

would just think to myself, “A better question is: Is Trish going to keep me?”

Well, fortunately, she did, and I am glad she did. Throughout the First Congressional District of Georgia, if you say Trish's name, nearly everyone you speak to will have either a story about how she helped them or at least know someone whom she had helped.

She has pushed passport applications. She is a passport expert. No one knows the passport system better than Trish DePriest, I assure you. She has passed through passport applications with lightning speed.

She has pulled veterans benefits out of the most unlikely situations and cleared up entanglements in Social Security checks in order to get constituents back on their feet, and oftentimes at a low point in their lives.

Constituents who come to Ms. DePriest often have nowhere else to turn, yet she is the secret weapon that always seems to come through in the most desperate situations.

One of her most famous cases includes helping a man who, quite literally, woke up next to a dumpster in Richmond Hill, Georgia, with no memory at all of any friends, of any family, or of his past life. Trish was tasked with helping build it back again from ground zero. To give you a sense of her blunt personality, she told the Savannah Morning News: “It’s like he appeared here from another planet.”

After 34 years of working for Congress, she has developed personal relationships with all the relevant staff members at each government agency, allowing her to perform her mighty tasks for constituents that other caseworkers may take years to develop.

She has learned throughout her years to always ask constituents for the other side of the story, which she has become famous for drawing out, while using this to her advantage in performing casework. A countless number of constituents whom she has helped out over the years come in and out of the Savannah office each day just to chat with Trish, update her on their lives, and become her friend.

Her bluntness and wit, her intelligence and sense of caring not only keep constituents coming back for her friendship, but keep her own work colleagues with a high level of morale.

But Ms. DePriest, Trish, is more than just an excellent caseworker and staple of government in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Trish was a loving spouse of 50 years to her husband, Joseph Roy DePriest, Jr., who passed away in 2012. She is a caring mother to Lisanne and Jamey.

She is also a breast cancer survivor, a testament to her strong will. In fitting fashion, when Trish was told of her diagnosis of breast cancer, she says she was more mad than scared and decided to jump in feet first and attack the problem—and that she did.

There will never be another Trish DePriest for the First Congressional

District of Georgia, but I know she will be around, helping other people wherever she can, and I hope everyone learns from her abundance of knowledge and her outlook on life.

Trish, we are going to miss you in the office. We are going to miss you a lot. We want you to have a happy and a well-deserved retirement. Thank you for your service to the people of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

God bless you, Trish.

□ 1330

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to speak here, and especially to follow friends—very dear friends—hear STEVE KING talk about the importance of life.

I know there is historical accounts in the Old Testament when it talked about different kings and what went on while they were there. It normally says something like: “and he did evil in the eyes of the Lord,” or “he did right in the eyes of the Lord.”

And every now and then, there is an addition to emphasize just how evil the people were. A society was under a particular king in Israel, and that addition was whenever—now and then, it would mention that mothers and fathers were sacrificing their babies on the altar of some idol.

And only if you believe the Old Testament, like the majority of Americans have for all our history, that ought to be quite an awakening when you realize that we have killed over 60 million babies.

I have talked to so many women who are brokenhearted, and they have got to learn to give it up and move on, but it eats away at them, the thought that they allowed a precious life to be taken that nature had entrusted them with. So, anyway, I just hate to see any women eaten up with guilt.

And it is not because there is a pro-life movement. It was there long before a pro-life movement. I hope that we can get the Heartbeat bill that my friend STEVE KING was advocating, I hope we could get that passed and get it to the Supreme Court.

Some of the rulings over the years have had to do with the ambiguity, the vagaries in at what point an abortion was no longer allowed. But any of us, if you see someone hurt and you want to find out if they are alive, you run up and you check. And if you find a heartbeat, then you call an ambulance—you call 911 and ask for an ambulance. If there is no heartbeat, then you report a dead body, and there is no lifesaving effort at all made if there is no heartbeat.

So I thought it was brilliant to have an approach like that. There are still

some vagaries as to when a child first starts feeling pain in the womb, but there is no question, if you have on videotape evidence of the heartbeat, you see it, you hear it, then that is not so obscure that even some of the dense heads at the Supreme Court would be able to realize, yup, that is proof positive, that is hard, objective proof that there is a life and being worth protecting.

So I really applaud and join in with my friend STEVE KING's efforts, and we hope that even the last holdout pro-life groups, the National Right to Life, would get onboard. Most of us here that are pro-life, if we hear that there is any bill that will save innocent lives, we get onboard; count me in; I want to be part of it; I want to support it. So it is really intriguing when we have a bill that will save lives, even more than bills that that person or that group is already sponsoring.

And if anybody holds back, I don't know—there is not a good reason for holding back, and hopefully, it is not just for selfish reasons. Because the real pro-life folks, we support anybody's bill. We don't care. If one of my Democrat friends bring it, it doesn't matter. If it is a good bill, we want to be there for it.

I have just finished filing, just moments ago, a new bill, and it has come over a long period of time—agonizing. Especially having been a felony judge, handled major civil litigation as well, and then having been briefly a chief justice of a court of appeals, when I see judges that are so immoral and outrageously unconstitutional that they become monarchs in their own little kingdoms, and they refuse to follow the Constitution like I did—I wanted to legislate. I disagreed with laws that existed, and especially some Federal laws that existed, so when my term was up, I didn't—the Governor offered to appoint me to another appeals position, and I said: “No, I want to legislate.”

And to legislate, I have to run for office to do that as a legislator. So I ran for Congress, and it was—it required financial sacrifice of basically everything my wife and I had, except our home and our cars, but, hopefully, before long, we will finish paying off our kids' college loans. They shouldn't have to pay them because, before I went on the bench, we had money set aside to deal with that.

But in the major financial adjustment from what I was making to what I made on the bench as a judge, that was part of the sacrifice, and I didn't want my kids to have to suffer—my wife and I didn't—because I chose to be a public servant.

But coming to legislature, here is the way you legislate. And we have too many judges that have not only been legislating, but on the issues of immigration, asylum, naturalization, DACA, we have had judges become all three branches. To me, that means they need to be removed from office—just removed. They need to be impeached and removed from the bench.

Doing that much damage to our constitutional system of restraint, of checks and balances, they have blown away all the checks and balances, and the only check on them, they think, ought to be in a higher court.

Unfortunately, we have people on the Supreme Court that are violating the Constitution, violating their oath, which, of course, would be a basis for removal. But they have become legislators, and anyone who can read, can read the Constitution and see where the power is on naturalization, immigration: it is in the Congress.

And there are certain executive powers that are newer to the executive branch, to the President—through the President to the immigration authorities, and we have judges that have usurped executive power, congressional power. And Congress has given certain authority to the President that we have the power to do.

And then to have judges come in and make national security decisions when they have a fraction, a tiny, tiny fraction of the information needed to make adequate national security decisions, that is why the Constitution did not put national security decisions in the hands of the courts.

So under our immigration laws that Congress had full authority to pass and did, immigration courts were set up. Now, I had quite significant concerns when I realized that Eric Holder, as Attorney General, then Loretta Lynch, they appointed all of the immigration judges without any other confirmation requirement. They just could pick them, and they served. That was a bit alarming.

And in previous legislation, I had assurances that my concerns would be fixed and we would come up with a way to confirm immigration judges. We still don't have a consensus on that. But nonetheless, in view of some of the decisions in recent days where a district judge in a small district in the United States, one little district in one State decides a national security issue for the whole country, it is outrageous.

Putting this Nation at risk because of their constitutional violations, which means their violations of their oath—and I agree with my friends here in Congress that say it is time to start bringing those people—I believe my friend, JEFF DUNCAN, was mentioning it earlier today. It is time to bring judges like that before our Judiciary Committee and vote to impeach them for violating their oath, violating the Constitution. Violating an oath is, I think, quite a significant charge in and of itself. It is a crime. But we have got to do something to rein in the runaway judiciary.

You know, the Founders, numerous of them had commented the judiciary will be the least threat to our checks and balances because they will have the least power. But somehow, all these years later, since 1789, when the Constitution was ratified, the judicial part of our government has become

really the biggest threat to checks and balances, to the constitutional restraints on power, which means they are a threat to our ongoing representative form of government.

So we obviously have to have quick decisions, quicker than have been made, regarding immigration status. And of course, the judges that Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch appointed had no problem at all saying: Okay. Here is your notice. We are not going to restrain you. You can go wherever you want, but come back in 4 years for a hearing.

And, of course, most of them never came back. And many of them, turns out, they have gotten taxpayer IDs so they can file tax returns, not for the purpose of paying more tax, but so that they can get back more tax than they paid in by claiming a bunch of children.

There have been TV stations and others that have looked into specific claims and found there is some places where there would be one house, dozens of kids would be allegedly in that house being claimed as dependents, and different families claiming dependents, but there is no telling how much.

I am sure it is billions of dollars that have been paid out to people illegally in the country for claiming that they have children. Some have been found. Okay, they had children, but they were in Mexico or Central America, and yet we are paying them for being here as illegal aliens, and not just through earned income tax credit—or the child tax credit, rather, but also for all kinds of benefits that they sign up for and get—food stamps, right on along the line.

But in order to stop one little district judge in one remote part of the country from deciding national security issues that put American citizens at risk, it is time to do what constitutional law professors have talked about for years—maybe not in some Ivy League schools where they don't really teach the Constitution. They teach how to avoid the Constitution.

But as my constitutional law professor, David Guinn, used to say at Baylor Law School, there is only one Federal court, tribunal of any kind that owes its existence to the Constitution, that is the Supreme Court. Every other Federal court owes its existence and its jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Now, that is the Constitution.

So, as some have said, Congress has the power to bring courts into the world, and we have the power to take them out. We have the power to say: This is your jurisdiction, and no more, or you will take on this area.

□ 1345

So we created immigration courts. We do need them, and we have to have them make decisions much more quickly. That is one of the things I am so grateful to Jeff Sessions for. He is appointing great immigration judges.

They are making decisions as quickly as possible, so they don't leave people in limbo for years, like was done in the past 8, or prior to the Trump administration. So he is making progress there.

But since Congress clearly has the power to set the jurisdiction for every Federal court tribunal of any kind, then it is time to do what my new bill—and I just got the number, and I appreciate the clerk's quick and efficient efforts—but this now will be H.R. 5648. It says:

To amend title 28 of the U.S. Code, to provide for Supreme Court original jurisdiction over certain immigration actions, and for other purposes.

Here is what it says on page 2:

The Supreme Court and any immigration court established under the immigration laws, as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are the only courts that shall have jurisdiction in which a claimant shall have standing to raise issues of immigration, naturalization, refugee status, asylum, and any other related matter or case involving a claimed right to enter or remain in the United States, or any case or controversy of any provision of the immigration laws, or any order issued or rule made pursuant thereto.

In other words, we need to end these runaway rapscallion judges who got through a confirmation by hook or crook and showed their real colors when they got out on the bench that they want to be little monarchs. It is time to rein in their jurisdiction so they can do no further damage to this Nation to our national security, which was never placed in the hands of the judiciary, it was always to be in the hands of the President and the Congress.

I hope we can get plenty of cosponsors and bring that to the floor. I really believe that, in this election year, if we can get that to the floor and pass it here in the House, then, in this election year, there could be so much pressure brought to bear on Senators down the hall.

We ought to be able to get it passed. It may be a long shot, but it was a long shot that the little 13 colonies could take on the most powerful country in the world, the most powerful Navy, the most powerful Army in the world, and win their independence, but they did. That is the hope that springs internal in the human breast. We have to start somewhere, and that is a start.

Now, it took me weeks to get it done, but I have written an article recently. Giving attribution, there are many other articles and sources I used in accumulating these 48 pages. But after standing up a number of times in our conference and pointing out to the Republicans in conference that any Republican who says they know Robert Mueller will be fair or come to a fair decision or a fair conclusion or be just, they don't know the Robert Mueller I know. Here is where you get into a lot of different opinions, but that is where it is helpful to look at things that he has done in his life.

I had hoped that, because he seemed clearly to be a person who should never have accepted the job of special counsel, that he was recusable. He was not qualified to be the special counsel on anything involving Russia, and certainly not the Trump campaign and Russia. Yet Rod Rosenstein, as the deputy AG, who had been involved in the Russia illegal attempts to gain control of U.S. uranium—and they knew that Russia was committing crimes to try to get our uranium—and Mueller was the head of the FBI, and he was the lead law enforcement person overseeing the operation, there was an informant within the system that was providing information to the Justice Department to Rosenstein and Mueller. Yet they put the kibosh on the investigation and the crimes that were being committed to get U.S. uranium. If they had not, then the sale of U.S. uranium that would end up in the hands of Russia would never have been allowed to go through.

CFIUS that approves sales that are sensitive to our security, they surely could never have approved the sale if Rosenstein and Mueller had just been honest and open that there is an investigation to Russia's illegal attempts to get our uranium. But, if they had spoken up about that, I don't think there is any question that the Clinton Foundation would never have gotten \$145 million in contributions from people involved with the uranium sale. And it is quite likely that Bill Clinton would not have gotten \$500,000 to speak for 20 minutes from Russia.

But I have written an article, 48 pages, entitled: "Robert Mueller: Unmasked." You can go to my website. You can go to Sean Hannity's website, or others. I wouldn't do it on Google because of their dishonesty when it comes to conservatives. But DuckDuckGo. Bing is not as bad as Google. But look up "Robert Mueller: Unmasked" and download this article, read it, and arrive at your own opinion.

This week, I found an article I had not seen before, by Eren Moreno, back in January of this year, entitled "Mueller, Rosenstein, and McCabe Exposed Covering Hillary's Uranium One Scandal." At the end of the article, they reference a succinct recitation of things that have occurred. We don't know who this person is. He has used an anonymous name. But here is the thread. He says: "As we now know, the DOJ have indicted a Mark Lambert on 11 counts related to his role in a bribery, money laundering, and kickback scheme."

Involving the sale of our uranium that would end up in Russian hands.

So they finally indicted somebody over this. There have been others who have been quietly handled, and they are referenced here.

And they reference an article here from the New York Post. It says: "Exec charged with bribing Russian official in uranium deal. There's an indictment in the FBI probe of the Uranium One

scandal, in which the Obama administration cleared a business deal that gave a Russian company control of 20 percent of the U.S. uranium."

"Background and reminder: from at least 2008, Robert Mueller's FBI were investigating Tenam, the U.S.-based subsidiary of Tenex, a subsidiary of Rosatom, the Kremlin's (Putin's) energy company. The same Rosatom that purchased Uranium One."

"Tenam was importing Russian uranium into the U.S. Between 2004–2014, the local manager, Mikerin, engaged with U.S. companies Transport Logistics (TL) and NexGen Security in a racketeering, wire fraud, bribery, and money laundering scheme."

"When a TL insider, William Campbell, blew the whistle on what he was seeing, Mueller's FBI started an investigation that led to at least four indictments by Holder's DOJ."

"Remember—the Tenam investigation is related to the Uranium One (U1) sale. That's because the Tenam investigation was hidden from Congress and CFIUS"—the group that analyzes and approves or disapproves foreign investments in the U.S.—"who approved the U1 sale in October 2010. If either had known about it, it's highly unlikely the U1 sale would have been approved."

"And the more you analyze the Tenam investigation, the more it appears that the Obama administration and/or Clintons deliberately wanted it hidden. Consider."

"William Campbell—the whistleblower. . . ."

He is the one who was providing information to Mueller's FBI about the illegal acts of Russia.

Now, there are times that the witness wants witness protection, wants to be anonymous, and doesn't want anybody to know who he was, or who she was, and so for those reasons of the informant's safety it is not given. But that was not the case.

Mueller at the FBI, the DOJ took a very unusual step. Instead of preventing others from knowing who this person was, they went after William Campbell and made him sign—under threat that they would come after and prosecute him—made him sign a non-disclosure agreement. Incredible.

They didn't want—Rosenstein, who is the U.S. attorney over the investigation—they didn't want Campbell out telling about all of the crimes committed in Russia's acquisition of U.S. uranium. They have their own informant sign a nondisclosure agreement under threat so he wouldn't let anybody know about all the criminality surrounding Russia's efforts to get our uranium. That doesn't make sense, unless you know how much money came into the Clinton Foundation after the deal was approved.

This goes on. It says: "Now consider this—none of the four indictments ever saw the light of day."

Actually, that is not quite accurate. They just handled it very quietly. It says: "Every one was either quietly

settled under plea agreements, or dropped entirely, as follows."

"Mikerin, the Tenam manager, was sentenced to 48 months under a plea deal, for crimes that had 20-plus year sentences."

That was in: "United States of America v. Vadim Mikerin—Original Indictment 11/12/14. Conspiracy to Interfere with Interstate Commerce by Extortion . . . Forfeiture."

Darren Condrey had a plea agreement regarding his violations of antibribery and conspiracy laws.

Carol Condrey had a plea agreement, and her case was dropped.

Rubizhevsky from NexGen had the case settled with a plea agreement. That is astonishing given the charges.

This stinks to high heaven. Mueller needs to go ahead and recuse himself and step down, and Rosenstein should do the same thing.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 1, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

4703. Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-317, "Office of Administrative Hearings Jurisdiction Expansion Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### 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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3997. A bill to waive the application fee for any special use permit for veterans demonstrations and special events at war memorials on Federal land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2152. A bill to require States and units of local government receiving funds under grant programs operated by the Department of Justice, which use such funds