

RECOGNIZING SWEETWATER SOUND

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share one of Fort Wayne's great American success stories, Sweetwater Sound.

Founder and CEO Chuck Surack's dream started over 40 years ago with a recording studio housed in a Volkswagen van. It has since evolved into one of the Nation's leading retailers of professional recording and music equipment.

Madam Speaker, Sweetwater's total sales in 2018 were record breaking at \$725 million. And just recently we found out that in 2019 it was another record year with sales of \$805 million, up 11 percent from 2018.

The total sales only tell part of the success story, though. Sweetwater has recently hired 159 new employees and has given back to Hoosiers by providing middle school students with free instruments.

Hoosiers are thankful for Sweetwater Sound's big contributions to northeast Indiana, and I look forward to watching them continue to succeed moving forward. In this record-setting economy, I look forward to seeing more American success stories just like this one.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO TURN A BLIND EYE TO THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I stand today with the chair of our Foreign Affairs Committee who just spoke here, Mr. ENGEL, as he makes a plea to this House for us to take a look at and get involved with what is going on in Syria.

Millions of folks are dying. They are being killed with the help of Assad and Russia. They are killing civilians, millions of civilians. They are killing the children. And for those who are injured that find their way to the hospital, it does no good because they turn around and bomb the hospitals. This is an outrage.

The United States of America cannot afford to turn a blind eye to this humanitarian crisis. We must get involved. We must pay attention. The families, the children, the people of Syria deserve better than this.

I want to thank Mr. ENGEL for the attention that he is paying to this issue and the way that he is trying to educate us and get us involved in saving those poor people who are being overrun, who are being killed by Assad and, of course, with the help of Russia.

RECOGNIZING ABC LIFE CENTER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ABC Life Center, a pregnancy center in Franklin, Pennsylvania in Venango County.

The Life Center offers pregnant women a wide variety of resources, including no-cost pregnancy tests, consultations for women with unexpected pregnancies, adoption referrals, counseling for women who have had a pregnancy end in miscarriage or abortion, and more.

The Life Center recognizes that being pro-life means supporting all life. The center itself encourages women by letting them know that their story, their life and their babies' lives matter. The center also dispels the notion that to be pro-life is to be antichoice.

In fact, pregnancy centers such as Life Center offer a great deal of choices and resources to women who find themselves unexpectedly pregnant.

Pregnancy centers like ABC Life Center encourage and empower women all around the country. I am proud of the work that they do every day to enrich the lives of women and children, and together they help spread the message that life really is a better choice.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-99)

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 Armed Services 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 with respect to the southern border of the United States declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020.

The ongoing border security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border of the United States continues to threaten our national security, including the security of the American people. The executive branch has taken steps to address the crisis, but further action is needed to address the humanitarian crisis and to control unlawful

migration and the flow of narcotics and criminals across the southern border. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 9844 concerning the southern border of the United States.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2020.

IMPORTANT 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, it is an honor to be able to stand in this hallowed Hall and address some things that have occurred that are worthy of attention.

Of course, there was applause in the gallery today on the passage of trying to restart the ERA. It is an amendment to the Constitution, and it was started back in the seventies. The amendment to the Constitution had a deadline as part of the amendment. The amendment did not get the required 38 states. The time lapsed. There was, as I recall, an attempt to extend the time, but some States that had been in favor of the ERA backed off.

□ 1145

So it is very clear to anyone who pays attention to the Constitution that, when an amendment to the Constitution by its own wording has a time deadline and that deadline is passed, then that amendment has not been ratified, is not part of the Constitution, and any efforts to change the amendment itself, including the deadline for ratification, would require beginning again.

There is no more iconic liberal judge on the Supreme Court, not in history, than the former head, as I recall, of the American Civil Liberties Union. She was there back when the American Civil Liberties Union cared deeply about civil liberties and even took on some clients and some causes of people that most of us thought were not worthy of a lot of attention. But they were so committed to civil liberties back in those days, they were more concerned about civil liberties than they were the client. That was in the old days.

Now, if it is not a liberal, then they are not concerned about civil liberties and abuses, since the Obama administration was the administration that so far appears to be the most abusive of the FISA courts, committing fraud upon the FISA courts.

But in fairness to the administration, it appears the FISA court judges did not have sufficient integrity or pride in their position that they were offended by having fraud committed upon them, because, apparently, the disdain for Donald Trump, then President Trump and his administration was such that it was okay. They were okay to be defrauded as judges, which sure brings

the issue of the FISA courts into focus as that issue will be taken up, as I understand it, as will issues over parts of the PATRIOT Act and other provisions that give the Federal Government tremendous latitude to spy on American citizens.

So it is an interesting time, though, where you never know where judges are going to come down. If somebody was appointed by a liberal judge, it is amazing; they appear to stay liberal, with disdain for conservatism and the strict language of the Constitution, wanting it to be a liberal, breathing, living document.

On the other hand, Chief Justice Roberts has pointed out he doesn't believe there should be Obama judges or Trump judges or Bush judges because you can't characterize them that way.

To an extent, he is right about that, because there are some Justices, particularly on the Supreme Court, who have been appointed by conservative Presidents who were liberals in conservative clothing, and they got on the Court and became some of the biggest flaming liberals we have ever had.

So you can't tell that someone is conservative if they are appointed by a conservative President, but you sure can tell if somebody is appointed by a liberal President. They have shown that they will stay liberal and not change. So it has been interesting to see that kind of conversion.

It appears pretty clear that some of these Justices, including Chief Justice Roberts, got into the position and began to care deeply about what the media and others thought about things they were doing.

So, for example, with ObamaCare, he was, apparently, from the reports, concerned that he might go down in history as being too political of a Chief Justice if he struck down ObamaCare. So he took something that was clearly unconstitutional, in effect, rewrote it, and had a very hypocritical opinion.

At page 14, I believe it was, he said, clearly, this is not a tax, because if it were a tax, Congress would have called it a tax, and they made clear it was not; and it is only a penalty, a fine, if you don't conform your conduct to the requirements of the legislation. Therefore, it is not a tax.

Since it is not a tax, then the anti-injunction law that prevents a plaintiff from filing suit until a tax is not only assessed but paid and keeps the court from having jurisdiction to hear it until the tax is assessed and paid, that doesn't apply, so the court can take this matter up. And now that we take it up, 40 pages later, he said it is constitutional, in effect, because it is a tax.

So he had to go through all kinds of mental gymnastics to what, in his mind, would prevent him from being classified as a political Chief Justice; but, as a result, he has become one of the most political Chief Justices we have ever had—unfortunately for him and the country.

So who knows. Maybe there will be people on the Supreme Court who will decide to rewrite the Constitution as he, in effect, rewrote the ObamaCare statute. But if you are actually going to follow the Constitution the way it is written and you are not going to rewrite the Constitution at the Supreme Court level, then the truth is, when an amendment fails by its own language and is not ratified, then anybody with any sense would understand you have got to start over.

Though I have plenty of disagreements with Justice Ginsberg over some issues, she has tried to be a person of integrity. Talking about the ERA, she says:

I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like it to start over. There is too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia—long after the deadline passed. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard the States that said, "We have changed our minds"?

So it is interesting. Yes, this legislation passed.

JIM SENSENBRENNER from Wisconsin appropriately brought up the point that this is actually amending the Constitution; it is amending the constitutional amendment. So, to be appropriate, it is going to require a two-thirds vote in the House, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and then 38 States. I believe it is, in order to have it ratified.

That was overruled to reinforce the fact that what we did today is really not constitutional. If we had tried to ratify it as a new amendment, like Justice Ginsberg was talking about, a new constitutional amendment, then, actually, you would, as Justice Ginsberg said, have to be starting the process all over again, and that does require a two-thirds vote here and in the Senate.

So what we did today made people that support it feel good, but it is not going anywhere; and even if it were, hypothetically, it just simply can't pass constitutional muster at the Supreme Court. A majority of the Court appears to believe that the Constitution means what it says.

We had one vote today. It was on the ERA. So we didn't do anything terribly effective today as the House of Representatives.

Also, I noted before I came over for the vote that, apparently, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it was reported—I don't know if other members of the majority signed the letter, but there was a letter to Attorney General Barr, and it expressed what sounded like the distress of the committee over Attorney General Barr's action in reining in prosecutors who have simply gotten out of hand.

Attorney General Barr has the distinct advantage of having a bigger picture than these four very politically motivated prosecutors who were pushing so hard for virtually the maximum amount of time for Roger Stone to serve in prison.

Anyway, if that letter was going to be truly accurate, it needed to say that this majority that has been trying to throw President Trump out of office, that has been using taxpayer funds for a number of years now to try to defeat President Trump in the 2020 election, which voted for impeachment knowing that President Trump was not going to be removed from office—so it seems the logical conclusion is, again, they were using taxpayer funds to campaign against President Trump, hoping they could besmirch him sufficiently, slander his name sufficiently, that it would help them defeat him in November.

Whereas, the minority of the committee did not agree with the letter because it appears clear to all of the minority I have talked to that Attorney General Barr is trying to do something and incorporate something called fairness in our legal system, because he has seen you had people in the previous administration who strong-armed salespeople into selling guns to people they knew should not have them and that they would end up in the hands of, most likely, Mexican drug cartels. And that is what the administration wanted to do. They were assuring they would be able to follow the guns and intercede, but that is not what happened.

Then we even saw emails that, after this was all exposed, there was an idea that, gee, maybe we can still use the fact that these guns went into criminal hands, even killed one of our own United States agents, a brave soul, Brian Terry, they were hopeful they could still use that to get antigun legislation passed simply based on their criminal activity in trying to get these guns into the hands of criminals who shouldn't have them.

So nobody was held accountable for that. Nobody was held accountable for the guns that were forced into the hands of criminals, ultimately, one of which killed Brian Terry. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

Nobody was held accountable for destroying evidence after it was subpoenaed, even with a hammer, even with applications like BleachBit, destroying subpoenaed evidence. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

So across the Nation, it appears maybe a small majority, but a majority, understand and believe that there are two forms of justice in America: one for those high-ranking Democratic officials who are never held accountable at all, and one for Republicans whose lives are attempted to be destroyed and, in some cases, are destroyed.

□ 1200

In some cases, they did nothing wrong. In other cases, they agreed to plead to something just because the bully Federal prosecutors have threatened to go after their family and continue to harass them.

I saw a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who had been blasting the FBI back during my first term,

2005–2006, and he was blasting them because he said—and I had not heard of it before, at the time—but a program called Able Danger had been able to identify a majority of the 9/11 hijackers. The FBI had that information. They did nothing with it.

I didn't know if Curt Weldon, the Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, was accurate in what he was saying, but hearing him make these speeches over and over about how the FBI should have acted. They could have prevented thousands of lives from being taken, all of those people from having to jump to their deaths because they didn't want to be burned at the top of the World Trade Center. All of that could have been avoided if the FBI had stepped in and used the information they had to stop 9/11.

I didn't know if that was true or not, but I was thinking, you know, Mueller and the FBI have to respond to Congressman Weldon in some way. They have to. This is really serious stuff. I thought they would make a statement and that they would come back with evidence to refute what he was saying, but they never did that.

What Mueller's FBI did, though—it had to be with his approval, going after a Member of Congress. It was believed that they got a warrant because they raided his daughter's law office. They alerted the media for the early morning raids so there was plenty of media there and plenty of media at his congressional office. People were apparently warned in advance by the FBI because nobody else knew.

They showed up with preprinted signs condemning Curt Weldon, caught red-handed, all of this stuff. It turned out, there was nothing ever done. He told me that, months later, he was contacted by the FBI and told: You can come get all of this material we seized in the raid.

They did the raid 2 weeks before the election, as I recall, about 2 weeks before the election. So the FBI, under Mueller, was able to singlehandedly defeat Curt Weldon. It helped the Democrat opponent to defeat Curt Weldon in the narrow loss that he had.

So the FBI didn't respond with evidence. They just helped manipulate the election system so Curt Weldon would lose. He did, and he said that they told him to come pick up all of this stuff. They never did present it to a grand jury anyway. That was kind of shocking.

So, clearly, Mueller and his FBI were motivated by shutting him up so he couldn't make speeches on the House floor anymore, and that is why the raid was conducted. But in his last most recent visit, Curt was telling me that—by the way, before I wrote about Curt Weldon, I had not seen him nor talked with him since 2006 when he left. I put that in the booklet I wrote titled “Robert Mueller: Unmasked.” I wrote about what happened to Curt.

At this most recent visit this year, he told me that, as he understands, it

turns out the FBI never even got a warrant. They just raided the office without a warrant, like any good dictator would have, the brownshirts. Law enforcement does, in places: We don't need a stinking warrant. We will just go harass and destroy.

That is really shocking if there was not even a warrant. But Mueller was irritated, apparently, with Ted Stevens, so the FBI framed Ted Stevens. It turned out, after he was convicted right before his election—he lost narrowly as a U.S. Senator—an FBI agent filed an affidavit and established how they had created a case against Ted Stevens that didn't exist.

Actually, Ted Stevens had overpaid for improvements to his home. It wasn't an illegal gift. He had overpaid, at one point telling the contractor: Look, I know I am overpaying, but I have people watching. I have to do everything by the book, so just cash the check—that kind of thing.

Anyway, Mueller and his FBI helped defeat Ted Stevens by convicting him right before his election. But then that conviction was thrown out due to the prosecutorial misconduct and, I would say, crimes committed by at least one FBI agent, if not more, and also by prosecutors.

They should have gone to prison for what they did, but I can't help but think that between what the FBI did to Curt Weldon, what they did to Ted Stevens, what they have done to other people with whom they disagree, that it had become a very dangerous place where, if you were in the right political persuasion or took the right positions on the right issues, then you could commit crimes, and the FBI would leave you alone.

If you were of the wrong political positions, on the wrong issues, they would come after you even if they had to frame you or set you up, as they did Ted Stevens and Curt Weldon, destroying their political careers.

So we are at a very dangerous time in this country's history. It used to be that the FBI had the reputation that it was the most trustworthy, effective law enforcement agency body in the world. But that has changed.

Unfortunately, we have an FBI Director—an article said, at one time, back in the Bush administration, he had told James Comey, who has lied, obviously committed crimes—and we can debate about how high or low of a level. But he told Comey: Look, if you and Mueller are going to make a move, I want to be with you guys. I want to go where you are going, when you are going.

Well, that guy who thought so highly of Mueller and Comey was put in a place he never should have been, and that is FBI Director at a time that needed cleaning up.

So I am hopeful that in the days, weeks, or months ahead, we will get a new FBI Director who will be serious about punishing wrongdoing in the FBI, which I believe will help them get back their reputation.

The more Christopher Wray appears to do more covering up than he does making accountable, he really needs to go sooner rather than later. They are not going to get their reputation back simply by ignoring things.

Of course, the FISA court pointed out in an order, after going for years without having any pride or integrity in enforcing their jurisdiction and being offended by fraud upon the court, it finally came out and said: Okay, this one guy, Clinesmith, had changed the wording, basically going from saying he did work for the U.S. Government or the CIA to saying he did not.

So, clearly, 180 degrees opposite of what the truth was, knowing it was false, he submitted it to the court. But that had been clear for months, if not years, and the courts did nothing.

It is what keeps compelling me to think maybe we just need to get rid of the FISA court system and come up with a new way, because I am not sure that the court with the judges who have been appointed to be FISA judges, that we can save that system, that Americans can feel comfortable that their privacy and their civil rights are not being violated by an overzealous group, especially when you look at the thousands and thousands of FISA orders. In 2018, out of mass applications for warrants from the FISA court, I think there was only one they turned down.

Some say: Well, maybe if we have an amicus, a friend of the court who will stand up for the party against whom a warrant is sought, maybe that would help provide enough protection for American civil liberties.

But then we saw in December, I believe it was, FISA court, feeling the heat of all of those who have come to distrust FISA courts, appointed an amicus. It turned out the judge appointed the very lawyer who for years had been trashing DEVIN NUNES and others, who it turns out were 100 percent right in the things they said in their report.

So it appeared clear that the FISA court was not serious about making fixes or changes or protecting civil liberties, but also it had gone into the Christopher Wray mode of covering up, hoping people wouldn't notice that so much illegality and impropriety had been going on.

We are going to be taking up these issues, the controversial section 215 from the PATRIOT Act and other things. Hopefully, we will take up the FISA court.

I am hopeful that we will have bipartisan action because I know from my time on the Judiciary Committee, there have been Democrats—previously, Chairman NADLER had been a staunch proponent of protecting civil liberties, but that appears to be more, nowadays, only protecting civil liberties if you are a Democrat, but not so much if you are part of the Trump administration or a friend of the President.

Hopefully, we can get past some of that and do some good and actually do the job of protecting civil liberties.

I have talked to Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN over the years, including more recently, because she, in the past, has been quite zealous for civil liberties. I understand she has a bill. Hopefully, that will be helpful in dealing with some of these issues.

But I am still concerned that the abuses may have grown so profound that we may not be able to fix the FISA court system. We may need to do as some have said—I think RAND PAUL has talked about just getting rid of it. But we will see where we go.

That same kind of duality justice or dual justice has raised its ugly head in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. Jessie Liu was the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and she had some people, it turns out, who were extremely partisan.

In fact, in a case involving Imran Awan, an IT technician here, involved with working with computers for dozens of Democrats on Capitol Hill—since 2004, he had worked, like I say, for dozens of Democratic Representatives. And it is one of the things up here on the Hill, if a Member of Congress tells you, “Oh, this is my computer person. He is great. She is great,” then others will say, “oh, I need somebody, so I will hire them.”

Normally, somebody who does that, since you don't need them full time, they work part time. Under the rules, they are allowed to work for multiple offices as long as their income does not exceed the maximum amount allowed—I think it was around \$170,000, something like that. You could work for multiple offices and accumulate up to that maximum. You can have multiple part-time employees. Apparently, that is what Imran Awan did, and he had a brother.

If you are going to do that kind of work, you have to file financial information, financial statement information. It turns out, he didn't disclose about selling cars or some of the assets or businesses he had, and that is a Federal felony.

□ 1215

He also had filed under the requirements here if you buy something, and I think it is \$500 or more, then you have to have the serial number, you have to keep track of it, and you have to be able to document where that item is at all times if it costs more than \$500.

When I came into office in 2005, there was some couch that was on my inventory. Nobody had seen the couch in many years, but I was told you can't take it off your inventory because it is part of your office. Well, if it had cost less than \$500 then that would not have been an issue. I have no idea where that couch was or is. It wasn't around when I got here.

But Imran Awan, apparently to get around the requirement of keeping se-

rial numbers and keeping track of things that he purchased allegedly on behalf of Congress Members for whom he worked, he would list iPads that cost \$799 as costing \$499 and then say that an insurance policy for it cost \$300, and that way it got around the requirement of keeping information on where those specific items were.

It turns out from, what I have read, it appears he and his brother owed six figures to somebody foreign, I believe. And so instead of paying the person back, they put this guy, who was not a computer technician—just had various Members, oh, apparently he told them, this guy is going to help with your computer system, so we need you to put him on part-time for your office. So he had the Federal taxpayers paying their debt to this guy.

It turns out he had two wives, and one was saying he had a tremendous amount of money. He is from Pakistan, and when he goes back, he is treated like a king by the secret police there, I believe it was ISI. He is constantly sending all kinds of computer equipment back to Pakistan since he was a Pakistan national.

Anyway, he had some ties with some very questionable people. It sounds like maybe the FISA court should have been issuing warrants to look at some of his stuff.

He was arrested in July of 2017 over his alleged involvement in double charging House Democrats for House IT equipment, House computer-type equipment, and privately exposing private information online. A probe of him found more than tens of thousands of dollars in computer technical equipment had been stolen.

He was indicted by a Federal District Court in August of 2017 for “conspiracy to commit bank fraud, bank fraud, making false statements on a loan or credit application, and engaging in unlawful monetary transactions.”

As I recall, he had, I believe it was a cousin who worked at McDonald's. He got him listed on the payroll for different House Members. I am sure they didn't know that he wasn't working. So he helped out the family by bringing in extra income for family members. Each one of those events would have been a Federal felony.

Evidence indicates that Imran Awan and his team members were copying data from the computers of House Members to the House Democratic Caucus server and then even to private Dropbox accounts—totally inappropriate and absolute wrongdoing.

He and his associates were even tossed off the House computer system because they provided false information to Capitol Police that being a fake copy of the Democratic Caucus' server. But incredibly none of that was used by Jessie Liu's attorneys against him. Instead, the U.S. Attorney's office for the District of Columbia opted to let him plead to a charge of just making a false statement on a loan application, disregarding the many, many felonies

that could have been charged and pursued to just find out: Why are you such a hero back in Pakistan?

What equipment are you sending back there?

Where are you getting it from?

How come you committed a felony by not listing your car dealership?

Because as our intel people can tell you, Madam Speaker, one of the ways that money is raised for terrorist activity is through bogus car dealerships where cars are stolen and then shipped. We don't know what the situation was with Imran Awan's alleged car dealership because he didn't have a dealer lot anywhere.

It is handy, though, no matter who you are, if you can have taxpayers pay back your loans by just listing them on the payroll of people whom you lied to about who is doing the work.

The problem, though, if Jessie Liu and these Democrat attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorneys' Office had pursued Imran for anything other than making a false statement on his loan, then there would have been a lot of embarrassment for Democratic Members of Congress because they had some guy like that who was cheating taxpayers, cheating the government, and committing crimes working for them. In fairness, it is hard to believe they would have known the kinds of things he was doing and getting away with. Anyway, the Federal judge sentenced him.

He filed saying he was broke, and he had no money. One of his wives said she was threatened by the FBI to keep her mouth shut, but she had indicated that he had all kinds of money. He had gold, and he had all kinds of money that he had been able to save while working for all these different Members of Congress. But he said he was broke. He filed something saying he was broke, and he couldn't pay anything. But then it came down to, in order to get probation he had to pay back six figures to the government. Somehow, he magically came up—I can't remember if it was 100 or \$200,000—he came up with it. He paid it, even though he alleged he was flat broke.

So when we hear about four Federal prosecutors who worked for U.S. Attorney of D.C. Jessie Liu being all upset over the Department of Justice wanting fairness for Roger Stone and not political vengeance, four of them quit. In analyzing who it is and what they were doing and why they quit, I think it is important to see who they are. There have been some good articles written about these people just in the last week.

Jonathan Kravis was appointed by former President Obama to be associate White House Counsel where he served in 2009 and 2010. He worked for Williams & Connolly, a lobbying firm for which Kravis had worked. It has a long history of its employees donating large sums of money to Democratic candidates, organizations, and causes.

He worked with Adam Jed to prosecute Paul Manafort. They went after

him with a vengeance for working for the Ukrainian Government. Manafort was cleared of all charges except two counts of conspiracy to defraud the U.S., for which Manafort is serving a 5-year prison sentence.

Kravis and his wife are connected with Codepink that most people around here know is a far left, anti-war organization.

Then Adam Jed, himself, apparently did work in 2003 or was a fellow at Humanity in Action group, a far-left-wing organization blatantly against political diversity.

He defended the Affordable Care Act contraceptive mandate in the case *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Sebelius*. That is where the Federal Government was going after these nuns who took a vow of poverty but also a vow to help people, and they believed it was against their religion to help pay for abortions. Mr. Jed had no problem in pursuing these poor nuns. That is his choice, but it does give an indication of where he stood, and it is certainly not anywhere close to the beliefs on the pro-life positions of Donald Trump.

Adam Jed also provided oral arguments to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act in the *Defense of Marriage Act v. Windsor*.

He contributed \$1,000 to Josh Kaul's candidacy for Wisconsin State Attorney General. Of course, Kaul was a lawyer for Perkins Coie which funneled money from the Hillary Clinton campaign to Christopher Steele who was the British spy who also apparently utilized other foreigners to try to affect the U.S. election in 2016. So, obviously, Adam Jed would have been supporting Kaul who worked for Perkins Coie.

I know we don't hear a whole lot about it from the other side of the aisle, but the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC actually paid foreigners to try to affect our 2016 election.

I constantly hear about how outrageous it was that the now-debunked allegations that the Trump campaign conspired with Russia to affect our election, they don't want to talk about what is slam-dunk proved that the DNC and the Clinton campaign absolutely did pay foreigners to try to affect our election. One foreigner from Italy was involved and a foreigner from Australia.

I know people like to say that there were no Ukrainians involved. That is totally debunked. The mere fact that Russia has constantly tried to affect our elections—so has China and so have other countries—does not mutually exclude the fact that there were Ukrainians who tried to affect our 2016 election. Exhibit A to me, Madam Speaker, would be you had the ambassador from Ukraine to the U.S. write an op-ed trying to prevent Donald Trump from being elected President.

That is foreign interference within an election. So, anyway, I don't know where they are getting this stuff, oh, that is Russian propaganda. The only

Russian propaganda that has been the most effective is propaganda from Russia that wants to divide America, and they have done a marvelous job at dividing America instead of bringing us together.

One of the other attorneys who resigned all upset about the treatment of—well, Attorney General Barr wanting them to pull their fangs back in and not try to be so vengeful simply because Roger Stone was a friend of the President. There is no indication the President had hired him to do anything, but they sure went after him because of a connection.

Michael Marando prosecuted the Imran Awan case. He is the guy who let him get away with all of this other activity without proper investigation.

In fact, there was an inspector general here. She ended up being, I think, president of some international technology organization. She was amazing. She had all kinds of evidence to prove felony cases against Imran Awan, but representatives from the U.S. Attorney's Office, I don't know if it was Michael Marando himself, the FBI, working at their behest, ended up threatening her: Don't you bring your notebook with all that evidence.

Then they turned around and later reportedly said: Oh, we interviewed her, she didn't have anything.

Yes, when you ordered her not to bring it to show you the cases against Imran Awan.

□ 1230

But that is Michael Marando. He laid him off with a wrist slap. I don't see how you can find any other basis other than Marando's political motivation. But he didn't pursue any of these other charges, and the question still exists.

As I understand, Imran Awan has filed a lawsuit, and it appears his intention is to try to get back on the gravy train here where he was on Capitol Hill, to get people to sign up to use him. I think there are enough people who got burned that it would probably be hard for him to do.

But a lawsuit, of course, when I heard that he has a lawsuit, that means discovery is in order. I am hopeful discovery will bring out all the lies and the crimes that it appears that he has committed. But no thanks to Michael Marando. He certainly didn't do anything that would have hurt Democrats on Capitol Hill but went out of his way to want to destroy Roger Stone.

Aaron Zelensky started his career as a special assistant to Koh, who was the State Department legal adviser in the Obama administration, but he has also clerked for what I felt was one of the most liberal judges ever, Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens.

He played a key role in obtaining a guilty plea from a guy who was an adviser at one time, Papadopoulos. This poor guy, he didn't have money. When the FBI and the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office came after him, Mueller's people, he didn't have money to fight.

He was being overwhelmed. They intimidated him enough into his agreeing to plead guilty to a minor charge.

But Zelensky was handpicked by Mueller when he was selecting people who hated Trump. Zelensky was hand-picked to be an investigator in that probe. Before joining the Mueller team, Zelensky worked for Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

Anyway, these people certainly had a lot of political baggage. They were clearly on a vendetta. They weren't pursuing justice. They were pursuing political vendettas, trying to get at President Trump.

There are tens of millions of dollars that were spent investigating what we now know was the Russia hoax. There was no collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia, despite what people are trying to allude to now. It wasn't. The evidence wasn't there. Mueller was disappointed. Weissmann was disappointed. All of these left-wingers were disappointed that, despite all the intimidation, all the threats, they couldn't find somebody who could actually implicate any kind of collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia.

But on Roger Stone's sentencing, when he was convicted, one of the charges was witness tampering. It sure sounds like he was kidding around by saying: Hey, I may have to come over and kill your dog.

I mean, who says that if they are not kidding? That is not all that effective of a threat. But when you have a judge who can't stand the Trump administration, and you have a juror who gets on—I would really like to know what kind of questions the jury was asked during voir dire. If Roger Stone's attorneys did not ask the jury panel their feelings about Donald Trump, then it sure sounds like that would have been malpractice. Roger should have a great case against his own lawyers, plus a great case on appeal for their impropriety as his attorneys.

But I find it hard to believe they wouldn't ask something about that because there is clearly some type of Trump derangement system. Some very smart, well-balanced people get so angry and frustrated over President Donald Trump that they don't think as straight as they normally would.

But to have the foreperson of the jury, the head juror who controls the discussions, shut people down, encourage other people to speak—the head foreperson hates Donald Trump.

Anyway, it is amazing the efforts that the Department of Justice, at least the U.S. Attorney's Office, had gone to, to become a tool for injustice. They wanted to max this guy out, the poor guy. Unbelievable.

I have sent people to prison for life. I have sent people to prison for 10 years, 9 years. I have had to look people in the eye and order them to be taken to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and put to death. Those are serious matters, and you simply cannot let any

type of vengeance or political persuasion affect you.

I know in east Texas, we have assistant U.S. attorneys who vote Democrat. But when it comes to enforcing the law, they enforce the law. They don't care what party you are. And it is so tragic, right here in our Nation's Capital, our own Justice Department, in our own D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office, you have people who are not nearly as just and fair as you find all over the country in most U.S. Attorney's Offices.

Another issue of the local D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office was a guy named James Wolfe. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury on three counts of violating title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1001. At the time he made the alleged false statements to the FBI, James Wolfe was director of security for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and that was a position he had held for about 29 years.

As the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence director of security, James Wolfe was entrusted with access to classified, secret, and top-secret information provided by the executive branch, including the United States intelligence community that they provided to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Wolfe was alleged to have lied to FBI agents in December 2017 about his repeated contacts with three reporters, including through his use of encrypted messaging applications. Wolfe is further alleged to have made false statements to the FBI about providing two reporters with nonpublic information related to the matters occurring before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

He was sentenced to 2 months in prison, 4 months supervised release for lying to the FBI. He has to complete 20 hours of community service—20 hours a month during his release for those 4 months—and pay a \$7,500 fine.

You compare what he did with what Roger Stone did. Roger Stone wasn't dealing with any classified information, secret or top secret. He used some bad judgment. But Jesse Liu's attorneys, these four who have now quit—thank God they quit.

We need to get some people in there where, when it comes to prosecuting, it doesn't matter what the defendant's political persuasion is. You seek justice. And there are Democratic and Republican attorneys, prosecutors, around the country who are quite capable of doing that. So I sure hope that we will get some better attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office.

It is amazing. I thought about Sergeant York, that movie. I believe Gary Cooper played Sergeant York. They were in the trenches, and they couldn't see the bad guys to stop them. He ends up using a turkey call that he used back when he was turkey hunting. One after another, enemy soldiers would stick their head up, and he was able to knock them off and eventually capture

this huge group. But in order to prevail, they had to get them to stick their heads up.

I think that is what this Trump derangement syndrome has done. There are people who have been working pervasively and, apparently, with political vendettas, but they have been able to stay below the radar. Along comes President Trump, and they get so deranged that they expose who they are.

So I thank all those political opportunists and zealots who use their position in the U.S. Government, including the Department of Justice, who have now exposed themselves.

Vindman is one those people who have exposed his animosity, and it is really good that he is no longer part of the National Security Council. It is good his brother is no longer in the Office of General Counsel. I think we will see less leaks now that he is gone from there.

Anyway, we are starting to see those people who have exposed themselves as political operatives, rather than doing justice, or following the orders of their Commander in Chief, we are seeing them exposed. We are seeing them moved out.

I am hoping, in the days ahead, there will be a lot more of that occurring. I think justice will be served better so the American people can feel more like—and not one party or another. People need to be able to feel, as a whole, regardless of the political persuasion of some prosecutor, that justice is being pursued and done, as it is being done in so many Federal districts all over the country. It has been a problem here in Washington, D.C.

When that happens, we will all be better off.

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

HONORING DR. STEPHEN A. HOLDITCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FLORES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Stephen A. Holditch of College Station, Texas, who passed away unexpectedly on August 9, 2019.

Before I continue our discussion about Steve, I want to give some context about the importance of his professional career.

Let me state, first, that Steve considered his roles as a husband, a father, and a grandfather to be his most important. Because of the exceptional way that he lived those roles, his legacy is readily apparent in the lives of those he left behind—his wife, Ann; his daughters, Katie and Abbie; and their five grandchildren.

The discussion of his professional accomplishments starts with a description of current energy metrics.

Today, the United States of America is blessed to be the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. As of this year, we are a net exporter of oil and natural gas. Reserves of American oil and natural gas rank us among the top 10 countries in the world. We also lead the industrialized world in the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions over the last two decades.

□ 1245

Ten years ago, no one would have ever predicted that we would be where we are today.

This new world of American energy dominance is having dramatic implications, both domestically and internationally. We have secure, stable, environmentally responsible, and attractively-priced energy sources for American families and businesses. We have become a reliable source of energy for our allies, giving them flexibility to move away from unstable Russian and Middle Eastern energy suppliers.

The oil and gas sector of our economy has created millions of good jobs and great paychecks for hardworking Americans. Our balance of trade payments has improved, and our geopolitical position has strengthened.

This dramatic energy renaissance didn't happen by accident or because of government. It is because of the result of American ingenuity, research, and bold leadership. While no one person is solely responsible for this seismic shift in American energy, there are a number of bold leaders who took these challenges that looked impossible to solve and then solved them; particularly in the area of stimulation of low permeability, or "tight" reservoirs. Their developments, studies, research, and field experiments using horizontal drilling and very large hydraulic fracturing treatments revolutionized American oil and natural gas and transformed our economy and our security.

One of those bold leaders was the late George P. Mitchell, Texas A&M Class of 1940. Another is the person that we are honoring today, Dr. Stephen A. Holditch, Texas A&M Class of 1969.

Stephen Holditch was born on October 20, 1946, in Corsicana, Texas, to Damon and Margie Holditch. Growing up, Steve and his family moved often while his father pursued a career in the oil and gas industry. He spent most of his childhood in San Antonio before moving to Richardson, Texas for his final year of high school, where he graduated in 1965.

Following graduation, Steve attended Texas A&M University, where he joined the Corps of Cadets and began his journey as a Fighting Texas Aggie. Steve quickly excelled, both in academics and in the Corps of Cadets. While at A&M, he was a member of Company F-1, a member of the prestigious Ross Volunteers Honor Guard, and a member of the Ross Volunteers Firing Squad. During his senior year, he served as Second Battalion Commander.