It was that sense of service that guided Pops on an epic 10,000-mile motorcycle ride across this great country to raise money for the brand-new Central Coast Veterans Cemetery on the former Fort Ord. During this trip, Pops and his fellow American Legion brothers of Post 31, Crash and Phin, the group known as the Black Sheep, carried an American flag, which you see here in this photo, from the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to Arlington National Cemetery, where that flag was flown over the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Now on Memorial Day each year, that flag is flown over the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to honor those who served and sacrificed.

Based on Pop's service, he was honored as the 2017 Veteran of the Year in Monterey County.

Today, we here in Congress honor Pops Culver not just as a veteran but as an American who not only served but understood and lived up to his obligation to serve those who served us.

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. Madam Speaker, the bill that was entitled the Violence Against Women Act was passed in the House today, and I deeply regret it was not the kind of bipartisan bill that I feel like we should have had.

I don't know anybody in this Chamber who supports violence against women or who does not want to do what we can to stop it. We battled this out verbally in the Judiciary Committee.

It is so clear to me, having prosecuted sexual assaults of women who were battered and beat up badly by their husbands or partners, that it is such an egregious thing. I heard over and over as a felony judge in Texas about how traumatized the women were and potentially would be for the rest of their lives. I heard that, with counseling, they could work to avoid having the triggers that put them right back in the place where they were so badly abused.

More recent literature indicates that women who have been sexually assaulted seem to have a much higher percent—a number of times, apparently—more post-traumatic stress disorder after having been sexually abused than even soldiers have after combat. One suggestion in a study indicates that because soldiers are trained for what they go through, perhaps that reduces the amount of PTSD. There is no adequate training to prepare a woman for the kind of abuse that so many have suffered.

One of the triggers that I have heard about as a judge that could trigger this trauma, reliving the experience all over again, is a woman being in a confined space and having a biological man come in to that confined space. We have heard of women assaulting men who have done that, some who may have been through sexual assault before.

I understand the idea of my colleagues across the aisle who want to help avoid hurting the feelings of biological men who think they are women, or according to the latest rendition of DSM–5, they are suffering from gender dysphoria, which is kind of the opposite of euphoria, but it basically is a confusion or a discomfort with one's biologically assigned gender.

So I get it. You don't want to make them feel bad. You don't want to hurt their feelings. So to avoid hurting their feelings, we would put so many women at risk.

A lot of folks I have heard say that one in four women will be sexually assaulted. If that is true, then that means that those who voted for this bill today would seek to punish again and again and again women who have suffered the outrageous and egregious assault sexually or being battered with no way out.

When my friend across the aisle, DEBBIE DINGELL, speaks of those fears and terrors as a child and abuse going on in the home, my heart goes out to her and anybody who has suffered like that.

But this is the United States Congress. Can't we have a bill that doesn't have a political aspect and that just tries to do the right thing by women who have suffered from sexual assault or being battered, and let them have a confined space without a biological man being forced into their traumatized world? Couldn't we agree on that? The answer is no.

DEBBIE LESKO, my friend and colleague also on the Judiciary Committee, has been such a victim. She had amendments. She spoke brilliantly about the suffering and what needed to be done to fix the bill. And yet, it was a political matter. It is too important that we not hurt the feelings of men who think they are women. Therefore, we are just going to let those women have to suffer. They just need to get over their trauma, their PTSD, their reliving the nightmare of a sexual assault over and over again. There is more regard for somebody's hurt feelings than someone else's. A woman's terror forces them over and over through such terror time and time again.

I read a story about a woman seeing a man and freaking out and started to assault him. If a woman has been through a sexual assault before, my heart goes to her, not for the guy who walks in and traumatized her so.

Yet if the majority here has their way, that bill would become law. Those traumatized women would be condemned to be traumatized repeatedly at the demand of the Democratic majority in Congress, in the House here.

□ 1330

I really would have hoped we could have had a bill that we could all, of one accord, say: This is right. This is the thing to do by women.

But we can't get a bill to the floor to try to protect unborn women, unborn girls.

In China, the abortion rate of girls is dramatically higher than that of boys, because they think—they haven't been like me and had three girls. They don't know how wonderful it is. So they think: Gee, if I am only going to be allowed to have one child, I prefer it be a boy.

And there is outrageous discrimination—a real, true war on women—going on in China. And China has yet to feel the destructive results of what they have required.

But that is a war, killing an unborn child because she happens to be biologically female. But we haven't heard condemnation about such practice in this Congress, and that is a legitimate war on women, children who were never given the chance to live simply because—not to live outside the womb simply because they are biologically women. It's very tragic.

I hope the Senate will use some common sense and have a heart for the women who have been victims of assault. And I know. I have seen it. I have heard it. As a prosecutor, I was frustrated by it, when a woman would come in, beat to a pulp, black and blue, all bruised up and scarred. You want to put her husband in prison forever, doing that to anybody, and especially a woman who could not defend herself.

And, time and again—too often, the experts will tell you, those who prosecute a lot—the woman will come back and say: You know what, now that everything has healed, it is really my fault.

And they have this idea that somehow they deserved that kind of beating when they didn't at all. As a judge, there were so many times that I told young children—you could tell they blamed themselves for a sexual assault—without the jury around, you need to understand this was not your fault. You didn't deserve this. You never did anything to deserve it. This was a crime committed against you. You were the victim, and don't ever think that you deserved it, or you are the guilty party.

Because it is amazing. Some men have the ability to make their victims think they are the ones at fault.

Yet, for those who suffer the trauma again, having a man confront them in a very confined space, they are going to be condemned to relive it over and over again. It is very unfortunate.

Hopefully, wisdom will win out and the Senate will help us have a bill that really considers the women and the damage done by the full complement, if you want to call it that, of this Violence Against Women Act, as it was labeled.

We have also heard repeatedly: There is no crisis on the border. It is not a national emergency. This is a manufactured emergency.

We have heard that over and over. We have seen the montages of the mainstream media saying: Manufactured crisis. Manufactured crisis.

Apparently Jeh Johnson, former Secretary of Homeland Security, didn't get the memo that he was supposed to come forward and lie, so he actually said: Yes, it is a crisis on the border.

It is a humanitarian crisis. It is a crisis for our Nation's security. And it is so out of hand.

I keep hearing every day from people whose jobs it is to protect America and to protect Americans, protect people who are legally here. But they are so busy having to get names, whether they are fictitious or not. Most of the time there is no proper identification. You have to take the person's word, take the information on where they say they have relatives.

I have pointed it out before, but I have been there when, while they are going through questions with one end of the group, at the other end, they are moving kids: Why don't you take this kid. You take this kid, claim it is yours. Oh, here. You take my address. I'll take your address.

These were addresses, apparently, where the drug cartels needed them to operate or work in either their drug trafficking or sex trafficking. So, under the laws the way they exist now, as the border patrolmen have said, you know, the cartels say: We're the logistics. The drug cartels get paid, and they hire some person to bring them across the border.

And the drug cartels, as I have heard them say out there in the middle of the night, when it is not on their list of questions to ask, but often it gets asked: How much did you pay to be brought into this country?

And when the question is asked: Where did you get that kind of money—$5,000, $6,000, $7,000, $8,000. You don't have that. Where did you get that money?

Well, we got so much here, so much there, some sent from the U.S.

Well, what about the rest?

They are going to let me work it off when I get where I am going.

So then, our own Homeland Security, our own HHS, they ship the drug cartels' future employees to the place that the cartels want them to work.

So, I would hope that, as people read stories: Oh, no, another meth lab busted, and this guy is part of the Mexican drug cartel, and it is not in Texas, then that is when people should remember: Oh, yeah, that's right. We use tax money to send the cartels' future employees to the cities where they want them to work in sex trafficking or drug trafficking.

I mean, an advanced civilization cannot continue to reach its potential when we are bringing in the people and paying to put them where they can destroy the city, the State, and ultimately our country. This is a crisis.

As I understand, down in the quadrant of Texas, especially down south of McAllen, where I have spent so many nights, one was saying: We process 1,200 a day, process 13,000 in about 10 days—one area.

It is incredible. How can an intelligent civilization keep doing that to itself in the name of helping our country and helping our neighbors, when the fact is that the most compassionate thing Americans could do for our neighbors in Mexico is to secure the border completely. Nothing comes in, like drugs or women being sex trafficked. And, no, the drug cartels are not going to take lightly to it.

But, you shut down the tens of millions of dollars every year that are flowing from the U.S. into Mexico that fund the mass corruption in Mexico, then Mexico, in my opinion, would become a top-ten economy in the world.

They have got some of the best natural resources in the world, a better geographic location than the United States because they are between two continents and two oceans. Their trade ought to be astounding.

And they have got some of the hardest-working people in the world. So why aren't they a top economy? It is because of all the money that flows across from the United States to the drug cartels in Mexico.

And, now, a huge source of revenue for them is the money they get from sending people across by the thousands each week. It is insane.

We can't prolong this little experiment in self-government when we are providing corrupt drug cartels with the method to take us down and to keep Mexico subjugated to their evil intentions.

An article from CNS News by Terence Jeffrey, April 3 of this year, points out that the five Federal district court districts that sit along the U.S.-Mexico border were the top five districts in the country for the number of defendants they convicted and sentenced to imprisonment in fiscal year 2018, according to the data published by the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

I have a rather interesting chart here. You see the Western District of Texas has had 7,126 individuals convicted as criminals and sentenced to prison; the Southern District of Texas, 5,939 people convicted as criminals, sentenced to prison; Southern District of California, very close, 5,470 convicted criminals sentenced to prison. So, it isn't just a wrist slap. Sentenced to prison.

You have got the District of Arizona, 4,378; District of New Mexico, 3,923. Of course, Florida is behind them. And there are a lot of people coming in illegally there, but it drops off so dramatically. So, you see a bigger number of these 30 top sentencing courts have 700 or less, and the Western District of Texas has 7,000.

So why is this? It is because they are border courts, and they are dramatically affected by criminals coming across our border.

As I understand it, one of the MS–13ers that was caught—supposedly, for every person we catch coming in illegally, there are many times that many that are coming in that we don't catch. No reason to doubt that that is true about gang members, gangsters, part of MS–13.

But, why are we allowing this to go on for ourselves?

The old saying in Washington is: No matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. And, the more you hang around this town, the more you see there is something to that.

Could it be that a majority in the House don't want to stop this because the thinking is: These may be our future hope for being in the majority and electing a President?

Heaven help us if that were the case, that power is more important than preserving a union where freedom once abounded.

□ 1345

Of course, it could never adequately abound as there was slavery.

I just finished a book about the miracle of Yorktown, focused largely on George Washington. And we know he ended up, though he was from a State that prohibited the freeing of slaves, he freed the slaves in his will.

But it wasn't until Martin Luther King, Jr., JOHN LEWIS, and others, withstood tremendous oppression in order that a White Christian boy like me could grow up and treat my brothers and sisters like brothers and sisters. So we have made great progress.

And then it seemed like, just as we get to the sixties, and the Constitution finally is meaning what it says, we start moving in a direction that most civilizations, when you read their history, actually were moving them to the dustbin of history.

Here we accomplished so much, and freedom for—we spread it around. The Civil Rights Act helped with that. And now we are going to punish women who have been victims of assault by forcing them to endure men coming into their private spaces.

We are going to take a country where a massive amount of crime is occurring on our border and our border areas—we are overwhelmed with people that don't understand that it is a lot of education and a lot of work involved in order to preserve self-government.

So it is not unusual to see socialism become so popular as an idea. It sounds wonderful. Everybody's going to share and share alike.

But then you dig down, and you find out historically, you can't have socialism; you can't have communism unless you have a big, powerful government, strong enough that it can take from those who earn things and give it to those who didn't, without their permission, and punish them if they try to object. That takes a big, strong government.

And our Founders found actually, if you let people keep what they earn, put a small tax on it so you keep order in the country, that that is far more productive. That is how the United States has been the greatest economy, and still is, in the world.

But those freedoms are going away. We are no longer ranked as the freest country in the world. And as those freedoms diminish, it shouldn't be a big surprise that freedoms are diminishing as people that don't understand what it takes to preserve liberty and self-government come in, unabated, virtually. We are not stopping people from coming in.

I am hopeful, prayerful, I hope that we will be able to have our government do what has not been done, as far as I know, since Woodrow Wilson, and that is, have people on the border, use nonlethal means, and say, you are not coming in to our country illegally.

We ought to have a bipartisan bill passed pretty easily with regard to asylum that says, You can't come into the United States and claim asylum. You have got to go to the nearest embassy or an American embassy, somewhere to claim asylum.

But if you come into the country illegally, and your first act in America involves breaking the law, then we are not going to allow you to apply for asylum. And you would see these massive caravans stop overnight. That is why there is such fluctuation.

Earlier last year, numbers were way down. People in other countries thought Trump was going to stop them; that we had a President that wanted to do all he could to stop illegal immigration, secure the border.

But by the time they found out that his party was not going to be in the majority in the House, and that people said they want to eliminate all barriers and let people in, anybody that wanted to come here, not just the over 1 million that we give visas to, then the numbers picked up.

And when they got word that if you have a child, whether it is yours or somebody else's, it doesn't matter, that gets you into the country, and keeps you in the country, get a child. Bring a child. That is the thing to do.

It is really outrageous what that has done to children. Now they are an important commodity to the drug cartels. Make sure, whoever you are, wherever you are coming from, even if you are an MS–13er, bring a kid with you, bring a child; because the United States made such a big deal about we won't separate children from parents, even though, to American citizens, we separate children from parents every single day of the year because, in America, at least in the past, we didn't believe in putting children in confinement for crimes their parents committed.

As a judge, I don't know how many warrants I signed, but I would never allow a child to be incarcerated because of the alleged crime of their parents. We don't do that. So we separate children from their parents every day in America, in every county in America, in every State in America. It happens all the time, because we don't punish the children for the sins of their parents.

But once word got out that if you come to America illegally with a child, you have got a good chance of staying in, claim asylum, the courts are backed up, and you have got a good chance of staying for years; and once you are here a number of years, just don't show up for your asylum hearing, and they won't know where you are, and you will be in good shape.

It has got to stop. The American people expect us to protect them, protect the Constitution, and we have not done a good job of that because there seems, so often, right here in this room, more devotion to people that hate America, that still want to come here, than there is to those who are legally here, that are saying, I don't want to be a victim of a crime; would you please protect me from people coming in illegally that may commit a crime against me.

And it shouldn't even have to be said, but because we have so many ''lame stream'' media folks who either are liars by trade, or simply that ignorant—no, all immigrants are not criminals or people looking to commit crimes such as robbery, rape, destruction, murder; but they do happen.

When you look at the percentages of people in our Federal prison who are in the country illegally, an objective bystander looking on would go: Wow, why is this country doing that?

Why are they letting all these people in illegally, when they may have 20, 25 percent in their prison who are there because they are in the country illegally? Why are they letting that go on?

And the only answer from an accurate cynic would be, Well, it is for politics. They think it is good for one political party, so they keep it up.

That is so dramatic, such a dramatic demonstration of where the real problems are in this country.

And I have heard my friend, now Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN, point out, every city in America is now a border city, because of all of the illegal aliens that they are having to take care of.

But an article in the Federalist, by John Daniel Davidson, April 4—it is actually his testimony before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—but he says: ''I visited a migrant respite center in McAllen, Texas, run by Catholic Charities of the Rio Grande Valley, the charitable arm of the Diocese of Brownsville. Sister Norman Pimentel helped establish the center in 2014, at the height of the unaccompanied minor crisis, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement was overwhelmed with thousands of children and teenagers turning themselves in to U.S. Border Patrol agents.

''At that time, the center was receiving between 60 and 120 migrants a day, nearly all of them families from Central America. Here's how it worked: Every afternoon, ICE dropped off the families at the Greyhound bus station downtown, about a mile from the respite center. Greyhound employees would call the center to let them know the migrants were there, and the center would send vans to pick them up.

''Once at the center, the children would be sent to a separate room for a hot meal while the parents took turns working with volunteers to get in touch with friends and family members all over the country.''

Or, as we have seen, sometimes those are not friends and family; they are people to which the drug cartels have ordered them.

''The goal was to get them all bus tickets and get them on their way that same day, usually later that evening, because the next day there would be another group of families coming in, and there simply wasn't space for more than a couple dozen people to spend the night there.

''This wasn't some gleaming facility. The center occupied one half of a rundown commercial building, consisting of a large multipurpose room, a bathroom and a shower, a small kitchen, and a separate room for the makeshift cafeteria. There was an area in a corner of the main room cordoned off for young children to play and a large stack of blue plastic mattresses in another corner.''

Anyway, ''in December, the diocese moved the center to a larger location, a former nursing home, about 16,000 square feet. . . . that's because the number of migrants turning up at the bus station skyrocketed. Today, the new respite center is receiving about 800 people a day''—800 people a day—''sometimes more. Last Sunday, 1,300 people were dropped off there and at other shelters around town.''

I mean, this is what is going on on our border, when we are the most generous country in the world.

Some people even in this room will shout: You know, we are a Nation of immigrants. That is right. And that is why we are so—we are the most generous country in the world when it comes to giving free passes into America. Nobody gives a million or more visas for legal entry into their country. Nobody. Not these countries that are geographically bigger. Not countries that have a number of times the population. No, nobody is that generous as we are with letting immigrants in.

So it is outrageous to say, because we want to limit those coming in to the very—the most generous number in the world, that we say come in legally, what is wrong with that?

As has been said before, a nation with no borders will not be a nation much longer. Not for long.

But, we find out, yeah, it is a moneymaker. It is a moneymaker for the drug cartels. Some people profit off the people coming in here illegally. The people that work here, either from

drugs or legitimate businesses, they send an awful lot of money home, and that is the kind of people we want, people that care about their families, want to help them provide, make their way. That is a very noble thing to send money home to family. Unfortunately, that is not all the people that are coming in these days.

I want to touch on one other matter, and that's with regard to the special counsel. I know there are people, the House and Senate, that say, Oh, you know, Robert Mueller is the gold standard when it comes to prosecutor. I submit that is some pretty tarnished gold with an awful lot of impurities, speaking metaphorically.

□ 1400

So I wasn't surprised when we learned that the Mueller report indicated, really, there is plenty of evidence Russians were trying to get the Trump campaign to conspire with them; no evidence they did conspire with the Russians.

Through the years of questioning Robert Mueller in our committee and doing a lot of research on the man, it would explain why I was so upset when he was appointed as special counsel, because I wanted somebody who would be fair and investigate all parts. But when we look back now, we see all the indictments that came as a result of having a special counsel, not one single one of the indictments involved a conspiracy of any kind between anybody at the Trump campaign, including our President, and Russia.

What we have learned from all the evidence we have gleaned in committee and in public is that there was a conspiracy, and it involved top people at the Department of Justice; it involved top people at the FBI; it involved the Clinton campaign; it involved Fusion GPS; it involved a foreign agent named Steele. He is a foreign agent.

And, by the way, our great Justice Department, such as it is—or was in the last couple years—never bothered to tell the FISA court: This man has no credibility with the FBI. We have stopped using him as an agent of our government, the foreign agent that he is, because he is not trustworthy.

Never bothered to tell the judge that.

And I don't know if it was one FISA judge or more, but the fact is that the FISA judges, nobody has punished any of the applicants, or affiants, that have come in and sworn before them that this is true to the best of their knowledge.

That was a lie. They didn't give the judge the best of their knowledge. It was a lie and they knew it, and they did it four times.

I have lost respect for whoever in the FISA court would not call those lawyers in, or the FBI agents, and say: You lied to me when you didn't tell me the full truth. You committed a fraud on my court, and now I need to decide how long I am putting you in jail.

They haven't done that. That tells me we either need to get rid of the FISA courts or we need to have such a big overhaul because they have gotten too comfortable in that star chamber.

And I know all of them haven't, because I know there are some good judges who have been nominated, confirmed by the Senate, and sit on Federal benches. I know there are plenty of good ones. I have got too many good friends not to know that. But we at least have some who don't care when they are lied to if it furthers their own political ideas, because that is the bottom line.

Why would the FISA court or courts that have been lied to, had fraud against the court, why would they not have already punished the people who committed the fraud against their court?

It seems to me it has got to be one of two reasons:

They must be dishonest people; therefore, they don't mind being lied to; or

They were so politically aligned with the people who were committing the fraud upon their court that they are fine with the fraud because it helped accomplish their political agenda as well as the ones who committed the fraud.

We need to do something about the FISA courts. It is a real problem.

I know there are a lot of people who think: Well, no, it is not really a problem because it has only been abused against Republicans, and we hate Donald Trump, didn't want him to be President, and so it is okay for them to abuse the FISA court system and the warrant system and the First and Fourth and Fifth and Sixth Amendments. It is okay to abuse those because we don't like the people being abused.

But there is a reason that we have an adversarial system. With all its flaws, it is the best there has ever been anywhere when it comes to justice. We are not supposed to allow the kind of thing that has now happened.

I was not surprised when Mueller couldn't help himself, Weissmann couldn't help himself: Yeah, the evidence is not there to prosecute anybody, but we want you to know we are not exonerating him.

Well, that is not a prosecutor's job. If a prosecutor learns that a crime has most likely—has probably been committed and that a person has probably committed it and they find out a crime has been committed, they look for a person who probably committed the crime. That is the job.

When you find the person, you gather enough evidence that you can have probable cause that they committed the crime. You get them indicted. You pursue them, prosecute them, convict them, sentence them. That is how it is supposed to work.

A prosecutor is not supposed to ever go into something to exonerate somebody. You don't go into it looking for evidence that exonerates somebody. You are looking for evidence that shows they are guilty. And if you don't find evidence that establishes they are guilty, then you are supposed to move on; although, Mueller has had a problem with that.

We also have seen the history, whether it was Comey admitting that—it sounded like he admitted a crime, because he leaked information that he knew should not have been disclosed to a professor so that he would get it to The New York Times so that they could have a justification for appointing a special prosecutor. Wow.

You have got 18 U.S.C. 1905, disclosure of confidential information. That is a general provision. It is a felony to disclose confidential information. You have got other laws.

Well, this from the DOJ, their own regulations. If you look at 1–7.110, it says: ''It is against the law to disclose classified information to someone not authorized to receive it.''

But that has gone on during the years Mueller was head of the FBI.

We have had FBI agents make clear: No way we could prosecute a Member of Congress without the knowledge and okay of the Director of the FBI.

That would be Mueller when they were pursuing Ted Stevens, Senator. They fabricated a case against the man. He had evidence he was not just not guilty, but completely innocent.

But you do your investigation. You gather up all the evidence that would show somebody is innocent, completely innocent, 100 percent innocent, and you don't let them have all their stuff back and you manufacture evidence. You threaten a witness to get them to lie so you can convict somebody. That happened to Ted Stevens.

When I first heard, gee, he had added a $700,000 addition to his home, something like that, I am going, well, he should have known better than that. Surely you are going to try a guy for that.

Well, it turns out he overpaid. He even told the contractor: Just cash my checks. I have to overpay, because they are watching everything I do, and I have got to keep my nose clean.

They still went after him and convicted him immediately before an election that he narrowly lost.

Thank God there was an FBI agent with a conscience who did an affidavit so the judge found out that the prosecutor, the FBI, had framed Ted Stevens for a crime he didn't commit.

Those people should have been disbarred. They should have been thrown out of the FBI. But the only guy forced out was the one who did the affidavit, because Mueller—obviously, it had to be done with his knowledge, that you run the guy off that had a conscience and reported it to the court and you keep on the FBI agent that helped fabricate the case against the longest serving Republican in the Senate at the time.

He wouldn't have been on that plane where he was killed if it hadn't been for Mueller's FBI and the framing of

Ted Stevens. So he lost his seat in the Senate, even though he was later exonerated.

And, of course, you know, we have these repeated examples. I am not even going to go back into the Whitey Bulger situation when Mueller was in Boston.

But, you know, Curt Weldon, serving here in the House, he was giving speeches right here over and over about the FBI could have stopped 9/11.

I didn't know what he was saying, whether it was true or not. He talked about a program Able Danger, but I sure did feel like Mueller needed to respond, because this was a serious allegation against his FBI.

Unbeknownst to me, he was going to respond, but not with a statement that Curt Weldon was wrong. No. What they did, and I put the story—I have got a lot of examples. I was doing an op-ed so people would know some about Mueller that I know and had found out and read about.

Anyway, I started an op-ed. I let my friend Sean Hannity know: I am doing an op-ed on Mueller, and normally papers only want 500, 800 words, max, for an op-ed, and I am already at 2,000.

Sean said: Just do it.

And, you know, it doesn't make me a dime in my case as a Member of Congress, but I felt like the story needed to get out. So Sean said: Well, yeah, we can put it up on the Internet. People can download it.

It ended up being 48 pages, but one of the things I brought out was Curt Weldon's situation.

So I will read from the story that I included. This was from an article by WND: ''Each of Weldon's 10 previous reelections had been by sizeable margins. Polls showed he was up by five to seven points in the fall of 2006. Three weeks prior to the election, however, a national story ran about Weldon based upon anonymous sources''—they had to have come from the FBI—''that an investigation was underway against him and his daughter, alleging illegal activities involving his congressional work.''

A week after the news story broke, alleging a need to act quickly because of the leak—and, see, this is typical for Mueller and his crime team. They leak information and then tell the judge: We have got to do something quick because this information is getting out.

Yeah. You leaked it.

Just like when they used this dossier. I used to have respect for dossiers. Now it is a pejorative. But it was prepared by a foreign agent named Christopher Steele, hired by the Clinton campaign, using Fusion GPS, using others like Nellie Ohr, wife of FBI top official Bruce Ohr, and they used this guy's dossier. Information from Christopher Steele's dossier, as fabricated as it was, was provided to a reporter who did a story about it.

It was one of the other frauds upon the court. They tell the court: See, not only do we have this information from Christopher Steele, a foreign agent that is untrustworthy—unfortunately, they didn't tell the judge that. They knew it, but they didn't tell it.

And they said: And look here. Here is a story that also has this information that corroborates Christopher Steele—not bothering to tell the judge, actually, that is Christopher Steele corroborating Christopher Steele. And he didn't even—he just talked to people in Russia.

□ 1415

So, you got a foreign agent using foreign agents. Who knows who they worked for. Maybe Putin. So a foreign agent using foreign agents in Russia, as he worked for the Clinton Foundation, Fusion GPS, to prepare opposition research that was not true against the opposing campaign for president.

So they didn't bother to tell the judge then here in Curt Weldon's case. It must have been somebody from the FBI leaked that they were going after Curt Weldon that helped them get the media involved and a judge to sign off on a warrant.

And, gee, when they show up early in the morning at 7 a.m., before business on a Monday morning—local TV and print media had all been alerted about the raid—well, who would have done that, but the FBI agents or maybe Mueller or one of his minions. They leaked to the media: They are all out there and they were in position to cover the story.

Within hours, Democratic protestors were waving ''Caught Red-Handed'' signs outside Curt Weldon's district office. But it turns out there was no follow-up, there were no questions, no grand jury investigation, nothing.

That is why they later called Curt Weldon's family and said: Hey, all that stuff we got in our raid, you know, you can come get it. Apparently, we didn't use it in a grand jury investigation.

No, they just used it to defeat Curt Weldon.

So, it shouldn't be a surprise when Mueller's report said: We didn't have evidence of a crime by the Trump administration or Trump campaign regarding collusion or any of that, but we didn't exonerate him.

Well, no, that is not your job. Of course, you don't exonerate somebody.

But as special counsel—it sure seemed just like Comey, these guys that were all in tight. You know, Comey, there was a great article some years back about basically he and Mueller are joined at the hip.

What a great gift for Mueller, though. He is begging President Trump to appoint him again back to being director of the FBI after Comey was fired based on Rosenstein's memo. And the President said: No, I am not going to give you a job.

Twenty-four hours later, he grabs a job that will allow him to go after the man who wouldn't hire him as FBI director.

Mueller, if he had any sense of decency, he would have told Rosenstein: Look, you and I, Rosenstein, Rod, we were involved in the original Russia investigation when we know Russia was trying to get uranium illegally. We really shouldn't be involved in this Russia investigation. It may bleed over. And the President is supposed to investigate. He wouldn't hire me yesterday. That will look bad.

But you would have thought a man of decency would have recused himself, which Mueller did not do. There are so many reasons for both him, Rosenstein, and certainly Weissman—they were all involved in that original Russia investigation on uranium that they put a lid on so that the sale could go through, because, let's face it, the Clinton Foundation wouldn't have gotten that $145 million from the people profiting from the uranium sale of U.S. uranium, ultimately to Russia. It wouldn't have happened.

But Mueller not only did not recuse himself, he accepted the job and immediately went about hiring people that hated Trump like he did. That is not the mark of a real man of justice, a real person of justice.

And he had a policy, when he was FBI director, the 5-year up-or-out policy, that caused us to lose, as was previously reported, thousands and thousands of years of experience. Why? If you got people experienced, they can tell you when you are screwing up, doing something wrong as FBI director. He just wanted young people who would salute the flag and do whatever he said. Very unfortunate.

So he brought down Ted Stevens. He brought down Curt Weldon. And what about Dr. Steven Hatfill? I mean, the story was that President Bush called him in—There is no evidence that Hatfill had anything to do with this anthrax. Why are you still after it? Are you sure he is the guy? And Mueller said: I am 100 percent certain; is what was reported.

And that is because, as the saying goes, normally Mueller—well, I guess the saying is: Often wrong, but never in doubt.

He tells President Bush: I am 100 percent certain. Yes, Hatfill is the guy.

He wasn't the guy. And that is why it cost the government a $6 million or such settlement for destroying his life.

If you look at Scooter Libby, Scooter Libby was framed, let's face it. And there is a great story explaining all that, in fact, how Judith Miller was manipulated. That poor person suffered as a result of trying to do the right thing. But she was ultimately persuaded that Scooter Libby said something he didn't. And she later, as it said, when Miller read Plame's own memoir, in there discovered that Plame had worked at a State Department bureau as a cover for a real CIA role. That discovery, in Miller's words, left her cold. The idea that the bureau, in her notebook, meant CIA had been planted in her head by Fitzgerald or the FBI. It was a strange word to use for the CIA. Reading Plame's memoir,

Miller realized that bureau was in brackets because it related to her work at the State Department. In other words, she shouldn't have testified against Scooter Libby. She was set up and manipulated and, as a result, a good man's life was destroyed.

But you will find, Mueller never apologizes when he always gets his man. It is just sometimes it is wrong. It needs more investigation. Not the Trump administration, but Mueller.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 8, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

609. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants (RIN: 3038-AE85) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

610. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — De Minimis Exception to the Swap Dealer Definition-Swaps Entered into by Insured Depository Institutions in Connection with Loans to Customers (RIN: 3038-AE68) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

611. A letter from the Chief, Officer Accessions Policy Branch [G1/DMPM], Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schools and Colleges [Docket ID: USA-2018-HQ-0018] (RIN: 0702-AA89) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

612. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause ''Oral Attestation of Security Responsibilities'' (DFARS Case 2019-D006) [Docket: DARS-2019-0014] (RIN: 0750-AK41) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

613. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Congressional Notification for Certain Task- and Delivery-Order Contracts (DFARS Case 2019-0007) [Docket: DARS-2019-0007] (RIN: 0750-AK45) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

614. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Consent to Subcontract (DFARS Case 2018-D065) [Docket: DARS-2019-0006] (RIN: 0750-AK24) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

615. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Certain Defense Acquisition Laws (DFARS Case 2018-D059) [Docket: DARS-2019-0013] (RIN: 0750-AK20) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

616. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of DFARS Clause ''Utilization of Indian Organizations, Indian-Owned Economic Enterprises, and Native Hawaiian Small Business Concerns'' (DFARS Case 2018-D051) [Docket: DARS-2019-0012] (RIN: 0750-AK06) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

617. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Alabama: Adamsville, City of, Jefferson County, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8571] received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

618. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Delay of Effective Date; Regulatory Capital Rule: Implementation and Transition of the Current Expected Credit Losses Methodology for Allowances and Related Adjustments to the Regulatory Capital Rule and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE74) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

619. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities (RIN: 3064-AF00) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

620. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Opportunities and Responsibilities for State and Local Report Cards Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

621. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-methyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)amino]-1-propanesulfonic acid monosodium salt polymer with 2-propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, C12-16 alkyl esters; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0058; FRL-9988-62] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

622. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2019, to March 31, 2019, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 116—26); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

623. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2019 [Docket No.: FR-6139-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD90) received April 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

624. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Offering a Lump-Sum Payment Option to Retirees Currently Receiving Annuity Payments under a Defined Benefit Plan [Notice 2019-18] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

625. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Permitted disparity in employer-provided contributions or benefits (Revenue Ruling 2019-06) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

626. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements [Announcement 2019-03] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

627. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Chapter 4 Regulations Relating to Verification and Certification Requirements for Certain Entities and Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions [TD 9852] (RIN: 1545-BL96) received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

628. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Reportable Transactions Penalties under Section 6707A [TD 9853] (RIN: 1545-BK62] received April 2, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 243. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of