

ready to go and defend our Nation's interests at home and abroad.

Equipment readiness is a challenge, because when you cannot plan long term for your buys of parts, whether they be for aircraft, ships, tanks, whatever it happens to be, again, your cost goes up.

We have the responsibility as the Congress to give our Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense the tools they need to keep our country safe. Continuing resolutions seriously hinder our capability to complete that mission.

I strongly urge the Senate to act swiftly and come to the realization that a continuing resolution is not an answer going forward for the safety and security of our country, all of its citizens, our families, and our coalition partners who rely on us when times get in dire straits.

So, Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak with you tonight, and I just want to end with one real-time, real-life anecdote.

Forty-six years ago yesterday, July 11, 1972, we saw the evidence of a successful evolving threat in Vietnam when the worst, most devastating helicopter shoot-down of the entire Vietnam war occurred. Sixty-two people perished in one CH-53 helicopter in the northern I Corps. We had not had the capability to adjust our tactics because the SA-7 missile had been introduced. That is how quickly life can change on the battlefield.

We as the Congress need to do everything possible to ensure that that doesn't happen to our Nation's warriors.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague not only for his service, but for his friendship.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I would certainly like to thank the gentleman, Congressman, general, and marine—marine nonetheless—for his fantastic service to this great Nation, both then and now, as a colleague, as a fellow veteran, and as a neighbor in the Cannon building on the south end there. I thank the gentleman for his service and his steadfast support of our military men and women.

Madam Speaker, the regular use, as you have heard, of continuing resolutions impacts commanders at all levels. You have heard about more training deaths than combat deaths. I have to tell you at the service and major command levels, commanders are not allowed to start new programs, increase rates of production, or begin new military construction projects. As you move to lower echelons of command, it forces leaders into making risk determinations related to readiness and training.

Consider, Madam Speaker, Oceana Naval Base. You heard the gentlewoman from Missouri talk about parts and maintenance and half of the Navy airplanes not being able to fly. Oceana Naval Base, which resides in my district, if it were a country, it would be

the seventh largest airforce in the world.

The Air Force Combat Command is also in my district. Flying hours for many of these units have been far below the needed hours for units prepping for combat deployments.

As you heard, many of the aircraft are grounded because of maintenance and not being able to get to parts. It has taken years and will take years to recover. We are certainly not there yet.

Air National Guardsmen who volunteer at the beginning of the year are only able to have orders cut for the duration of the continuing resolution if it happens. This sometimes reduces the level of their benefits, such as their basic housing allowance. They are eligible to receive less than that because the orders get broken into separate pieces.

This really affects the ones at the lower rank, the enlisted, like what I was, those who may have military families. Again, hurting our military families which is the strong basis of structure for a strong force.

Let me give you another example. While returning from a deployment, approximately 90 airmen had unanticipated changes in their itinerary which caused additional expenses to be incurred. Since these expenses were not authorized prior to the new fiscal year, these members were not reimbursed for more than 60 days after their return. Some of the unpaid expenses ranged from just a few dollars to \$7,000 for one young airman.

Imagine, Madam Speaker, if you are a young airman, E-3, E-4, and you have a family, \$7,000 is a lot of money. It could be the difference between paying the mortgage and keeping the lights on back home, contributing to the stress of our military families.

In the weekend of January 20, 2018, there was a scheduled training weekend. The expiration of the continuing resolution caused a last-minute cancellation of an event impacting 950 airmen. Fifty of the airmen who traveled out of Langley Air Force base, also in my district, before the order was given to cancel were immediately sent home without accomplishing any training events. They may never be able to get that training back as they prepare to go to combat for this Nation.

There are some other negative impacts that we don't hear about often. The Virginia National Guard is second contributing to the war effort amongst other guard units around the country. The Reserve components make up 47 percent of our Nation's operational forces, yet they are required to cease operations during a continuing resolution while Active Duty counterparts continue training. Forty-seven percent, Madam Speaker, of our operational forces have to shut down during continuing resolutions.

Let me read a couple things that I got from the Virginia National Guard.

During the most recent shutdown that happened, 3 days, was inac-

curately reported in many media outlets as having minimal impact, to the contrary Virginia National Guard faced the following: They had last-minute notification of inactive duty training for 2,211 personnel, resulting in the absence of anticipated monthly income, which equated to 4 days of Active Duty pay.

Notifications to more than 630 full-time soldiers and airmen that their potential employment would be temporarily terminated were sent out. That affects retention. \$28,000 worth of contract actions were canceled, and a projected \$7,500 in subsequent loss as a result of these cancellations.

Missed training opportunities. During the most recent shutdown, the National Guard lost training opportunities totaled \$7.7 million, affecting expected income for 58,000 soldiers and airmen and 37,000 Federal technicians.

Aside from those losses, that contributes to mission and morale impacts. Again, the Virginia National Guard is second in the Nation contributing to the war efforts, and the Reserve components make up 47 percent of the Nation's operational forces.

Madam Speaker, we have to do better for our military apparatus. I just want to reiterate to you that I have the great honor of representing the district with more military and veterans than any congressional district in the Nation. If there is anything going on in the world, if Mother Freedom needs to be defended anywhere in the world, then our men and women are there on the front-lines fighting for family, for friends, and for freedom.

We in Congress and the Senate owe them better, and we have to do better. We have to get our acts together. We have to lead with the courage and the spirit that they have. We can make it happen, and we should push and push until we got it done.

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

PETER STRZOK'S TESTIMONY ON CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting day here on Capitol Hill. Madam Speaker, the hearing was still going on when I was just in the Cloakroom, where we had an FBI agent, one of the top supervisors, he had been in charge of foreign counterintelligence as well, and then after his outrageous bias and comments through text messages came to light, Robert Mueller relieved him from the Trump investigation and left the others who were just as biased. But it was an incredible day.

For somebody who has not just shown bias, but outrageous animus, disgust, disdain, and deploring people who voted for Trump by their smell, he

tried to clean it up a little bit in his testimony today.

Madam Speaker, I thought it might be helpful to some of our Members who know there is some rule here of the House that somehow you are not supposed to besmirch other Members. I am not sure how far it goes, but if they will check the rule, it is for those who are elected, be it House Member, Senate, Vice President, President, we are required to show decency and not call into question the intentions of such an elected person.

When a witness comes before a hearing who is testifying 180 degrees opposite of what he put in writing thousands of times, for most of us, for a majority here in the House, it has no credibility. It makes the witness even look worse.

To come in after we have seen so many of the texts he sent, we have got a good sense of where this man's heart, soul, and mind have been. It appeared abundantly clear that he had gotten very, very good at lying. It doesn't violate any House rule to say that.

Now, when we were in our hearing, and one of my Democratic friends across the aisle yelled that I was off my meds, see, now, that was a violation of the rule. I thought about calling it out, having her words taken down, but we didn't need any further delays. But I thought it might be informative to my friends across the aisle who don't understand the rules of the House, but when somebody is lying through their teeth, sitting there smugly and smirking, and, frankly, when it hit me, that is probably the same smug little smirk you had on your face when you told your wife, no telling how many times, there is nothing going on between me and Lisa Page. He got really good at lying and showing no emotion whatsoever.

□ 1815

So, unfortunately, what I brought out in that hearing and he denied recalling should not be lost in the exchange about his lying. It is far more important.

But for the record, as a prosecutor, a defense attorney, a felony judge, a chief justice, and as a Member of Congress, I have asked thousands of witnesses questions. When you have somebody who has just gotten so good at lying that there is no indication in their eyes whatsoever that it bothers them to lie, somebody has got to call them out on it. It is just not good for the state of this Union.

It is also denying credibility to actually have the witness say he doesn't recall getting information about a foreign entity that is not Russia getting every—actually, it was over 30,000 emails, emails that were sent through to Hillary Clinton through the unauthorized server and unsecured server and every email she sent out. There were highly classified—beyond classified—top secret-type stuff that had gone through that server.

Out of the over 30,000 emails that went through that server, all but 4 of them—no explanation why those 4 didn't get the same instruction, but we have some very good intelligence people—when they were asked to look at Hillary Clinton's emails, they picked up an anomaly. As they did forensic research on the emails, they found that anomaly was actually an instruction embedded, compartmentalized data embedded in the email server telling the server to send a copy of every email that came to Hillary Clinton through that unauthorized server and every email that she sent out through that server, to send it to this foreign entity that is not Russia.

We know that efforts were made to get Inspector General Horowitz to receive that information. He would not return a call. Apparently, he didn't want that information because that would go against his saying that the bias did not affect the investigation.

Of course it affected the investigation. It couldn't help but affect the investigation. It denies logic and common sense to say somebody with that much animus, that much bias and prejudice would not have it affect their investigation.

Madam Speaker, I can tell you I know there are people in this House who don't care for me, but I can also tell you there is no one in this House on either side of this aisle who I would put up with being investigated and prosecuted by somebody with the hatred, the absolute nasty prejudice that Peter Strzok had for Donald Trump. I wouldn't put up with it. I would go to bat for any Democrat in this House, any Republican in this House, the ones who don't like me on either side. It wouldn't matter.

Nobody in the United States of America should have the full power of the Federal Government coming after them in the hands of somebody prejudiced, full of hate for that individual. But such is what we are dealing with here. That is why I laid the groundwork, gave the names of the people—some of them—that were there when Peter Strzok was informed about Hillary Clinton's emails for sure going to a foreign entity. This is serious stuff.

What came of our intelligence community providing that information to the FBI agent in charge, Peter Strzok? Nothing. Peter Strzok received the information that it wasn't speculation, that maybe Hillary Clinton's emails were capable of being hacked, but we have no evidence that they were hacked.

All this garbage that we have heard about from reports? No. When the FBI was told her emails were hacked and every email she received, every email she sent out—over 30,000, except for 4—over 30,000 were compromised and going to a foreign entity not Russia, and Mr. Strzok did nothing about it.

When I started laying the groundwork pointing out the people, I am told an attorney behind Mr. Strzok

mouthed, "Oh, my gosh," something like that, as I was laying the groundwork. I don't know if she knew what I was talking about or not, but I thought I picked up just a fleeting note of detection in Peter Strzok's eyes that he knew what I was talking about.

But, again, for my friends who are not familiar with the true rules of the House, let me explain. In trial courts, for example, the felony court over which I was a judge, the rules of evidence are very strict, and we protect the jury from hearing things that don't have any basis for believability. That is why most hearsay cannot come in, but there are exceptions.

But one rule that you always find in any court, no matter how strict the rules are, the credibility of the witness is always in evidence, always relevant, always material. The witness' credibility is always material and relevant.

When it has been as open and everyone in our hearing room knew what has been going on for such a prolonged period and I saw that look, that is all I could think is: I wonder if that is the same look you gave your wife over and over when you lied to her about Lisa Page.

The credibility of a witness is always material and relevant. Mark it down.

Now, in our House hearings, the rules are not that strict. It is more in the nature of anything that we feel may be relevant to the subject at hand. But in a hearing like today, even things that have nothing to do—they are not germane, they are not relevant, they are not material to what we are doing, we still have people bring in posters about something that is not germane, not relevant, not material; and they can get away with doing it, in some cases, as they did today, even though the rules probably could have restricted keeping some of that out. We have very relaxed rules, so these kind of things happen.

Like I say, to yell out I am off my meds, yes, that violates the rule, but I am sure my Democratic friend didn't realize what a rule-breaker she was as she tried to claim I was breaking the rules, which I was not.

But what really came home, too, is, again, Inspector General Horowitz did a good job gathering the evidence, except he refused to get the evidence that was offered to him about Hillary Clinton's emails absolutely, unequivocally being hacked and everything over 30,000, except for 4, going to a foreign entity not Russia.

You get the picture. The bias made a lot of difference in the outcome of the case.

Horowitz is just wrong about that. He was obviously—as I said at the hearing: So you give us over 500 pages showing bias by the investigators on the Republican side, and since you don't want your Democratic friends mad at you, you conclude there is no indication all of this evidence showed any affect on the outcome.

Well, hello. When you show such hatred and animus in the mind of the lead

investigator and you show that everything that concluded from that investigation was 100 percent consistent with the bias and hatred, you don't have to have the witness agree: You are right; you caught me. All my bias affected the outcome of my investigation.

Just like a prosecutor who puts on evidence that a guy gets in a car, drives to a bank, pulls out a gun, holds it to the head of the teller, makes the teller give him money, and leaves in that car, you have to prove intent, that he intended to rob the bank, but you don't have to have evidence that the bank robber said, "Hey, I intend to rob this bank." No.

When the results—and there are a lot of results—all of them are consistent with the bias and the hatred, the disdain, the animus, then you have got at least a de facto case, certainly one that can get past a motion for summary judgment and get to the jury and put in the hands of the fact finder.

Again, when you have somebody who is as good at lying to folks over and over and over again with a straight face, gets a lot of practice, and he comes before Congress—the guy is good. He is really good.

As I told him—I think, obviously, he and his lawyer had a different opinion, but it seemed to me it would have been more credible to come in and do what Inspector General Horowitz did, and say: Yeah, there is a lot of bias here, no question, but I don't think it affected the outcome.

Of course, he wasn't 100 percent sure, it didn't sound like, that it didn't affect when Strzok decided to end the Hillary Clinton investigation and when he immediately decided to pick up the investigation against Trump.

As I heard my friend say over and over about how Comey, of course, just really harmed the Clinton campaign, they are ignoring something that appeared pretty clear, even without resorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

□ 1830

We know Hillary Clinton's emails that she claimed were missing were found on Anthony Weiner's laptop. Maybe it was Huma Abedin, Anthony Weiner, one of their laptops. They found those emails there.

Of course, Peter Strzok, helping the woman whom he thought ought to win 100 million to 0 for President, wow, that was not good news for people like him who wanted to help Hillary.

They couldn't help the fact that FBI agents, when investigating something else, find all these missing 30,000 or so emails on this laptop. And they have got the information at least for some weeks, maybe 2, maybe 3, maybe 4. We are not sure, but they had found this information.

So Comey was in a difficult situation. He wanted Hillary to win, no question. He did not want Donald Trump to win. He never did like

Trump, never has, apparently, things he has said and done.

So what could he do that would cause the least amount of problems for Hillary Clinton?

There was a threat, apparently, that FBI agents were going to go public that they had found these missing emails and that Comey was blocking reopening the investigation now that we have all these emails. And if FBI agents, who are righteous, unlike Peter Strzok, really righteous people—and I know a lot of them around the country. They are good, decent, upstanding, honorable, give-their-life-for-their-country kind of people, not give their affair for themselves but give their lives for their country. Those people have gotten a big blemish on them because of Peter Strzok and others at the top of the Department of Justice in the last administration, as they held over. They would never do what Peter Strzok did. They would never do that.

So it gets a little like they erect a straw dog: You are condemning the thousands of great FBI agents around the country.

No, I am blaming you. We know they are good, but you are not.

And that is where we have been here. This country is in a lot of trouble. But it was very clear: Peter Strzok, intentionally and knowingly, with demonstrated prejudice, refused to pursue the disclosed fact to him, in his presence, that a foreign entity not Russia was getting every email that Hillary Clinton sent and received. There was classified material in there, and there was higher than just plain classified. There was extremely sensitive information in there.

What else did we know? Actually, if you dig what has been uncovered during the last 2 years, Hillary Clinton had the President's Daily Briefing going to her home. And there are times that the young man—I believe his name was Oscar Flores—who worked there, they may have tried to get him a clearance at one time, but, apparently, from what I could read, he didn't have any kind of clearance, yet he would print stuff off.

The President's Daily Briefing is some of the most sensitive information in the entire United States Government, extreme sensitivity, and she violated the law by making it accessible to people without the proper clearance and, certainly, her young man, or man, who was working there for her.

She violated the law. It wasn't necessary that she have intent; it was just necessary that she broke the law in that case.

I really would like to have intent be an element of most every crime that is in the Federal law. I think it would be a good idea. But right now it is not part of the laws she broke.

Yet people like Peter Strzok covered for her. They refused to pursue the things that would have made her guilty. They went after things to try to hurt Donald Trump.

When you look at that October press conference that Comey had, you realize, gee, what if he had not called that press conference and you had one or more FBI agents come out and say: "Hey, we found these emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop weeks ago, and Comey refused to reopen the investigation"; that would have doomed her election far worse than what happened.

So what, under the circumstances, was the best thing that Comey could do for his friend Hillary Clinton? It was to get out ahead of anybody disclosing that they had been sitting on the thought-to-be-lost emails and say: We have got them.

Then, as I had said back at the time, well, we will find out how serious Comey is. If he comes back within 2 or 3 days and says they have examined all 30,000 or so, whatever, of the emails, then we will know that this was just a charade to cover for Hillary Clinton, because they are not going to be able to adequately research all of those emails in just a matter of 2 or 3 days.

He came back very quickly, so that it would not affect the election coming up, and announced: No. Clean bill of health. We looked at all the new evidence. Nothing was there.

Except they still didn't bother to use the information provided by the intelligence community that was available. They didn't pick it up, didn't do anything with what was disclosed.

I am telling you, I am very grateful we have people working in this government who want to protect the United States and want to protect the United States' people. They don't get a lot of credit, usually don't get any credit, but they do a good job for this country; and my head and my heart and my salute go out to them as we deal with the mess that has been created by those with far more selfish motives.

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

CLOUD OF COLLUSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, in light of the upcoming one-on-one meeting between President Trump and Vladimir Putin, I rise today to remind the American people about the cloud of collusion hanging over their heads.

As the American people continue to learn details of this unfolding scandal, the implausible idea of Russia compromising the President of the United States becomes more fact than fiction. The President, his family members, his campaign staff, and his close associates have repeatedly lied about their multiple contacts with Russian officials and close associates of Putin. They have had no consistent explanation for these meetings. It has happened over and over.

Furthermore, the President continues to parrot Putin's version of