defeated U.S. Rep. Emilio Q. "Mim" Daddario and U.S. Rep. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., defeated Sen. Dodd and Duffy, Gaffney was rewarded with the state Party chairmanship. In two years, Nixon's 49-state landslide would sweep Republicans into complete power in the legislature. As Meskill governed, Gaffney made sure it ran as smoothly as possible.

In March 1974, everything that went well in 1972 turned upside down. With Watergate in full bloom and an urge to return to law, Meskill announced he would not seek a second term. While some blamed a freak ice storm that Meskill was slow to appreciate while out of state on vacation, the national storm clouds were darkening rapidly. When Republicans nominated Bob Steele, Gaffney stepped down as chairman.

In October, Meskill appointed Gaffney to the bench over the protestations of the Connecticut Bar Association. Gov. Ella Grasso didn't reappoint him three months later, so Gaffney went back to law.

In 1984, he and George Bennett formed Gaffney-Bennett and Associates. State lobbying was expanding at a rapid clip and along with a young Jay Malcynsky, also a New Britain lad, they came up with a winning formula of contract lobbying handled by both lobbyists from both Parties.

Every significant Republican over the last 50 years coveled or depended on Gaffney's counsel or high sign—Nancy Johnson, Stewart McKinney, Weicker and John G. Rowland not to mention scores of others who never measured up.

Almost to the end of his storied life, Gaffney kept his hand in the game, as honorary chairman of statewide campaigns for Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, delegating to a new group of operatives and making sure the vote got out. Even as he spent more time on his short game and his grand-

children, Gaffney would pick up the phone to call a Republican insider to find out what was going on—who was up, who was down and who the next up and comer was.

Like anyone in the game that long, Gaffney made his share of enemies who felt he hadn't been straight with them or was expedient in his relationships. No one's street is always clean, but most of those who complained the loudest were masking their own failures and looking for a convenient excuse to explain their defeat.

I enjoyed my chairman-to-chairman conversations with Gaffney, who always returned the "Mr. Chairman" salutation without hesitation. He knew how to work people and I was as thrilled as anyone to hear it. When we would share a timeless frustration that all chairmen have endured, he would let out a loud roaring laugh only the Irish can muster.

In going through the clips, I noticed a profile done by Hartford Courant report Michelle Jaklin, who quoted why a long-time Conservative GOP operative was supporting George H.W. Bush for President in 1988 and not her previously preferred choice of Jack Kemp or Pierre "Pete" DuPont. "Because Brian Gaffney asked me to," she replied. "Any loyalty you give Brian, you get back in spades. People have been with him for years and years."

Gaffney represented a time when Democrats and Republicans would beat each other senseless but when the whistle sounded, they picked each other up, wiped away the blood, picked up the loose teeth and went to have a cold one to make sense of it all.

He loved the game, the competition and the people up and down the line who made politics serious and fun, and he did it by living by a code that put a high premium on being true to yourself and others in the fox-hole.

Gaffney knew how to use power during a time when you could. By the late 1980's, the role of the state Party had shifted to one of communication, back office and training. It no longer held the cards to make candidates, reward friends and punish the wicked.

He was an Irish warlord, but with a sense of humor.

His passing is the final chapter of a bygone era—for good or bad—but one that worked."

It is my hope that the eulogy by Chris Healy will have future congressional scholars or those who peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD understanding the rich life and contribution of J. Brian Gaffney. The whole Connecticut delegation joins me in honoring Brian and extends our sincere condolences to the Gaffney Family.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS IN SRI LANKA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a hearing on human rights concerns in Sri Lanka. The Sri Lankan civil war ended almost 10 years ago this May. The 25-year war cost an estimated 100,000 lives and displaced hundreds of thousands more. The civil war was a brutal ethnic conflict between the majority Sinhalese and minority Tamils; both sides—the Sri Lankan Armed Forces and the rebel "Tamil Tigers"—have

been credibly accused of unimaginable war crimes.

To this day, justice for many of the victims remains elusive. Although many observers hoped that the reformist government of President Sirisena would increase access to justice, focus on human rights, emphasize transparency and accountability, and improve the rule of law, his administration has been criticized for having an inadequate response. Despite having run on a platform of ethnic reconciliation, President Sirisena has done little to mend the ties between the groups, and the political polarization has increased among both ethnic groups.

As one of our experts, J.S. Tissainayagam, attested, there has been no progress on holding those responsible for war crimes to account. And he will describe forced disappearances of Tamils and torture were endemic during the war. Much of this was facilitated by the draconian Prevention of Terrorism Act, or the PTA. The PTA has yet to be repealed, and is still in use by the government and security forces. Whereas most Tamils nowadays simply desire some semblance of self-governance and federalism, their areas in the north and eastern part of the island are increasingly militarized.

A concerning development in Sri Lanka is the resurgence of Sinhalese Buddhist nationalism. As one of our expert witnesses, Dr. Michael Jerryson, described, this particularly virulent strand of nationalism preaches exclusion of other ethnic and religious minorities, with Buddhist fundamentalists in groups such as the BBS saying "This is not a multi-religious country. This is a Sinhalese country."

What of the minority groups, such as the predominantly Hindu Tamils, then? Or the Muslims, who constitute a distinct minority, or the Christians, who can be either be Sinhalese or Tamil? If the character of Sri Lanka is solely Buddhist and Sinhala, there is little room for these ethnic and religious minorities to thrive, and reconciliation will remain a far off goal.

Unfortunately, the trend is heading in the opposite direction—in local elections in February of this year, a newly formed Buddhist nationalist party gained 45 percent of the vote, beating the government coalition combined. Furthermore, in March of this year, Sinhalese mobs engaged in an anti-Muslim pogrom after a local dispute, forcing the President to declare a state of emergency.

Sri Lanka's stability is of critical importance to the United States national interests. Strategically located in the sea-lanes linking the Persian Gulf to East Asia, this island-nation has seen a spike in recent activity by the Chinese. China's strategy globally is one of indebting countries and binding them in servitude so it can extract resources, so it is safe to say that Beijing's initiatives will not emphasize ethnic reconciliation and/or human rights. This presents the United States with an opportunity to stand up for justice and the rule of law and to oppose China's malign influence.

After a brutal war that cost an unconscionable loss of life, we must do better to help Sri Lanka get on the right page again. The country has promise and the people deserve better. Once all sides recognize this, this island-nation will finally have some semblance of peace.

CONGRESS OF FUTURE MEDICAL LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lance Tanner, who was chosen by the National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists to represent the State of Colorado as Delegates at the Congress of Future Medical Leaders.

The Congress is an honors-only program for top students in our country who aspire to be physicians or medical scientists. These students are nominated by their teachers or the Academy based on their leadership ability, academic achievement, and dedication. This program is designed to inspire young people to go into medical research fields or be physicians, and provides a path, plan, and mentoring resources to help them reach their goal. During the Congress, the students will have the chance to learn from leaders in the medical field as well as government officials, top medical school deans, leaders from the private sector, and even Nobel laureates.

This student's acceptance to this prestigious program is an incredible feat, and it is my honor to rise today and recognize the outstanding accomplishment of this future leader. Our nation greatly benefits from the achievements of physicians and medical scientists, and it is important that we continue to inspire younger generations to pursue careers in the medical field.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my congratulations and best wishes to Lance Tanner.

H.R. 4079, THE RESTORE ACT OF 2017

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that the House failed to consider H.R. 4079, the RESTORE Act of 2017, both this and last week. Further, Republican Leadership refused to allow debate or a vote on my bipartisan amendment to attach the legislation to H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

Two years ago, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 passed unanimously in both the House and the Senate and was signed into law. Members were led to believe that the measure was non-controversial and would help patients secure pain medications.

Instead, a joint investigation by "60 Minutes" and the Washington Post appears to confirm that the legislation has limited the DEA's ability to suspend a pharmaceutical distributor's license and shipments if they pose an imminent danger to public health and safety.

The RESTORE Act of 2017 would fully repeal the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 and restore the DEA's authority to carry out needed enforcement actions to combat the opioid epidemic.

Although many of the bills recently passed by the House were bipartisan and took incremental steps toward addressing substance abuse, they did not equip the DEA with the authority that it needs to keep our communities safe and healthy.

I urge Republican Leadership to reconsider this issue and allow the Restore Act of 2017 to be brought to the floor as soon as possible.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM JOINT HEARING ON OVERSIGHT OF THE FBI AND DOJ ACTIONS IN ADVANCE OF THE 2016 ELECTION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the implications of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Joint Hearing on the FBI and DOJ Actions in Advance of the 2016 Election.

The Report of the Department of Justice's Inspector General regarding these actions does not vindicate the President or conclude that the Trump Campaign did not collude with Russians to influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

Nothing in this report changes the fact on March 31, 2016, Mr. Trump met with George Papadopoulos at Trump Tower.

This is significant because as we speak, Paul Manafort, the chairman of the Trump Campaign, sits in jail as an indicted money launderer, and an unregistered agent of a foreign government.

Donald Trump is the first sitting president in history whose campaign chairman spent his time behind bars during his own presidential administration.

But Manafort is not the only member of the Trump Campaign staff indicted or to have pleaded guilty to felonies arising out of the Russia investigation.

He is joined by Michael Flynn, former National Security Advisor; Rick Gates, Deputy Campaign Chairman; and George Papadopoulos.

Now that we have discussed what is not present in this report, we can turn to what is included.

This report is clearly the product of attention to detail as well as a commitment to sharing with the American people information about the FBI's investigation into Secretary Hillary Clinton's emails in the days, weeks and months leading to the 2016 election.

I have spent the last few days studying this report which is comprehensive and answers a lot of questions that the American people have about the election.

I would like to acknowledge that I take a back seat to no one when it comes to standing up for law enforcement—they do a difficult job under difficult circumstances.

But I cannot help but notice some glaring things about this report.

The report concludes that while political bias was apparent in the atmosphere leading up to the 2016 election, political bias was not influential in individual decisions which were made.

There exist some operative dates and facts relevant to this inquiry that might cause some Americans to question that conclusion.

First, the announcement by the Inspector General's office that it would be conducting its investigation occurred on January 12, 2017, one week after then-President-elect Trump was briefed by the Intelligence Community about the existence of the FBI's counterintelligence investigation into Russian attempts to meddle into the 2016 election.

Many Americans will find this timing very troubling.

Second, in Chapter 7 of the report, the Inspector General cites all the reasons for concluding that Secretary Clinton did not break the law or have any basis to conclude that she broke the law for her use of a private server.

So it was the Inspector General office's finding that while it did not make any pronouncement on whether the decision was correct, it did say that the decision not to take any action was reasonable, and grounded in the law, facts and applicable DOJ precedent.

Moreover, the decision to on one hand decline prosecution, but on the other to editorialize Secretary Clinton's behavior as extremely careless, appears to be a political decision and one that had the foreseeable effect of harming Hillary Clinton and helping Donald Trump.

The month-long delay between the discovery of additional emails, in late September 2016, and the public announcement of this fact, on October 28, 2016, had the foreseeable effect of harming Secretary Clinton and helping Trump.

Secretary Clinton's campaign was not the subject of a federal counterintelligence investigation by our nation's law enforcement.

But the same is not true with respect to the Trump Campaign, which was under investigation for colluding with a hostile foreign power to influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

So, millions of Americans are left with painful realization that there was actually a pretty persistent double standard in favor of Trump and prejudicial to Clinton.

Under these circumstances, it is reasonable for Americans to conclude that Secretary Clinton was the victim of a double standard.

When the IG's Report was released, the president indicated that this report was a total vindication of him and his campaign in the election.

In fact, nothing in this report exonerates the Trump Campaign of colluding with the Russians.

This is because the IG office did not investigate any aspect of the Russian government's interference in the 2016 election.

One of the concerns the Report had with leaks is both the total universe of people privy to information, and the fact that guidelines about talking to the press were often flouted.

In that section, the Report references the improper disclosure of non-public information specifically as it relates to October 2016—and we seem to have a concern that the weeks that passed between the initial discovery of emails on the Weiner laptop led to their public disclosure in part because DOJ management was concerned that the information would leak anyhow.

In fact, we have documented reports of Rudy Giuliani going on Fox News and claiming to have information about this very subject.

Both in the Executive Summary and in the body of your report, leaks from April 2016 and October 2016 are cited.