

He was born in 1938 in Nangal Khurd, Hoshiarpur District of Punjab, India, to a farming family. As a young man, he immigrated in 1958 to Sutter County, settling in Yuba City, because of the potential he saw in the land, soil, weather, and its likeness to Punjab, India.

Indeed, it worked out very well. Through his hard work and determination, he became the largest independent peach grower in the world, earning him the title of “the Peach King.”

He was a deeply religious man, a leader in the Yuba-Sutter area, philanthropist, and active member of the Sikh Temple of Yuba City.

He played a critical role in founding Sikh institutions and festivals in the Yuba City area, as well as around the world.

In 1980, he started the Yuba Nagar Kirtan, called the Yuba Sikh Parade, which has now become an annual event and a staple to the area where people travel from all over the State, even all over North America, tens of thousands, to take part. I have had a chance to take part myself. It is indeed incredible.

When Sikhs faced hate crimes after the September 11 terrorist attacks due to misunderstanding, it was Didar who led a delegation of Sikhs to meet the U.S. President, George W. Bush, at the time.

He was a pillar of our community. His loss will be felt by Yuba City and indeed internationally.

#### HONORING MS. WHEELCHAIR AMERICA ALI INGERSOLL

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight Raleigh's own Ali Ingersoll, who won the title of Ms. Wheelchair America last month.

Ms. Wheelchair America is not your typical beauty pageant. Contestants are evaluated on their community advocacy and achievements, and the winner carries the responsibility of being a champion for the 61 million Americans living with disabilities.

Ali Ingersoll has embodied that mission since an incident left her paralyzed 12 years ago. She has dedicated much of her adult life to advocating for affordable healthcare for individuals with disabilities.

As Ali personally experienced in 2020, insurance companies often deny coverage of important equipment to help these Americans lead fulfilling lives. Now, Ali is fighting for full coverage of medically necessary equipment.

I am honored to represent Ms. Wheelchair America and look forward to everything she will accomplish in the future.

#### HONORING EDITH K. KENAO KANAKA'OLE

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

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as Hawaiian History Month in my home State of Hawaii. It is a time of celebration, recognition, and reflection.

Throughout this month, we honor individuals who have made a significant impact on the lives of Native Hawaiians everywhere.

Today, we recognize Edith Ke'kuhikuhi pu'uone na ali'iokohala Kenao Kanaka'ole, a revered Native Hawaiian dancer, chanter, teacher, kuma hula and founder of Halau o Kekuhi.

Edith was one of only five women in the country honored this year in the 2023 American Women Quarters Program.

“Grant us knowledge.” “E ho mai ka'ike,” is inscribed on the commemorative coin for Edith Kanaka'ole. It is a reminder of her lasting legacy and a guiding principle for Hawaiians. That is, to look to those who came before us so that we may find success in the present and prosperity in our future.

#### DERAILING THE FREIGHT INDUSTRY STRIKE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to indicate my appreciation to President Biden and Secretary Walsh, for, yes, diving in and stopping a union worker/freight industry collision and understanding the importance of providing benefits to our hard workers.

Yesterday, at the Teamsters, I indicated how important it is that workers have benefits, and the ability to go to the doctor. That is the fight that we must continue. I am glad it has been derailed, but we need to continue to fight to get a permanent solution for our workers.

I rise today as well, Mr. Speaker, to introduce and acknowledge the SHIELD Act, to shield doctors and nurses and other reproductive healthcare providers from harassment, litigation, and draconian laws. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that would protect pregnant people and the medical personnel who provide reproductive healthcare services to them and will prevent interference, restriction, and retaliation against doctors, nurses, nurse midwives, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and others who evaluate, diagnose, advise, treat, or provide other services in order to protect them, to give healthcare, and to stop women from standing outside the door of doctors' offices and not getting

care. I ask my colleagues to support the SHIELD Act.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are the times that try men's souls.

We have heard so much in recent days about the raid by the FBI in Mar-a-Lago. I have continued to hear from FBI agents and former FBI agents. Republicans on the Judiciary Committee have, as my friend JIM JORDAN has pointed out, received, I think, 14 complaints from people within the FBI about very serious problems. I have had several that I have received personally that were not included in those 14. I understand Senator GRASSLEY has also gotten some.

There is a systemic problem at the FBI. Christopher Wray was appointed to clean up the FBI. As I told President Trump later on: You have asked me about a few of your appointments; I wish you would have asked me about that one, because I could have told you a great deal, going back to the days of Mueller as director of the FBI. Director Christopher Wray learned some of those techniques.

Director Mueller, even going back as far as Boston, tried to keep two people who were innocent of the murder of which they were convicted—they were set up by FBI agents—and Director Mueller continued, even after it was clear they were innocent, to try to keep them from being released from prison.

Then along came Comey. He has had serious issues with truthfulness and yet does a great job of trying to play the victim.

I had one FBI agent, who had been around a long time, say: You remember back to the 1980s, 1990s, at the FBI? We were completely professional. If someone had a nonviolent background, we were just about doing our job. We would notify the—especially if we knew the person had a lawyer, we would notify the lawyer that your client needs to appear, is being indicted or has been indicted, needs to appear at this or that jail at a certain time. And, of course, if the person didn't arrive, they knew they would be picked up. But they were given a chance to voluntarily surrender. Normally, that went very well, quite professionally.

But what we have seen arise with the Department of Justice and the FBI is absolutely disgusting. I mean, I was a law-and-order felony judge. I have sentenced people for felonies, everything from probation to the death penalty. I know what it is to wrestle over the issue, presentence reports, evidence at sentencing, and what appropriate sentences are.

□ 1700

We expected local, State, and Federal law enforcement that came before me to be professional, and they better not lie or there would be consequences and there were.

But this FBI, this DOJ is so far out of control, and Christopher Wray took his appointment as Director—at a time we needed the FBI cleaned up—as a directive to sweep everything he could under the rug.

FBI agents have told me, from different places in the country that I have talked to, you know: What Director Christopher Wray keeps telling us constantly is nothing about being honest. Be truthful about everything you say and do. But his big line, they tell me, is “protect the FBI brand.”

And they make clear, they say he makes clear, and they follow up by their actions making it clear, that if there is somebody in the FBI doing something wrong, you better not report it to anyone but your supervisor.

I am not going to get into some of these because I haven't had an opportunity to properly go through them to exclude identifying information, but those that complained to their supervisors that I have seen the complaints, they are retaliated against.

So it becomes very clear to honest, honorable law enforcement people working at the FBI, at least many of them, that when Christopher Wray says, “protect the FBI brand,” he means don't you dare report anybody anywhere except to your supervisor, and that way we can get rid of you, we can make your life miserable, we can get you out of the FBI, so it is only people who won't complain about lies, dishonesty, corruption, because the message seems pretty clear: We want people that will help us convict the people we want convicted, whether they are guilty or not.

I am not going to get into all of the complaints that have been provided to me, the information; but I want to concentrate on one issue since Mar-a-Lago, the raid there by the FBI, again, they jumped the gun. Never, ever before has a former President had their residence raided. And it is very clear that with Director Christopher Wray and Attorney General Merrick Garland, here is the deal: If it is a supporter of President Trump, let's go after them, make their lives a living hell. Let's send the message out far and wide, you better back off supporting that guy, that former President Donald Trump or we will come after you. We will come after your friends.

Instead of doing what was done with people working with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who were given immunity agreements that would even include stuff like, we just want to see your laptop, and here is the deal we will make with you. Instead of getting a search warrant, grabbing the laptop of Hillary Clinton's assistants, they made a deal. We just want to look at your laptop, and here is our deal: We

will not use anything we find in the laptop against Secretary Clinton, against you, against anybody. We just need to see what is there. That is all we are going to do. We are not going to copy it or anything, and we promise we won't prosecute you.

I have never, ever seen a deal like that. Who would make that kind of deal except corrupt people in the Department of Justice and the FBI?

Because what you do if you are law enforcement, you get the warrant, you seize the laptop, and if there is evidence of crime on there, as you believe there is, then that can be used to prosecute the people instead of giving them an immunity agreement that you will not come after them at all.

There were incredible deals made to protect Secretary Clinton and the people who worked for her and to make sure they had no reason to testify against their boss. Because typically law enforcement all over the country, all over the world, knows if you are going to make a case against somebody at the top, whether it is the mob, whether it is the State Department, wherever, you make a case against the people below, and you say: Okay. Here are 20 violations; you are looking at 5 years, you are looking at 100 years. But we will make a deal, we will only pursue this charge that carries a 2-year sentence if you will help us on the people above you. And you work your way up the food chain.

That is the way great prosecutions have occurred against mob organizations, and it works the same way with any organization, except that the DOJ and the FBI chose to treat conservatives, chose to treat all of Donald Trump's friends, people that might have information against him, they were all treated very differently because there are two types of justice. Justice is no longer wearing a blindfold in Washington, D.C.

From some of the complaints I have seen, I used to think the problem was here at the national headquarters, but apparently it is not just the field office or the headquarters here because there has been so much corruption, it spread all over the country.

So there is all the indignation from the FBI and the DOJ about documents that were held in Mar-a-Lago. Now, I haven't talked to anybody with President Trump's team, with President Trump. It has been months. And the last time I talked to him, he was just calling, surprised that I was running for Attorney General in Texas, and it was a very short conversation. So we hadn't talked about any of this. But I understand his frustration because I have seen the way evidence was created to pursue two impeachments of Donald Trump.

I have seen the evidence, at least some of it, of the way the FBI and the DOJ falsely convicted Senator Ted Stevens immediately before his election. I think they tried him 2 weeks before his election, and he lost just by very little.

Then he was exonerated when one FBI agent who believed in truth signed an affidavit establishing that there was exonerating evidence, exculpatory evidence that they did not provide to Senator Stevens and that they forced a witness to say what he had made clear was not true, and they convicted him.

That seems to be a pattern. These kinds of things appear to be going on in different places. Oh, yeah, they are convicting some guilty people, but it makes it very difficult to know which is which when you have an organization that plays fast and loose with the rules and plays fast and loose with the truth.

So you have got people who have made complaints, and just like the FBI agent who had a conscience and reported the fraud in the prosecution of Ted Stevens by the Department of Justice and the FBI, he was run out of the FBI, and the one that was engaged in the fraud, according to the FBI, was reassigned and then promoted.

How do you have a national law enforcement entity that keeps integrity when integrity is no longer the key word? Oh, yeah, I have heard Comey and others talk about integrity, that the FBI, the “I” stands for integrity. Not anymore.

No. It is all about preserving the brand, which means you can't allow any information about corruption within the FBI to get outside, or we will use our ability to be corrupt to come after you for filing or making a complaint or reporting dishonesty.

Every American has a constitutional right to communicate with his or her, or whatever your pronoun is, your Member of Congress. It is a right.

And not only that, it is a constitutional right that those communications can be privileged and protected, which is why when William Jefferson, Congressman William Jefferson, who did have \$90,000 of cold, hard cash in his freezer—and I read the affidavit that was used to get a warrant to search his congressional office—and there were people that were on TV saying, gee, there are people like GOHMERT that are saying they had no right to raid that office.

Well, those individuals are just ignorant of the Constitution. But the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals was not. And they made clear, look, even though the Department of Justice in that case—and I had no problem with him being convicted. It appeared to me from the affidavit, holy cow, if this is accurate, they didn't need to raid his office. In fact, by raiding the office and violating the privilege, they put their case that was rock solid in jeopardy.

I remember being an assistant district attorney, right out of law school, ready to go pursue justice, and let's get the bad guys. And it always helps to have somebody that has been around a while, say wait a minute, think about this. What you are proposing to do to get evidence, it may violate the Constitution. It may not. But you have got

a rock solid case here. Why risk it being thrown out trying to make some point and get some little piece of evidence you don't need? You have got enough to convict. So don't create a possible error pursuing evidence you don't need. Just get the conviction. Don't get into the murky areas that may reverse your case. You will get the conviction, and you will keep the conviction. It won't be reversed on appeal.

But they put that case at risk because all those years before—and I did happen to be in the room. It was the conference room of the Speaker. His legal team, House counsel, White House counsel came over, DOJ counsel came over, and there was a lot of fury because of what the FBI under Mueller did, raiding that office, because in the past if someone had a warrant, like to search a congressional office, well, the DOJ knew, FBI knew there is privileged material in there. In fact, I am sure I am not the only one who has had FBI agents provide information about wrongdoing within the FBI.

□ 1715

Well, when the Founders set up these three branches of government, as Justice Scalia once explained to some friends from my old town, the reason we have more freedom than any country ever in history—at least we used to have it—was because the Founders did not trust government. So they made it hard for any one of the three branches to abuse people and abuse their power. And the only way the Department of Justice—that was created and financed by Congress—the only way to keep them accountable—or the intel community—is to make sure Congress does proper oversight. And you can't do proper oversight unless you are allowed to have people come to you privately and say, Here is the problem, and know that they are not going to have reprisals.

That is why we have the whistleblower laws that many are apparently using now. So the way it was done beforehand is you come to House counsel. We have a warrant. House counsel, who is familiar with the privilege of Congress to keep certain things private and other things not, would then go through everything that was specified, because you have to have in the warrant, you have to state with particularity the place to be searched, the things to be seized.

They would go through those, and they would put aside anything that was privileged and then give the things that were not privileged that matched what was in the warrant, give that to DOJ. But Mueller wanted to send a message to everybody in Congress, Democrats and Republicans. I don't care about your constitutional rights or privileges. We are going to go heavy-handed, and I am going to send a message to every single Member of Congress: You don't mess with me, or I will come search your office. And I will send a message to every FBI agent:

You better not complain to Members of Congress because I can go raid their office, and I can find out who you are, and I can destroy your lives as well.

That was a message very clear. And the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals said, Wait a minute. So the DOJ says, okay, we will take the stuff from the Congress Members' office, and we will have some people that won't be involved in the prosecution that work in our office. They will go through it and anything that is not privileged, they will go ahead and give that to the prosecutors.

And the Circuit Court is going: You can't do that in the same office. Come on. That has to be somebody different that makes sure that it is secure.

And we saw the FBI, all these years later from that, basically doing the same thing with Mar-a-Lago. You have Presidential executive privilege. You have attorney-client privilege. Apparently, that doesn't mean much anymore at the DOJ, but it still means something to those of us that care about the Constitution.

And yet, they set up their own department to go through—we will decide what you can claim as privilege and what—no, you don't get that right.

So what do they do? They hurry through it. So they have already been through everything before the Court could appoint a special master. And from what we saw in Ted Stevens' case and other cases, you can't be sure stuff won't disappear.

Look at what we just found out. All these years later, going back 6 years, that the FBI has covered up for 6 years that they employed the Russian. The FBI was colluding with Russia. The DNC, the Hillary Clinton campaign, they were all colluding with Russia to try to destroy Donald Trump. That is why the FBI hired Danchenko. That is why the DNC and the Clinton campaign hired Christopher Steele.

And what we are hearing on the news the last day or two is that at the time they went before a judge and swore an oath to keep getting the warrant to spy on the Trump campaign and on President Trump, they knew their basis was a lie. They committed fraud upon the FISA court.

And apparently, there are people in the DOJ that don't understand the F in FISA—that F word that is the first word in FISA is not what they apparently think it is. It stands for foreign. And they committed a fraud upon the Court and got a warrant for the first time in the history of the country.

They helped their political campaign by spying on a political opponent. Even the DOD, the Department of Defense got involved. They hired the professor. And, in fact, we had someone who was a whistleblower. He went and said, Look, there are hundreds of thousands of dollars being paid to this professor in London, and we got nothing in return for it. This is a problem.

So what happened? They fired him because he found where the DOD was helping go after, at that time, can-

didate Trump. They fired him. He is still trying to get his job back. He hasn't gotten justice yet.

But how can people in America have any confidence in the Department of Justice when they think—when there are so many people, apparently, who think it is okay to go commit a fraud on the court even at the highest level of the DOJ and the FBI. It is not okay.

Yes, every organization is composed of people who are human and make mistakes, but for goodness sakes, when you have top people who flaunt the law and think they are above the law, and that if they want to go after somebody, then they are Almighty God, and their judgment is tantamount. And if you ever report them, they are coming after you because they are God-like in their own minds.

Look, the FISA court is being abused so badly, we know now—and I've mentioned before—but that Verizon order that was leaked, I couldn't believe it. A judge signed that. Had the judge not read the Fourth Amendment? You have to describe particularly the place to be searched and what's to be seized.

And what the government, the FBI, the DOJ said is, you know what? FISA court, we need every bit of information this cell phone company has on everybody. American, foreign—we don't care. We need every bit of information they have on every single customer.

And the judge looked at it and went, Oh, okay. They need every bit of information that Verizon has on every single customer. Sure, I will sign that. Where is the particularity? Where is the evidence that any of these people have committed a crime—or “probably” committed a crime? You have got to have probable cause. Where was that?

And where is the indication that there was evidence in what was being seized to prosecute those people for committing—there wasn't any. No, they just wanted everything on everybody, and they used the FISA court to get it.

When I saw that, I am going, oh, my gosh. I mean, I have signed so many warrants over the years as a judge—I have turned many down. Wait, you don't have probable cause in here. You can't just plead conclusions. You have to assert specific facts in your affidavit that supports the application for a warrant so that, as the judge, I can find there is probable cause a crime was committed and probable cause to believe there is evidence that I am going to specify they can be found at this specific location. Being abused like crazy.

So here is a letter from—and this is from the attorney, Kurt Siuzdak. It is my understanding he is a former FBI agent. He sets out to Director Wray:

Under 28 CFR Part 27, you are advised that an anonymous employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is making a protected disclosure to the United States Congress and House of Representatives.

The anonymous employee is reporting to you and Congress that executives in the Federal Bureau of Investigation have been violating FBI security protocols that have been implemented to ensure the security of classified information. Since you have been Director of the FBI, many Senior Executive Service (SES) officials have been wearing their cell phones into SCIFs.

That is the secure compartmentalized facilities. It is like a room that they can ensure is totally free. It can't be bugged. It has not been bugged. There is nobody with any electronic devices that could be hacked so that people can listen.

I asked one of our intelligence people one time about a show that I saw, a movie, where a cell phone company required everybody at meetings to take their battery out of the phone: Does that keep a phone from being compromised during a meeting? He said, no, because even if you take the battery out—which I don't know how you do that with an Apple phone—but even if you take the battery out, there is another residual power so that your information is there when you put it back in, that we could still get in and we can listen to you. We can access the camera. We can watch.

That certainly didn't make me feel very secure about things as long as there are phones around. And he said other countries are really good at hacking. There are some that are great at it.

So if somebody has a phone in a meeting, we can listen, we can watch. So that is why you have a SCIF. And we have a couple of SCIFs here on Capitol Hill. You can't go in there—you can't even get near being in the SCIF with a cell phone. No Member of Congress is allowed. They are very strict. No Member is allowed to have a cell phone, a smartwatch—those kind of things.

The letter goes on and points out that:

These violations have occurred at the SCIFs (special compartmentalized information facilities) in field offices and at a facility known as LX.

The anonymous employee worked at LX and several field offices. The anonymous employee had visibility of counterterrorism, counterintelligence, and field office executives. Although all FBI personnel are prohibited from bringing electronic devices into SCIFs, FBI Senior Executive Service personnel openly and notoriously wore phones into SCIFs in ways that have made it apparent they were demonstrating their power and authority to subordinates.

These executives would walk into and out of the SCIFs multiple times wearing their cell phones on their belts and never stop to secure the cell phone prior to entering the SCIFs. When the phone rang, some executives would exit the SCIF and answer the phone, but others would start talking on the phone prior to exiting the SCIFs.

Depending on a particular cell phone's settings, apps, and vulnerabilities, eavesdropping using a cell phone's microphones may be considered a trivial cyber hacking exploit for advanced persistent threat or hostile nation-state actors. Some executives wore multiple holders which would indicate they were also wearing their personal cell phones in the SCIFs.

As a result, FBI executives have willfully compromised the security of FBI SCIFs since your time you became Director and potentially many years prior.

Additionally, the anonymous individual is reporting that FBI executives who are involved in preparing daily briefing materials for you or participating in FBI headquarters daily briefings have brought classified materials to their homes to ensure that they are prepared to answer questions for the next day's briefings.

□ 1730

Why, that is worse than what they are accusing President Trump of.

Although certain executives may have courier cards that allow them to transport classified materials, the classified materials in question were certainly not properly packaged, and the courier cards do not allow FBI executives to store classified material in their homes.

The anonymous employee advised that although the FBI is investigating individuals not currently employed by the FBI for mishandling of classified materials, the anonymous employees cannot recall a single FBI Senior Executive Service official who was even reprimanded for these violations unless it involved incidents in which the classified material was found in public. In contrast, DOJ has prosecuted non-SES FBI employees for mishandling classified information.

One reason for the failure to hold FBI executives accountable is that field office security officers generally report to the special agents in charge or assistant special agents in charge in the office. FBI special agents and employees do not stop these notorious security violations because reporting the misconduct of these executives would certainly result in retaliation and would be professional suicide.

Please note the DOJ OARM has determined that anonymous reports of serious misconduct can be protected disclosures. Although the Department of Justice Office of Attorney Recruitment Management has in section 5, subsection C of its procedures for FBI whistleblower reprisal claims brought pursuant to 28 C.F.R. of part 27 stated that it is not bound by any "case law of the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and any other Federal court of appeals deciding a whistleblower appeal from the MSPB."

They have made clear they are above the courts and above Congress. They are above everything. They will do what they please.

Wow. And they are in charge of justice.

You should also be aware that one of your Office of General Counsel attorneys advised me that she would not accept 28 C.F.R. part 27 disclosures because it wasn't part of her current caseload. Under that standard, OGC has completely insulated you from receiving protected disclosures from outside attorneys and thwarted Federal whistleblower laws and regulations.

Well, that is apparently because he is head of the FBI, and as head of the FBI, he is above the courts, and he is above Congress. He can do what he pleases.

We saw that Merrick Garland, our Attorney General, issued an order to the FBI that they are not to contact any Member of Congress. So much for the Constitution and your constitutional rights. I am the Attorney General, he is saying, and I can override

the Constitution, the Supreme Court, court of appeals, and the President. I am God when it comes to you, is the message. We Americans have a serious problem with a Director and an AG who are acting like that.

Because after that came out about saying there were phones especially in the Director's and Deputy Director's SCIF, the Director sent out their media person to say it is a lie, that there have not been any cell phones allowed in or around the SCIF. Then that triggered a number of complaints and people coming forward to set out that the Deputy Director's denial was a lie.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. I needed to know the time because I have to play by the rules. I can't act like I am the Attorney General or FBI Director and just ignore the rules and law.

So here is this letter again:

Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. part 27 and the FBI's Dodson rule, you are advised that an anonymous individual from the FBI is making a protected disclosure.

It goes on. This individual was an executive who recently worked at FBI headquarters. The person had work-related reasons for being in the Director's and Deputy Director's office areas on the 7th floor of the Hoover Building.

While working in the 7th floor SCIF areas, the individual observed numerous security violations involving the presence of personal electronic devices such as cell phones, smartwatches, and wireless sports bands. The individual recently read that the FBI publicly denied the security violations at FBI SCIFs and specific violations by Deputy Director Abbate.

The individual is reporting this issue because the FBI's denial casts doubt upon the credibility of the FBI employees who made the initial disclosure related to Mr. Abbate. This individual advised that the SCIFed areas where Director Wray and Deputy Director Abbate currently worked had multiple people wearing or displaying electronics that are prohibited in the SCIF.

In fact, the FBI has explicitly limited the smart bands and watches in non-SCIF areas because the devices pose such a serious security threat.

There is a little more. But then there is another to Mr. Abbate:

Last week, the Federal Bureau of Investigation issued a "categorical denial" about your failure to follow proper SCIF protocols to protect national security.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, these are the people who are condemning former President Donald Trump because they weren't sure the padlock they said they had to add on top of the locks he had already was good enough.

Frankly, if I were President Trump and I had seen and heard about wrongdoing at the top of the FBI, and I had seen the gestapo tactics they have used to go after nonviolent people who used to have their lawyer get a call saying

that he needs to report at a certain time in a certain place and they would do it, he had seen on the news how they would leak information whether it is CNN or some other liberal media so that people could be there when they knock down the door or drug people out of bed in their underwear and took them outside—the FBI didn't used to do that. Now, the gestapo used to do that. That is what they would do because they were about intimidation, threats, and torture if necessary.

But when somebody is nonviolent, no criminal history, and they are obviously not a threat, you are going to bring a full SWAT team so you can drag them out of bed?

One family reported that her 18-year-old daughter was grabbed by the hair and drug upstairs to show where something was.

For heaven's sake, what happened to the professionalism at the FBI and the Department of Justice?

Anyway, this letter says:

You also seem to have decided that "good of the Bureau" equates to the good of Paul Abbate. It does not. The FBI lied to the American people to protect you, which is shameful.

By issuing an absolute denial of your misconduct, you also implicitly claimed that the two individuals who reported the misconduct made false statements. This assertion is also false. Thinking back, you are certainly aware that many of your subordinates saw you wearing the phone in the SCIF. Now, your subordinates are coming forward, and their reports are far more damning to you and Mr. Wray.

You, Mr. Wray, and the employees on the 7th floor violated national security because you were all too lazy to secure the devices.

He put our most precious and most confidential secrets at risk because of his arrogance.

When SSA Schoffstall—he is a special agent in charge out West—emailed you requesting that you rescind the reprisals by Salt Lake City's SAC Dennis Rice—special agent in charge. Wray's and your replies to Schoffstall were "deleted, not read."

They didn't want to know about reprisals for doing his job and protecting the brand.

This supervisor refused to allow his subordinates to be pressured to lie, and you refused to help him.

That was what he did wrong. His subordinates were being pressured to sign a lie under oath that they knew was a lie, and they wouldn't sign, which would be a crime to swear under oath to something you know is not true. They were being demanded to sign a lie under oath. They wouldn't do it. When their Special Agent in Charge Schoffstall defended them and said: No, you can't make my agents sign a statement that they are telling you is a lie. Sure, we understand you want those things in there because you need them to have probable cause, but we are telling you they are not true.

So, the supervisor was punished for protecting the honesty and integrity of his field agents.

What do Director Wray and Deputy Director Abbate do about it? We don't

want to hear about it. We would delete it, and we didn't read it because we don't want to know about the pressure on agents in the field to lie on affidavits.

Who is going to investigate that? Oh, the DOJ. The DOJ has a little group of lawyers. They will look into it.

What a ridiculous system. They need oversight, and this Congress sure isn't going to have oversight because they want them to keep coming up with stuff to go after Donald Trump.

The letter goes on:

This supervisor refused to allow his subordinates to be pressured to lie, and you refused to help. If you want to understand how that feels, just ask the media representative who issued the denials about your personal violations in the SCIF.

Because somebody told that media rep to go out and lie and deny everything.

The employees of the FBI joined because they believe in its core values. They are held to the standard that every employee must be truthful and accountable. You have failed on both counts. You have mistaken your employees' loyalty to the FBI as some misguided loyalty to you.

In the last week, many of your agents and employees have advised me that I will be "killed" or, as one of your employees said, the FBI would issue me a one-way travel voucher off the 4th floor of a hotel balcony. How pathetic it is that your employees have so little faith that you can do the right thing that they would believe dissent against you is a life-threatening proposition.

Before you issue any claim to mock the statement, be assured that the employees who suffered death threats from within the FBI in 2020 have filed protected disclosures with the U.S. Congress. They begged you for help, but you and Mr. Wray ignored their pleas. Their SAC refused to notify the insider threat unit of the issue. Instead, the SAC opened a threat investigation at the field office level, but refused to assign an investigator to conduct the investigation.

Your employees have abandoned you because you abandoned them. There is nothing more that you can do for the FBI, you have demonstrated your lack of honesty and accountability. Please find a job that does not require either of those traits.

□ 1755

Another letter that came after the denial, according to these people is that is an outright lie from the top floor of the FBI.

The individuals have advised that they were associated with an FBI unit called Defensive Electronic Countermeasure Group, which is responsible for conducting electronic countermeasure sweeps in various FBI facilities. This individual or individuals was/were involved in a sweep of the Director's office and Deputy Director's office, including the conference areas inside the Hoover Building's 7th floor SCIFs.

It is their job to check for the security of these places.

During the sweep, dozens of electronic signals, including WiFi and Bluetooth signals, were emanating from within the "SCIFed" area. FBI cell phones, personal cell phones, and high-technology smartwatches were present in the FBI SCIFs.

According to the people who officially surveyed the SCIFs.

There were phones on desks. It did not even appear that the director's office employees were trying to hide the devices. The devices in the SCIF were the type that had cameras included within them.

Meaning, they can be hacked, and if people know what they are doing, they can take pictures, they can see what is going on through the phone that was left in the secured location. So much for protecting things. At least that wasn't the situation at Mar-a-Lago.

The SCIFs on the 7th floor of the FBI Hoover Building in Washington, D.C., are, for all intents and purposes, compromised. This includes the whole Director's and Deputy Director's areas.

They are the ones that are going to protect us from situations like a former President having documents.

These areas are where the most significant threats and most important top secret information in the United States are discussed. You and your executives have created one of the critical security threats to the United States. Because Director Wray and you work in this office area, there is no doubt that you both are aware of the violations. Please do not accuse your employees of lying because you cannot admit the truth.

It appears that you, the executives, and the staff of the 7th floor of the FBI building have formed a conspiracy to violate security practices to protect national security simply because you are not disciplined enough to properly store your electronic devices.

As time concludes, let me finish part of a disclosure regarding the Defensive Electronic Group that surveys these security SCIFs. This person said:

I was responsible for Technical Surveillance Countermeasures worldwide. Recently, I participated in an exam of the J. Edgar Hoover Building, specifically the conference room for the Deputy Director of the FBI. During the exam I observed dozens of strong Bluetooth signals.

That is in the SCIF that is protected from Bluetooth signals or any WiFi.

As I began looking for possible sources, I observed cell phones on desks and in use inside the SCIF. I had just begun looking for them when the chief security officer responsible for that area shut me down.

He was doing his job. He/she—whatever the pronouns are—was doing the job they were hired to do. Yet, they were shut down for doing it so that the Director or the Deputy Director's area could remain completely unsecured because they didn't want him to be reported.

He specifically directed me not to pursue it or take any action. As you know, cell phones are not permitted inside a SCIF. Based on the readings I observed, I believe every employee there was violating the cell phone policy.

That is at the top of the FBI. The DOJ doesn't appear to be concerned about security. If they were, they wouldn't have hired a Putin-lackey to provide false information so they could get a fraudulent warrant—six of them—to pursue and spy on the Trump campaign.

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

## DEVASTATION IN PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a devastating time for the people of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to share this with my colleagues and to ensure that their story is in the public eye because it is a story that addresses devastation like you have never seen before. I guess the story that is so devastating is the 600,000 women who are on the verge of giving birth in conditions that are so devastating.

The week of September 2, members of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus made their way as quickly as they could to the rain-torn, flood-torn region of Pakistan. We arrived on Sunday morning and immediately were able to secure a transport into the flooded areas.

As the government indicated, this is not overflowing rivers, this is sheer rain that generated into flooding. In the Sindh region, Balochistan, the southwestern region—sheer rain turned into floods that were unspeakable.

The water was unspeakable, it was of biblical proportion. The size and the width and the depth was unspeakable. It was a monstrosity. We took an aerial survey. You could not see land. It was only water as far as the eye could see.

In fact, tragically and unfortunately, we could imagine that whole communities were covered with water, that bodies are yet unfound. Even though the death toll is upwards of 1200 to 1300, with one-third or more of those being children. Can you imagine seeing the video of the currents rushing and tearing children away from desperate parents' hands or families being caught in the current and children being pulled away by the rushing waters?

We saw, as was displayed by the government, whole buildings and hotels coming down to the ground. There were 200 bridges destroyed and water going through those bridges. We could, of course, see that it was irreparable harm. Even as we were surveying we saw a bridge that was breached, which divided people that were on that one little line of bridge as their safety net because they were surrounded by water, and then they were separated because the bridge broke in half because the water was so powerful.

In the midst of that, we got a report that military forces had to flood towns of 250,000 people. They had to flood towns so that a city of 1.1 million people could survive. We landed in the city of Dadu, and there are now 400,000 homeless people in Dadu. Overwhelmed. There are 600,000-plus homeless people in Pakistan.

I know that America is a Nation that has always extended its generous arm. If there is ever a moment—as we have

done around the world in earthquakes—Pakistan's earthquake of 2005 and floods of 2010—as we have done around the world when the nations around the world have fallen upon disastrous times.

As a Member of Congress, I went into that horrific tsunami that impacted Thailand, Sri Lanka, and Indonesia, you could not recognize those nations. The tsunami had come and taken out all of the coastal land. People were drawn into the sea, and you never saw them again. Houses were destroyed. The United States joined with the United Nations and was there to help.

The United States has helped when there have been issues of national health crisis, we have been there. We became the leading guardians of fighting HIV/AIDS, particularly on the continent of Africa.

I do want to applaud the Biden administration on being the first donor of the United Nation's call for help for Pakistan, \$30 million. Just as we were leaving—after we had petitioned the Federal Government—they came with an extra \$20 million.

More importantly, as I left to go to Pakistan, writing President Biden about the issue of shelter and tents, the United States military dropped or delivered 300,000 tents on Wednesday or Thursday of last week to be delivered to homeless and helpless persons.

The Pakistani-American community have been outstanding, working with consul generals across America and the Ambassador. They are now raising funds, upwards of millions of dollars. But it is not enough.

First, Pakistan probably has \$10 billion in damages and destruction, but that number has been characterized as low because the water has not been able to drain because there is no drainage. That means that that water not being able to drain that damage will be caused and go on and on and on. I am afraid of dengue fever, waterborne diseases, hepatitis, malaria, with no medications.

While we were there we met a family that had just been plucked out of the waters. Their dad had a kidney transplant, who had not yet received his medicine—everything lost. We were able to press upon the military's generosity and good heart to get him his medicine and get it to where he is—out in an area where I saw no medical facilities.

I want the RECORD to know that even though this country is many miles away, we are connected by its democratic beginnings. This is the 75th anniversary of its independence. It has by and large had peaceful transfers of government, a frequent government, but a democratic government. The founding father, Dr. Jinnah, established this country—as India was established by Gandhi in its independence—that it should have as its form of government democracy.

I am fearful of the loss of life and children and disease will set this country back for many, many, many years.

Let me share with you this story.

The hospital has nothing. Pakistani floods put pregnant women in danger. Just 2 days ago this article from the Guardian came out. A third of the country is under water, and a U.N. fund says almost 650,000 women in affected areas need maternity services. That should give you an amazing level of fear—650,000.

□ 1800

I visit hospitals because I am an advocate for hospitals, particularly in rural areas. And they tell me, well, we have delivered 3,000 births in a month, and I applaud that. That is a high number here in the United States.

But I want to say this again. The U.N. says almost 650,000 women in affected areas need maternity services to have healthy babies.

Crying, vomiting, and 8 months pregnant—I know that wives and Members of Congress, women Members of Congress, women across America, can understand the fragility of a woman during her pregnancy. The young woman walked in labor pains for an hour in search of an ambulance. She wasn't driven. She wasn't on a bicycle. She wasn't on a cart. She wasn't on any form of scooter, any form of transportation.

When Naseeba, 23, eventually found one, she had to beg the driver to take her. Pakistan floods had left the roads damaged and gridlocked, making what is usually a 2-hour journey to the provincial capital of Quetta a punishing 12-hour drive; 2 hours to 12 hours.

She left her flood-ravaged home in Nasirabad district in Balochistan province in the morning and reached Quetta at night.

During this time, I didn't know what has happening around me; struggling to speak. When I finally reached the hospital, the doctors said I would not survive if they didn't operate immediately. Complications with labor, including severe high blood pressure, meant doctors had to rush to deliver the baby.

I would venture to say that this was a circumstance of life and death.

Complications with the labor continued. And Naseeba said she gave birth to a baby boy 2 days ago, but the doctors told her that the baby requires to be incubated, but there were no incubators available, so we had to take her baby to my mother's place, she said. I haven't seen my baby yet.

We can only hope that that baby survived, and that the help at home might have helped that baby breathe.

Naseeba is one of the thousands of pregnant women, according to the United Nations Population Fund, who will bear the brunt of the worst floods in Pakistan and are in desperate need of maternal health services.

And so I will be asking USAID and the head of that agency, who I am very gratified, was visiting Pakistan as we were visiting—as we were leaving, USAID was coming on the ground. As