

from lobbyists in Washington, D.C. He was able to get a lease for just \$50 a night—something you can't really get anywhere near Capitol Hill—and he only had to pay on the nights that he was there, even though the lease said that the landlord had to keep it open for 6 months—it was on demand and he could go there any time—oh, and, by the way, his daughter could also basically stay as well. When you put out the numbers, that agreement was two to three times less than what any ordinary citizen could have gotten.

This culture of corruption has now led to a Cabinet of corruption. I don't care whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, this is just not acceptable. It is time that the American taxpayer speak out and tell the Trump administration: We have had enough. You need to start firing these officials who are wasting taxpayers' money and getting sweetheart deals for lobbyists.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Speaker, when the President ran for office, he ran on a saying: drain the swamp.

Does this look like you are draining the swamp?

Does the list of people and the list of corruption we have seen, does that look like you are draining the swamp?

No, it seems like you are just adding it. All you are doing is adding more and more to the culture of corruption and creating that swamp.

If the President was serious about it, if my colleagues were also serious about draining the swamp, then they need to keep their own party and their own Cabinet members in check because, right now, that is not happening.

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

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, in fact, this administration has fertilized the swamp. It is tremendously, bigly huge right now. We have lobbyists who have inappropriate deals with Cabinet officials, we have Cabinet officials spending a lot of taxpayers' money to live up their luxury lifestyle of first-class jets, of luxury hotels, and of trips they don't need to take. This is simply not acceptable. This is exactly the opposite of what the President ran on, and the voters are going to know this this November.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, if you wonder why these Cabinet members feel that they can get away with this, if you wonder why some of these lifelong career politicians and executives think that this is a good idea, it is because they look at the top. They look at the top and they say: Well, my leader, President Trump, is allowed to do this, why can't I also take part?

It is the leadership at the top that is creating this culture. It is the leadership at the top that is not draining the swamp, but only making it swampier.

That is why you see Secretary Mnuchin, that is why you see Pruitt,

that is why you see all of these people basically acting like the President: wasteful with our tax dollars, abusing our tax dollars, and not even trying to explain why, or feeling bad about why they did it.

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

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, Congressman GALLEGGO and I are writing an open letter to the American taxpayers that is going to contain all of these facts, with the sources cited, so that the American people can see for themselves the huge waste of taxpayers' money from the Cabinet of corruption.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Mr. Speaker, while you are filling out your taxes—I already did mine. I did not procrastinate this time, thank God. I am sure Congressman LIEU is a lot more organized and probably got it done 3 months ago—but when you are doing your taxes, and when you pay your taxes, just remember, some of that money has gone into the pockets of some politicians who did not need it. It could have gone somewhere else. It could have gone to your favorite issue. It could have gone to our troops. It could have gone to some of our more important causes. Instead, it was because one Cabinet member decided that he needed to take a first-class trip instead of sitting in coach like the rest of us.

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

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 has been an interesting week here. I always appreciate following people speaking who want to limit waste in our Federal Government.

I only heard a little snippet, but it caught my ear. I heard something mentioned about EPA Director Scott Pruitt gave a raise to two people who shouldn't have gotten them.

Actually, I can elaborate a little bit on that.

One of his staff had recommended a raise to two people without the Director's permission, and they didn't get the raise. It didn't happen.

He is one of the most effective people in that job. He is one of the reasons the economy is doing well. And jobs for minority members are at an all-time high record-setting. So I can understand when a Cabinet member like Scott Pruitt is doing an incredible job and the economy is exploding as a result doing

so well, people being employed, and making more.

Mr. Speaker, I can also report, having spent 2 weeks in my district a week before and a week after Easter—I am hearing it from people in jobs you wouldn't even think of that—that the economy is doing well. It is pretty typical for people telling me, who are in retail, whatever it is, their sales are up 30, 40, or 50 percent from where they were after the first quarter, even last year.

I really don't believe we would ever have gotten a tax bill if we had not had the undying commitment to get something done that we had from President Trump. So it is a good thing. It is going to be a good year. When the economy is going good, it is a good thing. I have been here 13 years, but I have noticed that if Republicans are in the majority and the economy is being turned around—I know President Obama had said we will never see 3 percent growth in the economy again, it would take a magic wand, Trump would have to have a magic wand to get the economy growing by 3 percent ever again—and another piece of good news is we have found out that President Trump, as President, has already made enough changes, through people like Scott Pruitt and others, so that the economy has already hit 3 percent growth; and we hope by the end of the year it will be much better. So good news.

My friend is concerned about waste. It is not what was initially reported, but I am thrilled to see the concern about waste. I know that is one thing that both sides of the aisle now will be concerned about.

But it is interesting. When the economy gets to going so well, that is when I usually see my friends across the aisle get more concerned and start using the term "corruption."

And why not?

I know back in 2005 and 2006, when there were Democrats being arrested and there was trouble across the country with corruption on both parties, and we started hearing the term "corruption, corruption, corruption," it was a huge help to the Democrats. They won the majority. Then, as soon as people saw how bad the corruption had become under the Democratic majority, we were able to get the majority back.

Now the key is to do something with it. Obviously, we saw yesterday that it is not enough to just bring a balanced budget bill to the floor that doesn't have a spending cap that would have forced taxes to go up. That is not going to be enough to convince Americans that we are serious about cutting waste in our spending. We are going to have to actually avoid things like that outrageous omnibus that passed with over 60 percent of Democrats voting for it and over 60 percent, apparently, of Republicans voting for it.

There is another bit of good news. I do think this part of the news is a help

to the economy, and one of the reasons we are seeing a help to the economy.

I know there are some megawealthy folks out there who want to see no border like the Clintons were pushing for. They had megawealthy friends. They want as much illegal immigration coming in as they can. Never mind that there are criminals coming in, there are people who want to harm our Nation, and people here, never mind that. If people can be rewarded who are big donors, then good, let's have open borders.

But that is not the position of the people who elected President Donald Trump. We need to be about the things that allowed us to keep the majority and elected Donald Trump as President. If we don't, the majority will be lost, and then the next couple of years will be spent dealing with impeachment of a President who has been charged with what the prior administration did.

There is an interesting thing called projecting. One group commits horrendous offenses, then before the other side can properly investigate what that group did, the offending group starts projecting their offenses as if they were done by the opposing side.

There is an article entitled: "Attorney General Jeff Sessions Announces New 'Zero-Tolerance' Illegal Immigration Policy," and that is making a difference. We are having an immense problem as the call has been for more and more amnesty legalizing people here illegally. It has caused a flood of people coming across our southern border, so Attorney General Jeff Sessions' announcement is a big help. It appears that it is helping to slow the rate of people flooding to the United States.

□ 1230

Hopefully, the announcement by the President to call for National Guard troops on the border is also helping, because when people know they are going to be turned away, they realize, "Why should I even make the trip?"

But I would commend our National Guard. Of course, under the doctrine of posse comitatus, normally they are not to be used against U.S. citizens, that is the law under very tight exceptions, but they don't have to.

If the National Guard is allowed to go to the border, not like in the prior administration or even the prior troops that the Bush administration sent, if they are actually allowed to go to the border and stand there—I mean, the busiest sector for a long time now, for a few years or so, has been the McAllen sector. It was Arizona, but as that border was toughened up, McAllen down in south Texas, that sector became a busier sector. I think it had to do also with the activity of the drug cartel in Mexico that covers that sector of our border. Probably, if that surge coming up from Central America through Mexico, any of them were to make it, that is probably where they are going to be coming.

I have been there at night, and all night, many nights, and it is very clear, when Governor Perry sent game wardens, DPS troopers just to stand on the high bank on the U.S. side of the Rio Grande River, there are coyotes. I have been there with our folks, the Border Patrol that are doing the best they can there, and some of our DPS, and both have night vision gear. And the Texas DPS folks allowed me to use some night vision gear, and we were able to see some coyotes hiding behind the trees across the way. They were waiting for people on the U.S. side of the border, the Rio Grande, to move out of the way, because the coyotes, apparently, their lives can be in jeopardy. If the raft they use to bring across illegals is destroyed, then their lives may be destroyed by the drug cartel or the gang that was working for the drug cartel, so they don't want their raft to be destroyed, they don't want to get caught.

The experience is, since I have seen it so many hundreds of times, the people coming across in the rafts, they want to be caught, because they knew from the Obama years that when somebody gets there, they don't tell them, "Go back. You are not going to be allowed to set foot on U.S. soil." Oh, no. Once you get across, then it is time to in-process you. We have our questions to ask as we in-process you. We may put you in a facility and provide you food, three meals a day, take care of your needs, or we may just let you provide us the address that the drug cartels gave the person coming in illegally, or the family or group, the address being where the drug cartels wanted those individuals to go to work. Because as I have heard them say many times, "Oh, well, they told us I could work off the rest. \$7,000 to come in. I had \$1,500, we had people in the United States that sent \$2,000," these kind of stories over and over.

It is not on the list of required questions, but some of our folks would ask anyway, "How much did you pay? Well, you don't have that kind of money. Where did you get it?"

Then there was always at least \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000 that had not been paid. "Oh, they are going to let me pay that off when I get to the address they are sending me."

So what an amazing business model to have potential employees, basically indentured servants, and you don't pay your employee. No. They pay you a bunch of money to get to come to work for you because you are going to get them across the border.

Then the Department of Homeland Security under the Obama administration—you talk about waste, fraud, and abuse. The Obama administration would then have Homeland Security ship them to the city to which the drug cartel told them they wanted them to go work and gave them an address, and then when they got to the city, then they were allowed to work for the drug cartel to pay off the money that the

drug cartel said they still owed them. What a great business model. Your employees pay you to get to work for you, and the U.S. Government will send them to their location.

That is why Border Patrol told me, a number of different ones told me, that the drug cartels in Mexico look at our Homeland Security—this all occurred during the Obama years, as their logistics. They get them across the border, and immediately, Homeland Security takes charge and gets them to where they were needed in the drug trafficking arena. And there were places all over the country.

It is tragic, President Trump has pointed it out, and it is true, despite some of the naysayers, when groups start coming to the United States, whether they come from Central America and are allowed by what should be a friend in Mexico to come all the way through Mexico to come into the United States, there are going to be girls that are raped, there are going to be young women and some older women that are forced into sex trafficking, and there are going to be some people that lose their lives.

The very best thing we could do for the people of Mexico, and I am saying the people of Mexico, not elected leaders in government who have gotten there by the drug cartels, no, I am not talking about people under the control of the drug cartels; I am talking about the people of Mexico, the people that deserve so much better, the best thing we could do is totally secure our border so that the only people who come in come in lawfully.

We are trying to get the proper wording for a bill that will actually tell our Border Patrol, anybody coming into the United States through any place other than a legal crossing area are to be denied the opportunity to step foot on American soil, on U.S. soil. Because, I mean, I've been there, I have seen it.

Texas, the DPS troopers, the game wardens, they won't allow people to step on the U.S. side, but when the Federal folks come along, they say, "Oh, no, come on in so we can in-process you." I watched that over and over during the Obama years.

All we have to do is just say, "No, you are not coming in through an illegal avenue or an illegal method. You are not coming in. You are not going to set foot here. You come by air, then we are going to turn you around and send you right back. You come across the water, we are not going to let you land. We are going to turn around and send you right back. You are not going to step foot."

That is apparently what we need to tell our folks. Don't even think about in-processing. If you are going to come in, if you are going to come ask for amnesty or any kind of thing, come through a legal port of entry, come through a legal avenue, and we will have our folks talk to you before they allow you to come in. You need to be legal coming in or you are not coming in.

That is rather basic, but apparently we need something like that to make clear we are serious about enforcing our border.

So it is welcome news. We have an article, this one by Charles Ortel. He is quoting Jeff Sessions: “‘You play a critical part in fulfilling these goals, and I thank you for your continued efforts in seeing to it that our laws—and as a result, our Nation—are respected,’ he said.

“The crackdown comes after the Department of Homeland Security reported a 203 percent increase in illegal border crossings from March 2017 to March 2018, according to the memo. The department also noted a 37 percent increase from February 2018 to March 2018—the largest month-to-month increase since 2011.”

I will interject here, the reason is very clear for this. The more that people in Washington talk about the term “amnesty,” the word “legalization,” the word “DACA,” any of these things, it creates yet another surge and another surge.

My position has continued to be consistent. I thoroughly supported President Trump’s platform in this area, and it is probably the biggest reason that people went out and voted for President Trump. We are going to enforce our border, we are going to secure it, we are going to build a wall where we need it.

We have got to get that done, because when people talk about DACA, amnesty, legalization, it brings more and more people surging to our border, more people will be pulled into sex slavery, more people will be losing their lives, more people will be pulled into drug trafficking.

All of that hurts our country. It is destructive to Mexico, provides tens of billions of more dollars for corruption. I mean, Mexico, they have got the natural resources, incredible natural resources. They have got some of the hardest working people in the world. They have got the best location, right between two major continents, two big oceans, perfect location. The only thing holding them back is corruption. If we secure our border, it brings an end to the wild corruption that exists in Mexico and further south.

This article says: “Arrests of people trying to cross illegally into the U.S. from Mexico were actually at a 46-year low throughout 2017, according to data from the Department of Homeland Security.”

So that was great.

“Border officers apprehended approximately 310,000 people in fiscal year 2017—a 25 percent decrease from the previous year.

“The number of apprehensions jumped by 40 percent from February to March, which DHS said was consistent with seasonal trends.

“Sessions said the ‘unacceptable’ border situation is a result of Congress’ failure to pass legislation that would close ‘dangerous loopholes’ and fund

President Donald Trump’s proposed border wall.”

So one of the big problems I had with the omnibus bill, it not only didn’t provide funding for the wall, here we have a majority in the House, majority in the Senate, and basically it was a slap at President Trump: “Not only are we not giving you money for the wall, but we are going to put \$1.5 billion in there and say it is only to replace fences, and they have got to be open where you can see through them.”

What a slap at the President, what a slap at the people that are trying to control our border, secure our border.

Another article from CBS News about the same policy, the same announcement. That was from April 6.

Then this from The Hill, Michael Stopa: “Jeff Sessions sends California a strong message on immigration.”

It starts: “There is more than a little historical irony here. In response to the Trump administration’s initiatives to restore order in and respect for the Nation’s immigration laws, the California State Legislature passed, and liberal politicians and business and entertainment elites of the State are vocally defending, three laws which openly defy the Constitution and challenge the Union.”

It is basically a declaration of secession from California. That is my interjection.

This says: “The California regulations are dedicated to maintaining a traditional way of life and protecting economic and political power built on the manual labor and, eventually, the votes of an illegal class of workers.”

□ 1245

“By protecting the institution of illegal immigration, the California laws not only usurp Federal prerogatives (to the detriment of less affluent Californians) but also undermine law enforcement far beyond the borders of the State. Therefore, the Justice Department this week initiated court proceedings against the rebellious State, challenging the constitutionality of the three statutes.

“So, deriding California’s ‘irrational, unfair, and unconstitutional policies,’ Attorney General Jeff Sessions began his march to the sea. It is a script just made for Hollywood. According to the Los Angeles Times, the three laws which the Justice Department is challenging make it a crime for businessowners to voluntarily help Federal agents find and detain undocumented workers, prohibit local law enforcement from alerting immigration agents when detainees are released from custody and create a State inspection program for Federal immigration detention centers.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me interject here. This part here, “prohibit local law enforcement from alerting immigration agents when detainees are released from custody,” that needs a little further elaboration.

What California is saying, if they are in custody, then they have been

charged with a crime, or they have been accused of a crime, or there is probable cause to suspect them of a crime.

So when California passes laws saying these people who are in custody, because we have probable cause to believe they are criminals, we don’t want the Federal Government to know that we have illegal aliens who we have probable cause to believe committed crimes, we want those people in California, in San Francisco. We want those criminals, those people there is probable cause to show committed crimes, we want them in our State, we want them in our town; and so we are passing a law, let’s keep these criminals in California, for Californians, taking jobs Californians would do if they were paying a little more for them, but these people here illegally, some of them will take them, others will get welfare. Others will apply for child tax credits and get thousands back they didn’t pay in.

That continues to happen and, hopefully, will be coming to a stop soon, once we get the IRS under control and get the IRS to begin following the law as they so boldly and brashly offended and violated during the Obama administration.

We couldn’t believe that there was so much money being paid out in child tax credits. How is that happening if people are illegally here?

Well, it turns out, even though the law says you have to have, basically, a valid Social Security number to get more money back than you paid in, the IRS, some time back, decided, you know what—I know they intended well. They thought, gee, there are a lot of people working that would pay taxes if they had some number to allow them to pay taxes. So even though the law doesn’t allow it, we are going to give these working people taxpayer ID numbers, and then that way, they will file income tax returns, and we can get all these billions of dollars in taxes from people that are working here that are here illegally.

But that went a bit awry because as soon as people began figuring out, wow, I am filing a tax return, and even though the law requires I have a valid Social Security number, the IRS is sending me back thousands of dollars, all I have got to do is file and claim I have a whole bunch of children somewhere, and they will send me a check.

Well, it is time for that to come to an end. It is time for the law to be enforced. Some of these things, we don’t need new laws, we just need the law enforced.

What these articles are saying is that the new Attorney General is intent on enforcing the law as it is, even though a place like California is spurning its own citizens and saying, we would rather have people who commit crimes than allow the Federal Government to move those who commit crimes amongst us.

It is an unbelievable story. That is not governance; that is insanity.

Well, I am thrilled the Attorney General is taking a stand for law enforcement. It has been so badly needed for so many years.

This article from Robert Moore and Matt Zapotosky, believe it or not, from the Washington Post, they can get an article every now and then of interest. This is from Las Cruces, New Mexico.

“Attorney General Jeff Sessions, whose Justice Department has come under intense criticism from President Trump and some congressional Republicans in recent days, repeatedly praised President Trump in a speech to law enforcement officials Wednesday about immigration enforcement.

“You might even say we have got a new sheriff in town,” and that is pretty true.

But here again, the report comes back that there is this increase, big increase, people flooding to our border because of all the discussion about legalization, amnesty, DACA. Until the border is secured, this body has no business taking up any legislation or even talking about legislation that will legalize anybody that is here. Let's get the border secured, then we can work it out.

I have no question whatsoever. In my mind, we could get a bipartisan legislation passed from the House, through the Senate, the President will sign it, after the border is secured. But until the border is secured, we are luring more people to their deaths, into sex trafficking, just by dangling this shiny object, coming to the United States, and luring people into their detriment.

If the government were an individual or a company, and it was saying things that lured people in to an area where they were harmed, then that person or that company could be sued and would have to pay out incredible judgments for this attractive—what is called an attractive nuisance.

They are lured in by promises of legalization, amnesty, DACA, all this, and yet, some get here, lose their lives on the way, or once they get inside the border trying to get somewhere, many young women lured, or forced, rather, into sex trafficking, drugs. That is an outrageous, attractive nuisance. But since it is the government, you can't sue them.

Hopefully, we can do something about that, if a State or local government were trying to get the language right, so that if you are a State or a local government, and your policies encourage people to come to the area illegally, and to the detriment of local citizens, you know, the local government should be liable.

This from Laura Jarrett and Evan Perez, earlier this year: “Federal authorities are actively investigating allegations of corruption related to the Clinton Foundation, the charity of Bill and Hillary Clinton, according to a U.S. official briefed on the matter.”

The reason I am bringing this up, Mr. Speaker, is so many people are saying nothing is being done and, actually,

the reason they are saying that is we have an ethical Attorney General, unlike previous years, who doesn't make a big announcement about investigations that are quietly, ethically taking place.

So a lot of people, because they are used to having Justice Department officials like Mueller and Comey leaking things, Loretta Lynch, Eric Holder, leaking things out there that should not be released and they should not be releasing; now we have a Justice Department, at least at the top, they are not leaking stuff, so you don't hear about it much. And that is why I think these articles are important.

“The FBI and Federal prosecutors are looking into whether donors to the foundation were improperly promised policy favors or special access to Hillary Clinton while she was Secretary of State in exchange for donations to the charity's coffers, as well as whether tax-exempt funds were misused, the official said.

“The investigation”—and this is not an illegal leak. This is a legitimate story.

“The inquiry was first reported by The Hill, which cited law enforcement sources and a witness who was interviewed.

“It's unclear precisely what, if any, new evidence ignited the current Federal investigation, after initial inquiries had stalled prior to the 2016 election.”

Oh, it reports: “The investigation, led by the FBI field office in Little Rock, Arkansas, is being overseen by the U.S. Attorney's Office in the State, according to the source.”

They are not putting out information about who and what they are doing like, obviously, Mr. Comey had gotten into the habit of doing.

A representative for the Clinton Foundation dismissed the substantive allegations as unfounded.

But the article goes on: “The current probe of the foundation comes at a sensitive time for the Justice Department.”

“Some Republican lawmakers on Capitol Hill have cheered Trump on, while others within the party, and many Democrats, have raised concerns in recent months.”

But this article says: “The fundamental thing is you cannot be Secretary of State of the United States of America and use that position to extort or seek contributions to your private foundation.”

CNN was told on New Day in 2016: “That is a fundamental violation of law and that does appear to have happened.”

“The fact remains that Hillary Clinton”—this is from her spokesperson—she “never took action as Secretary of State because of donations to the Clinton Foundation.”

And naturally, that would be the right thing to say because it is a crime to do that.

But the fact is, and apparently the investigation is into the over \$100 mil-

lion in donations that were made to the Clinton Foundation that appears to have dried up and gone nonexistent after Hillary Clinton lost the election.

So what are you to conclude? Hundreds of millions of dollars pouring into the Clinton Foundation while she is Secretary of State and while she has a chance to be President, and as soon as people realize they could pay but there would be no play, there would be no pay-for-play, that you would not be able to keep paying for the opportunity to see the Clintons or get some favor from the State Department or get some favor from a potential President, dried up, people weren't rushing to give donations anymore.

This from Daniel Flynn, March 20. “As Washington obsesses over alleged collusion involving the Russians and the current administration, a separate investigation in Little Rock looks into alleged corruption involving the previous administration and the Russians.

“‘FBI agents are interviewing people,’ Joseph DiGenova, a former U.S. attorney hired by the President on Monday, told The American Spectator over the weekend. ‘That is a big deal. I can assure they are interviewing people because our firm represents one of the people they have interviewed.’”

□ 1300

“DiGenova says the investigation has been ‘underway for some time’ and involves the Clinton Foundation, ‘which includes Uranium One and its various transactions.’ DiGenova notes that he did not know whether investigators have empaneled a grand jury or not. For many, the FBI expending resources on interviewing witnesses and investigating the massive foundation for months indicates that if a grand jury does not already exist, one will soon.

“Sources tell The American Spectator that the investigation began focusing on Uranium One, a Canadian energy company sold to a state-owned Russian company, before broadening to a much wider range of issues. Though the Clinton Foundation calls Manhattan home and the State Department operates in Foggy Bottom, Eastern District of Arkansas U.S. Attorney Cody Hiland presides over the investigation because the foundation also boasts ventures, including the Clinton Presidential Center, in Little Rock. The foundation reports on its website that ‘we work on issues directly or with strategic partners from the business, government, and nonprofit sectors to create economic opportunity, improve public health, and inspire civic engagement and service.’ These partners, given Hillary Clinton's role as Secretary of State from 2009 to 2013, made observers uneasy prior to her assuming that role and led to special transparency and ethics rules ostensibly embraced by the foundation. Given uranium's role in nuclear weapons and nuclear energy, and the U.S.'s position as a minor player in uranium

production, the specific case of Uranium One involves more than mere corruption.

“‘What I’ve always wanted is a grand jury to look at it,’ Peter Schweizer, who exposed the Uranium One scandal to a wide audience in Clinton Cash and exposes a number of alleged pay-to-play schemes in his new book *Secret Empires*, explained to *The American Spectator*. ‘The common sense of the average America will determine pretty quickly that there was pay to play involved.’”

In any event, the deal which then put about a fifth of the uranium of the United States under the control of the Russian Government required the approval of various Federal Government entities, including Hillary Clinton’s State Department. Rosatom, the energy company owned by the Russian Government, obtained that approval and optimally gained full control of Uranium One.

Just incredible.

So, good news. That is being investigated under the Jeff Sessions Justice Department. There is some good news, and I look forward to real Russian collusion being exposed after proper investigation and the projecting, which has occurred by people who did collude improperly with the Russian Government in the past administration, actually being held to account for what they did but what they continue to say others in the Trump administration did in order to try to run out the statute of limitations on their wrongdoing.

Well, the statutes of limitation haven’t all run, the investigations are ongoing, and I still hold that hope that springs eternal in the human breast that real justice will be done.

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

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) for 30 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the memory of our dear friend and colleague, Senator Daniel Akaka.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory and in celebration of my friend and mentor, Senator Daniel Kahikina Akaka, who took his final breath exactly 1 week ago today.

I was in Hawaii and woke up very early to a text message from one of his children, who let me know that he had passed away around 5 o’clock that last morning. We all took that day to remember him and his life and to think back on the memories that we have of how he dedicated his life to serving the people of Hawaii and our country.

From his service in the U.S. Army back during World War II, to his years that he spent taking care of our “children,” “keiki,” as a public school teacher and a principal, his work in the

State, and then serving more than 36 years in the United States Congress.

He was the first Member of Congress to serve of Native Hawaiian ancestry and made history in many different ways.

He is known throughout Hawaii for so many reasons, but when you say the word “Akaka,” it is synonymous with “aloha,” because that is what he represented throughout his life. And the warmth and the fondness, the love and the kindness that he shared with everyone, made it so that he was not known so much as Senator Akaka so much as Uncle Danny.

He did all of this with his wife, Millie, by his side. Mother of five children, Auntie Millie herself is a force of nature. She was ever-present here in Washington, with Senator Akaka in his travels, and expressed aloha in her own way.

In everything he did, Senator Akaka put service before self. He truly walked the talk. He carried the spirit of aloha with him in his heart and at the forefront of his actions.

Now in the last week, the people of Hawaii, many people across the country, many of our colleagues here in Washington have been sharing their own personal stories about how Senator Akaka touched and inspired their lives, talking about the legacy that he left behind and the example that he set with his life.

And the central theme in each of these stories that I have heard all comes back to aloha. “Aloha,” which means kindness, respect, and love for others, regardless of any differences that we may have, whether they be by race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or anything else.

To this day, here in the Capitol, sometimes I will bump into some of his former colleagues in the U.S. Senate, even here people he served with in the U.S. House, and as soon as you mention his name, you can kind of see their shoulders fall, their stress fall away, and they get a smile on their face as they think about the time that they had serving with him.

They will have little stories about a code that they went on with him or a committee that they served on with him, and they always talk about how kind he was. No matter who you were, no matter what was going on around you, he always took that moment to share the warmth of his own heart with yours.

This even came from those who disagreed with him. This even came from those who fought him hardest on the signature bill that he tried to pass, the Akaka bill.

Even if they opposed his policies, none of them had anything ill to say of him.

This speaks to the impact that he left on the United States Capitol, on Washington, on this country, and on Hawaii.

And it speaks to the legacy that he leaves behind that will continue to inspire leaders of our country and leaders in our community, people everywhere, to serve in their own lives in that same

spirit of aloha and respect for everyone.

After I returned from my first deployment to Iraq with the Hawaii Army National Guard, I had the privilege of being able to work in Senator Akaka’s office as a legislative aide. He was chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee at the time, and coming back, this was a great opportunity, I felt, to be able to help him in that service to help make reforms and changes to our VA and our country’s policies and how our veterans are cared for, in particular the post-9/11 veterans, in particular the large number of National Guard and reservists who were being activated to serve in the Middle East, and who were not being treated with the kind of respect and honor and dignity that they had earned through their service. This included everything from the GI Bill to VA services and qualifications that they earned.

I was able to experience firsthand on a daily basis the impact that he made, his example of aloha. Taking the time as he was rushing to a committee or rushing to vote to stop and say “hello” to the janitor who was mopping the floor; to stop and say “aloha” to visitors who were coming from Hawaii or from other States; to stop and talk to the staff and ask how they were doing, how was their family, how were things going.

He invested in building lifelong relationships. He spent that quality time, whether it was short or long, because he understood how important every individual is, and how he wanted to take advantage of that moment to share his aloha, recognizing that only by working together, only through aloha and bringing people together, can we make real positive change.

For those of us who had the opportunity to work with Senator Akaka, either in his office in Washington, in Hawaii, on one of his campaigns, or in some capacity, we have bonded over the years; and every year we got together with Senator Akaka, his wife, and his family to celebrate his birthday in September of every year.

During this last year, this past September, I was able to spend some time with him and chatted a bit. And as he always does, he asked: How are things going in Washington? And he expressed his sadness about how divisive things have become, how the kind of collegiality and respect that existed when he was serving in the U.S. Senate for so many years that allowed people to disagree without being disagreeable, that allowed people to debate strongly their disagreements on issues but come together at the end of the day to find a solution, that that has largely been lost.

And as a result, we are seeing the gridlock and the divisiveness and the lack of results, the lack of delivery to our constituents, in large part, because