he will continue to fight for what is best for Colorado and the whole country.

EQUALITY FOR RESIDENTS OF NATION'S CAPITAL

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, D.C. makes a big deal of Emancipation Day. That is the day that Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in the Nation's Capital 9 months before the Emancipation Proclamation freed the rest.

You will forgive us if we say that it is hardly enough that more than 150 years later, the residents of your Nation's Capital, White and Black, are number one in Federal taxes paid to support this Republic but have no final vote, like the vote just cast in this House on the House floor, and no Senators whatsoever.

Emancipation Day will mark the day when we will celebrate H.R. 51 to make the District of Columbia the 51st State.

Lincoln freed the slaves in the District of Columbia. Congress must pass H.R. 51 to make freedom mean equality for the residents of your Nation's Capital with all other Americans.

□ 1215

HONORING BAYLOR UNIVERSITY LADY BEARS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. FLORES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Kim Mulkey and her Baylor University Lady Bears for winning the 2019 NCAA Women's National Basketball Championship, their third national championship in 14 years.

''Together to Tampa'' was the adopted slogan for the team, and that is exactly what they did: they played together as a team to get to Tampa and they won together as a team in Tampa.

The Lady Bears played an incredible season, ending with an overall record of 37 and 1, and a 29-game winning streak.

It was also a monumental season for Coach Mulkey, who eclipsed the 550 career wins mark and is now only the third women's basketball coach to win at least three national championships.

Congratulations to Coach Mulkey, the Lady Bears Basketball Team, Baylor University, and all of Baylor Nation on another national championship.

Sic 'em, Bears.

HONORING WAYNE LLOYD VAN RIPER

(Mr. FULCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Wayne Lloyd Van Riper to this great country.

Wayne Van Riper is a veteran of World War II and is celebrating his 95th birthday on April 16. During his service in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1945, his efforts were instrumental in providing support to the 293rd Combat Engineer Battalion, A Company.

Wayne was born in the State of Washington in 1924. After enlisting after high school, Wayne served in George S. Patton's Third Army. Entering Active Duty in 1943, Wayne served valiantly in England, France, Germany, and was on his way to Japan, but Japan surrendered before he arrived there in 1945.

After the war, Wayne attended Oregon State University, and purchased a pear and apple orchard in Oregon. There he met the love of his life, Wanda Johnson, and married her in August of 1948. They have a daughter, Teresa Rae Lash, and a son, Kevin Wayne Van Riper. Later he retired and moved to McCall, Idaho.

On behalf of the people of Idaho and America, I thank Wayne for his military service and wish him all the best on his 95th birthday.

SUPPORT DAVID BERNHARDT AS SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration's notoriously rocky relationship with Congress, and even his own party, meant that he had to resort to overregulations to get stuff done. His pen and a phone approach resulted in considerable executive branch overreach.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a nominee for Secretary of the Interior who is the exact opposite. David Bernhardt is a lawyer who understands exactly what powers and authorities his department is granted under the law and will never overstep those authorities.

During the shutdown, for example, he expertly used the authorities under FLREA—whatever those initials represent—to keep many of America's parks open, even as other agencies were closed for business. It is this kind of thinking—putting Americans and those who visit public lands first during tough times—that makes David a talented public servant. He will be an incredible Secretary of the Interior, and I urge the Senate to speedily confirm him.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SOMALIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116–27)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, with respect to Somalia is to continue in effect beyond April 12, 2019.

The United States is strongly committed to Somalia's stabilization, and it is important to maintain sanctions against persons undermining its stability. The situation with respect to Somalia continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 2019.*

NET NEUTRALITY

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, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

CONGRATULATING STEVEN KANDARIAN

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Steven Kandarian on his retirement from MetLife after serving as chairman of the board, president, and chief executive officer for the last 8 years.

After Steve Kandarian earned his undergraduate degree from Clark University, his JD from Georgetown University, and his MBA from Harvard Business School, he began his career as an investment banker before founding and serving as managing partner of Orion Partners, a private equity firm based in Boston.

Mr. Speaker, between 2001 and 2004, Mr. Kandarian was executive director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the PBGC. During his time at the PBGC, he made the case for comprehensive reform of the pension funding rules to put the defined benefit system and the PBGC on a sound financial footing. His efforts helped lay the

groundwork for the enactment of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

In 2005, Kandarian joined MetLife as executive vice president and chief investment officer. And from 2007 to 2012, he led MetLife's enterprise-wide strategy.

Under Mr. Kandarian's leadership during this time, MetLife identified the housing bubble early and reduced its exposure to the 2008 financial crisis. His efforts helped MetLife emerge from the credit crisis with the financial strength to complete the company's $16.4 billion purchase of Alico from AIG. This cemented the company's position as a leading U.S.-based global life insurer.

When Mr. Kandarian became President and CEO of MetLife in 2011, and later chairman of the board of directors in 2012, his leadership saw the company expand into North Carolina, my home State. And, in fact, MetLife expanded and became a leading company in my part of North Carolina because of Mr. Kandarian's efforts. With its growing presence in Cary, North Carolina, MetLife now employs many of my constituents at their Global Technology and Operations hub. In fact, over 2,000 North Carolinians go to work every day in MetLife in Cary, North Carolina.

And MetLife also has had a long history of giving back to the community in North Carolina. Since they began hiring in Cary in 2013, employees have contributed thousands of volunteer hours to local service projects like Habitat for Humanity. And the MetLife Foundation has made grants exceeding $2 million to support a number of community programs, like those that serve disabled veterans, as well as serving emerging innovations with local technology engineers. None of that would have been possible without Steve Kandarian's leadership at MetLife.

Mr. Kandarian has also been a leader in the policy realm, championing tax reform that resisted the status quo and in pursuing financial services regulation that targeted risky activities rather than entities. His successful challenge of MetLife's designation as a systemically important financial institution was emblematic of the worthwhile quest to find the right regulatory balance, not regulation at any cost.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Kandarian on his long and successful career, and I wish him and his family well in his retirement from MetLife.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from North Carolina's words.

Today, we voted on a bill referred to as net neutrality. It is a position that was taken up by the Federal Communications Commission back during the Obama administration. It was quite interesting. During the Obama administration, President Obama had said he would not allow the FCC to take over control of the internet, and then apparently was convinced otherwise and eventually made clear to the FCC they would take over control of the internet.

I know the bill is referred to as net neutrality, but it is anything but neutral. It is government control of the internet. And, yes, I realize that the internet has produced some billionaires who are tremendous contributors to the Democratic Party, but, to me and to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, it is more an issue of independence of this incredible invention of the internet. If it creates more billionaires that happen to become Democrats, so be it. But let's leave the internet free.

Net neutrality does not leave it free. It is government controlled. And that is what the new chairman, Chairman Pai, undid. He said: We are backing off. This is an executive position taken by the executive branch during the Obama administration and we are now, as an executive branch, taking our hands off of the internet so that people are free to become billionaires, but we are not going to pick and choose winners, which means the government chooses losers, as well.

There was a good article by James Gattuso on March 11, 2019. He said:

''Just over 1 year ago, the Federal Communications Commission voted 3–2 to repeal the network neutrality rules it adopted in 2015.''

That is such a misnomer, net neutrality.

''However, the FCC regulation could make a comeback if House Democrats have their way.

''Lawmakers in the House and Senate introduced legislation Thursday to restore the rule.''

That is from last week.

''Sponsored by Senator Ed Markey, a Democrat from Massachusetts, and Representative Mike Doyle, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, the 3-page bill makes no attempt to modify or improve the 2015 rule. It simply declares that the 2017 order repealing net neutrality 'shall have no force or effect.'

''Formally titled the 'Open Internet Order,' the FCC imposed the rule 4 years ago under its Democratic chairman, Tom Wheeler. But the political battle over net neutrality has gone on close to 17 years.

''A Columbia University law professor, Tim Wu, coined the term 'net neutrality' in 2002. Wu argued that because internet service providers such as Comcast and AT&T enjoy near-bottleneck control over the traffic going to web users, they should be prohibited from favoring any web content over another.

''In other words, according to Wu, internet service providers should be required to treat content providers neutrally.

''But regulation can make problems of its own. Today's market for internet access is not perfectly competitive, but it is also clearly not a monopoly. Most Americans have the ability to choose from at least two service providers.''

And this gets critical here. It says:

''In addition, net neutrality would do nothing to increase the number of companies that compete in the market for access. In fact, it could make it harder for new entrants to compete effectively with existing market leaders.

''That's because one of the best ways to get a foothold in a market is to differentiate your service.''

It is called competition. This goes on to say:

''For instance, T-Mobile to differentiate itself in its struggle to compete with industry leaders AT&T and Verizon, pioneered 'zero rating' pricing plans that allow free access to content from participating content providers without incurring a charge against your data cap.''

□ 1230

''T-Mobile's free-data option has made wireless broadband available to millions at affordable rates. Zero-rating, nevertheless, has been condemned by many as a violation of net neutrality and could be banned, should Congress restore the rule.''

Now, that is what is so amazing about this term, ''net neutrality.'' It means the government could, and probably would, say to somebody like T-Mobile—and I don't have their service. I don't have a dog in that fight. But they could say to an entity like T-Mobile: Look, we are not going to let you have a no-charge access to data through your plan, through your wireless plan. No, that won't work. You have to charge something.

If this net neutrality—so-called, which, when you hear ''net neutrality,'' it ought to mean, in your mind, government-controlled, because it is actually antithetical to what it says it is. It is government-controlled.

But that would say to somebody who is trying to break into the market, they would say: Okay. We would give you free access, no cost, no data cap, so that we could get into the market, develop customers. They would be loyal to us.

No, the government wants net neutrality/government control to be back in place. They can say: You can't do that. We are not going to let you become competitive with the two companies that control the lion's share of the internet.

The government shouldn't be in that business. Let it be competitive.

It just seems every time the government gets its hands on something that has been as productive as the internet, it chokes it; it overwhelms it with regulation. That has been one of the beauties of the internet.

So, as this article says: ''Net neutrality''—government-controlled—''is not needed to save the internet but, in fact, could jeopardize it.

''The FCC was right to reject the net neutrality''—or government-controlled—''rules completely. Congress should do the same.''

Even though it has passed the House, 13 Democrats voted with the Republicans, who said: Look, let's at least

add a provision to this bill that forbids the government from taxing, just completely forbids it, so you can't tax the internet. For internet service, you're not going to tax internet service.

And so that was bipartisan. We had 13 Democrats vote with us. We don't want to tax the internet service.

But, unfortunately, it was narrowly defeated by a majority, being all Democrats voted to allow the potential to tax the internet.

So that ought to tell you, basically, what you need to know about net neutrality. It is going to be a way, number one, for government control and, number two, to eventually get around to providing revenue—that means taxes—on what has not been taxed so far.

GREG WALDEN, who is managing this bill, had a good article. He said: ''Net neutrality is a bipartisan issue in Congress. Despite the overheated rhetoric and the political talking points, Democrats actually agree with me and my Republican colleagues on the key net neutrality parameters that protect a free and open internet for consumers.

''Democrats agree with Republicans that internet traffic should not be blocked. There is bipartisan support for prohibiting the blocking of illegal content on the internet.

''Democrats agree with Republicans that internet service providers should not be allowed to impair or degrade lawful internet traffic on the basis of content''—as long as it is legal—''a process known as throttling. There is bipartisan support for prohibiting the throttling of illegal content on the internet.''

But it goes on to say: ''Democrats, however, believe that net neutrality can only be achieved by regulating the internet as if it were a utility under title II of the Communications Act, which was originally used to govern monopoly telephone companies in the 1930s. The 'Save the Net Act,' imposes the heavy hand of Washington's regulatory bureaucracy over the single most important driver of economic growth, job creation, and a better quality of life for all Americans. This will do everything but save the internet.

'' 'Title II' sounds inconsequential, but layering this new national governance over the web''—over the internet—''would give the Federal Communications Commission unbridled regulatory authority'' over the internet. ''The government would have the power to tax the internet''—because most of the Democrats voted to allow taxing the internet—and it would allow them to ''dictate where and when new broadband networks can be deployed and take over the management of private networks.''

In a rural district like his in eastern Oregon, ''title II inhibited the ability of small internet service providers to expand broadband to underserved communities, saddling these small businesses with onerous reporting requirements that shifted their focus from their customers to new, expensive regulatory interference. Nationwide, title II had a chilling effect on internet investment, which declined for the first time since the dawn of the internet age, decreasing consumer choice and increasing the digital divide.''

As GREG WALDEN says: ''Fortunately, we do not need title II to achieve real net neutrality. Republicans have put forth serious proposals—a menu of options—that would keep the internet open and free, so it can continue to be a driver of opportunity for all.''

But that means, since it just passed the House, we are going to need to count on the Senate not to take up more government control of the internet but, instead, to take up a bill that does keep things fair instead of having more government control and potentially taxing the internet usage.

I shift to another topic, since Attorney General Barr testified this week, may be testifying again. It is interesting, as more information comes rolling out about the Muellergate.

This article from the Daily Caller, from Chuck Ross, ''Cambridge Academic Reflects on Interactions with 'Spygate' Figure.'' Her name is Svetlana Lokhova. She says she ''did not get along with Stefan Halper, which is what she says made a dinner invitation to the Cambridge University professor's home in January 2016 all the more peculiar.

'' 'Halper was a lurking presence with a horrible aura—I avoided him,' said Lokhova, a Cambridge postgraduate student who studies Soviet-era espionage.

''Lokhova dodged the invitation to Halper's home, which she said was sent to her by Christopher Andrew, a Cambridge professor and official historian for MI5, the British domestic intelligence service. But the past 3 years have revealed new details about Halper and other activities that went on at Cambridge that have caused Lokhova to question why she was asked to that dinner at Halper's.

''For one, a series of stories that appeared in the press in early 2017 heavily implied Lokhova was a Russian agent who tried to suborn Michael Flynn at a dinner hosted at Cambridge on February 28, 2014. Flynn served at the time as Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

''A year after those stories appeared, The Daily Caller News Foundation reported Halper cozied up to three Trump campaign advisers: Carter Page, Sam Clovis, and George Papadopoulos.''

Isn't that interesting? Those are the ones—particularly Carter Page and George Papadopoulos. Those are the people that the Department of Justice and FBI used to claim there were some kind of ties to Russia when, now, we are finding out it was Fusion GPS. It was Bruce Ohr at the FBI, his wife Nellie Ohr, working with Fusion GPS and working with foreign agents, former foreign agent, also, we know, from MI6.

But, apparently, they are working with the British Government in trying to create reasons that the FBI could go before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, FISA's secret Star Chamber, and get warrants to spy on the Trump campaign.

It all started to come out. This is somebody who is now described—or has been, in the last 2 years: Oh, this was a Russian agent. It turns out, she was being manipulated by MI5 and by people, as we will be finding out, with the Justice Department, FBI, Clinton campaign, to try to set up so that they could go after the Trump campaign officials, spy on them, and potentially bring down the Trump campaign as an insurance policy just in case the unthinkable happened and Donald Trump were elected President.

The article goes on: ''A year after those stories appeared,'' as it says, ''Halper cozied to three Trump campaign advisers. . . . In May 2018, Halper was revealed as a longtime CIA and FBI informant, a revelation that led President Donald Trump to accuse the FBI of planting a spy in his campaign. The Republican coined the term 'Spygate' to describe the alleged scandal.

''After Halper's links to American intelligence were revealed, The New York Times and The Washington Post reported he and another Cambridge luminary, former MI6 chief Richard Dearlove, raised concerns about Lokhova's contacts with Flynn that were subsequently passed to American and British intelligence.''

Far bigger than Watergate, because Watergate concerned people hired by the committee to reelect Richard Nixon, when this involves the spies owned, controlled, and former spies of the British Government working in collusion with the FBI, the Clinton campaign, Fusion GPS.

It says: ''Lokhova blames Halper for distorting her brief interaction with Flynn into, 'an international espionage scandal' in which she wound up as collateral damage.

''What Halper staged is a textbook 'black-op' to dirty up the reputation of a political opponent. He needed an innocuous social event to place Flynn in a room with a woman who was ethnically Russian''—I was unlucky to be picked.

''Lokhova, a dual Russian and British citizen, has spoken out before about Halper and the allegations about her in the media. She accused Halper of making 'false' and 'absurd' claims about her in 2018 interviews with TheDCNF. She has also taken to Twitter to criticize the reporters who published allegations about her and Flynn.''

□ 1245

''The Guardian's Luke Harding is one target of Lokhova's ire. She has criticized the British reporter for a March 31, 2017, story that contained thinly veiled allegations she tried to compromise Flynn.

''According to the report, which was based on anonymous sources, American

and British intelligence developed concerns about Lokhova's interactions with Flynn at the February 2014 dinner, which was hosted by the Cambridge Intelligence Seminar. Halper, Dearlove, and Andrew are co-conveners of the seminar, which hosts events for current and former spies.''

Halper, Dearlove, and Andrew, they appear to be the ones who should have been spied on, but, instead, they are the ones being used by British intelligence, working together with the FBI, the Department of Justice, Fusion GPS, Bruce Ohr, Nellie Ohr, and the Clinton campaign, to come after Donald Trump.

''The Wall Street Journal also published an innuendo-laden story March 18, 2017, about Flynn and Lokhova. The hook for the story was that Flynn had failed to report his contact with Lokhova to the Defense Intelligence Agency.

''Lokhova, who has lived in the U.K. since 1998, vehemently denies the insinuations in the articles that she is a Russian agent or that she tried to seduce Flynn. She has provided emails and photographs to TheDCNF to help back up her case. She also notes that all of the allegations about her have been made anonymously.

''Dan O'Brien, a Defense Intelligence Agency official who accompanied Flynn to the Cambridge event, told TheWSJ he saw nothing untoward involving Lokhova. Lokhova's partner, David North, has told TheDCNF he picked Lokhova up after the event.

''Since learning more about Halper, Lokhova has reflected back on the few interactions she had with him over the years at Cambridge.

''A veteran of three Republican administrations, Halper joined Cambridge in 2001. From his perch at the stories university, Halper wrote books about American politics and the geopolitical threat that China poses to the West. He also received over $1 million in contracts from the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment to write studies on Russia, China, and Afghanistan.''

It is interesting, as an aside, but Adam Lovinger was working for the Defense Department, and his job was to look for improprieties within the Defense Department. He noticed these million-dollar contracts going to Stefan Halper and said: Wait a minute. We are paying this guy $1 million? We are not getting anything for it. What is this about?

And for that, the Obama administration crushed Adam Lovinger. He was an honest whistleblower. He wasn't even a whistleblower. He was doing his job, which was to look for improprieties. He found things that raised questions. He raised the questions about: Why is Stefan Halper being paid all of this money? We are not getting anything from this guy that helped the Pentagon. Why is he getting a million bucks from the Pentagon?

Well, unfortunately, for Adam Lovinger, he stepped on a land mine, and the Obama administration set out to get him fired and to destroy him for noticing the impropriety—at least, it appeared to be an impropriety; that is why he brought it up—that involved Stefan Halper that was used by the Obama administration Justice Department, FBI, Fusion GPS to help them set up the Trump campaign.

''Lokhova says she first remembers seeing Halper in November 2013, when she gave a talk about her research on Soviet-era spy archives.''

She said: '' 'The guy looks at us like we're completely horrible people, and then gets up and sits across the room.'

''Lokhova also said she learned from a Cambridge faculty member that Halper was spreading rumors that she was linked to Russian intelligence.''

Anyway, it just shows how outrageous the conduct has been that we are now beginning to find out about. And, certainly, it was high time, after 2 years of finding nothing for which the Mueller special counsel office was set up, hiring people who hated Trump, they couldn't find anything. They couldn't find evidence that they could take to a grand jury and get an indictment.

And that is just probable cause. That is not beyond a reasonable doubt standard.

And, certainly, because Mueller couldn't stand the man who—24 hours before Mueller was offered the special counsel job, he had been begging President Trump to make him the Director of the FBI again. President Trump turned him down. Twenty-four hours later, he jumps at the chance, although he certainly should have recused himself. He was conflicted in far too many ways to be a special counsel on something involving Russia. He jumped at the chance to investigate the guy who refused to hire him.

Another article from Catherine Herridge. And Catherine Herridge has done extraordinary work looking into these different issues.

She points out that: ''Russian woman claims she was manipulated into entrapping General Flynn.''

''A Russian-born academic who was at the center of attention in 2017 for past contact with former National Security Adviser Michael Flynn told FOX News in an exclusive interview that she is not a spy for Moscow—and, to the contrary, believes she was 'used' to smear Flynn.''

She said: ''I think there's a high chance that it was coordinated, and I believe it needs to be properly investigated.''

So Catherine has done good work on that.

And then an article from Jason Beale from The Federalist, entitled: ''How Obama Holdover Sally Yates Helped Sink Michael Flynn.''

And of course, we know Sally Yates was working as the Deputy Attorney General, and she refused to defend constitutional activity by the Trump administration, so she was fired. Unfortunately, there were people who were totally devoted to Sally Yates, couldn't stand Trump, some of whom are still at the Department of Justice undermining the Trump administration.

But this goes on to say, '' . . . Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates made a couple of urgent trips from the Department of Justice building to the White House, carrying information she believed to be critical to U.S. national security.

''Yates was aware, likely through intercepts of Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak's communications, that the newly seated national security advisor, retired Lieutenant General Michael Flynn, had discussed with Kislyak Russia's response to the Obama administration imposition of sanctions for Russia's attempts to meddle in the 2016 elections. According to news reports, Flynn had asked Kislyak to wait a few weeks and allow the incoming Trump administration a chance to review the issue before Russia retaliated. Flynn's conversations with Kislyak occurred on December 29, the day Obama announced the sanctions.

''Recall that this period between the election of Trump in early November and his inauguration in late January was characterized by a frenzy of questionable and as-yet unexplained actions taken by the Obama White House, intelligence agencies, and the State Department. The Steele dossier was in circulation at various levels of government and media officialdom; Carter Page's communications—and those of anyone with whom he communicated, and anyone with whom they communicated—were being monitored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and National Security Agency.

''The great unmasking had also begun, with unprecedented numbers of requests forwarded from various Obama administration officials to the NSA to reveal the identities of American citizens otherwise protected in their reporting and transcribing of intercepts of foreign official communications. Distribution regulations were relaxed to allow wider access to these NSA intercepts, and the word went out throughout the halls of every government agency to get everything into the system, lest these barbarians coming into office destroy evidence and deny their roles as Russian agents.

''It was inevitable, then, that David Ignatius of The Washington Post would publish a column on January 12 describing Flynn's December 29 phone calls with Kislyak, information he attributed to 'a senior U.S. Government official.' Ignatius' column began thusly:

'' 'Something is rotten in the state of Denmark,' mutters Marcellus as ghosts and mad spirits haunt Elsinore castle in the first act of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet.'

''After this past week of salacious leaks about foreign espionage plots and indignant denials, people must be wondering if something is rotten in the

state of our democracy. How can we dispel the dark rumors that, as Hamlet says, 'shake our disposition'?

''The 'senior U.S. Government official' who leaked both the name of a U.S. citizen captured in an intercept of a foreign government official's communications, and the fact that the foreign official was under NSA surveillance, has not been identified. Nor has there been any indication that a thorough investigation has been, or is being, carried out in search of his or her identity.''

It is a crime. What happened to smear Flynn and the Trump campaign involved crimes by senior DOJ officials. Perhaps it was Sally Yeats who committed the crime, perhaps others, but it needs to be investigated, and there was no way in this world that Robert Mueller was going to investigate anything to do with corruption in the Obama administration.

There it was, all of these leaks that were clear, most of them. Each of them would have been a crime. There is plenty of evidence there to support that. But, instead, Special Counsel Robert Mueller pursued things and got indictments for things that made clear we didn't need a special counsel to do what Bob Mueller was doing.

If you look back, there is nothing he did, nothing he produced that could not have been done without a special counsel's office. In fact, he ended up having to pass some stuff off to the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York.

Even as badly compromised as Bob Mueller was from even being special counsel, he recognized he had gone beyond his limits, as broad as they were, and needed to pass some of those things off.

There is another article here from Brooke Singman, ''DOJ Watchdog Reportedly Scrutinizing Role of FBI Informant in the Russia Probe.''

It talks about: '' . . . Inspector General Michael Horwitz is looking into informant Stefan Halper's work during the Russia probe, as well as his work with the FBI prior to the start of that probe.''

And the article goes on to talk about Halper. I mean, he was used to try to set up Michael Flynn. He was used to try to set up Papadopoulos. He was used to try to set up Sam Clovis.

That was the insurance policy that Peter Strzok and Lisa Page texted, lovingly, back and forth about, although, to the ignorance of Peter Strzok's wife.

Some people think, when I asked Peter Strzok in our Judiciary Committee hearing about him having that same smirk the hundreds of times he lied to his wife, that that was inappropriate; it violated the rules.

Well, the rules in our committees are extremely relaxed compared to rules in a jury trial of which I have had many as a litigant and as a judge. I know the rules.

□ 1300

I know the rules, and I heard him in his deposition talk about how he never lies, he just always tells the truth. I knew he was lying when he said basically that he remembered Frank Rucker, the investigator for the intelligence inspector general, coming over and advising about something, but he didn't remember what it was about.

I guarantee you, he was lying when he said that because Frank Rucker went over—and it is now public. I knew at the time, but it has now been made public. It was China, and the intelligence inspector general knew China was getting every email going in and out of Hillary Clinton's private server.

Since Strzok and others apparently had protected information about what happened with her server, here comes the intelligence inspector general's investigator who discovered the fact that her private server had been compromised. He rushes over with Janette McMillan from the intelligence community. She was an attorney.

They briefed Dean Chappell, who was the FBI liaison with intel, and the FBI's head of counterintelligence, Peter Strzok, and he tells him: Look, we now have proof positive Hillary Clinton's private server was hacked. We found this anomaly in there.

As I dug in to figure out what this thing is, it was an embedded placement in the server that directed every email coming in and every email going out of Hillary Clinton's private server, which we also know contained classified information, and directed it to go to a known front organization for the Chinese Government.

Peter Strzok, after all the protection he tried to afford Hillary Clinton, is going to sit there and lie and say: Well, I remember Frank Rucker coming over and telling us something, but I don't really remember what it was.

He remembered very well what Frank Rucker said. That was a lie. Since he has said previously that he told the truth, then any time he had ever told a lie, it would have been admissible in front of a jury. Even with the more restricted rules of evidence, you could have asked about every time he ever lied. I just chose to make one blanket question about the hundreds of times he lied to his wife. He does not always tell the truth. He is a liar, and he lied there under oath.

That wasn't the only thing. Yes, David Ignatius participated as a recipient of criminal—of a crime, really—sending him leaked information from either the Justice Department, FBI, or NSA. Any one of them that submitted information to him committed a crime. We need to know who it was. We need to know how deep and how far these crimes committed by our people who are supposed to be investigating crimes, not committing them, how far this goes.

Now that Mueller will be out of the picture, I think we have a chance to get those things determined. As long as he was there, then these folks were protected. But now that he is finished wasting America's money and time, we can start getting down to investigating the real crimes that occurred.

I want to finish. I got a copy of a wonderful book, really interesting, called ''Dark Agenda'' by David Horowitz. I was in his presence once, and I introduced him as—he was a former socialist. David Horowitz turned 80 this year. He said: No, I was a communist. I was a complete communist. I was one of those rebelling in the sixties. I was part of the riots and all those things.

He came to understand that communism doesn't work. It never has. Socialism doesn't work. Margaret Thatcher said that the reason it doesn't work is that, eventually, you run out of other people's money.

I would submit that the answer I got at a Russian—well, Ukrainian—collective farm back in the seventies. I said: Why aren't you out working in the field? It is midmorning.

The farmer says: I make the same number of rubles if I am out there in the sun as I do in the shade, so I stay in the shade.

Those who are crazy enough to work while others are getting paid the same as them eventually quit working, and the whole system falls. It always does.

It sounds wonderful, share and share alike. Isn't that socialism and communism? Isn't that wonderful? Share and share alike.

A Christian ought to be in favor of that, except it requires in this world a totalitarian government strong enough and powerful enough to take from those who earn and give to those who don't and strong enough to suppress anybody who objects.

Eventually, it falls. It can't work. It never will work. It never has worked.

But David Horowitz deals with another subject here in ''Dark Agenda,'' and I think it is worth hearing his words themselves.

The first chapter is named ''Religion Must Die.''

He starts: ''On Sunday morning, November 5, 2017, a gunman walked into the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas. He wore tactical gear and a black face mask marked with a white skull, and he carried a semiautomatic rifle. He shot and killed two people outside the church, then went inside, walking up and down the aisle, cursing and shooting people in the pews. He reloaded again and again, emptying 15 magazines of ammunition.

''When the gunman emerged from the church, he found an armed citizen facing him from across the street, a former NRA firearms instructor named Stephen Willeford. The two men exchanged fire, and Willeford hit the gunman in the leg and upper body. The wounded shooter limped to his car and sped away. He was later found at the wheel of his crashed car, killed by a self-inflicted gunshot to the head.

''The attack killed 26 people, ages 5 to 72, and wounded 20. The killer had been court-martialed in the Air Force for domestic violence. He had beaten his wife and cracked the skull of his infant stepson. The Air Force failed to

report his conviction to the FBI's crime information database.''

Parenthetically, we didn't need new laws. We just needed for people to obey the laws we had. The Air Force violated the law, and this guy got his gun as a result. The Air Force failed to obey the law and report this to the FBI's crime information database. He got a gun and did destruction.

Horowitz said: ''The slaughter of unarmed Christians in a church sanctuary was a cowardly attack on one church. But what happened after the church shooting was part of a wider war by the political left against Christians and Christianity.

''As news of the shooting broke, prominent Christians took to Twitter and urged fellow believers to pray. Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, a devout Roman Catholic, tweeted, 'Reports out of Texas are devastating. The people of Sutherland Springs need our prayers right now.'

''From Hollywood to New York and Washington, the left responded with a chorus of jeers and insults. Former MSNBC political commentator Keith Olbermann suggested in a tweet that Speaker Ryan should proctologize himself with his prayers.

''Seattle Democrat Representative PRAMILA JAYAPAL tweeted, 'They were praying when it happened. They don't need our prayers. They need us to address gun violence.' Comedian Paula Poundstone sneered, 'If prayers were the answer' to mass shootings, 'wouldn't people at a church service be safe?' Actor Wil Wheaton tweeted, 'The murdered victims were in a church. If prayers did anything, they would still be alive, you worthless sack of. . . . '

''These and other comments from the secular left displayed not only a smug disdain for Christians but an amazing ignorance of how religious Christians view prayer.''

Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that David Horowitz has been an atheist—he is Jewish—and he is writing this book. Amazing.

''Christians don't view prayer as a magic incantation to make themselves bulletproof. Christians believe in the teachings of Christ who warned them: 'In the world ye shall have tribulation.' In the Garden of Gethsemane, Christ prayed to be delivered from the agony of the cross, but He ended His prayer, 'Nevertheless not my will, but Thine, be done.' The answer to Christ's prayer was silence, and He was later crucified on a Roman cross.

''In her commentary on the church shooting, MSNBC host Joy-Ann Reid tweeted that 'when Jesus of Nazareth came upon thousands of hungry people,' He didn't pray. He fed the people.''

Horowitz said: ''She is simply wrong. Matthew 14:19 records that, before Jesus fed the people, He looked heavenward and prayed. Jesus prayed and He acted. That is how His followers still view prayer. They pray and they act.

''At around the same time Joy-Ann Reid was tweeting, the Billy Graham Rapid Response Team was already in action, rolling into Sutherland Springs with 16 chaplains to comfort grieving families and help meet their material needs. Two days after the shooting, the Southern Baptist Convention announced it would pay all funeral expenses for the 26 slain churchgoers.

''Because this is a world made by flawed human beings, it will continue to be a world of tribulations. There will be more shootings, attacks, fires, floods, earthquakes, and other tragedies. Christians will call for prayer, and leftists will mock them for it, imagining there are solutions that can perfect this life and regarding Christians as the enemies of that perfection.

''Since its birth in the fires of the French Revolution, the political left has been at war with religion and with the Christian religion in particular.''

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is really interesting coming from an atheist Jewish individual.

Horowitz said: ''In a symbolic revolutionary act, the Jacobin leaders of the French Revolution changed the name of the Cathedral of Notre Dame to the 'Temple of Reason.' Then, in the name of 'reason,' they proceeded to massacre the inhabitants of the Vendee region of west-central France because its citizens were Catholics.

''This has been called the first modern genocide, but it was far from the last. Karl Marx famously described religion as 'the opium of the people' and 'the sigh of the oppressed.' Inspired by his hatred ever since, revolutionaries have regarded religion as the enemy of progress and the mask of oppression.

''In Russia, Marx's disciples removed religious teaching from the schools, outlawed criticism of atheists and agnostics, and burned 100,000 churches. When priests demanded freedom of religion, they were sentenced to death. Between 1917 and 1935, 130,000 Russian Orthodox priests were arrested, 95,000 of whom were executed by firing squad.

''Radicals in America today don't have the political power to execute religious people and destroy their houses of worship. Yet they openly declare their desire to obliterate religion. In their own minds, their intentions are noble. They want to save the human race from the social injustice and oppression that religion allegedly inflicts on humanity.

'''Religion must die in order for mankind to live,' proclaimed left-wing commentator and comedian Bill Maher in 'Religulous,' the most-watched documentary feature of 2008. Both title and script were transparent attempts to stigmatize religious people as dangerous morons whose views could not be taken seriously.

''Throughout the film, Maher travels to Jerusalem, the Vatican, and Salt Lake City, as well as other centers of religion, interviewing believers and making them appear foolish. How did he gain interviews with his victims? He lied to them, saying he was making a film called 'A Spiritual Journey.'

''According to Maher, 'The irony of religion is that because of its power to divert man to destructive courses, the world could actually come to an end.' He predicts the destruction of the human race as a result of 'religion-inspired nuclear terrorism.' Hence the need for religion to die if mankind is to live.

''Maher's views accurately reflect the attitudes of a movement called the 'New Atheism,' whose leaders are prominent scientists and best-selling authors, far superior in intellect to Maher but equally contemptuous of religion and religious believers.''

□ 1315

''Like Maher's film, the New Atheism movement seeks to discredit all religious belief by caricaturing its adherents as simpletons, and worse. The stated goal of the New Atheism is to delegitimize and extinguish the religious point of view.

''Maher's suggestion that religion—and evidently religion alone—threatens the existence of the human race is simply malicious. Both he and the New Atheists are blind to all the positive influences religion has had on human behavior, and they ignore all the atheist-inspired genocides of the last 250 years. In the 20th century alone, Communist atheists slaughtered more than 100 million people in Russia, China, and Indochina. Not even the bloodthirsty jihadists of radical Islam have killed innocents on anything close to such a scale.

''It's striking that Maher and the New Atheists ignore the appalling body count of Marxism—an ideology that is explicitly atheistic, whose atrocities were committed in the name of social justice. According to Maher, it is religious people who are 'irrationalists,' and dangerous because they 'steer the ship of state not by a compass, but by the equivalent of reading the entrails of a chicken.' Yet civilization was built and improved by such irrationalists—believers like Locke, Newton, Washington, Wilberforce, Sojourner Truth, and Abraham Lincoln. For the five millennia of recorded history, with few exceptions the most rational, compassionate, and successful decision-makers, both military and civilian, have been people guided by a belief in God, including some whose spiritual compass took the form of reading the entrails of a chicken.''

That is David Horowitz' sense of humor.

''Near the end of Maher's rant, he pauses to address any religionist who may have unwittingly strayed into the cinema where 'Religulous' was playing: 'Look in the mirror and realize that the solace and comfort that religion brings you actually comes at a terrible price. If you belonged to a political party or a social club that was tied to as much bigotry, misogyny, homophobia, violence, and sheer ignorance as religion is, you'd resign in protest.'''

Horowitz says: ''How myopic. And the crimes and horrors committed by atheism? From the French Revolution to the Bolshevik, from the Vendee to Vietnam, the bigotries and atrocities committed by the forces of godlessness match and even outweigh those committed by the forces of godliness. If a history of violence, persecution, and murder serves to discredit an ideology, why hasn't Maher resigned in protest from the party of atheism?''

I appreciate those brilliant, insightful observations by an atheist Jew, who is a friend. Amazing from a man who is an overt, unapologetic, rebellious communist, to now having written a good account of the war to destroy Christian America.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 5(a)4(A) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Ethics for the 116th Congress:

Ms. BONAMICI, Oregon
Mr. HIGGINS, New York
Mr. KEATING, Massachusetts
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
Mr. PERLMUTTER, Colorado
Mr. RASKIN, Maryland
Ms. SEWELL, Alabama
Mr. SOTO, Florida
Ms. TITUS, Nevada

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 9, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X, I am pleased to appoint the following Republican Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Ethics for the 116th Congress:

The Honorable BILL FLORES of Texas.
The Honorable JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.
The Honorable PETE OLSON of Texas.
The Honorable ANN WAGNER of Missouri.
The Honorable JOHN KATKO of New York.
The Honorable BEN CLINE of Virginia.
The Honorable BILL HUIZENGA of Michigan.
The Honorable DAVID ROUZER of North Carolina.
The Honorable JOHN H. RUTHERFORD of Florida.
The Honorable VICKY HARTZLER of Missouri.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1839. An act to amend title XIX to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, establish a State Medicaid option to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through health homes, prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the Medicaid drug rebate program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2030. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and carry out agreements concerning Colorado River Drought Contingency Management and Operations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, April 12, 2019, at 2:30 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2018 and the first quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SADLOSKY, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 22, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Daniel Sadlosky	2/18	2/20	United Arab Emirates		1,111.89		*11,858.39				
	2/20	2/22	Saudi Arabia		957.32						13,927.60
Committee total					2,069.21		11,858.39				13,927.60

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
*Total air.

MR. DANIEL SADLOSKY, March 25, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Curtis	10/1	10/2	Germany		292.00		[3]				292.00
	10/2	10/4	Rwanda		578.00		[3]				578.00
	10/4	10/7	Botswana		693.00		[3]				693.00
	10/7	10/8	Angola		480.00		[3]				480.00
	10/8	10/9	Tunisia		179.00		[3]				179.00
	10/9	10/10	Portugal		322.00		[3]				322.00
Matthew Zweig	10/21	10/23	United Kingdom		925.18		4,234.04				5,159.22
	10/23	10/26	Israel		1,460.00						1,460.00
	10/26	10/29	Bahrain		900.53						900.53
Mira Resnick	10/25	10/29	Bahrain		1,697.89		2,969.43				4,667.32
Janice Kaguyutan	10/20	10/23	Japan		1,362.00		7,241.11				8,603.11
	10/23	10/26	South Korea		992.00						992.00
Amy Porter	10/20	10/23	Japan		1,378.31		6,220.86				7,599.17
	10/23	10/26	South Korea		1,002.32						1,002.32
Douglas Anderson	10/20	10/23	Japan		1,362.31		6,220.86				7,583.17
	10/23	10/26	South Korea		985.52						985.52
Megan Gallagher	11/5	11/10	Niger		688.21		6,771.14				7,459.35
Mark Iozzi	11/5	11/10	Niger		688.21		6,771.14				7,459.35
Kimberly Stanton	11/21	11/24	Switzerland		1,325.17		1,034.88				2,360.05
Hon. Norma Torres	10/22	10/24	Guatemala				1,120.63				1,120.63
Eric Jacobstein	10/22	10/24	Guatemala				531.63				531.63