

We intend to come forward with that, but we are trying to work to make sure that other suggestions are consistent with law, and we may move with those as well.

We haven't made that determination yet.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate it. I understand that there hasn't been any determination yet, but there is a growing frustration that this needs to be addressed by the Congress. There is a move to initiate a discharge petition to get that bill brought to the floor, so those discussions will continue.

Hopefully, we can address the problem of BDS not only in a resolution but also in legislation that has teeth in law to help those States that want to confront it and also to help, in a bigger way, our ally Israel.

My final point is on the process that we have seen. Of course, this week, there was only one bill that came under a rule. As far as amendments go, we have seen a growing trend toward shutting out Republican amendments.

If I can just go through it with the gentleman, as we have looked in this Congress, of the amendments that have come out of the Rules Committee, 74 percent of those amendments were Democratic amendments; 14 percent were Republican amendments; and 12 percent were bipartisan.

If I can compare it to the last Congress when we were in the majority, there were, in fact, more Democratic amendments than Republican amendments allowed. Forty-five percent of the amendments were Democratic; 38 percent were Republican in our Republican majority; and 17 percent were bipartisan.

When you compare last Congress when we were in the majority, we let more Democratic amendments to the floor than Republican amendments.

So far, we have seen a complete reversal of that, where our amendments have been shut out at a very high level, again, 74 percent to 14 percent.

I would ask if the gentleman can look at addressing this problem and try to bring some parity to the floor process as it relates to that disparity, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Of course, what the gentleman didn't say is that the last Congress had the most closed rules of any Congress in which I have served, the most closed Congress that we have served in, according to outside observers.

There were 30 amendments available to this bill. I am not sure how many were asked on the Democratic side or the Republican side, frankly. But having said that, there were Republican amendments made in order. Mr. MCGOVERN, the chairman of the Rules Committee, has said he intends to have as many amendments made in order as they believe consistent with getting our work done.

□ 1245

So I would say to the gentleman, unlike the last Congress, I think you will see closed rules be very much the exception while, frankly, they were very much the rule in the last Congress. But I take the gentleman's point, and I will have discussions with Mr. MCGOVERN. But as you know and I know he is one of the fairest Members in this House, and we will be trying to accommodate Members.

I will also say that the gentleman's statistics include the appropriations process, where there were a lot of amendments on both sides of the aisle. We have not gotten to the appropriations process. As you know, it is my intention that we get to the appropriations process and, frankly, try to conclude the appropriations process next month, and I am sure there are going to be a lot of amendments coming from both sides.

Mr. SCALISE. I hope when we get to that appropriations process that there would be open rules, as we did.

And I guess the gentleman doesn't have to worry about his majority breaking the record of closed rules, because this week we only had one rule, and, in fact, again, a modified rule, where over 30 of our amendments were shut out. Hopefully, more legislation starts moving through the process.

When we look at last Congress, we passed over 50 rules last Congress. So far, this Congress, only 34 rules. We actually had 30 bills signed into law at this point in the last Congress, 30 bills signed into law under our majority, only 16 signed into law here. Hopefully, we see more productivity as well as more openness in that process.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think the viewers and the Members of Congress are probably glazed over right now with these numbers, but I will tell the gentleman, there was not a single open rule in the House that was presided over by Paul Ryan, not one—not one. Check your record.

But as I say, Mr. MCGOVERN has clearly said that we want to have amendments made in order so that both sides can get a fair hearing, and I think he has been doing that, and I think he will continue to do it.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, as eyes are glazing over, for clarity, there were many rules where every single Democrat amendment was included. So if you want to call it a modified rule, closed rule—for people watching, when Republicans and Democrats go to the Rules Committee to try to amend a bill, when every single Democrat amendment is allowed in, that is an open process.

Today, for example, the only rule today, over 30 Republican amendments were shut out—over 30 were shut out. So, many times we had rules where every single Democrat amendment was allowed. In the last Congress, more

Democrat amendments were allowed than Republican amendments.

But this, hopefully, can get addressed and corrected, and maybe when we get to an appropriations process, it will be more fair in that regard.

With that, I look forward to next week, hopefully get some of those things done.

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

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, we had an interesting debate and interesting vote today regarding the Paris climate change agreement that is a treaty. It hasn't been properly treated like a treaty, just like the Iran treaty was a treaty.

No matter whether the House or the Senate agreed to violate the Constitution and treat the Iran treaty in exactly the opposite format as required by the Constitution, it doesn't matter. It was treaty. It was never properly ratified.

It doesn't matter whether it was a Republican or a Democrat who came up with the bill. A Republican Senator or House Member cannot come up with a bill that changes the Constitution and say: Do you know what? We are going to take this treaty and act like you have to have two-thirds to vote it down instead of two-thirds to ratify it.

But that is what they did, so the President did exactly the right thing. It was time to stop giving billions of dollars in both direct money aid to the largest sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

It was also time to reimpose the sanctions that had basically brought Iran to its knees begging for help. Well, the Obama administration helped them in two ways: number one, allowing them to pursue nuclear capabilities, just doing it privately.

I am one of three people who met with the two main inspectors from the IAEA over in Europe, and they would issue the statement each time that they had seen no evidence that Iran was developing nukes. They were asked the question: Did you see the military facilities that they keep so hidden in secret and where their nuclear development would be occurring?

In response, they said: No. Gee, they gave us a video that they said came from there, but we had never been allowed to examine the facilities.

So the IAEA was not allowed to examine the facilities where nuclear weapons would have been developed, probably were being developed.

From Iran's standpoint, based on how ridiculous the agreement was and knowing their mentality of cheating, certainly they would have been pursuing nuclear weapons, whether or not

they would wait for 10 years before actually going public with actually having nuclear weapons.

But I even asked: Okay. The Obama administration sent them \$150 billion in cash. Say, hypothetically, Iran decided, “We will just take some of that \$150 billion and buy us one, two, three, four, five nukes from North Korea or from Pakistan.”

We know that during those final years of the Obama administration that Iran had met with Pakistani officials and with North Korean officials, so that was certainly a possibility, but I wondered if the IAEA had a capability of noting and discovering if Iran were to import a nuclear weapon from, say, North Korea or Russia or Pakistan. Apparently, unless the Iranians brought their new nuclear weapons immediately near the detection equipment, there would be no way to know that Iran bought nuclear weapons.

So, to anyone who used reason in dealing with the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, responsible for killing so many precious American military members and others, President Trump did a great thing. He did the right thing. It was a great thing to do for America’s future safety; it was a great thing to do for the world’s safety; and it was absolutely a helpful thing to do for the nation of Israel. So that was smart.

We have had these different climate accords, and what so many of them have in common, basically, was, gee, we will pay the world lots of money, supposedly some type of guilt money, even though we have been more philanthropic than any other country in the history of the world.

To any astute eye examining the state of the world and world history, it becomes very clear that the only countries that are able to do anything about pollution on the planet are countries that have a strong, vibrant economy. Countries that are struggling are doing all they can to put people to work and to survive. They just can’t spare the money to clean up the environment.

You have got countries like China and India, massive polluters, and under these accords, heck, China wouldn’t even have requirements for them to clean things up until 2030, and by then, there would be all new agreements that would probably give China even more time.

These accords appear to be geared to do one thing: do damage to the economy of the one country that is doing so much to clean up carbon emissions and to clean up pollution.

I have an article here from Forbes. This is back in the fall of 2017. Yes, the U.S. leads all countries in reducing carbon emissions—and that was 10 months into the Obama administration—but, as the Environmental Protection Agency announced, we are leading the world with respect to our CO₂ footprint in reductions.

The Washington Post fact-checked this claim and rated it three

Pinocchios, which means they rate the claim mostly false.

They further wrote that Pruitt’s usage of data appeared to be a deliberate effort to mislead the public. But the data mostly supports Pruitt’s claim. You have to consider the source, Madam Speaker.

Just like during my days on the bench as a felony judge, major civil litigation, it was all about the credibility of the witness.

As we have seen, The Washington Post is exceedingly biased and slanted in their reporting, so we need a source that gives Pinocchios to The Washington Post.

If you look at the 2017 BP Statistical Review of World Energy, since 2005, annual U.S. carbon dioxide emissions have declined by 758 million metric tons. That is, by far, the largest decline of any country in the world over that time span, and it is nearly as large as the 770 million metric ton decline for the entire European Union.

By comparison, the second largest decline during that period was registered by the United Kingdom, which reported a 170 million metric ton decline. So we had a 758 million metric ton decline in carbon emissions in that year, and the U.K. was second. They were not quite up to our 758 million metric tons. They were at 170 million metric ton decline.

But, at the same time, China’s carbon dioxide emissions grew—that is grew—by 3 billion metric tons, and India’s grew by 1 billion metric tons.

So we are over here in the United States trying not to destroy our economy and yet cleaning up the environment more than anybody else in the world, and this ridiculous accord—really, a treaty—allows the biggest polluters in the world to keep polluting much more, just either one of those, than the rest of the world.

□ 1300

It is just phenomenal.

The article goes on: “The Washington Post gets into per capita emissions, and indeed despite the decline, U.S. per capita emissions are still among the highest in the world. However, The Washington Post story claimed: ‘The United States may have had the largest decrease in carbon emissions, but it is still the largest per capita emitter.’”

“That’s not accurate either.

“According to World Bank data, U.S. per capita carbon dioxide emissions rank 11th among countries. So, we are not the largest per capita emitter, but we do emit 2.2 times as much on a per capita basis as China. But, China has 4.3 times as many people, and that matters from an overall emissions perspective. China’s lower per capita carbon dioxide emissions are more than offset by its greater population, so China emits over 70 percent more carbon dioxide annually than the U.S.”

So, there is a lot of manipulation as to what is going on, but it is ridiculous

for the United States to be part of a treaty in which the United States is punished, and our economy punished and the American people punished even though we are cutting the rate of carbon dioxide emissions more than anyone else.

Another article from Liz Peek on The Hill: “China’s rising emissions prove Trump right on Paris Agreement.”

This article is from last year: “Nothing horrifies the intelligentsia more than President Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on climate change. But, based on new information on China’s emissions, it increasingly looks like the President made the right call.

“Just last week, an analysis from Greenpeace indicated that China’s 2018”—and the numbers we were quoting before were from the year before—“carbon emissions were on track to grow at the fastest rate in 6 years. The study, based on government data regarding the use of coal and other energy sources, shows carbon output rising 4 percent in the first quarter of this year. Analysts are projecting similar gains over the next several quarters.

“The weakness of the Paris Agreement was that it was lopsided, requiring little from China and a great deal from the U.S. President Obama committed the United States to reducing carbon emissions in 2025 by 26 to 28 percent, which would have meant a substantial jump in electricity costs.

“By contrast, China committed to boosting nonfossil fuels to around 20 percent of its overall energy mix by 2030 and a ‘hope’ that emissions might peak at that time. As one analyst commented in The New York Times, ‘What China is pledging to do here is not a lot different from what China’s policies are on track to deliver.’”

So, the President really did do the right thing for the American public.

We lost a great man, a former Member of this body, in John Dingell. He and I had disagreements over some issues, but I knew John Dingell—I knew, and I know—was an honest man. He was an honorable man. He was a very decent man. He was a genuine asset to this legislative body.

He followed the rules. He made others follow the rules. Yet, he was removed as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, even though he was looking forward to working diligently on a healthcare bill.

He was removed as chairman of the committee because he made a statement that can still be found on YouTube. Like I said, he was an honest man. He did not want to move the cap and trade bill out of his committee. As he said, that cap and trade bill was basically—the big thing in it was a carbon tax. He said that cap and trade bill is not only a tax; it is a great big one.

And he had talked about how, when you skyrocket the costs of energy, you know, the rich people are inconvenienced, but it is the poor in the Nation, it is the lower middle class, it is the

senior citizens on a fixed income, on Social Security, where they may go for years without getting a cost-of-living increase, and, even if they get one, it doesn't keep up with skyrocketing energy costs.

And he could not abide hurting poor people—hardworking, lower middle class people—with skyrocketing energy that they couldn't afford to pay for.

And that is where so many of these things lead. If we are going to have compassion for the people that are the working poor, for heaven's sake, the last thing you want to do to them is skyrocket the cost of what they absolutely have to have just to exist.

In America today, you have got to have energy, whether it is electric energy, whether it is natural gas energy, gasoline, diesel. You have got to have energy. Even a wood-burning stove. You have got to have energy.

These kinds of bills that push for these kinds of efforts devastate the working poor in this country.

Here is an article from Justin Sykes—it also is from 2017—analyzing Obama's Paris Agreement. The title says, "All Cost and No Benefit for the U.S."

So, I am pleased that President Trump withdrew us from the treaty that was never properly ratified and that would continue to send jobs to China and India from the United States.

We have a President who understands, before America can continue to be the most philanthropic country in the world, helping those less fortunate, you need a vibrant economy. And simply bringing the U.S. economy down to the almost no rate of growth during the Obama years is not going to help us help other countries.

So, the economy, as some may recall—you can go back and see President Obama talking in terms of basically the 3 percent growth is a thing of the past; the economy can't grow past that; we need to get used to the new normal.

Well, under this President, the new normal is over 3 percent growth, and the only chance we have to overcome our massive deficit and growing deficit is to get the economy going so strongly that it grows in enough sufficient manner that we are able to start paying down our deficit, if we will just quit the massive overspending.

Now, we have had quite a show—really, more of a circus—in our Judiciary Committee the last couple of days. It has really been outrageous. The Judiciary Committee ought to be, if anything the last bastion of civility in this town.

The Judiciary Committee should be the committee from which good rules emanate that inspire others in the country and around the world that we have a model that can be followed. What occurred in our Judiciary Committee in the last 2 days has made a mockery of the legislative process.

And something that our committee, under our new majority, Democrat ma-

jority, has not been willing to focus on that is a threat to our First, Second, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights is the overreach by the Department of Justice, by the FBI, and potentially by the Intel community, in taking away Americans' right to have privacy in their phone conversations, in their emails; their right to have a court system in which the judges are not closer to being a prosecutor than they are actual even-handed judges.

And one of the things that is a huge concern for me and should be a huge concern for all Americans—I know it used to be a big concern with our now Chairman NADLER. My first term here in '05 and '06, at that time Congressman NADLER was a great stalwart in pushing for privacy rights and civil liberties to make sure the government under the Bush administration didn't overreach.

But an interesting thing happened on the way to their majority and having the Obama administration in charge, which seemed to be a complete loss of interest in protecting civil liberties of people whom the Obama administration chose to spy on.

And I know that the Attorney General has said he is going to be following up with critically important investigations now, but I would hope—and maybe the majority just really doesn't want to protect Americans' rights, is more focused on trying to destroy the current President.

But there are things that have now arisen. Evidence is clear: massive, widespread abuse at the top of the FBI, top of the DOJ, potentially in the Intel area. And even to the point that we would have a special prosecutor, Robert Mueller, who, in the words of Wilford Brimley: Last time we had a leak like this, Noah built himself an ark.

That seems to be what has happened under Mueller's watch, when he was at the FBI, under Mueller's watch as a special counsel.

And a good example is in this article from BuzzFeed. They are certainly no fan of mine, but the News Editor-in-Chief Ben Smith has this article from April 18, 2019. In this article he says: "Our reporters"—talking about the BuzzFeed reporters—"went back to the two senior law enforcement sources who had told them, as the article put it, that 'Donald Trump directed his longtime attorney Michael Cohen to lie to Congress about negotiations to build a Trump Tower in Moscow, according to two Federal law enforcement officials involved in an investigation of the matter.'"

That means there has got to be a couple of people on the Mueller team leaking information that turns out was not accurate, but leaking information. For one reason, obviously, since it turned out not to be accurate: to do harm to the President of the United States. That is not the job of the Department of Justice or the FBI.

□ 1315

Further down in the article it says—and this is a news editor-in-chief talking at BuzzFeed—"Our story was based on detailed information from senior law enforcement sources. That reporting included documents specifically"—and get this—"specifically pages of notes that were taken during an interview of Cohen by the FBI."

Now, we got to looking at this issue back—regarding witness statements that are taken down by the FBI, and it is really time that the FBI came on up into the 20th century, the latter half of the 20th century. I am not even asking them to come to the 21st century.

But a practice of the FBI has been—and it is advantageous to law enforcement that does this, it is not really honorable, but it is advantageous—they don't like to film, or record statements made by witnesses. They prefer to have an FBI agent take notes of their interpretation of what the witness is saying. If they recorded it, by video, or audio tape, then, when there was a question, Well, which is right; the FBI agent's notes, or the actual words coming from the witness's mouth? Then you could go to the tape and find out which was actually accurate.

But when there is no recording, then, advantage goes strictly, inures strictly, to the benefit of the government agent, because, gee, they have got no convictions; they come into court. I saw so many felonies being tried in my court. I have tried felonies many times. But you know which way the jury is normally going to go? They are going to believe the law enforcement officers, especially prior to the last few years, back when the FBI had a much higher, well-thought of reputation. It has been devastated in recent years.

But they come in and testify and the witness says, that is not what I said. You don't get to see a video. You don't get to hear the audio of what the witness actually said. What you have to decide between is this FBI agent that has never been convicted and looks good on the stand, sounds good on the stand, and this defendant, that probably has a criminal record. So that usually goes in the direction of the FBI agent.

But now, most State and local law enforcement offices have done more and more to record statements, to record what happens, so that juries can see for themselves; so they don't have to judge between the credibility of law enforcement or a defendant. They see for themselves. They hear for themselves what was said or done.

The FBI doesn't like to do that. They much prefer to have agents make their notes of their interpretation of what the defendant said. And Mueller particularly loved that during his 12 years as Director of the FBI, because his people always got the benefit of the doubt, and they were able to convict people because the FBI agent, who may have completely misinterpreted what was

said in his or her notes, they get the benefit, and the defendant gets convicted. So that has been a great strategy for law enforcement.

Some people felt like I was a hang-'em-high-type felony judge, but I wanted fairness. We have got to have fairness. And because of the credibility issues of the FBI, I feel comfortable Christopher Wray won't do it. He is more interested in trying to rebuild the image of the FBI without actually correcting anything.

So I am sure he is correcting some things, but certainly, he is not changing 302, witness statements taken down in writing as the FBI agents' interpretation.

And there are other indications he is more interested in trying to have a good front, making it look like the FBI is better now. But there are actions that do need to be taken.

But this story, going back to it; that reporting included documents, specifically, pages of notes that were taken during an interview of Cohen by the FBI. "In those notes, one law enforcement source wrote that: 'DJT personally asked Cohen to say negotiations ended in January, and White House Counsel office knew Cohen would give false testimony to Congress. Sanctioned by DJT. Joint lawyer team reviewed letter Cohen sent to SSCI about his testimony about Trump Tower Moscow, et al, knowing it contained lies.'"

Well, it turns out, those notes that were taken by FBI agents were not accurate, which, again, causes problems for credibility.

But the real problem is the fact that you had investigators, which must have been FBI, working for the Mueller team, and they are turning over documents that, at least, were law-enforcement sensitive, and they are probably classified to some level.

And as we know, as people looked into it after former FBI Director Comey basically admitted a crime, that he had leaked information that he had taken down or typed up in a memo based on his conversation with the President—well, under the FBI rules and regulations, that is not his property. It is not to be leaked. And yet, he leaked it to a professor friend so that the professor friend could get it out to the press. I think it was the New York Times.

But regardless, get it out to the press for the sole purpose of trying to get a special counsel appointed to harass President Trump.

So you have got the former FBI Director—what kind of example is that? Comey is knowingly leaking information that was potentially criminal to leak. And so when you have the FBI Director potentially committing overt crimes himself, what kind of example—what do you expect that to do inside the FBI?

As an example, I know from talking to FBI agents from all over the country, they were, and still are, amazed at

the things that top people in the FBI in Washington did to destroy FBI credibility. Of course, I think part of that was a result of Robert Mueller's 5 year up-or-out policy. He used it to eliminate people in the FBI that had more law enforcement experience than him. He ran off thousands and thousands of years of experienced, ethical, moral, upstanding FBI agents.

I wonder why would an FBI agent, director, run off their most experienced agents from all over the country? And really, the only reason I can think of that you would do that, you know young guys coming right out of school that are patriotic; they come in; they take their orders. They don't have the experience to know when it is a stupid order or maybe an improper order, and so they are not going to talk back. They are going to salute Mueller and go do what he said; whereas, he knew that people that are longer in the tooth, that have been around, when he ordered one of his ridiculous policies into effect that he would later have to repeal, he didn't want the experienced FBI agent saying, sir, I know it seems like a good idea, but 15 years ago we tried that and here was the result. It doesn't work out like you think it is going to.

Mueller didn't want anybody there that would do that kind of thing. He didn't want anybody that knew more than he did. He ran off thousands of years of experience.

I cannot help personally but think, if Mueller had not run off so many thousands of years of FBI experience, there would have been people around inside the FBI who could have nudged an FBI director like Comey to avoid committing crimes; could have encouraged an idiot like Peter Strzok, maybe a great law enforcement officer at one time, but clearly immoral, illegal in his conduct, and a disgrace to the FBI, and a guy that can lie with a smirk on his face. That was pretty impressive.

But there would have been people around to say, you can't do that, and if you don't stop, I am going to report you. Well, Mueller ran those guys off. He didn't want people like that.

A good example is the FBI agent that—after Ted Stevens, under the Mueller FBI, was tried and convicted of a crime that he did not commit right before the election—so he lost his seat in the U.S. Senate—we had an FBI agent come forward, he filed an affidavit that he swore to that the FBI had, in effect, manufactured a case against Ted Stevens that did not exist; that he did not accept hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of improvements to his home. He paid for them. He overpaid for them.

But the FBI did their raids. They hid evidence that he needed to—it would have exonerated him, not just raised a reasonable doubt, but completely exonerated himself, and the FBI agent identified his superior that participated in manufacturing that crime.

So what happened with Mueller as director of the FBI when he finds out, if

he didn't already know, that he had a supervisor agent who manufactured a case to convict an innocent man?

Well, the Mueller FBI ran off the guy that filed the affidavit because he had a conscience, and Mueller didn't want people of conscience in the FBI under him. He wanted people that would salute Mueller, salute the flag, and do whatever he wanted done.

And apparently, in that case, it was manufacturing a criminal case against a U.S. Senator, the longest serving Republican in the Senate at that time.

And, of course, you have the case of Dr. Steven Hatfill. Mueller had no evidence whatsoever that Steven Hatfill was guilty of the anthrax crime that killed and harmed people after 9/11. And at one point, the nonexistence of any evidence caused, apparently from reports, President George W. Bush to call Mueller in and say, hey, it doesn't look like there is any evidence here. Are you really sure that Dr. Hatfill is the anthrax defendant, the guy? And Mueller reportedly said, I am 100 percent certain.

There was no evidence. None. He just had a feeling. He basically framed an innocent man and ultimately, the U.S. Government had to pay over \$6 million in settlement to Dr. Hatfill.

He didn't really get his life back. We still talk about him in terms of anthrax.

But when Mueller was asked if he had any regrets, apologies, he said, absolutely not. He had no apologies. He didn't care if he ruined an innocent man's life.

He never apologized about Ted Stevens and, of course, Ted Stevens was killed in a plane he would never have been on if the Mueller FBI had not manufactured a case against him.

□ 1330

So it shouldn't come as a big surprise here that you have a Mueller team—it has got to be Mueller investigators; they were the ones that were doing this investigation—and they are leaking their own documents that are not to be leaked, well, unless they are directed to by Mueller, so I guess that is a possibility. But anyway, leaking this to the press.

And it wasn't just one FBI agent, according to the BuzzFeed news editor in chief, because he says, in the story he wrote, that they had "senior law enforcement sources."

And they gave BuzzFeed—it is a liberal news organization, being kind here. They gave them the FBI notes to try to bring pressure on Cohen. That is the reason normally that law enforcement does this, to build up public hysteria against somebody and hatred for someone so that they ultimately give up and agree to testify however they are asked to testify.

Now, this BuzzFeed editor also says: "At the time, the sources asked reporters to keep the information confidential, but with the publication of Mueller's report, they have permitted its release."

That is so outrageous. I mean, was nothing learned from the FBI framing the wrong person in the Atlanta bombing case? Apparently not.

And then what happened to Curt Weldon. He used to come speak from this very podium multiple times in my first term—I think it was mainly in 2006—and he kept alleging that the FBI had information that they knew there was going to be a terrorist attack, just like what happened on 9/11.

I didn't know how Congressman Weldon knew what he was talking about. He sure seemed to. He kept making these allegations that the FBI didn't do their job. They could have saved 3,000 American lives on 9/11.

Anyway, they were very tough allegations against the FBI, and as a freshman, I am thinking: Wow, Mueller has got to come back and respond to this. This looks bad for the FBI. Even though he only took over shortly before 9/11, it still makes his FBI look bad. Mueller has got to come out and address this.

Apparently, Director Mueller, FBI Director Mueller, did address the allegations of Congressman Curt Weldon, because 2 weeks before his election that year, in 2006, there was a raid of the Weldon office, his daughter's law office, and it was early morning, and the press was all there.

Gee, had to have been the FBI. They are doing the raid. They got the press all there.

And in no time at all, there were protestors with already-made signs at Curt Weldon's office calling him all kinds of names, thief and different things. And that, occurring 2 weeks before the election, caused him to narrowly lose.

Then some months later, they were notified by the FBI: Oh, by the way, you can come get all that stuff we seized during our raid. We didn't really use it for grand jury or anything.

They apparently used it to defeat Curt Weldon as a Member of Congress, who made them feel bad.

An intelligent person might ask: Well, look, if that is what the FBI has done to people in the past, whether Hatfield or Weldon or Stevens, aren't you concerned about doing just what Curt Weldon did?

And the fact is it should be a matter of concern. We are seeing, even from BuzzFeed, how the FBI will disclose information that is not even accurate to bring down public opinion against both a witness and, in that case, the President himself just to smear somebody's name even when it is not accurate.

So it should be a matter of concern. But if people don't stand up in this body—actually, the way Jerry Nadler used to years ago—about concerns with Federal law enforcement activities, if we don't stand up here, nobody is going to, and it isn't going to get better.

So it is a risk we have got to take, because somebody has got to speak up about these outrageous abuses. And they truly are abuses.

Now, as the evidence continues to come out, what appears to be quite clear was not that there was collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign to bring down Hilary Clinton as a candidate, but the Russian effort has not changed, not when they were the Soviet Union and now that it is an independent country of Russia. They want to cause as much problem and division in the United States as they can, and, boy, did it work this time.

Just a little over a week ago, apparently, former MI6 agent, secret agent—he is no 007, that is for sure. Christopher Steele was hired by Fusion GPS, that also hired Nellie Ohr, who is the wife of a top FBI official named Bruce Ohr. She was digging up dirt, whatever she could find—that was why she was hired—on Donald Trump; and Christopher Steele, who hated candidate Donald Trump was hired to dig up dirt on Donald Trump.

As I understand it, he didn't even go to Russia. He is calling, emailing, whatever he needs to do to communicate, and word gets out around Russia this British agent now working for the Clinton campaign through Fusion GPS and working with at least one FBI top official, he is looking for dirt on Donald Trump in Russia.

Steele has now basically admitted: You know what? It could well be that the people that gave me this dirt about prostitutes and Donald Trump that has now turned out to be 100 percent fabricated, it is possible that those could be agents for Vladimir Putin.

You think? You bet.

Russia was able to divide this country and had plenty of willing accomplices in what turned out to be an outrageously corrupt top in the FBI and some in the DOJ.

You know, I know Mr. Rosenstein has said, oh, he was joking when he said he would wear a wire into the Oval Office to try to trap Donald Trump as President so they could try to remove him as President. I mean, they were working on a coup.

But from what I understand, we know he was not joking, because there was a second meeting in which Andy McCabe and another person, at least one more person, were there when Rosenstein brought it up on his own again: Hey, I wasn't kidding. I really am a team player. I know you are mad at me for the memo about Comey that allowed him to be fired, but I am a team player. I want to be part of the team. I will wear a wire into the Oval Office to try to trap the President. I am really willing to do that."

And McCabe, apparently just blown away that Rosenstein would offer to do that again, goes back and has a meeting with his subordinates and says: You won't believe Rosenstein just brought up again he is willing to wear a wire into the Oval Office. I don't know what is wrong with that guy.

Well, there is a massive stench that has existed. It came about during the Obama administration. It came about

when Robert Mueller ran off so many of our incredibly qualified, upstanding FBI agents.

I was hoping that when Christopher Wray came in, he would help clean up the mess, get rid of the bad actors, but he has been more of hold what you have got and try to make the picture look rosier.

Why would I say that? Because I know from having talked to the individuals who found the information. They knew that Hillary Clinton's private server was hacked by a foreign country, and it was not Russia.

I knew at the time I was asking Peter Strzok questions, but I didn't mention the country. But now it has come out that a Chinese intelligence agency had embedded instructions in her private server that every email coming in and every email going out was to go to this Chinese intelligence agency, and it happened.

We also now know there was classified information that came and went through her private server.

But the inspector general for our intelligence community was so concerned, he told his investigator, Frank Rucker: Frank, you have got to get over there and tell the FBI. They don't know that her private server was hacked. You have got to go tell them.

This didn't come out in the hearing. I didn't bring it up. But I did ask Strzok, because we know from his private texting that he was doing everything he could to exonerate Hillary Clinton and doing everything he could to prevent Donald Trump from becoming President.

So it had to come as an incredible blow to Peter Strzok when the intelligence community's investigator, their IG investigator, comes over to the FBI, as directed by the IG, and he has to tell Peter Strzok because he is director of counterintelligence at the FBI. And they have their liaison there, Dean Chappell, and they have another person there; and the IG also sent over one of their top lawyers, Janet Mitchell.

Rucker says: I needed to get you this information, and you weren't responding, so here it is. We now have proof positive that Hillary Clinton's private server was hacked, and it was hacked by China, and every email coming in, going out is going to their intelligence agency.

And this didn't come out in the hearing, but the fact is he was shocked at the response by Peter Strzok, because he just looked at him. He showed no surprise. And Chappell and Strzok thanked Frank Rucker for the information, shook his hand, and sent him on his way as if it were no big deal.

So where does Christopher Wray come in there? After that came out that our United States intelligence IG had proof positive that Hillary Clinton's private server had been hacked and after it was exposed what a detriment it was, possibly criminal activity by Peter Strzok, and after it came

out that they were instructed that her private server was hacked, what does Christopher Wray's FBI do? They release an official statement that the FBI still has not seen any evidence that Hillary Clinton's private server was hacked.

That was despicably dishonest. All they had to do was contact the intelligence community IG's office. They could have gotten the information.

But Christopher Wray was more interested in trying to preserve the old reputation of the FBI, so he continued with the facade: Well, yeah, we put on our blinders. We see no evil. We hear no evil. We don't know about any evil. We are not going to go look at the evidence that absolutely, unequivocally shows her private server was hacked. We will just ignorantly and intentionally mislead the American people and say we haven't seen any evidence that her private server was hacked.

□ 1345

This is a dangerous, dangerous time in our history. People can throw all the rocks at Bill Barr. I didn't know the guy. I don't think I ever met the man. I had concerns because he was a private friend of Bob Mueller, and his wife was a friend of Mrs. Mueller. I had concerns.

Now that he is trying to get to the bottom of all the corruption within the FBI and at the top of the DOJ, the rocks are being hurled.

This should be a time when we come together to try to root out the corruption. If they can attempt a coup of a duly-elected President, whether you like the electoral college or not, if they can do it to a Republican, then the day can come when we have conservative people who disagree with a liberal President and decide to take him out the way they made so many inroads into almost taking out Donald Trump.

This is a scary time in our history. I literally hope and pray, and I know there are people who make fun of the prayers, but I truly believe prayers have brought about God's blessing on this country.

We have a chance to fix things here, but it is going to take courage by people who are willing to stand up to an FBI, some corruption at the top.

There are still some people at the FBI who do not like Donald Trump. They are still there. They still would like to cover for people who were helping try to effectuate this attempted coup on Donald Trump. They need to go.

It used to be—and I know personally—assistant U.S. attorneys who were career, or FBI agents who were career. Most times, you don't even know how they voted. You don't know if they did vote because they had one interest, getting to the truth of whether or not there was probable cause a crime was committed and, if so, who probably committed it. That gets them an indictment, and then they can go for a conviction. That is what they were interested in, enforcing the law.

The FBI under Robert Mueller and then James Comey became an instrument to abuse enemies, and it has to be cleaned up.

I have seen no indication that Christopher Wray is interested in doing that. He is covering for the guys who created the problem. Maybe he is doing some things internally that I am not seeing, but he is not the answer.

For the sake of continuing this little experiment in self-government, we need to clean up the mess at the FBI in Washington, D.C., and the mess that still exists at the top of the Justice Department. Then we can have a chance to keep this little experiment of self-government going.

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

LEADING ON CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise this body for passing H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Climate change is the greatest existential threat to our species. It is also an unequivocal economic opportunity. Replacing the need to extract and burn fossil fuels with renewable and clean energy saves money.

This White House is failing to seize this domestic opportunity while simultaneously walking away from our international partners and competitors that are committed to this challenge.

Of all the misguided decisions of this administration, few have been as reckless as announcing our withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement. It is environmentally foolish; it is economically naive; and it cedes leadership to China and others on the defining challenge of our time. That is foolhardy.

H.R. 9 is a reclamation of that mantle. It is a demonstration that Americans are determined to lead, even if the White House is refusing to do so.

I am proud to be a part of this effort, not because it is enough, but because it is the kind of leadership into the breach that has long defined true American greatness.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 406. An act to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent Resolution reaffirming the United States commitment to Taiwan and to the implementation of the Taiwan Relations Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Homeland Security; and to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1222. An act to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 3, 2019, at 2:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

879. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid; Revisions to State Medicaid Fraud Control Unit Rules (RIN: 0936-AA07) received April 25, 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.

880. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2017-C-6238] received April 25, 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.

881. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Effectiveness of Consumer Antiseptic Rubs; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-0124 (formerly part of Docket No.: FDA-1975-N-0012)] (RIN: 0910-AH97) received April 25, 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.

882. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2020 — FY 2024 Five Year Service and Asset Line Plans and FY 2020 General and Legislative Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(b); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e); (108 Stat. 918) and 49 U.S.C. 24320(a)(1); Public Law 114-94, Sec. 11203(a)(1); (129 Stat. 1630); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

883. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Lake of the Ozarks, Village of Four