HONORING ELAINE EIGEMAN

(Mrs. RODGERS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Elaine Eigeman.

In Congress, every day we have people who come to the Nation's Capitol to advocate for important issues facing people in every community across our country. However, few do this as tirelessly and with as much passion and grace as Elaine.

As the board chair of the Lymphedema Advocacy Group, Elaine has given a strong voice to lymphedema patients all across the country.

She was the driving force behind the Lymphedema Treatment Act, which we will introduce in the House this week, to require Medicare to cover an essential part of lymphedema treatment.

Elaine developed lymphedema in 1999. Throughout her journey, she has made it her mission to support others and to be a voice for all suffering from this disease.

Thank you, Elaine, for your leadership and for creating a vibrant community for patients in the Northwest and beyond. I am proud to be your friend.

HONORING NATIONAL DEAF HISTORY MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor National Deaf History Month, celebrated March 13 through April 15 each year.

What started as a very small observation at a Washington, D.C., library has grown to a 32-day-long celebration recognizing the countless contributions of deaf and hard-of-hearing Americans and honoring deaf culture.

I was so pleased when one of my constituents, Dawn Watts, an advocate for the deaf community, approached me with an idea of introducing a resolution recognizing Deaf History Month in Congress for the very first time.

I want to thank Dawn, as well as the National Association of the Deaf and the American Library Association, for their insight and support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Americans to take time this month to learn more about deaf Americans who helped shape our country, and I am honored to be able to have introduced this resolution.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, America is built on some core values that everyone should have an equal voice in our democracy, that everyone deserves equal opportunity, and that equal work should mean equal pay.

Right now, however, equal work doesn't mean equal pay. According to the United States Census Bureau, on average, women earn just 80 cents for every dollar earned by men. This wage gap hurts women, of course, but it also hurts their families and our economy as a whole.

Yesterday, we took a major step toward addressing this challenge by passing H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill will help close the wage gap by holding employers accountable for discriminatory practices and making it easier for workers to seek redress.

If we believe that Americans deserve equal pay for equal work—and I believe that as deeply as I believe anything—then this bill is how we put our values into action.

I thank Representative DELAURO for her decades of leadership on this issue, and I urge the Senate to take up this bill. What better way to conclude Women's History Month than by making history for women and for all Americans?

SUPPORTING TRANSGENDER TROOPS

(Ms. HAALAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our transgender troops.

The United States is stronger and safer when our military reflects our Nation's diversity. This administration's transgender ban makes a mockery of that commitment. And let's be clear: This is a ban.

We must not ask transgender servicemembers to go back in the closet or tell them: You are less than other Americans.

I wholeheartedly support every single American who wants to serve our country. My father was a 30-year career marine, and he would never judge another marine on anything other than their ability to complete their mission. Why should there be another standard?

Trans servicemembers meet the same standards as every servicemember, and this was confirmed during a subcommittee hearing when trans troops testified as witnesses. These transgender troops were highly decorated and earned recognition on the basis of the quality of their work.

As all military personnel do, transgender troops deserve our respect. I challenge anyone who favors this kind of discrimination to look at their transgender constituents and tell them they are not fit to serve.

I thank my colleagues for taking a stand for all of our servicemembers today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, the Honorable Brian J. Mast, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BRIAN J. MAST,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT, THE HONORABLE BRIAN J. MAST, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Stephanie Cope, legislative correspondent, the Honorable BRIAN J. MAST, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Stephanie Cope, have been served with a subpoena for testimony in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE COPE,
Legislative Correspondent,
Office of Congressman Brian Mast.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my honor to yield to my friend from New Jersey, not just a friend, but a brother, ardent pro-life advocate who I have seen has compassion for every baby child.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE AMERICA NEEDS TO HEAR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and

colleague for yielding and for his leadership on behalf of human rights. We have worked on issues in Sudan and other issues over the years. I want to thank him for being such a compassionate person.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, I attended a premiere of the new film, ''Unplanned,'' which opens this weekend in over 1,000 theaters. The movie is extraordinarily well written, well directed, and well acted. Ashley Bratcher is spectacular as Abby Johnson, the key character in the film.

''Unplanned'' tells a largely untold story, a very difficult story, and is packed with insight and a profoundly important message that America and the world needs to hear.

Based on the life of Abby Johnson and her book, ''Unplanned,'' the film chronicles Ms. JOHNSON's work at Planned Parenthood as a student activist, followed by almost 8 years at a large Planned Parenthood clinic in Texas, where over 20,000 abortions were performed.

Working as a counselor and then as actual director of that clinic, Abby says that 10 minutes of participation in an ultrasound-guided abortion shook the foundation of her values and changed the course of her life. She writes in the book, which is powerfully portrayed in the film:

''The details startled me. At 13 weeks, you could clearly see the profile of the head, both arms and legs, and even tiny fingers and toes. With my eyes glued to the image of this perfectly formed baby, I watched as a new image emerged on the video screen.''

''The cannula, a straw-shaped instrument attached to the end of a suction tube, had been inserted into the uterus and was nearing the baby's side. It looked like an invader on the screen, out of place. Wrong. It just looked wrong.''

She goes on to write, and you can see this portrayed on the screen:

''My heart sped up. Time slowed. I didn't want to look, but I didn't want to stop looking either.''

''At first, the baby didn't seem aware of the cannula. The next moment was the sudden jerk of a tiny foot of the baby as it started kicking, as if trying to get away from the probing invader. As the cannula pressed in, the baby began struggling to turn and twist away.''

''And then the doctor's voice broke through, startling me. ''Beam me up, Scotty,'' telling the assistant to turn on the suction.''

The abortion clinic director went on to write:

''I had a sudden urge to yell, ''Stop,'' to shake the woman and say: ''Look what is happening to your baby. Wake up. Hurry. Stop.''

''But even as I thought those words, I thought of my own hand and saw my own hand holding the probe. I was one of them, performing this act of abortion.''

Again, her eyes shot back to the screen, and she writes:

''The cannula was already being rotated by the doctor, and now I could see the tiny body violently twisting with it. For the briefest moment, it looked as if the baby was being wrung like a dishcloth, twirled and squeezed. And then the little body crumpled and began disappearing into the cannula before my eyes.''

''The last thing I saw was the tiny, perfectly formed backbone sucked into the tube, and then everything was gone.''

Abby Johnson writes:

''The image of that tiny, dead baby, mangled and sucked away, kept replaying in my mind.''

''What was in this woman's womb just a moment ago was alive. It wasn't tissue. It wasn't cells. This was a human baby fighting for life, a battle it lost in the blink of an eye.''

She writes in the book:

''What I have told people for years as a Planned Parenthood leader, what I believed and taught and defended, is a lie.''

Mr. Speaker, someday—someday—future generations of Americans will look back on us and wonder how and why such a rich and seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with the capacity to protect and enhance vulnerable human life—the weakest and the most vulnerable—could have so aggressively promoted death to children by abortion.

They will demand to know why dismembering a child like the one that Abby Johnson witnessed—pulverizing an infant with suction or chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals failed to elicit empathy, mercy, or compassion for these victims.

□ 1215

No one is expendable or a throwaway, Mr. Speaker. Every human life has infinite value. Birth is merely an event; it is not the beginning of life. Abortion is violence against children and it is violence against women.

The movie ''Unplanned'' not only moved me, as I believe it will move others, but it also inspired me, as I believe it will inspire others, to care even more for both victims of abortion, the mother, and the child, to love them both, to reach out to post-abortive women. And there are ministries all over this country that say, Yes, an abortion has been procured, but we love you and we want to see you reconcile and find peace and joy again.

This movie makes clear that we need to continue to reach out to the people inside the abortion industry, in the sincere hope that they, like Abby Johnson, will recognize that there is nothing compassionate, benign, or nurturing about abortion.

Abby Johnson has formed a ministry, a nongovernmental organization. It is called And Then There Was None. It is designed to assist abortion clinic workers out of the industry. To date, approximately, 500 abortion clinic workers have left that field of work including seven abortion doctors who now nurture life, rather than kill it.

Abby Johnson is a courageous, selfless woman who spreads truth and compassion. She speaks truth to power. ''Unplanned'' is a truly amazing movie.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman stay for a question.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and touched by everything my friend from New Jersey has had to say. But at one point, my friend said, he really believed that some day Americans will look back on this point in history. And one of my great concerns, because of the love I know is shared between us both for this country; and desperately wanting this country, our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, someday to enjoy our freedoms, one of my biggest concerns is that it won't be Americans that look back; that if we stay on this road where we dismember and kill babies, it may not be Americans that look back, it may be historians in some other country after the United States no longer exists in its present condition that look back and say, Wow, look how degenerate they had gotten, and it just seemed so accepted.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend, have any concerns that, perhaps, if we don't address this problem that it may not be Americans that look back and see this problem area?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do believe that there are deep concerns about the loss of life and what it means demographically, both here and all over the world. I mean, in places like China, sex selection abortion has claimed the lives of so many of the girl children that there are tens of millions of men who will never marry because the women simply have been exterminated through sex selection abortion.

I have held a number of congressional hearings—I have chaired them—where we have talked about the disparity between boys and girls. One estimate posited there are 62 million missing girls in China alone.

One of my witnesses said that if you look at all the women that have been killed in Asia through sex selection abortion alone, and it is worldwide, it equals, equates with the number of all the women and girl children living in the United States of America. I mean, that is a horrific crime, in my opinion, against women. And the disparity in male to female that is a consequence leads to other horrific consequences, like human trafficking.

As my good friend knows, I am the prime author of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and four other laws that combat human trafficking, including the most recently signed, the Frederick Douglass anti-human trafficking law signed by President Trump just a few months ago. I am the author

of those bills; and we watch very closely what is happening all over the world.

In places like China, trafficking has increased because of the missing daughters who have been killed, simply because they happened to be girls and women, young women, young females.

On this floor of the House, as the gentleman knows, because he voted, as did I, we had a bill to ban sex selection abortions. And to this day, I am shocked and dismayed how many of our colleagues—and I respect our colleagues on both sides of this issue—didn't see that discrimination begins in the womb, when a woman is singled out, a girl, girl child, simply because she is a girl and is killed for that reason.

Sex selection abortion is almost never—although it is occasionally for the boy child, it is the girl child who suffers. So when we look back, when our future generations look back, they will also note that discrimination. Why did that bill not become law?

It seems to me there are at least 20 nations around the world where there are disparities; India and China are among the worst, but it is a huge problem. And we need to look at protecting unborn children as a human rights issue.

Killing an unborn child in the womb is the only human rights abuse that dares call itself a human right; and there are people, purveyors of abortion, who do that on a regular basis. They keep saying it is a right; a right to dismember a child; the right to chemically poison a child.

As the gentleman knows, because he was, again, one of the sponsors of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I have re-introduced in this Congress—Trent Franks had introduced it in previous—passed three times here on the House floor. It says that children at least 20 weeks, and maybe earlier, but at least at 20 weeks, need to be protected because they suffer excruciating pain when they are being dismembered, for a couple of minutes. We are not sure exactly how long, but the evidence is very, very clear that they suffer as they are being killed by abortion.

And that legislation passed with good numbers, good—a large number of Members of the House, but it is not law yet.

So, you know, I think when we look back, we are going to say we had all these opportunities. And now the most recent—and I appreciate my friend from Texas yielding this time—the most recent outrage is what is happening with regards to children who are born alive and then are killed after birth.

We just had the mayor—not the mayor—the Governor of New York eviscerating protections for children who survive abortions.

Years ago, the Philadelphia Inquirer did a piece, a big piece, a big article called ''The Dreaded Complication.'' And the dreaded complication were those children who somehow evaded the dismemberment process or some other part of that process and emerged alive. It was usually a hysterotomy abortion in most cases, but other cases as well, to go on and breathe and gasp and cry. And these very weak and vulnerable children should be protected.

We have a bill that has been introduced, the Born-Alive Protection Act. We have asked, as just a few hours ago from this floor many times—I did it as well—asking that our friends in the majority would allow this bill to come up, so at least when these children are born alive, the same regimen of care, the same due diligence would be given to that boy or girl, gasping for breath, to ensure that they are protected and get resuscitation.

Why, in these abortion clinics, are they allowed to die due to exposure, or sometimes to additional effort to just kill them?

This legislation has had a large number of cosponsors in the House and Senate. The Senate had an opportunity to take it up and it was voted down, sadly, by other friends on the other side of the aisle. And again, we reach out to our friends on the other side of the aisle to say this is a human rights issue.

Born alive? I did a speech in 2012 on what is called after-birth abortion. Two ethicists wrote this piece—and I would invite anyone who wants to, read it; it is on my website.

Two ethicists wrote this piece about how we ought to kill babies after birth because, really, they are not really different than the child before birth. They can't dream; they can't talk; they don't have cognitive abilities that say, a 4-year-old or a 5-year-old might have.

You know, birth is an event that happens to all of us. It is a continuum of life, and abortion is violence against children. But after-birth abortion also is violence against children.

Let me just conclude. Many people, like Alveda King, Dr. Martin Luther King's niece, she has had two abortions. And she has said, how can the dream survive—that is to say, her great uncle's dream, I have a dream—if we kill the children and hurt and wound the women?

The pro-life movement, and I have been in it for 47 years, care for both, mother and child; love them both. And, again, this new movie, ''Unplanned,'' chronicles a woman, Abby Johnson, who was right there with the strongest of the pro-abortion activists in this country, including counseling women to get abortions.

And then she was director of a clinic in Texas, as I said earlier, in the gentleman's home State. Then, when she saw that child killed, in real time, on an ultrasound, it shattered the myth that somehow that child is not human and not alive, and she walked out the door and never came back.

There were people praying for her from the 40 Days for Life, a very, very humane organization of men and women who pray for the clinic personnel; they pray for the babies; they pray for the moms. That is their agenda, care, love, compassion.

She then, later on, and as depicted in the movie, was at—you know, trying to reach out to some women as well, so they wouldn't make this irreversible decision.

So I want to thank the gentleman again. But, you know, someday we will recognize that these children—and you know, this millennial generation and others that are coming along, you know, first baby pictures now for parents and grandparents are of ultrasound imaging of their children. That is what goes on the refrigerator. The newborn pictures go on, too, with great smiles and great joy when the child is born. But we now know, before birth when he or she is a girl or a boy. We know just so much, and we have that picture, which is the first baby picture.

And to think—and this is what got to Abby Johnson—she watched as that child was dismembered right in front of her. She was holding the probe; and it just dawned on her, the blind spot was lifted, and she realized, I am participating in the killing of a baby. And she left that clinic, and now she is one of the most courageous pro-life leaders in the country and the world.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate those words from my friend, CHRIS SMITH, and I look forward to seeing that movie.

I was very moved watching the movie ''Gosnell''. It just—I thought about the poets, the inhumanity to man. It is tragic.

Having talked to people that have taught in China, you know, it is a human crisis what is going on with the abortion of so many women. And like my friend, CHRIS SMITH, I can't help but wonder why that is not considered a war on women when you kill a baby in utero simply because the child is female. But apparently, in China, since couples are only allowed normally to have one child, many couples think, well, we would rather have a boy. Discrimination against girls.

As a father who has three girls, they have brought joy to my life in so many ways. I just cannot fathom the thought of ever doing anything to have prevented those girls from being born.

But there are far-reaching implications when you have a gendercide. But as was pointed out by a teacher in China, first of all, the boys don't have as much opportunity to have female friends, making it more difficult to find a heterosexual partner.

But more than that, because it is restricted to one child, you have two sets of grandparents and two parents, six people who have one child to focus on, and it actually—

One of the greatest disciplined groups of children in the world used to be considered from China.

□ 1230

More and more, you have doting grandparents and parents. Since they only have one child to dote on among the six of them, more and more of those Chinese children are being spoiled rotten. It is much more difficult to maintain order, because now that there is one child to spoil among six people, the teacher is never right. The child is always right.

It is interesting, seeing all the far-reaching ramifications of this gendercide against women. I hope and literally do pray that things will change, and babies will no longer be killed just simply because they are female.

FRAUD ON FISA COURT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are four other topics I wanted to touch on.

One, I was greatly surprised to find out about a motion and order by the Obama administration in 2012 before the FISA court, because being on the Judiciary Committee—I wasn't there when the PATRIOT Act was passed; I have been there for reauthorization—I have grave concerns about some of the civil rights there.

My colleagues across the aisle on the Judiciary Committee, many of them had extremely grave concerns when they were in the minority about civil rights and civil liberties, and those seem to have taken a backseat while the President was President Obama.

I am hopeful that, now that there is not a Democrat in the White House, we can get some bipartisan concern again about civil liberties, after the Obama administration really did run roughshod over so many.

One of the things we were assured in reauthorizing the FISA court, the procedures and all, is that no American, and this was in the PATRIOT Act as well, but no American would be caught up in any foreign surveillance or surveillance by our U.S. entities, whether CIA, NSA, whatever, unless the American citizen was engaged in a conversation with a known terrorist, foreign terrorist, or an agent of a known terrorist organization.

Then through this colonoscopy, figuratively speaking, that the Trump campaign and administration were getting, we come to find out things were far more loose in protecting civil liberties and privacy rights.

On the FISA court, unfortunately, we have at least one or more FISA judges that really don't care about the Constitution. They don't care about Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights. They have allowed the Justice Department to run roughshod over those.

I am very concerned about how far this goes back. Did it go back before the Obama administration? Is it a newer invention? Just how many activities once considered unthinkable by the Federal Government are now just ho-hum to FISA judges?

The fact is that we now know the FISA court, at least one, perhaps more courts, were lied to. Since this is basically a Star Chamber where the public is not allowed to know what went on—things are held in secret. The transcripts are held in secret, unless you get them released by WikiLeaks, as the application for warrant, the affidavit on which it was based, and the order regarding Verizon some years back—WikiLeaks released that.

That was the eye-opener for me, because as just an ardent historian when it comes to so many things American, and that includes First Amendment rights, I was shocked, Fourth Amendment, Fifth Amendment.

We know the Constitution is very clear. You can't just say: Give me all the information you have.

It is required that you have some kind of probable cause here, and you have to describe with particularity the area to be searched or the thing to be searched and the specific thing that is being sought for which there is a warrant.

I was overwhelmed to see an affidavit saying: Well, for America's protection, we just need every bit of information that Verizon has on every one of their customers.

I am going, oh, my gosh. During my days as a felony judge in Texas, if an officer had come with an affidavit and an application signed, sworn to, and given that to me, that we need a warrant, I am going, you have got to be kidding. There is no particularity here. It is just saying give me everything you have on every customer this company has.

Are you kidding? You need to go back to school. I am not sure I need to be signing any more warrants for you if that is the way you consider constitutional rights.

Yet, it was just ho-hum for the Justice Department, ho-hum for the FISA court judges.

I mean, unless there is some FISA judge that signed these four warrants regarding the Trump campaign, and individuals with it, who has just completely lost his or her mind and doesn't know what is going on, that judge, or judges, has to be aware they were lied to. There was fraud upon that court.

The fact that we have Federal judges who were confirmed by the U.S. Senate after being appointed by a U.S. President who would not be bothered that the United States Department of Justice and the FBI had people who would come before that judge and lie to that judge, and the judge is not bothered—''oh, well.''

I remember after a bankruptcy hearing many years ago, I really liked this judge, but he said: Louie, you seem bothered that the person who filed bankruptcy got caught in a huge lie. That seemed to bother you. But, Louie, they all lie. You just got to get used to it.

Well, I have still not gotten used to the idea that somebody can come in and lie under oath before a judge without any ramifications coming from that.

The fact that we have one or more FISA judges who are not bothered, have done nothing, and have put no one in jail for the fraud committed in the FISA court tells me we have to either get rid of the FISA courts—go back to the way it was before, when if you had a matter of national security, it was treated differently, but we didn't have special Star Chambers where you came and had secret hearings. You just went to a normal judge and handled things in camera, if necessary. We have to either do that, get rid of the FISA courts, or we have to have some safeguards to make sure that Americans' rights are protected.

But there is a motion and order here. The motion, it was secret, classified, before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. This is from April 23, 2012. It has now been declassified. I had no idea that the Obama administration, the Justice Department, had sought this and gotten it, but apparently, as broadly spread as information was about American citizens whose names were unmasked and about what they were saying when it didn't necessarily involve any foreign terrorist organization—I am still not over the fact that some of us were lied to, in order to get some of the PATRIOT Act reauthorized. That was not the Obama administration I am talking about.

But this is a motion, and the title is: ''Government's Submission of Amendments to Standard Minimization Procedures.'' That is the procedure where, if it is an American citizen who is caught up in a phone surveillance, phone conversations that are being surveilled by our intelligence, the minimization is what the law requires where you mask the name. You minimize the conversation so that the identity and other information is not available for review, because the Constitution protects American citizens and gives them Fourth Amendment and Fifth Amendment rights that otherwise would be abused.

But this says: ''For FBI Electronic Surveillance and Physical Search Conducted Under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and Submission of Revised Minimization Procedures for the National Counterterrorism Center, and Motion for Amended Orders Permitting Use of Amended Minimization Procedures.''

Then I see that it was classified by Tashina Gauhar, Deputy Assistant Attorney General. She answered directly to Rod Rosenstein, I guess still does.

My understanding is, and I was told, that she is one of the key people who was telling Jeff Sessions that he needed to recuse himself. This is an attorney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, who was loyal to Sally Yates, is still loyal to Sally Yates, even though she refused to do her constitutional duty to defend a constitutional act by President Trump. She didn't care for the President, so she wasn't going to carry out her constitutionally mandated duty.

Fortunately, Sally Yates is no longer there, and we have at least some people there who are willing to carry out their obligation under the Constitution.

But when my friend Jeff Sessions was saying he has talked to career people and they have encouraged him, told him he needed to recuse himself, I had heard that Tashina Gauhar was one of those people. You can call her a career person. I hope her career is about ended, at least in the Justice Department.

I also had understood she was someone who was trying to make Jeff Sessions look bad. As the National Security Council liaison, the notices of NSC meetings would go to her for the Attorney General. I was told she would sit on those and not get them to the Attorney General. He would get his notices late. He would be, therefore, the least prepared at the NSC's critical meetings. Sometimes, he would have conflicts because she didn't get him the notices early enough. Yet she, I was told, is one of those who said: Oh, yeah, you have to recuse yourself.

Her loyalties were more to President Obama and Sally Yates than they appear to be, at least to me, to the Constitution itself. Yet she is the one who is also pushing to change the minimization requirements.

What really got me as I read through this lengthy motion, I think this is really the crux of it, over here at page 64.

□ 1245

Over here on page 64—so, obviously, it is a long motion on behalf of the U.S. Government by Tashina Gauhar—it says:

''The following underlined text will be inserted into the first sentence: 'The FBI may disseminate FISA-acquired information concerning United States persons, which' ''—and then here is the underlined part—'' 'reasonably appears to be' ''—and then not underlined—'' 'foreign intelligence information' ''—more underlining—'' 'is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance, or is evidence of a crime being disseminated for a law enforcement purpose.' ''

Look, when you get language like this that could allow the massive distribution of what we were assured during reauthorization of these type procedures—oh, no, it is so restricted.

See, here are the regulations. This is who can find out about an American citizen who was surveilled electronically. It is protected. If somebody—an American citizen—happens to be captured just because of who they are talking to, you know, we have the minimization—nobody gets to know who that person is. The requirements are so tough to reveal the name.

Oh, no, not in this that was filed by Tashina Gauhar, if it reasonably appears it is necessary to understand some intelligence. Good grief, that throws the door wide open. You could justify giving this constitutionally protected information to basically anybody. Well, I think this will be important to help them understand some other intelligence information. This is an outrage.

And I had no idea—I don't know of anybody who did know back in 2012—that the Obama Justice Department was throwing this door open with this kind of vague and ambiguous terminology: Oh, well, if it helps them understand other information, well, then they can see and hear and get all of what otherwise should be constitutionally protected information where the U.S. Government has been spying on U.S. citizens.

As I have said before, I mean, it is becoming more and more clear that the only thing that Orwell got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984. But here, oh, yeah, anything that our DOJ, our intelligence, want to disseminate to their friends, even if it is somebody that may be working at the U.N., we will disclose it to anybody, because it will help them understand other information better.

For everyone's sake, this is such an outrage. And here it is, 7 years—yeah, next month—7 years since this motion and order was filed in order to allow the government to pass around top-secret information that should be not only classified, it should never have been obtained in the first place.

And then, through the investigation of the Donald Trump campaign, we find out that, actually, you don't have to be a terrorist or a member of a known terrorist organization. If you happen to be an ambassador, which, I would imagine, most all of the Members of the House and Senate have met with ambassadors and have talked to ambassadors of foreign countries. And it had never crossed my mind that our Justice Department, or our NSA, CIA, or FBI, that they may say: Oh, here is a Senator or a U.S. Congressman who is having a conversation with a foreign ambassador, so we get to surveil this Member of Congress or Senate.

But, it turns out, if you have a conversation with an ambassador, you can't be sure anymore that you don't have the FBI's electronic intelligence community noting and logging and checking everything that you are doing and saying. That is incredible. That is just almost unfathomable, due to the protections that used to be observed for American citizens. I thought we made progress.

The days when Attorney General Kennedy authorized a wiretap of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Hoover were surveilling so many people that never should have been allowed to be surveilled, I thought we had gotten beyond that. Some of those activities were unconstitutional, were illegal. I thought we had progressed to the point that Members of the House and Senate, both sides of the aisle, should be deeply offended to find out that their government may be spying on them, perhaps when they talk to an ambassador. Even if it is not a terrorist country, it is just extraordinary what we have been finding out in the last 2 years about the extent of abuses of Americans' privacy rights.

I am hoping, though, that we can work across the aisle to rein in some of these abuses, since the Obama administration is no longer there and the protection that seems some of my colleagues were trying to afford them, even though, in my mind, it meant really abuses of Americans' constitutional rights.

And then, somewhat related, my friend RAND PAUL, down the hall, this story from Paul Bedard, yesterday, notes that, ''Senator RAND PAUL escalated his demand for an investigation into former Obama officials who 'concocted' the anti-Trump Russia scandal, revealing that former CIA director John Brennan was the key figure who legitimized the charges and discredited 'dossier' against the President.''

And it is interesting. This term ''dossier'' everybody is using now because of the former MI6, a former FBI informant who became no longer trusted by the FBI, no longer usable, because he was untrustworthy by the FBI, which was never conveyed to the FISA judge, that allowed the judge to keep signing warrants based on this untrustworthy person, but now to have this. As Senator PAUL was reporting in a tweet, he said that he had heard from a high-level source that Brennan helped to validate the dossier in intelligence reports.

''A high-level source tells me it was Brennan who insisted that the unverified and fake Steele dossier be included in the intelligence report . . . Brennan should be asked to testify under oath in Congress ASAP,'' Senator PAUL tweeted.

In an earlier tweet Wednesday, Senator PAUL called for wide investigation into former President Barack Obama and his team. ''Time for Congress to investigate. What did President Obama know and when? How did this hoax go on for so long unabated?''

It goes on to say:

''Brennan has denied in the past that he included the salacious dossier. . . . But at least two other top intelligence officials said he did.''

And we do know, sort of parenthetically here, it is not in the article, but we know Brennan has admitted being untruthful under oath before the Senate. He has admitted perjuring himself when it suited what he wanted to accomplish. And this is a guy that was overrunning the Trump campaign, Donald Trump and his campaign—then Donald Trump, now President Trump—just abusing his position as head of an intelligence agency.

This says, ''And Washington Post editor Bob Woodward also said that Brennan endorsed the dossier from Christopher Steele when he''—Bob Woodward—''got a copy in late 2016. Woodward said that Brennan felt it matched the Russia collusion charges he had heard.''

And I can't help but wonder now if where Brennan heard this was when it came out of his own mouth.

''The dossier was never considered true until it was recognized in intelligence assessments and only after the late Senator John McCain and top Obama officials helped circulate it, said Paul.''

''The dossier was underwritten by the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign. By indicating the Kremlin interfered in the election, it helped to fuel false allegations of foreign collusion with the Trump campaign, leading to 2 years of nonstop investigations.''

'' 'I'm very concerned that it's becoming more clear that the Obama administration was able to obtain a FISA warrant to spy on our campaign based on phony opposition research from the Clinton campaign. Having Federal law enforcement spy on a Presidential campaign based on phony campaign research is really distressing and the true untold story,' he said.''

This is a problem. I know others may feel otherwise.

I like ADAM SCHIFF. He was put in charge of—back when he was in the Judiciary Committee where I was serving, we actually impeached two Federal judges who needed to be impeached, who needed to be removed, and my colleague, ADAM SCHIFF, did a wonderful job in handling that effort. As far as I am concerned, he developed great credibility with me in his professionalism in the way he handled the impeachment of those two Federal judges.

But, over the last 2 years, as he has continued to say we know there was collusion between the Trump administration and Russia and we have evidence and on and on, his credibility when it comes to intelligence matters has now been done great harm, not only here, but abroad. So I think it is time to have a different chairman of intelligence.

It is too important that we have someone who is a chairman that hasn't spent 2 years saying something was true that it turned out wasn't. We need to have a Democrat who has credibility with foreign governments, as well as here in the House, as well as in the Senate, and there are people like that. There are people like that on both sides of the aisle that have that kind of credibility that we know just would not be spreading something that wasn't absolutely true.

So I agree with my friends that are on the Intelligence Committee, and I appreciate my fellow Texan, MIKE CONAWAY, for pointing out this is now a problem and it needs to be addressed.

□ 1300

This article points out something I very much appreciate. The article is from Gregg Re with FOX News. ''President Trump, in an exclusive, wide-ranging interview Wednesday night with FOX News' Hannity''—and that was a great interview my friend Sean Hannity had with the President, really enjoyable, last night. But anyway, it says, '' . . . to release the full and unredacted Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrants and related documents used by the FBI to probe his campaign, saying he wants to 'get to the bottom' of how the long-running Russia collusion narrative began.

''Trump told anchor Sean Hannity that his lawyers previously had advised him not to take that dramatic step out of fear that it could be considered obstruction of justice. 'I do, I have plans to declassify and release. I have plans to absolutely release,' Trump said. 'I have some very talented people working for me, lawyers, and they really didn't want me to do it early on. . . . A lot of people wanted me to do it a long time ago.' '' I was one of those people.

He says: ''I'm glad I didn't do it. We got a great result without having to do it, but we will. One of the reasons that my lawyers didn't want me to do it is, they said, if I do it, they'll call it a form of obstruction.''

Last fall, when I was in the Oval Office along with the President talking for a while, and then his personal attorney came in, it seemed clear to me that his personal attorney was very concerned about declassifying the documents, that it was not the time to do it.

But there is no reason not to do it now, for sure. These things need to come out. We need to see just how badly abused this system was.

My friend JERRY NADLER is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I remember my first term. There was no more vocal advocate on behalf of civil liberties and privacy rights. I really hope that our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will join in with Republicans to try to correct this situation.

Clearly, there are still many people who are working in the Trump administration who don't want President Trump to succeed, don't want the President to succeed with what he is trying to do, what he promised he would do.

I don't think anybody has to worry about President Trump being abusive secretly of somebody's rights. But if this isn't handled now, even though Republicans are not in the majority, if we don't clamp down on what we see are clear abuses within the DOJ, within the intelligence community, with the FISA courts, then we are easily headed for a time when somebody else will come in there and they will see how the system was abused during the Obama administration.

I don't know whether that will be a Democrat or a Republican, but I am telling you, if we don't clamp down on it now, the abuses will allow the arising of a Chavez. It will allow the arising of these people who got elected and then became totalitarian.

I think there is a great deal to the poster that circulated: ''The problem with socialism is, you can vote your way into it, but you have to shoot your way out of it.''

That is what they found in Venezuela. They voted it in, but in order to have true socialism, you have to move toward totalitarian. You have to have such a powerful government. You can take from those who have earned and who have worked and give to those who are more desirable to have it, according to the government.

It is interesting that we have billionaires who are contributing massive amounts of money to move toward socialism. Obviously, they don't know their history well enough to know, that, yeah, they are considered good friends of the movement—thank you; you are a hero—but then when you move either toward communism—which true communism means there is no government. Everybody just shares and shares alike out of the goodness of their heart. You never can get there. You got to have a totalitarian government. That is why communism doesn't work.

Socialism, they welcome the help of all the rich people. But once you move toward real, true socialism, most of the time, the billionaires, they are going to end up in prison or dead and their money confiscated.

So I am amazed that so many billionaires don't realize they are just lackeys who are being appreciated now, but some day, they are going to go under the bus, and their money is going to be relieved from them.

It is a very critical time. As the Mueller investigation has finally concluded, having questioned Mr. Mueller numerous times, having done so much research on the man I feel like I know him very well—obviously, not as well as Eric Holder, who thought he would end up with an indictment to keep going.

I can't help but wonder if we have a new Attorney General who came in and realized there is nothing here. After all these subpoenas, tens of millions of dollars, it is time to wrap it up.

I really do think Mueller, left to his own devices, would have just kept an investigation going until every potential limitation on anything he had done wrong had run out.

But it is time to reform FISA courts, time to reform DOJ, time to reform our intelligence communities so the kind of abuses that have just gone on will not continue and Presidents in the future, whether Democrat or Republican, will not be tempted to abuse the system, as it is now appearing to have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence. At this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.),