

Congressman Jim Jordan

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 03 July 2016

Preacher: Jim Jordan

[0:00] Ollie, Jordan, their family have been worshiping here at Grace for a number of years. We appreciate their presence so much. Very often he's unable to be here on a Sunday because commitments and responsibilities in Washington don't always allow him to come home for the weekend.

But I'm sure that any time he can get away for the weekend, he does. And Washington life, I suspect, can be very hectic with all the hubbub going on.

And it's a welcome relief to get away from all the hustle and bustle and get home to more friendly surroundings. And we've come to appreciate the Jordan family a great deal.

And we value their ministry. And we are truly glad that Jim is in Congress. And we're glad that you're here this morning.

And we welcome you to the Grace Pulpit. There will be, I trust, a Q&A; if we're able to work that out. So our roving microphone can be prepared. And when the time comes ordinarily for dismissal, if we are not prepared to dismiss then, and we may well not be, if you have to go, feel free to excuse yourself and go ahead and leave.

[1:07] But we will be here. I won't say as long as it takes because that might be well into the afternoon. There's a lot to talk about. And I'm sure a lot of people have a lot of questions about a lot of things.

And some of them he would probably like answers to himself. Some of them he has answers for. But we do appreciate so much you being here, Jim. Thank you for coming. And we welcome you to the Grace Pulpit.

Lord bless you. Thank you. Well, it's good to be with you. So a couple months ago I had breakfast with Pat Cadell.

And some of you may know Pat is a guy, he's actually a Democrat strategist. Some of you may wonder what's a conservative guy like me doing hanging out with a Democrat strategist. Pat started working in politics back in 72 in the McGovern race and worked for Carter.

You may see him. He does some commentary on Fox News. But he had given a speech. Pat had given a speech last fall.

[2:17] And I happened to read his speech. And I thought he had sort of captured this turmoil we're seeing in American politics that, frankly, we haven't seen in a while. And what's happening with the parties and the respective nominees and everything that's kind of played out.

But he sort of captured what was going on, I thought, before most others. And actually read the speech. He gave a speech. He was actually at a conservative forum last fall. Read the speech.

And I called him up and said, I'd like to talk to you some of the surveys and polling you're doing, I think, is interesting. And, again, I think you've captured something before most of the talking heads had done so. So we had breakfast and a nice meeting.

But he said a number of important things. But one of the things that stuck with me, he said, Jim, I want you to remember three numbers, 70, 60, 80. All right. Seventy percent of Americans believe our country's in decline.

Sixty percent say that they are better off than their parents, but they think their children are going to be less – not as well off as they are. And then probably the best – the most telling number was 80 percent think that Washington is completely rigged, completely rigged against them.

[3 : 30] They think it exists for the political elite, the connected class, the corporations who have all the lobbyists. And they think it's completely rigged against regular average middle class Americans and American families.

And I tell folks the reason eight out of ten people think that Washington is rigged against them is because in most cases it is. It does exist to serve the connected class.

And so it was an interesting discussion we had about that same time. Polly and I were home one weekend, as Pastor was just talking about. I do like to get home almost every weekend.

And when I come home, one of the things I like to do is just – we've got about eight acres. Some of you know where we live up in Champaign County. And I just – give me the chainsaw and the weed eater and just guide me out and doing my thing.

And it was one of those kind of days, but it started raining in the afternoon. I still remember the day because I was actually weed eating in the rain. And Polly looked out the back door and yelled at me like, what the heck are you – just leave me alone.

[4 : 31] I'm doing fine, you know. So – and – but finally we – I stopped working and we – you know, our kids are all gone, just the two of us. So we said, let's go to dinner. We go to dinner and we come back home and we're watching some goofy movie on TV.

And it's an old movie. I can't remember what the movie was, but it's old enough that there's still commercials, right? So we were watching on regular TV. And during the commercial breaks, I was flipping over to C-SPAN, and it happened to be the same day as the White House Correspondents' Dinner.

You know, this is where the president tells his jokes and all the big shots in Washington show up. So before I – I click over to commercial break and C-SPAN's – you can tell it was an exciting evening for the Jordans.

They're watching C-SPAN on a Saturday night. But they're panning the crowd, and it is just as Pat Cadell described it. It's all the people who – all the elite in Washington. It's all the big – it's Wolf Blitzer and Major Garrett, all the big press people.

And then it's Joe Biden and Steny Hoyer and Pelosi and Eric Kanter, and, you know, they're going through this. And so we're watching a little bit, and I click back. We go back to the movie and we're watching.

[5 : 39] And then next commercial break, I do the same thing, click over. And the president's actually giving his remarks and telling his jokes. And after one joke, the camera is doing the same thing.

It's sort of panning the crowd. And it stops on one guy, and it pauses there for a while. And it's a guy that I don't have a whole lot of respect for. In fact, he and I have kind of butted heads for a couple of years now.

But it's the commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, a gentleman named John Koskinen. The guy, frankly, I think should have resigned. We're actually trying to impeach the individual. Because he, you know, he took over, and this is not my words, this is the president's words.

He took over the IRS a few years ago, and his responsibility was to restore confidence in the Internal Revenue Service. I think he's done anything but. In fact, he's presided over an agency that allowed 422 backup tapes to be destroyed, containing potentially 24,000 emails, many of which were likely Lois Lerner emails.

If you follow this scandal, she was the central figure in this whole targeting scandal. He allowed that to happen after he was on notice that there were problems with Ms. Lerner's hard drive and that there were emails that had been lost there.

[6 : 51] Waits four months to tell us, and in that interim, four months to tell us that there are problems with her hard drive. And in that interim, that time frame is when the backup tapes were destroyed. That all took place with two subpoenas in place and three preservation orders in place.

Seems to me that's a record that indicates you should be gone. We've called for his resignation. We've called for a special prosecutor. And now we're trying to impeach the individual. Something hasn't been done, frankly, a person at that level of government in over 140 years.

But we think it's warranted. Anyway, the camera pauses on him, and there he is. Fancy tux, black tie, this smug look on his face.

And I'm like, no wonder 80% of the country is fed up and think this town doesn't work for them. If any of you have seen or read *The Hunger Games*, have you seen the movie?

This is truly *The Hunger Games*, right? The capital city's got their deal going, and everything seems fine there. Meanwhile, the rest of the country is in a different situation. So keep that picture in mind of John Koskinen, commissioner, not just of any old agency, an agency that has the power and influence over people's lives.

[8 : 00] Could do all kinds of harm over, we all have to deal with them. Keep that picture in mind. And I want to read from you. This is actually a column I kept from 22 years ago in a file.

It was actually written by Pat Buchanan, 1994. But that picture in mind, as we think about those individuals who 240 years ago signed the declaration, and what they had to endure when they signed that document.

Remember what they were doing. It's always important. They were committing treason when they signed that document. But they felt it was treason that was justified.

They felt they were doing the right thing because their rights and liberties had been infringed upon so much. They said, we're going to do something that's never been done before. We're going to declare to the world why it's appropriate to commit treason, why treason is actually the right thing to do, because we're going to start a place where freedom and liberty and fundamental principles actually are of paramount importance.

So I'm just going to read from part of this. It'll take me a little while, but disaster struck first Honest John Hart. Just months after he signed, British and Hessian troops invaded New Jersey, forcing him and his family to flee.

[9 : 19] His wife did not survive. Broken in hell from hiding in barns all winter, Hart went home to find his farm destroyed. Rebuilding proved too great a task. By the spring of 1779, John Hart was dead.

New Jersey's Richard Stockton suffered a similar fate. After rescuing his wife and children from advancing British troops, he was betrayed by a loyalist, imprisoned, beaten, and nearly starved.

He returned an invalid to find his home gutted, his library and papers burned. He too never recovered, dying in 1781 a broken man. Hart and Stockton lost everything they had except their honor.

Two of the other soldiers, sons of New Jersey's Abraham Clark, were captured by the British and so horribly treated, one was locked up in the dungeon of a notorious prison ship, Jersey, without food or light.

General Washington himself wrote in rage against and disgust to General Howe about the situation. William Ellery of Rhode Island, who marveled that he had seen only undaunted resolution in the faces of his co-signers, had his home burned also.

[10 : 28] Francis Lewis's Long Island home, too, was looted and gutted, his wife thrown into a dark prison cell without a bed. Health ruined, Miss Lewis died in two years.

Lewis's son would die in British captivity. Not until 1783 did William Floyd return to Long Island. By then, his wife, too, was dead. His fields had been stripped, his machinery destroyed, his home plundered, and was used as a barracks.

Only days after Lewis Morris of New York signed, British troops ravaged his 2,000-acre estate, butchered his cattle, drove his family off the land. Three of Morris's sons fought the British.

The time is now at hand when we shall see whether America has virtue enough to be free, Josiah Bartlett said of New Hampshire. He said that in Philadelphia.

In that summer of 76, surely she did. When the British seized the New York houses of wealthy Philip Livingston, he sold off everything else, gave the money to the Revolution, and died in 1778.

[11 : 35] Hearing that, George Clymer had signed. The British sent a detachment 20 miles west of Philadelphia to destroy his home. His wife and children fled into the woods.

Clymer took his remaining fortune, invested it in continental dollars, urged fellow merchants to do the same, and enlisted to fight as a captain in the Army. Arthur Middleton, Edward Rutledge, and Thomas Hayward, Jr. went home to South Carolina to fight.

In the British invasion of the South, Hayward was wounded, and all three were captured. As he rotted on a prison ship in St. Augustine, Hayward's plantation was raided. Buildings burned, and his wife, who witnessed it, all died.

Other Southern signers suffered the same fate. Among the first to sign had been John Hancock, who wrote in big, bold scripts that George III, quote, could read my name without spectacles, and could now double his reward for 500 pounds for my head.

If the cause of revolution commands it, Hancock roared, burn Boston and make John Hancock a beggar. Here were the men who believed in the cause far beyond themselves. Consider Caesar Rodney, probably the most famous story of the guys who signed this.

[12 : 45] Caked in mud after riding 80 miles, Rodney arrived to vote Delaware support there in Philadelphia that summer. Suffering from a face cancer so horrible it had to be hidden behind a scarf, Rodney knew his signature would be his death sentence.

His long planned trip to England for life-saving surgery could now never happen. The year peace came, the cancer killed Caesar Rodney. Perhaps the most inspiring example of this undaunted resolution was Thomas Nelson, Jr., returning from Philadelphia to become governor of Virginia.

Nelson joined Washington's army just outside Yorktown. Observing during the battle that his artillerymen were directing fire all over the town, but were being careful to avoid the area where his own beautiful home was located, Nelson asked why they were not firing in that direction.

Out of respect to you, sir, came the reply. Nelson stepped forward to the nearest cannon, aimed it at his house, and fired. The other guns joined in.

His home was destroyed. These stories of men who defied a king to give birth to a country were gathered by a great patriot, Governor Mildred Thompson of New Hampshire.

[14 : 02] Governor Thompson put them in a book called 100 Famous Founders. Now, think about that, what those guys endured, and compare it to what we see today.

And you think about why these guys were willing to put it all on the line, and as we just read, give it all, lose it all. Think about what they wrote.

And we've talked about this before, but I'm convinced next to Scripture, the best words ever put on paper were what those guys wrote in 1776 and what they were willing to sign and give everything up for.

We hold these truths to be self-evident. All are created equal, endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights among these life, liberty, pursuit of happiness. Amazing concepts in the document that started this thing we call America.

Right? I heard, I think it was Gingrich I heard, and it was so right. He said, our closest relative is Great Britain. Right? And Great Britain, the people ultimately got power and rights and liberties, but it was a top-down model that developed over time.

[15 : 10] Right? God, under the British system, God gave power to the monarch, the king, the queen. Right? And over time, they gradually dispensed rights and privileges to the noblemen, and then down to the merchants and shopkeepers, and finally it was all the people.

But in America, we said just the opposite. We said, no, the way it works in America is we start from a different premise. God created us all in his image, and we as the people, we the people, are going to loan power to government, not because we got our rights from government.

We got them from God, created in his image. We're going to loan power to government to protect those fundamental liberties. Radical, no nation, no nation ever started on that premise.

And these guys understood it. They understood it was radical, but it was the right thing to do, and they were willing to risk it all to make it work.

And they believed, I got this in the mail the other day, and I just kept it. They believed, look at the first three presidents. Let's read a quote from each of them. Washington said, to the distinguished character of patriot, it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of Christian.

[16 : 21] First president, George Washington, father of our country. Adams wrote, not about the Declaration, but about the Constitution. The Constitution was made for only a moral and religious people. And Jefferson, the guy who wrote the document, who wrote the Declaration.

God, who gave us life, gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?

Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and that his justice cannot sleep forever. However, we get our rights from the creator. We are endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights. And it's government's job.

It was a friend of mine who said, our rights aren't grants from government. They're gifts from God. And when you start from that perspective, it changes everything. Think of the contrast.

John Koskinen sitting there, smug look, arrogant, a guy who I think should resign, a guy who I think allowed and he wasn't there when it took place, but has not complied with the investigation where fundamental liberties were attacked.

[17 : 26] You think about what took place at the IRS? This is one of the reasons I've been so fired up about this issue for now three and a half years. These guys who started this country and then later put together the Constitution, the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, our first ten amendments, the first amendment, the first one, probably the most important.

You think about the rights we have under the First Amendment. Freedom of religion, freedom to practice our faith the way we think the good Lord wants us to, freedom to petition our government, freedom to assemble, freedom of the press. But under the First Amendment, what's our most fundamental liberty?

Fundamental right we have under the First Amendment. Our right to do what? To do what I'm doing today, to speak, right? Freedom of speech. And when the founders were focused on your free speech rights, what they mostly had in mind was your ability to speak in a political fashion, a political nature to speak out against the policies of your government and not be harassed for doing it.

What did the Internal Revenue Service do? They harassed people. They went after people for speaking out about politics, for speaking out against this situation.

It was conservative groups speaking out against the ridiculous spending and Obamacare and maybe a host of other things. That is as wrong as it gets. And that should never happen in our country.

[18 : 40] And when it does and someone is brought in to clean up the mess and doesn't clean it up, in fact, makes it more difficult to get to the bottom of what really took place in our investigation, shouldn't happen.

I'm going to read a little bit more reading than I've probably ever done when the pastor's been giving me the chance to speak here. If you've got your Bibles, turn to – I may not have brought them because I normally don't do this.

Just turn to 2 Chronicles 26. And this is – one of the things we have in Washington is a number of Bible studies throughout each week that we're down there.

The one I typically go to is the one on Thursday afternoons. It's a 1 o'clock study. It's done by the Christian Embassy. And the guy who leads it, a gentleman named Tom Barrett, super guy, is actually a layman, successful consultant and travels all over the world talking to companies about how they can improve their operations.

And interesting guy. And one of the best Bibles I've ever been a part of. But I thought that he – we did this study a while ago, so it's kind of on my mind. And I thought we'd read some chapters.

[19 : 55] It's about King Uzziah, I think is maybe named Azariah and some other places in Scripture. But King Uzziah – and I thought I'd just read a few verses. Let's start at verse 3. 26, 2 Chronicles chapter 26.

Let's start at verse 3 if we could. Uzziah was 16 years old when he became king.

He reigned 52 years in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Jequilah of Jerusalem. And he did right in the sight of the Lord according to all that his father Amaziah had done.

And he continued to seek God in the days of Zechariah, who had understanding through the vision of God. As long as he sought the Lord, God prospered him. Now he went out and warred against the Philistines, broke down the wall of Gath, the wall of Jebna, wall of Ashdod, and built cities in the area of Ashdod among the Philistines.

And God helped him against the Philistines, against the Arabians who lived in Gerbal and the Minuites. The Ammonites also gave tribute to Uzziah. And his fame extended to the border of Egypt and became very strong.

[20 : 59] He built towns and towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate and at the valley gate and corner buttress and fortified them. And he built towers in the wilderness and hewed many cisterns, for he had much livestock both in the lowland and the plain.

He had plowmen and vinedressers in the hill country and the fertile fields. Moreover, Uzziah had an army ready for battle, which entered combat by divisions according to the number of their muster prepared by Jael, the scribe and Messiah, an official under the direction of Hananiah, one of the king's officers.

And the total number of the heads of the household was 2,600. And on and on it goes. I mean, this is amazing. When you read this, I didn't know much about this guy, but he sounds a lot like David and Solomon, like this guy's got it together.

They prospered. He prospered. His army was huge. They were winning battles. They were beating their big-time enemy, the Philistines. So this guy, it's going well for him.

And then we get to verse 16. It's always how these stories seem to work. You've got all this stuff and then there's but, right? But when he became strong, his heart was so proud that he acted corruptly.

[22 : 12] And he was unfaithful to the Lord his God for he entered the temple. And he talks about what he did wrong here and the consequences that happened. And I don't like, you know, I'm certainly not a pastor and I don't want to read too much into it.

I think this is mostly a story about Uzziah and what happened to him and historically what took place. But it seems to me that there's some application and lessons there, probably primarily for us as individuals.

When we all, I think, all pray to this sometimes where things start going well and we start thinking a little higher of ourselves than we should. And that's when we maybe lose perspective and don't do the things and conduct ourselves in the way that we ought to.

But I started thinking about this. Maybe this could also, in this situation, kind of apply in a broader and greater context when you think about our country.

And when we were young, how focused America was on doing the right thing. And now that we are strong, maybe there's some pride and some, you know, wrong kind of behavior as a nation.

[23 : 13] I mean, I think about in 240 years, what this country has accomplished, it is, I mean, it's one of the things that gives me hope. It's still the greatest thing going, greatest nation ever.

And you look at the good America has done around the world. You look at how we, the greatest economy in history, we're 300 and some million people. But we're the greatest economy in the entire world, the highest standard of living, just the number of things that have happened in our time frame.

But maybe now we're getting kind of like Uzziah. After doing all that good work and being focused on the right thing, maybe we've gotten a little proud. And we need to, I think, begin to refocus on those fundamental principles and those things that matter most.

One of the other things Pacquiao told me, I thought it was an interesting line. He said, if our country keeps doing what we've been doing, think about our fiscal mass and a host of other things.

If we keep doing what we've been doing, he said, in eight to ten years, there will still be a United States, but there may not be an America. Now, think about that line.

[24 : 27] What we associate with that one, with America, what we're about. And it's kind of hit me like, wow. Stop and think about that. That's a sobering thought.

So I thought I would take just a couple minutes, and then, as Kasia said, we'll get to questions. But a couple minutes just to talk about what I, you know, this is one guy's perspective, so take it for what it's worth. But what I think we need to try to refocus on.

And, look, in my judgment, there are lots of policy changes we need in the law and policy coming out of Washington. On sort of a practical level, I do think our tax code is a disaster.

I think it hurts economic growth. You realize, I don't mean this to sound partisan, but this is just, this is the truth. This is the first presidency since World War II where not one single year did economic growth reach 3% or exceed 3%.

Never happened before. We're bumping along annual growth rate about 1.3%, 1.4%. That will not cut it. When you think about the baby boom generation who's retiring every day, the demands that's going to have on Social Security and Medicare, it will not cut it to grow, to bump along at that poor growth level.

[25 : 47] So I think part of what's contributing to the poor growth is a ridiculous tax code. I tell folks all the time, you know, think about our tax code. Everyone knows we should, I think everyone knows we should throw it out except the politicians in Washington.

Any tax code on the personal side which says to half the population, you don't have to participate in the main tax, the income tax. Any tax, any tax code that says you don't have, that half the population doesn't have to participate in the main tax is broken.

And then on the corporate side, any tax code which says to American companies you're going to pay the highest rate in the world is stupid. So if you have a tax code that's broken and stupid, you might want to change it, right?

I mean, this is to me so obvious. I think the regulatory burden is ridiculous. The regulations we put on business owners, one of the things I do when I'm back home, we travel all across the fourth district.

We talk to small business owners and they will tell you. And there's certain companies who they're at 47, 48 employees. They want to grow, but they're afraid to grow over 50 because then Obamacare kicks in for them as an employer.

[26 : 54] It's just that's stymieing economic growth and a host of other things that matter. And I saw where it was announced yesterday that Murray Coal headquartered in Ohio.

Coal company is going to lay off all kinds of workers because of the EPA. So there's a host of regulatory burdens and Obamacare and stuff. But I think sometimes it's more basic than that, not just the specific policies, but just certain fundamental values that have always been associated with our country.

But maybe like Uzziah, we're starting to drift away from. So I thought I'd talk about three of them. And I just three basic principles of freedom, work and truth.

I'll start with freedom. And I use the IRS example already. But when you think about your attacks on the First Amendment liberties, that's the best one. This is. What they did is just wrong.

And we have to, I think, as policymakers and as citizens, just stand up and defend the rights we have and talk about them and make it make it important. But also in the First Amendment, your religious liberty rights.

[28 : 08] When you think about. When we think about what the health care law did, that's a different hobby lobby and some of the things we've seen. The decision a year ago now on.

Marriage and the implications that's going to have. I mean, I'm nervous if we don't. Begin to push back that there may be a day in the not too distant future where a.

When pastor stands here and talks about the fact marriage should be what it's always been and what how God intended it, that that may jeopardize the tax exempt status of Grace Bible Church. My buddy, Congressman Labrador, has introduced a bill that's designed to protect that basic fact.

If you're a institution. Right. Right. It was actually a Mormon. And he's thinking about Brigham Young University. I think about Cedarville University and other places where they could lose certain students because of the policies that the university has may not be able to get Pell grants and some of this.

That's common if we don't begin to push back. And that's a direct attack on freedom and your right to practice your faith the way you think the good Lord wants you to. Second Amendment liberties just last week or two weeks ago.

[29 : 20] We had the Democrats. I think about this. Democrats do a sit in. Protest on the House floor, take over the entire operations of the House of Representatives. Because they want they want a gun control legislation to come to the floor.

As I said to the press. Historically, sit ins and protests were used to. Secure the rights that are guaranteed to you under the Constitution, not to diminish the rights that we have.

They were doing a protest to diminish people's Second Amendment liberties. Kind of turned everything on its head. And then your Fourth Amendment rights.

Freedom from unreasonable search and seizure. One of the things the Internal Revenue Service is doing. And frankly, many of our federal agencies, the law enforcement division of our federal agencies. We learned about this a few months back and something we're beginning to investigate.

There's a technology out there called Stingray technology. And in simple terms, what it is, it's a device that when you take it into an area, it mimics the cell phone tower.

[30 : 29] And it tricks every or has every phone. Instead of the cell phones in that area going to the tower, it actually comes to this device called Stingray.

We're now actually the more advanced devices called Hailstorm. But it's cell site simulator technology so that the phone number routes to the device.

They get the number. They know the person. And more importantly, they know where you're standing. They know your geolocation. Now, think about this. First question I ask the IRS is, why do you have this anyway?

Right? Seems to me maybe the FBI, certain kind of important criminal cases they're trying to solve. Why does the Internal Revenue Service have it? And we found out they've used it 37 times.

And here's the scary part. We believe they used it those times without going to a judge and getting a probable cause warrant, but a lower standard to get the okay to implement this technology.

[31 : 25] And you start thinking, without getting too conspiratorial here, you start thinking, well, so think about how they might use this in the future. Pro-life group is having a rally in a certain community.

And they want to know who's all – remember, remember what they did with the IRS. They wanted to know who's all in your conservative group. You were applying for tax-exempt status.

And they also were looking to get donor information, who was donating, who was contributing. So now, stingray technology, there's a rally being held. They want to know who's coming to the rally, who those people are.

They want to look at your – this is scary stuff. And so when we talk about just fundamental liberties, we're talking about the first and the second and the fourth amendment, your basic rights under the Constitution that we have to stand up and defend.

I shared this story with some of our staff the other night. We had a busy week this past week. We weren't in session, but we had to fly down because of this – we were unveiling the report from the Select Committee on Benghazi.

[32 : 23] It's a busy time because you just do press after press after press trying to tell the story. And it was Tuesday night, and so I took some of our staff, our personal staff, and then we got a really sharp lawyer on the committee who did a lot of work for us.

In fact, wrote – helped draft and write most of our – Mike Pompeo and I did a separate report on the Benghazi thing. So I took him out to dinner, and I don't know why I got on this, but I told him a story.

I said, 1987, I had the opportunity to travel to what was still the Soviet Union. I went there to wrestle. And a lot of the things I'll remember from that trip, the main thing is you thank the good Lord you live here.

I mean, you really – I always joke and tell people I was in Moscow in February. Moscow in February, it's like 400 below zero. And the food is terrible, and you're like, praise the – thank the Lord that I live in the – but one of the other things I'll remember about that trip, we were wrestling in Tbilisi, which is in the country of Georgia.

Then, of course, it was part of the Soviet Union, and this is where wrestling is big in this part of the world. This is where the big tournament was. And it's 1987, and one of the things that all the Russian wrestlers and all the Soviet bloc, communist bloc countries, they all wanted to trade with the Americans because, I mean, we had all the good stuff, right?

[33 : 52] We had the good sweats, the good running shoes, wrestling gear. And most importantly, what we had back in those days was Levi blue jeans, right? That's what they wanted. So I'll never forget this Russian wrestler, Soviet wrestler, walked up to me kind of in the lobby area of the hotel where we all stayed.

And he walked up to me, and he said, changey, changey, which I interpreted as the international language for I want to trade. I'm like, you know, I'm an American. God bless the free market.

I literally started to dig into my bag, and I was going to start wheeling and dealing with this guy, seeing if I could get one of those ugly Russian hats, you know, whatever you're going to do. So I was literally opening my bag, and then he did the thing I remember and, frankly, will never forget.

He goes, and he motioned to walk around the corner. All right, just wrestling. I wasn't worried about anything. I started to, I mean, it didn't matter to me.

So I grabbed my bag, and I start following him, and as I'm following him, it hit me. That's the difference, right? That's the difference. He thought someone was watching him, or at least there was the possibility someone in a position of importance in the government was watching him, and he was a little uneasy about being seen in public trading with an American.

[35 : 16] He wanted to go around the corner. He wanted to go around the corner. We would never think of that in this country until now, right? That's what scares me.

So when we talk about just fundamental freedom, it is that basic, and we as citizens, let's hope we never have to have, you know, do what, and I'm not advocating this, but do what those guys did 240 years ago, but we have to be willing to stand up and defend the liberties that these guys gave it all for.

The second thing is, and this is another thing, it's just freedom, hard work. This is something we're losing in our culture.

The other thing, when I travel around and talk to business leaders, I will get this. I get this every single day, and business owners across the 4th District, they'll say it'll be something like this, some line, something like this.

They'll say, hey, Jordan, in spite of all the stupid things going on in Washington, we're still creating jobs, but one of our problems is finding people who have the willingness to work, and it's really sad, too, in our culture.

[36 : 22] Sometimes it's the ability to pass the drug screen. This heroin thing is so bad, but it's a work thing. You think about our country, America, one of the things I think about America is we just work.

Americans work. Polly and I traveled to, we went to Italy a couple months ago to see our granddaughters, and we, well, we wanted to see our son-in-law and daughter, too, but we went mostly to see our granddaughters.

But we, yeah, yeah, you got it. So we were there, and we're there the first day, and the second day, we're, like, sitting around, and it's getting close. It's, you know, it's, like, 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and I'm, like, Rachel, you don't need to cook anything.

Let's just, you know, Polly, and we wanted to sample some of the Italian food. Like, they live in, Rachel, Chris, and the girls live in northeast part of Italy. And I said, you don't need to cook anything.

Let's just go out to dinner, and, you know, we'll pay to go out to dinner. And she goes, well, we can't. What do you mean we can't? She goes, well, it's 5 o'clock. The restaurants don't open until 7.

[37 : 24] I mean, I'm just country boy. I didn't know this, right? I mean, I'm in America. You would never find a restaurant in America not open at 5 o'clock, would you? No. I mean, and she goes, well, it's just sort of the culture. You know, the restaurants open at noon.

They stay open until 2.30. Then they close. Everyone takes a nap, and then they come. They don't open until 7. And I'm like, whoever heard of this? I mean, I'm – but think about that. That mindset and that culture, you're starting to see some of that creep into our culture here in the United States.

We've always been – not work, you know, 24 hours a day, but a country and a culture where work is important, hard work is important, and Americans have always been noted for that.

And frankly, I would argue it's the reason we're the greatest economy – one of the reasons we're the greatest economy in country in the world. So we've got a bill that we've introduced, probably my best friend in Congress, Congressman Meadows, and I've introduced it in the House and Senator Lee in the Senate.

And it simply says if you're going to get benefits and you're able-bodied adult with no dependents, think about a single guy, single guy, able-bodied, and you're going to get taxpayer help, there should be a work component before you get food stamps.

[38 : 31] There's been almost a doubling – we're up to like 47 million Americans on food stamps. And a significant number, certainly not the majority, but part of that number are the group I just described, single, able-bodied adults without dependents.

And we're saying if you're going to get – if they're going to get your dollars, your tax money, there should be a work component. Maine is doing this. Maine has not accepted the waiver out of the work requirement. And they are now imposing a work requirement in their state, and they saw an 80% reduction in that subgroup.

Because you know what people said? They said, well, if I've got to go do this work requirement to get the food stamps, I'll just get a job. Imagine that, right? And some of them maybe have already had a job, and they said it's not worth the hassle, but I'll do something.

But – so it's a good concept, and it's just basic stuff that we should be doing. And then the last thing I would say is it's time for particularly folks in leadership positions and public policy positions that influence public policy to just tell the truth.

Just be straight with the – I brought a copy of Time magazine, not something I typically read. And this is back in – end of April.

[39 : 49] And I was flying home one Thursday or Friday afternoon, and our press person, Darren, he handed it to me. He said, you should read this on the plane. And he handed me this.

Here's the cover of Time. Time did something that they've never done before when you read the inside cover. For those who still get their print edition, they personalize the copy. So there's a couple million people who still get their print edition.

So they would put, you know, dear Jim Jordan, if I was a subscriber, dear, you know, your name there. And then you owe \$42,998.12. That represents what every single American man, woman, child owes to pay off the \$19 trillion debt we have.

The 300-some million people who live in our country, what we would each have to pay to deal with that huge debt. It's a great article written, again, unusual for Time, written by a conservative economist.

Interesting. So if you get a chance, read the piece. One of the things that jumped out at me. So our debt – and again, we have to be willing to just be square with the American people and tell them how serious the situation is today.

[40 : 56] Our debt has doubled in the last 10 years. So we went from, you know, \$9.5 trillion to \$19 trillion today.

Ten years ago, when it was \$9.5 trillion, the interest on the debt – to service the debt, the interest payment was about \$220 billion. Anyone know what the interest payment is today to service the \$19 trillion debt?

This is what's interesting. About \$220 billion. You can say, well, how is it the same? We all know what's happened with interest rates. Right? Record low rates. So in a – what the Federal Reserve has done, in essence, is they've allowed the politicians to continue to spend and there not be any real consequences.

But it sort of begs the obvious question now. What's left for the Fed to do so that the government can keep spending? Right? And so now we're hearing for, at least in my mind, for one of the first times I've ever heard it.

Have you heard this concept called negative interest rates? Anyone heard this? They've done it in a couple of countries in Europe already. And there's – now, negative interest rates, the way it works is you buy a treasure bond, treasure bill, pay a dollar for it.

[42 : 12] And they said, yeah, when it matures, we'll give you 98 cents. Right? Such a deal. Yeah. Right? Or I guess it's good for borrowers, people who want to – and the credit, but it's not so good for the savers.

That's where we're headed. So it's time. We level with the American people. Look. Things have got to change. And really, it's – you can – we're still early enough. You can fix it.

You can fix – so we're spending here. You don't have to take it flat or take it down. You just got to bend the curve down and then, probably most importantly, get in place the policies that are conducive to growth.

Because over time, you can grow out of it. And a country is – you can carry debt if you're healthy. And we're still the biggest economy in the world. So it's still – we're still able to save it if we get about fixing it.

But it's like any other problem in life. The longer you wait, the more drastic measures you have to take in order to solve it. So it's a time to be honest on fiscal matters. And, frankly, it's a time that just – this is fresh on my mind, so I'll talk about it, and then I'll take your question.

[43 : 25] We need – we just need leaders in the government to tell the truth. And this past week, we unveiled this report. And, again, at the risk of sounding a little political.

But I believe this is as sure as I'm standing here because I think the evidence so overwhelmingly supports the conclusions that we reached, Mr. Pompeo and I reached in our report.

What happened now almost four years ago in Benghazi, Libya, and then how our leaders talked about it and tried to present it to the American people is just flat-out wrong.

No military assets took off. The attack starts at 3.42 – these are all Eastern times. 3.42 Eastern time. The mortars hit the roof of the annex at 11.15 that night.

No military assets even took off to get people there to help Americans fighting for their lives. But what did start before the mortars hit the annex at 11.15 that evening was the political spin.

[44 : 28] And this should not happen in a country as great as ours. Secretary Clinton at 10.08 that evening – I said this at the press event – at 10.08 that evening with Tyrone Wood still on the roof of that annex fighting for his life and his fellow citizens' lives.

She starts to spin when she says, some have sought to justify this vicious behavior as a response to inflammatory material posted on the Internet. She starts talking about the video, the film. And we know that was misleading because at 11.23 that night she sends an email to her daughter and says, terrorists killed two of our people today.

The next day she's talking with the Egyptian prime minister and she says to the Egyptian prime minister – this is straight from the call notes that we got in our investigation.

We know – not we suspect, not we think, not maybe – we know the film had nothing to do with it. It was a planned attack, not a protest. And this kept up – and we chronicle – if you've got nothing better to do, read the 50-page report that Congressman Pompeo and I put together.

We chronicle day after day for weeks what they said privately and what they said publicly and how privately they told the truth. It was a terrorist attack and how publicly they blamed the film and the video.

[45 : 41] And again, in a moment of crisis, you want your leaders – particularly like this, when it's a crisis moment and Americans gave their life for the country, you want them to tell you the truth. And they continued doing that, and I believe they did it, and this is – this is why we wrote it.

I believe they did it, and I think the evidence is clear they did it for political reasons. Remember the context here. Secretary Clinton is the one who pushed to go into Libya initially. She's the one who pushed to help oust Gaddafi.

And this was supposed to be their legacy, their crowning achievement in foreign policy for the Clinton State Department, the Obama administration. You can oust a dictator.

You help with the Arab Spring. You do it without putting boots on the ground. And then it's so wonderful, you don't need the security presence that, frankly, they were all demanding. We had a diplomatic security agent who went there and came back, and his response was, it was a suicide mission.

Everyone there was going to die because the security position was so bad. But they didn't want to beef it up in my judgment because this was – this is how it works. We don't need to. We can treat Benghazi like it's London or Paris where you can count on host nation support to help buttress your security.

[46 : 51] And then the attack happens, and it happens on September 11th. It happens 56 days before an election, and it happens with their legacy on the line. And so they go about misleading the American people, and that is just flat out wrong.

So I think our charge, if we're going to – I always use the term protect the promise that the founders envisioned this country would always offer its citizens.

If we're going to do that as citizens in 2016, we've got to be willing to stand up and speak out about freedom issues, liberty issues. We've got to be willing to stand up and talk about the work ethic's important, and we've got to be able to stand up and say let's just tell the truth.

And as citizens, we're able to handle the truth, give us the truth, and we'll have to deal with it. And there's going to be some tough choices we're going to have to make when you think about the fiscal situation. But I'm – yeah, I guess I'm always optimistic because it's America.

I'm convinced we can handle it. I've shared, I think, this statement with you before, but maybe my most – my favorite quote, one of my favorite statements made by a baseball pitcher, a Christian guy, pitched for the Dodgers, Earl Horshizer, led him to the World Series way back, like in the 80s or something.

[48 : 10] And he said, he said, great things can happen to ordinary people who are willing to work hard and who never give up. Great things can happen to ordinary people who work hard and never give up.

My favorite word in the whole statement is the word ordinary. You know, sometimes we – I think we make people – we're all just regular ordinary sinners, need of God's grace, you know. So these guys that we read about that gave it all, I think they were mostly ordinary guys with extraordinary character, ordinary guys who probably were pretty smart too, but they were still ordinary, regular human beings.

America has always been a place where ordinary people do extraordinary things, and it makes us this great nation we are. We're no different today. We're all just a bunch of ordinary people, but we can do great things standing up for the right principles and help the country get back on path, back on the right path.

And the last thing I would say is this, and then I'm getting – I guess I'm like Pastor. He usually goes to 1130. It's 1125.

One of the neat things that happens to me is – this happens almost every week. Someone will walk up – and this, I think, underscores what else we need to do as a culture and as a people.

[49 : 27] If someone will walk up to me and they'll say, hey, we're praying for you. Sometimes they don't even know who they are. You talk about something that special, you're just – yeah, just some kid who grew up in Graham High School, and somehow, I don't know how, got to be in Congress.

And someone you never heard of is actually praying for you. It's like, wow, they're taking time to pray for her. So one of the things we all need to do – and I'm trying to challenge myself because I'm not doing it near as much as I should – pray for the country.

Just pray for the country. We're supposed to do that. We all – at least if you're like me, you don't do it enough. But that's important as we head forward. And you think about 240 years ago when it all started, time to keep praying that we can keep it up.

So, all right, I talked too long, but your chance to ask questions, and we'll go from there. It goes fast, doesn't it, Pastor?

Right, Aaron? Like you look at the clock. How did that go? Note, we do have a microphone for the front and one for the back today. Don't be bashful.

[50 : 37] I've been in town halls where people yell at me, and I even had – I had one guy swear at me one time. That was as close to wrestling as it gets right there. Mr. Moore, who I've known for a long time.

Good to see you. Jim, I just want your opinion, feelings, ideas about this. It has to do with minimum wage, working.

Yeah. You talked about that subject. Working, hard, I believe in that, and I agree with you 100%. Yeah. Go back to the Civil War. We fought a Civil War.

And everybody thinks it was to free the slaves of the South. That's what everybody thinks the Civil War was about. But it wasn't about that at all. The whites of the South had the same morals as the whites of the North about keeping a person in slavery.

That war was fought because the South, the plantation owners, the rich of the South, would lose their standard of living, would lose their riches.

[51 : 41] They felt if they lost their slaves that worked their farms. Those in other occupations didn't have that concern as much. So that's why the South wanted to break away, because you were going to take away our standard of living, because we needed those slaves to work.

Okay, now I'm going to transfer that to today's society, as we live today. And it has to do with the minimum wage and pay. We have slaves today out there that are working.

They're making less than those slaves had back in the South. That plantation owner gave them a place to live. He gave them food. He gave them clothing. We have people working. I'll use Walmart as an example.

They call them associates. They call them a place. That what they're getting paid for, they cannot buy food for the family. They cannot buy a house. They cannot get clothing. They do not get enough for doing that.

They are essentially corporate slaves that we have today. What is your feeling about that aspect? Well, it differs a little bit from, I think, what underlies your question.

[52 : 53] I would say, first of all, I do think the Civil War was fought over slavery, but also some economic concerns as well. I get that. My concern with mandated minimum wage is what ends up happening is there's less opportunity for people to get that first job.

I may have shared this with somebody before. I think what you're going to find is if you go to \$15 minimum wage, which they're talking about doing in Cleveland, Ohio, some states have done it, is you're going to reduce the number of opportunities for people to get that very first job that helps them get to something else.

And I always tell the story, think about the first job you had, the very first job you had, and the skill set and the principles you learned that helped you get to a better position in life. I mean, some people, as a waiter or a waitress, delivering papers, doing work.

My brother and I was mowing lawns. And I know we were working for less than minimum wage, but we learned some valuable lessons and principles that helped us get to something better in life.

We're going to reduce opportunities for people to learn the skill set and the values we all learned in those first jobs if we go to this, because you just will have less opportunity for people.

[54 : 15] Right now, what I see out there is, particularly for young people, for anyone willing to go get a certain skill set, as an example, if you can weld today, if you can weld, guarantee you're going to make \$20 an hour or more, more than \$20 an hour, and there are all kinds of opportunities.

But there's just not the people right there to do it. So I'm very nervous about government injecting more and more interference in the free market, because I just, over time, the more command and control you have from some central location, whether it's Columbus, whether it's Cleveland, or whether it's Washington, D.C., I think it tends to hurt opportunity, economic opportunity, and frankly hurt growth.

So we'll see. So I'm not in favor of these mandatory increases in the minimum wage. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Well, talking about the minimum wage there and stuff, I don't agree with it either, by the way.

But anyway, I think it's probably more of a comment I have. But I think if, like, the tax codes and where the IRS is focusing to do the audits and everything on certain companies and lowering getting rid of Obamacare and stuff, companies would probably look at, you know, paying more, because they'd have more revenue to pay.

[55 : 59] Oh, no doubt about it. If you – the owner of the company, the management of the company, they want the best employees they have, and that's how they – this happened probably six, seven years ago.

I'm in a hearing, and we got folks from OSHA. And they're talking about – I can't even remember the issue. Maybe it was Obama.

Maybe it was some other policy. I think it's something to do with the Clean Water Act or something. And we're questioning. This one guy started to make me mad because he just – I felt he was just arrogant.

And finally, I just got frustrated. So I asked him a question, and he was talking about the folks who – employers and owners of small businesses and sort of their attitude.

So I asked him a question. I can't remember the gentleman's name, but I said Mr. Smith. And he was some – big shout at OSHA. I said, Mr. Smith, I said, you would agree with me, though, wouldn't you, that most employers, even though there's some exceptions, most employers care pretty deeply about the well-being of their employees.

[57 : 09] After all, they live in the same – many of them live in the same community. They go to church together. Their kids go to school together. Their employees are the reason they can make a product that can compete in the marketplace and that they can have a living and that their company works.

So, you know, they've invested in these. So I say, even though there's some exceptions, you would agree, wouldn't you, that the vast majority of employers care deeply about the well-being of their employees.

And this guy – I mean, that's the biggest softball question you can ask, right? I mean, I framed it for this guy to say, yes, Congressman, you're better. And he said, with just as much arrogance as you can imagine, he said – I'd like to think so.

And I'm like – then I lost it. I just went after him. I mean, I started yelling. I'm not yelling, but I mean, I got fired. Because it's like the vast majority of employers – now, there are exceptions. There are some employers who maybe don't treat their employees the way they should, but the vast majority do because they know if that employee doesn't succeed and do well, their company is not going to do well.

There's investment in training. And so – but that's not the attitude of the bureaucrats all too often. They take a different approach. And that leads to some of these policies. And we need safety policies, and I get all that.

[58 : 24] And there was a time in the past where there – I get all that. But at some point, you have to recognize that fundamental principle as well, that they care about the well-being of their employees because, after all, that's how they make a living, the employer and how the business succeeds.

Okay. Yeah, Jim. A couple, maybe just a couple quick comments and then a question.

But when you were talking about the national debt, and I was trying to put that in perspective, just a few weeks ago I was reading something, but I didn't do the math on this, but I read the difference between a billion and a trillion.

Oh, yeah. And it said a billion seconds is about 32, 33 years. A trillion seconds is 27,000 years. Yeah. That's quite a difference.

The other thing I guess, it's just unbelievable to see the sit-in on the Congress floor. Unbelievable. And I guess the other thing, is there a good chance that the FBI will take into account your committee report?

[59 : 28] And I really appreciate the fact that you guys did a summary on that because I think that's very important. If I had to bet, I don't think there's an indictment.

I just don't see – this is a sad fact, but I think our Justice Department is unfortunately way too focused on politics and not focused on justice. So I do not see it happening where there's an indictment of Secretary Clinton.

Maybe someone below her, if I had to – this is always dangerous to do, but maybe Jake Sullivan. Maybe they get someone else for sending something that was classified.

I don't know. Jake – you know, her key people are Huma Abedin, Cheryl Mills, Heather Samuelson, Jake Sullivan, and some of the key people who work for her at the State Department. Cheryl Mills has worked for the Clintons for a long time.

I just don't see it. Now, the one thing that gives me a little pause that someone may be indicted is the fact that Brian Pagliano – you follow this story – Pagliano is the guy who set up her server. He's the tech guy who worked for – I think he worked for Senator Clinton and worked for her at the State Department, but he's the guy who set the server up and that email arrangement up.

[60 : 38] And he was given immunity. And you all know how it works. You don't give someone immunity unless you know what they got, and it helps you get someone higher up. So we'll see.

It's kind of interesting. I'll tell you a story about Pagliano. He – I thought this was interesting. We called him in as a witness in front of the Benghazi committee. This is months and months ago, maybe a year ago.

And when he – you know, we're in his – because we did it in a closed hearing, closed setting in his deposition. And his lawyers had said, well, he's going to take the fifth, which he wound up doing.

But Chairman Gowdy said, we don't care that he says that. We're going to make him come do it. He may change his mind. We're going to make him walk in and do it, which is the right move. So he comes in, and we're all sitting in this room.

And I'm kind of sitting back off the table, and there's actually a seat open beside me. And we're sitting there, and our council sits at the table. So in walks Mr. Pagliano, and there's some other people walking with him in kind of the confusion room.

[61 : 42] This one guy walks up. He's getting ready to sit down, but he's younger. I mean, he's mid-30s kind of guy. And he walks up, and he's getting ready to sit down beside me. And he says, oh, I'll sit beside the Ohio guy. So I look up at him, and I said, oh, how are you doing?

I said, you're from Ohio as well? And he goes, yeah. I said, where did you go to school? He said, went to Ignatius in Cleveland, and we started talking football and wrestling and talking to St. Ignatius. It's a great sports school. And we talked for a little bit, and I said, now, who are you with again?

I said, you a new Democrat staffer? He said, no, no, I'm part of Mr. Pagliano's legal team. He said, it's me, and it's this lady, and that guy, and that guy.

And I turned to him, and I said, takes four lawyers for a guy to take the fifth? Right? I mean, all you do is read from the card. On the vice of counsel, I choose to exercise my Fifth Amendment privilege.

Da, da, da, da. Anyone can. You don't, frankly, need a lawyer as long as you just read the card. And when I said that, he got this kind of sheepish look on his face. Now, remember, these weren't just any four lawyers.

[62 : 42] These were four lawyers from Wilmer Hale. Big firm. And their top litigator was sitting at the table with Mr. Pagliano. Right? And this guy beside me probably went to Harvard or Yale or Michigan.

He went to a good law school. And I'm thinking, four lawyers for a guy, Brian Pagliano, who makes \$120,000 working as a bureaucrat in the State Department? He can't afford four lawyers from Wilmer Hale for very long.

Who in heck is paying for this? I mean, that's the first thing that comes to mind. Like, who's paying for this? And I don't know. And I'm just speculating. But is the Clinton Foundation paying for it? I mean, so this is the kind of stuff we're up against.

And so when you see something like that happen this week, where a former president meets with the attorney general, the former president may be part of the investigation of his wife and this whole – like, this should not happen.

You cannot do that stuff in this country. And it's – so – but to your point, Gary, I just – I don't think – I don't think it's going to happen based on everything I've seen. I mean, we've talked with the Justice Department about the IRS.

[63 : 46] They didn't indict anyone, prosecute anyone in the Internal Revenue Service scandal. I remember we met with them after. When they made the decision they weren't going to indict anyone, we met with lawyers from the Justice Department. And we've been after them to give us the notes from the interviews and the depositions and things they did.

We want to see what you ask and what took place, why you made the decision you made. And they won't give them to us. They're reluctant to give us anything. We said, you've already made a decision.

Why can't we see it? And one of our Democrat colleagues asked those lawyers when we're in this meeting, they said, well, was it a close call? And the one lawyer from the Justice Department, no, it wasn't a close call. It was – we knew we shouldn't do it.

There was, you know, criminal intent. We weren't going to be able to prove criminal intent. And I looked at that. I said, it's not a close call. If it's a slam dunk, let us see the evidence. Right? We're just going to take your word for it.

Let me see the evidence that you put together and see what kind of interviews you did when you made that decision. Of course, they don't want to do that. Drives me nuts. I'll take a couple more and then we'll – it's getting close to lunchtime for all of you.

[64 : 51] We'll give the pastor the last word after Marvis, it looks like. I was wondering about, you know, the Democrats did the sit-in. Yeah. And then Paul Ryan adjourned early.

Are we going to see another sit-in when you go back? Maybe. You never know. Well, it's tough to understand how you would handle that when it first happens.

And my gut tells me the speaker handled it probably appropriately the first time. They try it again. I think you probably have to deal with it, you know, right away, first ten minutes.

You just can't tolerate. This is supposed to be – the House of Representatives is the people's – they call it the people's house. It's why the founders, when they put together the Constitution, they wanted the house to be the body closest to the people.

Best reflect just the will of the people. That's why every two years – I tell folks all the time. That's why every two years, you all get a chance to throw me out. That's a good thing. It is a darn good thing.

[65 : 56] The Senate's a different animal. That's why, you know, they get six-year terms. It's supposed to be a little more subdued and take time and slower. The House is much closer to the temperature of where the American people are.

And what they did was they disrupted the ability of the people's house to actually do the people's business, right, against the rules. Violation, complete violation of the rules.

And maybe the first time happens, okay. But if they want to keep doing that, you have to, I think, step forward and deal with it. It's almost like, you know, my dad used to have the attitude when it came to discipline.

If you do it right, you don't have to do it often, right? And he would sometimes – he'd step in and do it right. At least we didn't think it was right when we were getting it. But, you know, and so if it happens again, I think you've got to step in and deal with it.

So I think that's what the Speaker plans to do. You know, we'll see. But this week's a big week because, you know, we've got this week and next week on this convention, and we have the typical recess time frame.

[67 : 07] And this week Donald Trump's coming to talk to the Republican conference, to all the Republicans in the House on what would be Wednesday or Thursday, the 7th, whatever day the 7th is.

So they may try something again, but it seems to me if they do, you should – the Speaker should step in and not let it continue. You can't keep rewarding and letting that kind of behavior go on in my judgment.

Do you have a question, too? Okay. You touched on this Stingray technology. Yeah. Where all do you see that going?

Well, we're looking to do more hearings on it. And, you know, always step one, the powers that the legislative body has are the power of the purse, which is a big power, the power to hold hearings, the power to pass legislation.

But hearings is called the oversight authority that the Constitution gives the legislative branch to oversee, have hearings, gather information, get information to the public via those oversight hearings, important responsibility and power that the legislative branch has.

[68 : 15] So step one is to do that, do more investigation, bring it to light. We'll do that. What's interesting about this, and this is one of those issues where I'm working with a guy, a liberal member from California, who thinks like – who also is very nervous.

This is one of those issues where conservatives in the ACLU tend to get on the same team because when it comes to your fundamental liberties and rights, I always joked it.

I used to work really closely when he was in Congress with – on these kind of issues with Dennis Kucinich. You think about – you know, Kucinich is like way over here, right?

And he probably thinks I'm way over here. But on these kind of issues, Dennis is a good – he's a good man, and I have a lot of respect for liberals who really believe it, and Dennis does.

So there's – I think there's a – there's a coalition that can be put together that's – I think can be helpful. So we'll keep doing hearings on it and draw – one of the things we're talking about doing is the IRS, in my judgment, shouldn't have this technology.

[69 : 22] Certain other law enforcement agencies, if they're going to go get a probable cause warrant, that's fine. Remember, that's what the Fourth Amendment's about. You've got to go to a judge and show there's probable cause to get – to take the action you're seeking to take and get the judge to sign off on.

That's why we have the separate and equal branches and the checks and balance. So short of that, though, I don't think they should be using it. So we'll keep having hearings. Pass. I have a couple of questions about the Ben Dobby thing that has really been very unsatisfying to me.

And the first has to do with – we keep hearing about there were repeated pleas requests for additional security. Months and months in advance of the Benghazi attack, and they were persistently denied.

But I never hear of who it was that denied them. We keep getting this unnamed sources. They never put a name with who makes the decision to deny additional security.

And Mrs. Clinton said that she was not aware that additional security was even requested and that the request didn't get to her. Well, it got to somebody because somebody said no.

[70 : 40] And we'd like to know who was it that gave the order request denied. And secondly, we've heard repeated testimonies from men who were willing to go and wanted to go to try and aid those who were under fire at Benghazi.

And they said they were given a stand-down order. They refused permission to go to their aid. Then we hear from some authorities that there was no stand-down order.

And somebody is lying, but there never seems to be a name given to the somebody. Yeah. The first name is Charlene Lamb. She was the head of diplomatic security at the State Department, career employee in the State Department.

She sort of took the fall for this. But in my judgment, Secretary Clinton still bears the responsibility. She's the secretary. More importantly, you're exactly right. So Gaddafi is ousted in August of 2011.

The attack happens 13 months later, approximately 13 months later, September 12, 2012. In that 13 months, there were 200 security incidents, over 200 security incidents in Libya. I mean, major things, too.

[71 : 54] Assassination attempt on the British ambassador. Breaching of the compound. So the facility, the State Department facility was about a mile from the CIA annex in Benghazi. State Department facilities had the wall blown up, people trying to get in, bumped.

I mean, major things happening that lead up to this. Repeated requests, as the pastor said, from folks on the ground saying, we need more good guys here. We cannot rely simply on some normal security presence from the United States.

And then the host nation buttressing, it's not good enough. Plus, frankly, you couldn't count on a couple local militia of, you know, uncertain character with AK-47s.

You're not the most reliable. So they said, we need more. Those were repeatedly denied. That went to, the person who denied it was Charlene Lamb. But on August 17th, 2012, less than four weeks before the attack happens, there's a memo that's sent to the secretary.

Memo from Beth Jones, pretty high up individual in the State Department. And the title of the memo is, and we present this in our report, Uptick in Violence in Eastern Libya. And it talks about, I mean, it goes, it's a long recitation of all the problems that are happening there, how bad the situation is.

[73 : 13] They talk about urgency, lawlessness, widespread violence. These are the kind of terms used in that document. That actually does get to the secretary. So here you are. You got this history. You have the diplomatic security agents who have been there and come back and say, call it a suicide mission.

Direct quote from that individual is, everybody in Benghazi is going to die. This is how bad it was. And you have this memo, kind of the last chance Clinton has to actually make a different decision and say, either give more support or pull our people out.

And you have the fact that most other countries had already left. We were one of the last flags flying in Benghazi. But Secretary Clinton doesn't pull out because, again, I believe she doesn't change because this is her legacy.

And they are so committed to this mindset and worldview that they can't change. And remember, and I pointed this out, we pointed this out in our report and I pointed it out on Tuesday.

Sidney Blumenthal sends her an email back in August of 2011 when Gaddafi is ousted. And Blumenthal is one of her advisors, been an advisor to the Clintons for a long time. And we get this email and it's it's he says, you are this is a great moment.

[74 : 25] Do a press event. Even if it's this is direct quotes, even if it's in the driveway of your vacation home, do a press event. Take credit for this. And then he says, this is a big moment. You are vindicated and vindicated is a key word because she's she pushed people like Robert Gates and other folks in the White House to do this.

There was a there was a group who didn't want to get in there and mess with throwing helping overthrow Gaddafi. You are vindicated. History will treat you well, but don't wait. Help Cleo now.

And Cleo is a reference to the goddess of history. So when you're you think the goddess of history is looking over your shoulder and your legacy is on the line and you're committed to this thing.

And then when it happens, as I said earlier, you have to mislead the American people, which is what they did. In reference to the stand down order. There's there's a there's kind of two contexts that the one is just a slow response we had in general.

The fact that nothing even took off until after the attack was over is we were making. They had people get out of their uniform, get in civilian clothes, get back in their uniform, get out of it.

[75 : 34] Several times they changed clothes because, again, political concerns were driving. Do we really want people going in in uniform and in marked vehicles? They were nervous about that instead of like people are fighting for their lives.

Let's just go. So, again, political concerns drove that. The specific stand down order referencing Geist and Teagan and Paranto and Ty Woods, when they're going to lead that group over from the annex to the State Department facility and rescue people who had the first wave of the attack.

We had conflicting testimony. We talked to the station chief. The guy's called Bob, the station chief at the CIA facility, who said that there wasn't a stand down order.

And then we had testimony from the four guys who were portrayed in the film, I think very accurately, who said there was a stand down order. So when you have conflicting testimony, you have conflicting testimony.

I know who I believe. I mean, you're going to believe the guy who had a motive to slow things down, Bob, the station chief, and everyone in Washington who he's communicating with reacted without the, you know, with little urgency and slowed things down.

[76 : 44] Are you going to believe the guys who were willing to go risk their lives and did risk their lives and save their fellow citizens? I mean, I know who I believe. Just as sure as I'm standing here, I believe those guys.

And determined that Charlene Lamb was the one who was responsible for denying additional security. Has she resigned? Has she been – has she resigned? She has left employment.

She was on – she was on leave for a while. But, frankly, the punishment or ramifications have been very little.

But, yeah, she had to go on some kind of unpaid leave or paid leave for a time. John Kerry reinstated her. And then I think she has now since resigned. I sat in on part of that deposition when she was there.

And one wonders, would she be available then for reassignment to some other cushy job in the administration? Potentially. I think, if I remember correctly, she is just retired, and she had served long enough where I think she's probably getting her pension like Lois Lerner is.

[77 : 51] That's the part that – and I'm going way too long. But that's the part that frustrates – and I hear it every day out and about, the part that frustrates so many other people. You think about – I'll use the IRS example, and I'll finish here.

And it's why there's this frustration with Washington, and the 80% number is what it is. If any private citizen was under investigation by the Internal Revenue Service, and you had documents that were important, and you lose those documents, and then the tape that's backing up those documents suddenly disappears, you're in huge trouble, right?

You're definitely getting fined, but you may be going to jail. That exact same fact pattern applies to John Koskinen's IRS. And that's the part that just frosts people, that here he is not only maybe not going to have anything happen to him, he's sitting at the White House Correspondents' Dinner with the smug, arrogant look on his face.

And it just – it so frustrates – so frustrates people. Pastor, thank you. Thank you all. Have a great Fourth of July. Thank you. And I just say regarding the IRS, don't let go of it.

We appreciate your dogged determination. In dismissing, we're going to ask you to just sit and relax and enjoy musical benediction, and it's about liberty and the freedoms that we enjoy.

[79 : 22] And then the conclusion of that, you'll be dismissed.