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 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 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—no matter what, he’s been there for the 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 delays and 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 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 have not recovered there yet.

Air National Guardmen 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 cancelation of training events 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 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 deploping people who voted for Trump by their smell, he...
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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 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 mark, I 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. Somebody was 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.

I thought it 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. Somebody was 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.

So, unfortunately, what I brought out in that hearing and he denied re-calling 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 on their face that they are lying, 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 new witnesses say he didn'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 any email that she sent out. They 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 and analyzed data 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 she sent out through an 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 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 on a theory or prej-udiced, 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.

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

Inspector General 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 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.”

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, 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 clear, even without re-sorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

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 on 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 who are righteous, unlike Peter Strzok and the people—I 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.

Again, 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 the truth.

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 clear, even without re-sorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

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 on 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 who are righteous, unlike Peter Strzok and the people—I 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.

Again, 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 the truth.

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 clear, even without re-sorting to people who have provided information about what went on.

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 on 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.

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 laptops a few 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 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 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 salutes 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. PASCRELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. 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 closest aides, 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