

and effective May 15, 2022, of the “covered period” designated on January 4, 2021.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS
TO COMMISSION ON INTER-
NATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1988 (22 U.S.C. 6431), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2022, and ending May 14, 2024:

Mr. Nury Turkel, Alexandria, Virginia

Mr. Frank R. Wolf, Vienna, Virginia, to succeed Ms. Anurima Bhargava, Chicago, Illinois

Dr. David G. Curry, Corona Del Mar, California, to succeed Dr. James W. Carr, Searcy, Arkansas

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 1687(b)(1)(A–B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2022 (Pub. L. 117–81), I am pleased to appoint the following member to the Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States:

Mr. Matthew Kroenig, McLean, Virginia
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. §2702 I am pleased to reappoint the following member to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Mr. Günter Waibel, Oakland, California.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

WE LIVE IN INTERESTING TIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is truly an interesting time, which takes me back to the alleged Chinese curse that may you live in interesting times. Well, we are living in interesting times.

Growing up hearing the term “pot calling the kettle black,” it is a colloquialism. Another term, and I brought this up years ago here on the House floor, about gaslighting, we certainly seem to be experiencing some of that these days and have for some time.

But to have the Secretary of Homeland Security, who seems to be an intelligent person, come and testify under oath with a straight face that the border is secure and not be satisfied with that but refer to the Trump administration as having dismantled the immigration system, the ability to secure the border, when exactly the opposite is what was occurring and exactly the opposite of what is occurring now.

It is not secured. All you have to do is go look. I mean, it is incredible, but it is said so often, including by people on the committee of oversight for Border Patrol, the Judiciary Committee.

Having spent so much time down on the border, I like to be there late at night when there is an awful lot of movement normally across the border illegally, but I experienced under the most closed administration, the least forthcoming administration since I have been in Congress since January 2005. In fact, they zoomed up Border Patrol cars to prevent me from getting to the border to see how bad it was.

I was able to go around one night and get back to the border through the local park down south of McAllen, but that was no thanks to the Border Patrol that, in the past, most of them knew that I was their friend and asserted on their behalves because they were not being treated fairly and properly, especially during the Obama administration.

But it is important for any Member of Congress to be able to get to the border unimpeded. Now Secretary Mayorkas says he looked into it and couldn’t find anyone who had ever directed that a Member of Congress, me in particular, was not to be allowed to get to the border.

So, I look forward to using his testimony under oath and seeing who now will try to prevent me from getting to the border.

They will let you go as long as you give them time to set up a dog-and-pony show and have time to restrict the area that they are going to allow you to see, but that is not the way you do oversight.

When I was a judge, I would just show up at a prison, a jail, a halfway house, different places. If I was going to send somebody to a place, I wanted to be able to see how they were being treated without warning.

I still think that is a good idea. Of course, we know the Washington, D.C., jail out east of town where so many January 6 defendants were being held, they wouldn’t let us in, not to visit, not for any reason. It really has been astounding.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE and I were finally allowed to get in there, and we hope to do that again soon because we are hearing more stories of abuse.

I got a letter in response from the U.S. marshal whom I asked to go do a health and safety visit regarding Ryan Nichols. As I understand the letter, they called over and got information from people who had deceived some of us before, and the U.S. marshal seemed quite satisfied with that without bothering to see for himself.

It is rather unfortunate because the U.S. marshal did an inspection last September or October, I believe it was October, and found that hundreds of the inmates were not being properly treated and needed to be transferred out. So, hopefully, the U.S. marshal will get back to doing the job of the U.S. marshal.

The law, the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court for a couple of centuries, has made clear you are not allowed to punish people in pretrial confinement.

Just as the FISA court has shown no pride and no protection of their court and authority, they have demonstrated that they don’t mind being lied to by lawyers. They don’t mind having fraud upon the court because it is a secret star chamber.

I had hoped that when FISA judges found out they had been manipulated and lied to that they would have enough integrity that they would be upset about being lied to. But, apparently, because of the lack of contempt, the lack of show cause hearings as to why contempt was not appropriate, the lack of prosecution by the Department of Justice going after people within the justice system, I have come to the conclusion—I hoped we could save the FISA court, but apparently, it does not appear that that is going to be possible.

Our Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has not had enough concern about lies being perpetuated, fraud being perpetuated on the FISA court, that he, as far as we know, has not done anything about that because certainly no one is punished, not even for perpetuating lies in order to spy on the campaign and even the Presidency after the person they were spying on and trying to prevent from winning the election won the election.

It is a very disturbing time for those of us who have spent much of our adult lives in the State and Federal justice system trying to see that justice was done. It is a very disturbing time.

Going back to the term “gaslighting,” we are told that we are crazy. We are making stuff up. I know with regard to the 2020 election, people continued to repeat the untruth that

there was no fraud in the 2020 election when most every election that has ever been did have fraud, did have improprieties. It is just a question of how much.

But it is John Fund that wrote a book on election fraud, quite good, some years back. As pointed out before, the biggest fraud about elections is saying there is no fraud in elections.

When Congress made the inappropriate step of mandating electronic voting back after the unfortunate situation in Florida, where even though fifth graders were shown to be able to utilize the butterfly ballots quite effectively, we had Democrat voters that were not able to figure them out. Perhaps another visit to fifth grade might have helped them before they voted.

That is why we were told we had to upend our election system in the United States and go to electronic voting. Many of us are hoping we will get back to paper ballots because we have seen, although people were gaslighting and saying: "Oh, no, no. These machines do not connect to the internet." Then we find out that when there was a problem with a voting machine, they would contact one of the hired guys that would use their iPad, get on the internet, and fix a voting machine without actually being in its presence.

That is using the internet. Yet, we were gaslighted and told even though it was going on, it wasn't going on.

Just to remind people who are not familiar with the term "gaslighting," I thought the 1944 movie with Ingrid Bergman is a great movie. I have watched it more than once. Her husband was making her think she was going crazy or was crazy when she wasn't at all. He was being evil. This from *Medical News Today* says: "Gaslighting is a form of psychological abuse where a person or group makes someone question their sanity, perception of reality, or memories. People experiencing gaslighting often feel confused, anxious, and unable to trust themselves."

"The term 'gaslighting' derives from the 1938 play and 1944 film "Gaslight," in which a husband manipulates his wife into thinking she has a mental illness by dimming their gas-fueled lights and telling her she is hallucinating."

□ 1330

The article goes on to give different examples. It says that gaslighting often develops gradually, making it difficult for a person to detect.

According to the National Domestic Violence Hotline, techniques a person may use to gaslight someone include countering. Countering describes a person questioning someone's memories. They may say things such as: "You never remember things accurately" or "Are you sure? You have a bad memory."

Another technique is withholding. When someone withholds, they refuse to engage in a conversation. A person using this technique may pretend not to understand someone so that they do

not have to respond to them. For example, they might say: "I do not know what you are talking about" or "You are just trying to confuse me." I would submit that withholding can include when being asked for information, for evidence, that being withheld and in return being told: "No, there is nothing there."

It comes to mind back when Jeff Sessions was the Attorney General, some of us had concerns about a matter that needed to be investigated, and we knew that there was a person of integrity who had a notebook full of documentation, many of which documents could quite easily constitute an offense under Federal law. That was pointed out that, gee, this needs to be investigated; this person needs to be talked to.

Eventually, this incredibly competent person was contacted by an FBI agent, after the Secretary of the Department of Justice asked them to take a look. The FBI contacted her and told her to come for a visit and under no circumstances was she to bring her notebook that contained valuable evidence of apparent wrongdoing. When she arrived, she was grilled for 2 hours. She did as she was instructed by the FBI and didn't bring her notebook of documents.

Then when Secretary Sessions asked about the matter, he was told: "Yeah, we looked into it. We talked to her. She didn't have anything." Well, that is a form of gaslighting. You direct a witness not to bring the documentation she has and then tell your boss: "Yeah, we talked to her. She didn't have anything." Well, you told her not to bring the evidence.

So these kinds of things, unfortunately, still go on. I can't help but suspect that when Bill Barr said there was no fraud in the election, he was relying on people, like Jeff Sessions did, when he was lied to, because obviously Bill Barr didn't go out and do an investigation personally; he relied on people perhaps he should not have relied on.

How do we know that anybody at the FBI would lie? Well, we found out it was even done before a Federal judge or Federal judges. The other shoe is yet to drop on all of that.

But something has got to be done. We can't have a star chamber system where judges are lied to. Clearly, when the judges don't care—they have got lifetime appointments—that is one thing. But then when their adjudications, their hearings, are in secret, they have a layer of anonymity that protects them from being judged and ridiculed for either stupidity, naivety, or just dishonesty. Whatever it is, it is not right. That is why our court system was required to be public originally.

But as we see these fundamental foundational principles being removed in the last decades, recent decades, it ought to be a warning, it ought to be a red light flashing, bells going off, "Danger, danger, Will Robinson." This is serious stuff, and it needs to be looked into.

According to this article, trivializing is another technique. This occurs when a person belittles or disregards the other person's feelings. They may accuse them of being too sensitive or of overreacting when they have valid concerns and feelings like, say, about an election.

Some of us who in this Chamber objected to electors exactly—well, almost exactly—like our Democrat friends did on January 6, 2001, January 6 of 2005, and 11 times on January 6 of 2017, so some of us felt like our Democrat friends understand there is nothing unconstitutional or criminal or illegal about coming into this Chamber and objecting.

Now, the difference was, the Democrats in 2017, January 6, 2017, as I recall, they didn't have a Senator to join the objection, which made them illegitimate. On some objections in 2021, we did have Senators; some we didn't. At least we had Senators join on some.

But we thought surely the Democrats, since they objected every time a Republican won since 2000, they would understand or would believe the legitimacy of raising an objection, yet they convinced so much of the American public that anybody that objected was guilty of sedition, treason, all kinds of crimes, which often is a mark—I have been a prosecutor and a felony judge. A lot of times when somebody who has done some activity accuses somebody else of having criminal intent when they do the same activity, it is evidence that they had criminal intent when they did that action.

Interestingly, I am still amazed that there are still people in this body that want to accuse those who objected—as Democrats have, like I say, in 2017, 11 times—accuse them of criminality. That is amazing. Perhaps that lends itself to being a form of gaslighting. We are crazy, we are criminal, because we did what they have done every time a Republican won in the last 20 years.

Another technique is denial. Denial involves a person pretending to forget events or how they occurred. Like when somebody says: "No, we never do that; we never did that." Well, do you think we are crazy? It is in the RECORD. There is video. You can go online and find the video of it occurring.

There were objections by Democrats, which sure sounded to be spurious. But the meme that was going around was saying, What is the difference between criminal conspiracy and truth? The answer was: About 6 months. Well, that is inaccurate, because it has been about 18 months, and we are still discovering truth on some things that we are alleged to have been just crazy—a form of gaslighting—crazy, insurrectionist, criminal conspiracies. These people are insane that think there were any problems with the 2020 election.

The movie that Dinesh D'Souza and Catherine Engelbrecht and Gregg had put together, worked on, "2000 Mules," that is one technique of fraud that was utilized in the 2020 election. These are

things that ought to cause bipartisan research and effort to try to prevent if anybody is truly interested in having free and fair elections.

Another technique, according to this psychological article, is diverting. With this technique, a person changes the focus of a discussion and questions the other person's credibility instead. For example, they might say: "That is just another crazy idea you got from your crazy friends."

I keep hearing people making allegations against Clarence Thomas. I was speaking at an event where John Yoo also spoke. He clerked, as I understand, for Justice Clarence Thomas. I was quite pleased to hear him say what I believe is absolutely true, for anybody that cares to do their research, that Justice Clarence Thomas is one of the most intelligent judges to ever sit on the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet, he is demeaned.

We had a hearing going on. A man named Mark Paoletta was testifying, and he mentioned that he believed the attacks on Justice Thomas were racist, because he is a Black person, an originalist regarding the Constitution, who appears to be conservative.

One of the Democrat members on the committee asked for any evidence whatsoever of any racist attacks on Clarence Thomas. The response was: "Well, you just had a chairman call him an Uncle Tom. That is number one, but I have got tons more, even from this hearing." And he did, but he was cut off and not allowed to give further evidence of the racism being utilized against such a brilliant Justice on the Supreme Court because he happens to be Black and he happens to think for himself.

I mentioned this in our hearing, because I don't think people know his background. I was greatly intrigued and found it extremely interesting reading Clarence Thomas's autobiographical book "My Grandfather's Son."

He has been accused—I have heard him be accused many times of not being Black by people who don't know what it is to be poor and Black. Justice Thomas does. He lived with his mother, as I understood, I recall from the book, about 6 months in Atlanta, a horrendous time. But basically, he and his little brother were raised by their grandparents in Pin Point, Georgia, right on the coast.

Because they were on the coast, he pointed out, they had food, they could get greens that were called poke sallet. I don't like them, but they could always go out and pick poke sallet growing wild. Because they were right there on the coast, they could get fish or different type things, whether it was mussels or clams or fish, whatever, they were able to get a lot of food.

He was so smart, so intelligent, he got a scholarship to Holy Cross and then ultimately decided he wanted to go to law school, applied to Harvard. But I think it was half a day he was at

Harvard, and as he thinks of himself, he was an angry, Black, radical, liberal, and he felt like Harvard was too conservative.

□ 1345

He felt like Harvard was too conservative, so he left and applied for Yale, and he liked Yale better because it was much more liberal, he felt like.

But he began to notice that liberals seemed to look down on him, that they didn't want to talk to him about anything but sports or oppression of Blacks in America, and he noticed that the two or three conservatives in the school were interested in his opinions on all kinds of things and would talk to him about things, and he began to notice and appreciate that.

In a discussion with one of the few conservatives that were talking about seatbelts, helmets, whether they should or shouldn't be mandatory, and he expressed the opinion that, gee, he felt like they just ought to have a law passed that required everybody to wear a seatbelt and everybody on a motorcycle to wear a helmet.

And the conservative, giving a more libertarian question, said, in effect, you have seen government used to oppress Blacks in America, why in the world would you ever want to give the government any more control over your life? That set him thinking. Eventually he began to realize, you know what, it is not a good idea to continue to give the government more and more power because it can be abused.

This is a man who thought for himself. But he also knew how intelligent he was, and it had to be a bit insulting to have people act like, gee, if it weren't for us liberals, you, as a much less intelligent Black, would never have even gotten to be in the school with me, whereas he knew the truth. He was there because he was a brilliant person, and he has not gotten credit for his consistency, for his intellect, for his integrity. It is constantly being demeaned, and they try to gaslight him. It hasn't worked.

Another technique is stereotyping. An article in American Sociological Review states that "a person using gaslighting techniques may intentionally use negative stereotypes of a person's gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, or age to manipulate them. For example, they may tell a female that people will think she is irrational or crazy if she seeks help for abuse."

As an assistant DA, I saw that, and it was amazing to me. I was a bit naive, but to see a woman bruised and battered, clearly beat up, we wanted to see her husband put in jail. Nobody should ever treat anybody—male, female, anybody—the way that some of these battered women got treated. And yet they would be gaslighted to the point that after the bruises and the abrasions went away, they would come back and say, "I don't want to press charges."

In one particular case, I said, "This is not your choice. Under the law, we

have the right to go after your husband because he clearly abused you, and it is going to keep continuing. We asked you when you came in, you know, do you promise you will not back off this time, you will let us go after your husband for this kind of abuse?" And she had said, "Absolutely," with her face all swollen, black and blue, scraped. It was horrendous.

And yet he worked on her psychologically. She eventually comes back and says, "I want to withdraw the charges." We said, "We have got the pictures. We are going to go ahead and press charges this time." "Well, if you do, I am going to say that I was trying to kill him and he was just defending himself." The psychological abuse had worked, and it was just so heart-breaking. Usually they had been gaslighted to the point they thought they deserved it. Nobody deserved that. But we are seeing these same techniques being used today.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, for such time as she may utilize.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GOHMERT for yielding. I am a survivor of domestic violence, and it is still hard for me to talk about it, and it has almost been 30 years ago since I left my abusive ex-husband.

Domestic abuse and violence is very common, unfortunately. I think one in four women are abused by either a boyfriend or a husband, and it is a very, very big issue that I am glad Mr. GOHMERT is showing attention to and shining light on.

At this time, very briefly, I thank our U.S. Supreme Court Justices for the hard work and dedication that they have, and I condemn the intimidation tactics that are taking place against our U.S. Supreme Court Justices. It is an absolute shame. It needs to be stopped.

As we await the U.S. Supreme Court's decision that may overturn *Roe v. Wade*, I stand with the vulnerable women and girls grappling with unplanned pregnancies and the precious infants that they carry.

Pro-abortion advocates and some elected officials push vulnerable women and girls toward abortion and deem it as an empowering choice. There is no empowerment nor compassion in abortion. There is no encouragement in crushing, dismembering, poisoning babies, and sucking them out of the womb with a vacuum.

That is why it is so important that we support vulnerable women and girls who are facing unwanted pregnancies and help them during that critical time. That is why myself and millions of women across the country support pro-life pregnancy centers, support adoptions, support housing for vulnerable women.

What is often forgotten in this argument is the long-term psychological mental health of the mother who aborted their baby.

One of the reasons that I believe I have been led to serve in Congress is to help save the lives of innocent babies in the womb. And now as you see on this floor, Republicans over and over again have called on Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats to put up a bill to save babies that are born alive—yes, born alive—from a botched abortion. Right now we have found that they are being laid aside on a table or they are found in a wastebasket and left to die. Certainly America can do better. We must do better.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Arizona so much. I miss her on the Judiciary Committee because of the very type of insights that we just heard from her. I am grateful for her service, her intellect, her insights, and especially her pugnacious nature that did not cause her to back down, that caused her to stand up after being a victim herself.

I was approached by a lady in a store in Longview, Texas, an adjoining county to where I was a district judge, and she asked if I remembered her. I didn't. She never testified in court, but she said she was there in the courtroom when I sentenced her husband. She said she and her daughter had been abused year after year, and her husband had been arrested different times, but he was such a smooth salesman that he always convinced judges to give him a slap on the wrist and probation and be on his way. She said that I was the first judge in all those years to be able to see through her husband's great salesmanship and send him to prison.

There are a lot of things that aren't pleasant about being a judge or a justice, been that, too, but to have somebody say, "You gave my daughter and me our lives, and we are doing great, and she is doing great, and she is going to go to a great college now," but you have got to be able to see through gaslighting. You have got to be able to see through lies and get to the facts.

Now, we are being told about what a terrible shortage of baby formula there is in this country; and there is. You go in the stores, the shelves have a tremendous shortage. We hear different excuses. But if you had a businessman like President Trump in the White House, when he would see a shortage of something that was needed, he would find out where the problem is. He would call the people that could do something about it, "Hey, we have got to do something about this," and they would figure out a way to get something done about it, find out where the holdup was, where the problem was.

But, instead, when there seems to be a shortage or a problem, Republicans say, "Hey, why aren't we doing something about the baby formula?" This gaslighting technique is used. And then we find out not only is there a shortage in the store, but you just shipped truckloads of baby formula to the border, which acts as a draw to more illegal immigration, especially women with babies or parents with babies to

come across and get the baby formula that is not being allowed to go to Americans and American citizens or people who are legally here.

The thought comes of the flights. Every week we are in session, flight up here, flight back, we sit through the same presentation over and over again by the flight attendants. Sometimes they do it live, sometimes they are just going through the motions and there is a tape playing, but they make very clear, if we have a problem like the fuselage depressurizing, the oxygen mask will drop down, and adults are to put the mask on themselves before they put it on the child, and the reason is rather simple, because if you are trying to put your child's mask on and you don't have oxygen, there is a good chance you will pass out, and then both you and your child will die. You get that on yourself, and then you will have the oxygen you need to think clearly, to make sure your child or children or those dependent upon you can get what they need.

□ 1400

When someone is determined not to provide help to Americans that you are sending all over the world, or you are sending as a lure to people to come in illegally—which we heard during our committee hearing: Yes, we do want to make these people into voters that are flooding in illegally. That was quite a revelation; although, we had suspected that for some time. But there are consequences to not taking care of the greatest, most philanthropic country in the history of the world that has done more for other people, other nations.

Yes, we have had our own problems, but no one has fought racism like was fought here. The most loss of life ever in any war was in the Civil War; over half a million people died over this issue of slavery. There is no country that has ever fought to end slavery, to end racism the way this country has. I thought we had made tremendous progress.

That was one of the things about the United States Army—I was at the Home of the Infantry—you just wanted to make sure that the person next to you was going to be helpful. You weren't concerned about their race or anything like that, you just wanted to make sure that you were going to work together. It was quite a good microcosm. Even though the 4 years I was in, it was not a pleasant time to be in the military. We were sometimes ordered not to wear our uniform off-post because there were people that hated us for wearing a uniform. That was post-Vietnam.

With regard to the baby formula, if you keep drawing people into this country—and now we are told we need to pay people to have abortions—you keep taking those actions, you will destroy this Nation. And once this most philanthropic country in the history of the world is destroyed or converted

into some dictatorial Orwellian society, all these countries that we have been able to help, since particularly 1789 when the Constitution was ratified, that help is not going to be there.

Having heard from people and countries, especially legislatures and parliamentarians in other countries that we consider to be free, they privately will say—and have—you have got to protect America's freedom. We see you losing it. And when you lose your freedom in America, there will be no place else to go to have freedom. You are the one that has secured it for the places that have it. This is so important.

So when our judiciary and our executive Department of Justice abuses people and abuses the system, and uses lies instead of truth, and uses technology to spy on its citizens, we are in big trouble.

I know when I first got here in January of 2005, Republicans were in the majority but when it came to civil rights, we had a lot of friends on the other side of the aisle that felt the same way. There were some on our side who wanted to protect all the power we could give to the Department of Justice, but again, there were people on both sides of the aisle that said this is a threat to our democratic Republic. We can't give them this much power.

Over the years, after Democrats took the majority in January of 2007 through January of 2011 and then got it back, we are not getting the kind of help we did those first 2 years with dealing with the abuses within our own ministry of truth. Because the DOJ really, using Orwellian terms from 1984, and as I have said before, what we are seeing is, the only thing Orwell got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984, it's now. And it's not called the ministry of truth or the ministry of love.

The ministry of love, of course in 1984, people will remember, that was the entity that took people into custody, knocked down doors. They used techniques like our current DOJ does to intimidate people, to use much more power than they ever need just to intimidate—like 1984, like a totalitarian government.

I bring that up because I remember in the 1980s—and I had so much respect for the FBI agents I knew, and I had seen numerous times. I didn't do a lot of criminal work during the 10 years that I was a civil trial lawyer, but they would contact a soon-to-be defendant saying, we got an indictment, we got a warrant. You can either report to the jail at 10 a.m. tomorrow or we will come get you, and you would much rather come in on your own. If they had a lawyer, they would call the lawyer: Have your client come in at 9 or 10 a.m.

Not now. Oh, no. Oh, no. The Justice Department wants to come in and knock down your door because it is a lot more fun. They have got the battering ram. And it is a lot more fun to get people in their underwear or maybe

in their pajamas that are in bed, because you get to scare them. It is easier to intimidate them.

What happened to those days when it didn't matter whether the assistant U.S. attorney or the FBI agents voted Democrat or Republican? They were going to make sure they didn't abuse their power. I am not seeing that kind of concern like I used to see from people in the Department of Justice.

I know there are some that feel that way but, yet they are being gaslit if they try to report or be whistleblowers, and their careers are destroyed. Kind of like Director Mueller destroyed the career of the FBI agent that was the whistleblower and reported the unethical and, I would say, illegal conduct by the FBI in trying to persecute during the prosecution of Ted Stevens when they abused the system and convicted an innocent man.

Yeah, the Mueller way. You promote the one that engaged in the fraud, and you punish the one who reported the fraud within the FBI.

We have just seen it grow worse and worse as Mueller's dear friend, James Comey, took over. The abuses grew. And then Christopher Wray was appointed to clean up the FBI. It appears to me his way of cleaning things up is just to sweep it under the rug. If somebody lies to the FISA court, commits a crime, whereas if it were a conservative, they would put him under the prison rather than punish him, would just let him go get a higher paying job somewhere else.

That is not punishment. It is not deterrent. And it is doing massive damage to this country.

So we have the ministry of truth now called the disinformation board that has been created. This is being led and created by people who have been champions of disinformation, champions of gaslighting, who want to convince America: If you think there is a problem, if you think there is abuse in the FISA court, if you think there was any impropriety in elections, then we need to come after you and charge you with disinformation.

For those who have not read 1984, or don't remember, the ministry of truth, in this case now called the disinformation board, they were charged with rewriting history every day. As Orwell pointed out through, I believe his name was Winston, one day they might say, well, this government did not invent the airplane but all of the good changes that have made it more effective, more efficient, faster, those came by our great, Big Brother Government.

Then eventually, you would get to the point where you would just forget all of that and say, Big Brother Government created the airplane, has had everything to do with making it effective, and just take credit for everything good and then blame anybody else for anything bad.

So that seems like where we are going. We could call it the gaslighting

board, but it is called the disinformation board. And it is headed by a person who, herself, has been quite guilty of disinformation, yet she is going to be in charge of coming up with disinformation for the future, apparently. We can expect problems ahead for sure.

Now, this article from yesterday, May 12, from the New York Post, Nina Jankowicz says, "Verified Twitter users should edit others' tweets."

I mean, we are right out of 1984, going back to the days of the 1950s when some songwriter wrote, If your mommy is a commie, well you gotta turn her in.

This is where it appears the disinformation board wants to go. Yeah, kids, turn in your parents if you find out that they have said anything privately at home that is inconsistent with the new truth that the disinformation board has come up with.

This is dangerous stuff. It cannot be overstated. We have got to stop the disinformation board. The solution to misinformation is more freedom so that people that have accurate information can come out with it. But when the government puts its finger on the scales of justice, on the balance, then you can be assured you are going to get less truth and less justice because it is not going to be fair.

I mentioned before that I was an exchange student for the summer to the old Soviet Union. From what I understood, it was the Soviet government, it was the Communist Party that put out all this misinformation. They would lie about things. They would cover up. I still wonder how many cosmonauts may have died during their space program, but they never came out truthfully with what all happened.

I was with a couple of Soviet college students, who I liked a great deal; they were wonderful people. We were looking at an exhibit about some of the space program things. Gagarin was the first human ever in space, and there were some entries about Gagarin and the world hero that he was. Up to that point, I felt like, well, these are college students who would be the most likely to get upset if they were lied to. And it said something about Gagarin being killed by testing a new experimental plane. My Soviet male, college friend, who spoke terrific English, said, Yeah, well, we know that is not true. I was intrigued. I never heard them indicate that they knew they were being lied to by the Soviet government.

The other Soviet college student said, Yeah, there is no way that happened. And I said, You don't believe he was killed testing a plane as a test pilot?

□ 1415

They both chimed in that, no, there is no way. He was the greatest hero in the history of the world, the first man in space. There is no way the Soviet government would allow him to get

into a plane by himself that wasn't safe. That didn't happen. It was too important. He was too important as a hero, as someone that made us admire our government. They wouldn't let him die like that.

Well, I don't know whether he died as a test pilot or not, but I was intrigued that they believed to their core that the Soviet government lied to them. Why? Because the Soviet government constantly lied to them.

They wouldn't make up lies. In fact, remember, this was 1973. I found it interesting, in Pravda, they were reporting some things about Watergate emerging back in the U.S., and because it really was like a disinformation board or ministry of truth, whichever one you want to call it, they made everything about the Soviet Union. Everything was centered on the Soviet Union.

So their take on Watergate was that because Richard Nixon came to the Soviet Union, the first President ever to do so, that is why the Democrats came after him and were wanting to throw him out of office or put him in jail, because he made friends with the Soviets.

That was their take in order to make it all about the Soviet Union. Of course, we know crimes were committed, and the coverup was the worst of it.

But this is where we are headed, and it is a very dangerous time. We do not need a disinformation board. We need people being able to stand up and speak up without intimidation because they are conservative Black or because they are abused or whatever. They need to be able to speak up and bring evidence forward, or at least have an investigation to get to the bottom of things without being belittled, without being gaslit. That will do more to secure our freedom for the future.

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

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do the impossible. We are going to do like 20 boards in 30 minutes. Just please wave at me if I start rambling at hyper rates of speed.

One of the reasons for today's presentation, it is somewhat of a follow-up from a couple of weeks ago, but also somewhat of just this frustration of statements from our brothers and sisters on the left, from the President, even the comments this week of: Okay, Republicans, where is your plan?

Have you seen the numbers of bills that we have offered to take on inflation, to promote economic growth, to promote fairness? None of them can get a hearing around here.

My point comes to something very, very simple. We intend to judge the