

CONGRATULATING HARDING UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIAN JEAN WALDROP

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Jean Waldrop, librarian of Harding University, on receiving the Suzanne Spurrier Academic Librarian Award.

This award is given—in memory of Suzanne Spurrier, the former library director at Harding University—each year to the librarian who exemplifies the spirit of outstanding service and is dedicated to the professionalism that we expect from all librarians.

Miss Waldrop has been working at Harding's Brackett Library since 2006 and oversaw several areas of the library before becoming its director. She has served as the secretary for ARKLink, a board member for Amigos, and is currently serving on the White County Regional Library System board and the Searcy Public Library board.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Jean Waldrop on receiving this recognition and wish her much continued success.

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

#### HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### IMPEACHMENT HEARINGS FIT A PATH AND A CONTINUUM

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and to be recognized for 30 minutes here as the week closes out and we head back to our districts for Thanksgiving.

The scenario that has been playing out here now for several weeks in this Congress has been a topic across the news, across the land, and certainly reverberates within the walls of this building and the halls of the outside buildings everywhere around this country.

I speak, of course, of the attempt to impeach our President, President Donald Trump. The circumstances around this week and last week and the previous week are pretty fresh in our minds, but I would like to paint the scenario on how we got to this point and how the effort to impeach Donald Trump has evolved into the hearings that we are seeing now that are taking place before the Select Committee on Intelligence—finally out in the open—and the hearings and the deliberations that I think are likely to take place on

the other side of this Thanksgiving divide.

Madam Speaker, it all fits a path and a continuum, and it is something that one can trace back clear into as far back, I will say, as perhaps the fall of 2015.

Being a Representative from Iowa, I have been involved in the Presidential selection process at the first-in-the-Nation caucus. We did an event on January 24, 2015, that effectively launched the Presidential campaign for the Nation on that day and brought in a dozen candidates that were eventually announced as candidates for President on the Republican side, and a number of other folks who we had speak that day who we thought might enter into the race.

There was a short handful that were invited that didn't come to that event. But because of that, I found myself in the middle of this churning of the nomination process. I saw the policies and the issues that flowed from that debate, and I was in the middle of the debate myself intensively for nearly a year and a half.

At that event that we did in Des Moines at the Hoyt Sherman Place—it is a theater that our future President Donald Trump spoke from the stage that day, as did a good number of others—as we watched this all unfold and they saw that Donald Trump was moving closer and closer to the nomination—we didn't know this at the time, but we know it now—there were powerful forces within the departments of government that were positioning things against whoever the Republican nominee would be, but certainly against Donald Trump as he became the nominee.

We have seen the texts that came forth from Peter Strzok and from Lisa Page that talked about how it could never happen; that Donald Trump could never beat Hillary Clinton. But they had an insurance policy in the event that that outside long shot actually took place.

Madam Speaker, I want people reminded of this because this insurance policy is being executed right now here in the House of Representatives in these impeachment hearings that are being conducted by ADAM SCHIFF, the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Now, a number of things happened that need to be investigated that were not investigated nearly as deeply as they should have been and that is, for example, the mishandling of classified information on Hillary Clinton's server, her using a private server that she had set up intentionally to avoid the secure server that one would have as a Secretary of State.

The evidence shows that it is very likely, if not already confirmed, that Barack Obama communicated with Hillary Clinton through that server knowingly, and that he had an email address that was exclusive to him, that was certainly known by a number of people

who he communicated with on the off-line off channel, against-the-law effort to communicate outside the bounds of the government secure servers.

That was going on and she, you know, she paid for BleachBit. She hired people to scrub those servers to get rid of the information. There were over 30,000 emails that were the property of the American people in the form of the Federal Government that were destroyed.

We haven't found those, and she has not been held accountable for that. And the mishandling of that information was clear. It was a stark violation of Federal statute. In October of 2015, and again in April of 2016, then-President Barack Obama said: Well, Hillary Clinton would never intend to jeopardize our national security.

And when he spoke those words, he spoke those words into what became later on, effectively, law. Because the law doesn't require that there be any intent. Negligence, gross negligence, is the only requirement.

She was clearly grossly negligent. She certainly intended to circumvent the secure servers that had been set up for that very purpose of protecting the classified information of all of those emails that we got down out of Anthony Weiner's laptop. There was reported to be 650,000. Some of them were classified emails that went up into that laptop of Anthony Weiner.

□ 1400

But she was never taken to account on that. There was an interview of Hillary Clinton that took place July 2, 2016. That interview had in it, by testimony of the then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch, and also James Comey, the director of the FBI, both testified that there were eight agents in that room that questioned Hillary Clinton. They disagreed on how many were from the Department of Justice and how many were from the FBI.

Since the FBI is a division of the Department of Justice, I think that it is probably not as important an issue as this is: That we don't know their names. But I believe they were hand-picked to bring about the result.

The statement that was delivered 3 days later by James Comey on July 5, that 15- to 17-minute long presentation that sounded like an indictment of Hillary Clinton until you got down to the last few sentences of it, was written clear back in May, and it had the words "gross negligence" in it. And they changed those words from "gross negligence," because that matched the statute that would have been a clear violation, to "extreme carelessness" as opposed to "gross negligence."

And then James Comey said Hillary Clinton would never intend to, and you could not prove intent, so no serious prosecutor would prosecute because you couldn't prove that she intended to jeopardize our national security. But the statute doesn't require the intent. It was Barack Obama's words that