

# 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: 04 March 2018

Preacher: Jim Jordan

[ 0 : 00 ] I wanted to talk to you about the Museum of the Bible. It has just opened up in Washington, D.C. this last November, and I get the privilege of working there, volunteer, and I wanted to share and let you know about it, how good it is.

I'm excited about it. It was started just in 2012 when Steve Green, who is of Hobby Lobby, had started a collection of biblical artifacts and bought some Bibles, and then he took it on the road and exhibited them around the world, and then he bought the building in D.C. in 2012, and in five short years, he opened up the Museum of the Bible, and he has this mission in mind, and that is that all people around the world engage in the Bible, and he says it doesn't matter what religion you are or where you're from.

He wants everybody to come and consider what it says and let the Holy Spirit do the rest. Yes, thank you. The Museum of the Bible is a block and a half over from the National Monument. It's 430,000 square feet full of artifacts, 40,000. There's six floors. The neat thing about the building itself, it was a food warehouse in the early 1900s, and a train would actually come through this building and unload refrigerated goods and dry food, and they claimed they want to still feed the world with that building, and I think that's real clever.

And throughout the building, there's things like grapevines, a motif that's on this glass stairway in the middle of it, which is just beautiful. And if you don't want to do the steps, they've got elevators with screens, three screens that show you videos of Israel with beautiful, acidic type of sounding music, and that in itself is just one of my favorite parts.

[ 2 : 14 ] Of course, they've got some Bibles and cases, and they have ancient biblical texts like the Humarabi stone and Stella's facsimiles of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which are convincing to me.

And somebody said, well, yeah, but the museum in Israel doesn't even have the Dead Sea Scrolls actually on display. Somebody had tried to light them up or whatever, so it's like a crazy thing. But it's fun to see the old Bibles, the pocket prayer Bibles, which are kind of funny because they're this thick and they're this big, so it's not really going to sit into anybody's pocket.

But you can see a couple pages from the Gutenberg Bible. It takes you through the translation of the Bible from Hebrew to Greek to Latin to English, and then just how many languages they've spread God's word.

It's fascinating. On the history level, then they have an impact level, which is of American history. You've got Billy Graham on there, circuit preacher writers for the Great Awakenings.

[ 3 : 26 ] So you've got American history and its impact on the cultures, our food, what we eat and the art, and all of that is on the second level.

The third level is my favorite level, and they've got a mock village of the first century Judean village, what it would have been like to live in Jesus' times, complete with a mikvah.

Does anybody know what a mikvah is? It's a ceremonial cleaning that they would do. It's a spring-fed bath, and people would walk through it, and they still do if you're Orthodox Jewish. But if you were going to temple, you would walk through this bath of water, and if you were a rabbi or a wealthy person, you would have one at your home.

But they have one by the synagogues, and they have a synagogue in this village. They have a home. It's just really a beautiful thing, and they have people dressed up in character to talk about it.

[ 4 : 30 ] And they say, have you heard of this rabbi Jesus of Nazareth? He's talking out there, but he's just from our village. It's just, you know, they're like, I don't know, you know. So to just kind of put yourself in that time and the tones and the politics of King Herod, how he was in charge.

And so there's history. There's politics. All of that. They have a rooftop garden, which is beautiful, and off to its side, a restaurant they call Manna.

And you can taste Mediterranean fast food type of, you know, you can get your falafel fix there. And it's really nice.

And for kids like toddlers up through fifth grade, they've got this little room called Courageous Pages. And it reminds me of like a biblical Chuck E. Cheese because the kids, there's like a ball-climbing, you know, gym set in there that they can just get their wiggles out.

And maybe while Dad or Mom goes off, you know, a parent can stay with their kid and throw balls at Goliath and all that. So it's really thought out for a family experience.

[ 5 : 43 ] They have some of the Bibles that they have on display. They've got a Lincoln Bible, Elvis' Bible. They've got the Vinegar Bible, which is like a mistake, a printer's mistake.

So for the parable of the vineyard, they misprinted Vinegar. So it's kind of like an eclectic collection of Bibles. But it's got a lot of different experiences to it that they mix it up with movies, caricatures, all those things.

One thing I have to fill in, if you make the journey there, there's a thing called the flyover. And it's a movie experience. It's the one thing that's cost.

Everything else is free, though it's ticketed. But the flyover takes you over the National Monument, and you go through buildings, and you see Bible verses.

You see the National Monument, like you're flying through the air. And it kind of reminds you of an IMAX theater, but it's just a little bit more. And that's all I'm going to say, because there's some surprise to it, and it's just a lot of fun to do that.

[ 6 : 59 ] What I want to show you is a video, just a YouTube. That's something that they promoted on TV as commercials, but I think it's well done.

It takes you through history, starting with Abraham. And you can't understand what he's saying, and that's not the important part. But then the volume will change. But I just wanted you to know it's not your ears.

Can you hear? I might have killed it. But anyways, if you come to D.C., I just want to give an extra invitation to not only go to the museum, but I can take you through the Capitol.

And I would personally love to do that. I enjoy doing that. So just let me know ahead of time. And I've listened to David Barton, and I can share some of those biblical things about the Bible and our godly heritage that's a part of that beautiful building.

So I enjoy all of that. And I hope you enjoy this tape, too. That's right.

[ 8 : 19 ] Take care. Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[ 10 : 53 ] Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

[ 13 : 53 ] Thank you.

Thank you. And he said, Congressman, I want to know a couple things from you. I want to know what keeps you up at night. I thought about it and, you know, I gave kind of answered, you know, there.

But I started thinking about that when Pastor asked me a few weeks ago to fill in this morning and say a few things and take some questions from you. I thought, well, maybe it would be good to just answer that question.

What does keep you up at night? What concerns me about our great country and, you know, things that are going on? And obviously there's that sort of the, you know, the answer of you're concerned about North Korea.

You're concerned about the terrorist threat. You're concerned about China, Russia. And I am. And, you know, those are obviously real and serious concerns.

[ 15 : 14 ] But I think it was, I forget which founder, but one of the founders, maybe it was Franklin, talked about the real concern for America long term are threats from within.

And not so much threats from abroad. And when you think about it, that's, those are the things that concern me the most. And first and foremost is, and this is just basic economics and mathematics, but the first thing that concerns me is this debt problem.

And we've touched on it before in times that, you know, pastors had me talk. But it is really serious right now. We just blew an opportunity six weeks ago to actually start to move things in the right direction and instead continue the same old, same old.

Where Washington just spends your money and mortgages the future. But think about some of these numbers. Without getting all boring and sounding like an economist, think about the fact that we've got a \$20 trillion debt.

Now, let me back up and say, the good news is this. The economy is moving in the right direction. And, you know, say what you want about, you know, CNN doesn't seem to want to give President Trump any credit for anything.

[16:24] But it's been a pretty darn good first year. I've said this on TV. I said this the other day giving a speech. Think about President Trump's first year. I mean, regulations are down.

Taxes are down. The economy is up. The economy is moving in definitely in the right direction. We're up over 3% growth during the previous 10 years. We never hit that. We were bumping along at a percent, percent and a half annual growth rate.

We're up over 3%. So that's moving in the right direction. ISIS is backpedaling. The embassy is going to go to Jerusalem, which is a big move.

I mean, that is the right kind of foreign policy decision, the right kind of message sent from the White House. And Neil Gorsuch is on the Supreme Court. So it's been a, you know, all in all, I'd say a pretty darn good first year. But, of course, the press would never give, you know, the mainstream press.

I think I've shared this with you before. A line from Cal Thomas. You never read Cal Thomas, syndicated columnist, Christian guy. It's a great line when he's talking about the way normal people see things and the way the elite national press, you know, the New York Times and the Washington Post.

[17:27] Washington Post criticizes me every single week, it seems like. In fact, I tell my colleagues if the press isn't saying something bad about you, you're probably not doing anything any good. But Cal Thomas has a great line.

He says, I get up every morning, I read my Bible in the New York Times so I can see what each side's up to, right? You know, you guys know that line. So it's been a pretty good year economically speaking.

And we've been traveling around our district talking with business leaders, and they're all confident. They feel like this wave of regulation is now stopped and in some cases receding.

They know they're going to get to keep more of their hard-earned money. Tax cuts are good. So all that's good, and there's a confidence level, and there's job creation, and good things are happening. So all good, but still, some of the numbers are scary.

\$20 trillion debt. This year, our deficit, which is your annual, you know, focus on annual spending, our annual deficit's going to be a trillion dollars.

[18:29] It's a lot of money. And probably scarier yet is when you look at deficit, well, a couple things. First, debt to GDP is about one to one.

That's a dangerous place to be. Probably more telling is when your deficit relative to your GDP is higher than your growth rate relative to GDP. So our deficit, we've got a \$20 trillion economy.

We've got a deficit of a trillion. That's 5%, and our growth rate is only 3, 3.5. You're not really gaining on the problem. And it needs to be the other way around. We need to be growing at a 5% and only having deficits, something below that, you know, preferably way below that.

So these are things that I think are scary. And then probably what really bothered me the most was, as I said, six weeks ago, we had a chance to break this pattern that is now just that, a pattern in Washington where whenever we on the conservative side want to do more for our military, and make sure our troops have what they need to defend this great country, the left always demands if you give a dollar for defense, you've got to give a dollar for the rest of government.

And it's ridiculous. So then you're just growing government, growing programs, growing spending. And so remember, I guess it would be probably, yeah, probably six, seven weeks ago, when we had sent over a short-term, we in the House sent over to the Senate a short-term spending bill, and Mr. Schumer decided he was going to shut down the government because he thought amnesty, in

simple terms, he thought amnesty was more important given letting people who came here illegal stay, this whole DACA situation, he thought that was more important than paying our troops and funding the government.

[ 20 : 14 ] And so the government shut down over that one weekend. And then quickly, Mr. Schumer had a change of heart. And he said, you know, kind of shazam, I'm going to open the government back up.

And the reason he decided to open the government back up, because in public opinion, he was getting his tail kicked. I mean, just old-fashioned politics. And so he opened the government back up. And we funded the government for like three weeks.

And then we sent over, three weeks later, the exact same bill, with one notable and real exception. We said, instead of just funding our troops short-term, let's fund the troops for the, pay for our military for the rest of the fiscal year, for the full year, and increase what we're going to give to our troops.

And then hold the line on the rest of the government. And instead of standing firm in that position, right at the last, we passed it in the House, instead of standing firm in that position, our leadership decided to do what Washington always does, which is just spend more on everything and continue this same old pattern of growing government while we increase what we need to do for national defense.

And what bothers me is we were so poised to win. I mean, we could have had the debate. We would have won. Do you really think Chuck Schumer was going to shut the government down again when we were just, the only difference was we were going to fund the troops for the full year and give them a pay raise?

[ 21 : 31 ] I don't think so. But unfortunately, too many of our guys, our leadership, are afraid to, I always say sometimes I think they forfeit before they even step on the mat to wrestle. Like you can't, you're not going to win.

You got to go out there and go on the offense and actually compete in the competition and have the real debate. And unfortunately, we didn't. So this is a concern. I know I've shared with you before, my old coach in high school, he talked about, this is not an exaggeration, he talked about discipline every day.

I mean, I would say he was the toughest teacher in the school, toughest coach in the state. And I can remember Coach McCann, he passed away a few years ago saying, when he came into his class, he said, hey, Jordan, this is not any class.

This is chemistry class. And more importantly, it's my chemistry class. You want to do well in my class, it's going to take discipline. You're going to have to read the material the night before, come in class prepared, do the experience.

It's going to take discipline to do well in this chemistry class. And then the wrestling room, it was intense. I can still hear him. Self-discipline is the most important character quality.

[ 22 : 37 ] You need to accomplish anything in meaning, significance. You've got to have self-discipline. Look at that guy. Shut up. He sounds like my dad, right? You get it all day at home and you've got to get it from your coach.

But he had a great definition. It hangs in the wrestling room and he says discipline. It's the Ron McCunn wrestling room. And some of you know that a brother coach is there and they're the best team in the state. They'll be the best team in the state next week again. But all those state banners, the biggest banner is the one that says, Coach McCunn's statement, it says discipline.

Doing what you don't want to do when you don't want to do it. And back in the day, it meant doing things his way, you'd rather do them your way. It meant doing them the right way when you'd rather do them the easy way. And the problem in Washington is, particularly on spending, is we always do it the easy way.

We always do it the convenient way. It's just more convenient to say, oh, if you're going to get a dollar to do what needs to be done for national defense, you've got to give a dollar to the liberals, a dollar to the left for more social programs.

It's just easy to do that. Now, okay, we'll just keep spending. And, oh, we're fine right now. The economy's growing. The bond market hasn't increased that much. We're still able to handle the interest payments we've got to handle. So it's just easy to keep on doing the same thing, the convenient thing.

[ 23 : 43 ] But we're unfortunately approaching a point where we can no longer do that. And we're going to have to get a handle on this spending. And so our group, I belong to this group called the Freedom Caucus, and we're going to keep fighting. We're the group that opposed it.

We will keep doing it. But that makes me nervous. When you think about what keeps you up at night is when you've got a \$20 trillion debt and you're running another trillion dollar deficit and the bond market is starting to go up, we're only paying this year about \$230 billion in interest payments to service that \$20 trillion debt.

And the reason we're only, it's funny you talk about government, only \$230 billion. But relatively speaking, if interest rates go up much more, we're going to go to \$3, \$4, \$5, maybe even as high as \$800 billion if interest rates get to a normal level to service the \$20 trillion debt, which means you can't.

You can't do it. And that's when you get into big problems and big inflation, and also I'm concerned about that. The second thing, and I'll talk about this and then be happy to take your questions.

The second thing, when Mr. Carey asked me his question. By the way, I hope you all get this book and read it. I couldn't put it down. I mean, he grew up on a farm in Medina, Ohio, and then went off in the Air Force.

[ 24 : 55 ] I mean, was a top fighter pilot. Won the very first NATO competition of fighter pilots. He was the winner. He was that kind of, that good at what he did. And he was a farmer and a flyer.

I mean, that's what he did. It's a fascinating book. And it jumps back and forth, by the way. He starts the very first chapter's Father's Day, 1965, and he's flying a mission.

He's got a two-year-old and a one-year-old at home with his wife, and he's flying a mission, gets shot down. That starts his seven and a half years as a POW. And then the next chapter jumps back to when he's a kid on the farm in Medina County, and it's just back and forth between him surviving and dealing with all the terrible things he had to go through as a prisoner of war and then growing up on the farm and fascinating book, and he's a believer, which is interesting as well as he works through it.

But when you think about the second thing that scares me and keeps me up at night is this idea that now big governments attack on fundamental liberties and the rule of law.

And it, you know, attack on First Amendment rights, your Second Amendment liberties. I thought it was interesting. The pastor had in the bulletin today something from General Kelly about your Second Amendment rights.

[ 26 : 13 ] And governments also attack on your Fourth Amendment liberties. But you think about the First Amendment, I mean, this is as basic as it gets. Our right to assemble. Our right to practice our faith.

Our right to have freedom of the press. Freedom to petition your government. And most importantly, the First Amendment is what? Your right to do what? Do what I'm doing right now, to speak. And speak in a political nature.

That's what the founders wanted you to be able to do and not be harassed for doing it. And yet, we saw a few years ago, we saw an agency in the federal government with the power and the clout and the ability to impact people's lives that the IRS has.

We saw them systematically and for a sustained period of time target people for their political beliefs and their First Amendment free speech rights when they went after conservative groups.

And probably more concerning to me today is what you see happening on college campuses.

I mean, this attack on free speech, safe spaces, speech codes, you can't say certain things.

Someone told me this weekend that Purdue University just said you can no longer use the masculine and feminine pronoun.

[ 27 : 22 ] You've got to use some neutral pronoun when you're talking. I mean, it's the craziest stuff I've ever heard. Purdue. I thought they were kind of one of the more conservative institutions in the Big Ten. So, this attack, we did a hearing.

If you've got nothing better to do, watch some of the highlights from a hearing. We did this about, oh, 10 months ago, I would guess. But we had Ben Shapiro, one of the sharpest young minds in politics today, Jewish American, just a brilliant, who's been harassed probably more than anyone on any college campus.

He came and testified in front of our committee. And then we had Adam Carolla, the comedian. By the way, he was hilarious in talking about, he's doing a movie with Dennis Prager on this very issue,

free speech on college campuses.

But what's going on is frightening. And it's, Mr. Shapiro talks about, he calls it the heckler's veto. And the idea that people shout you down enough because they don't like what you're saying, you don't even get a chance to say it.

You don't even get a chance to talk. And you get disinvited. You're first invited to speak. And then they say, well, no, no, it's too dangerous. We're not going to let conservatives and libertarians and Christian folks come to college campuses to speak to the student body.

[ 28 : 33 ] It is a scary thing where we're headed. Prager makes a good point. He says, the First Amendment is not about speech you like. It's by definition about speech you don't like.

Right? And the left, it used to be you could have this, it was a marketplace, particularly on college campuses. And it's like, take your best shot, get your best hold, make your best argument, and let's have the competition of ideas.

Now it's, unless you're willing to, you know, say it the way the left wants you to say it, you don't get a chance to even speak. And that is a big concern and something we're going to continue to highlight and talk about in our committee.

Obviously, the tragedy that terrible events and evil events that took place in Florida a few weeks ago has, again, brought the nation's kind of focus on the Second Amendment and on gun rights. I think it's important we, first of all, remember what the Second Amendment is about. The Second Amendment is clearly about individuals and states having the ability to keep and bear arms to protect them from the federal government.

[ 29 : 47 ] From the federal government attacking and trying to take away your basic liberties. And yet, we always lose sight of that, it seems, in these debates. There's lots of proposals being put forward.

I think the vast majority of them are a problem. Because, well, there's a bill right now in the Senate, sponsored by Senator Cornyn, which would expand the way the background check works for people who purchase a firearm.

And I'm very nervous about it because it would allow, in simple terms, bureaucrats to take away your due process rights, your fundamental Second Amendment rights, without a court of law having the actual hearing and seeing the evidence and making a decision.

And, again, that's not how it works in this country. It just doesn't work that way. You can't have bureaucrats in the executive branch saying, we unilaterally take away your rights without your, I mean, one of the fundamentals of America is you get your day in court, particularly when it comes to your basic rights.

And so I'm nervous about that legislation. I think we can stop it. Our leadership has assured us on the House side they're not going to let that bill come to the floor. We're going to encourage them to keep their word.

[ 30 : 56 ] There's other proposals that scare me. And I think what always happens after these terrible events is we forget some of the basics. And I don't want to, I guess, get too far into the gun debate.

But I do think it's important to understand that, you know, bad guys aren't stupid. They're just bad. They're going to figure out a way around the law.

Remember this individual in Florida. He had some kind of interaction with a government entity, law enforcement or otherwise. I think almost 30-some times he interacted with a government agency. And then on the day of the attack, the government, i.e. the sheriff's department, it looks like, didn't engage and do their job.

And so now we're supposed to believe the answer is more government? 30-some times government failed. The day of the actual attack, government looks like it didn't do its job. And now we're supposed to believe that more government is somehow going to solve these problems.

[ 31 : 54 ] And I just don't see it as the answer. The answer, I do believe, is something that the president has talked about, which is allowing the good guys who have the training to actually carry a firearm to protect themselves and protect the students and student-athletes at their institution.

This coach who gave his life for his kids, I think if he'd have been armed and trained, and I believe he would have engaged the shooter, my guess is I'd bet on him winning. So I do think that makes sense if local school boards want to move in that direction.

I always tell this story. You think about it. I remember I was having a few years ago when I was in the state senate, and it was a debate on whether to allow law-abiding citizens to undergo a background check and have the training to carry a concealed firearm in our state. And I was supportive of that, and we had this long debate on the floor. And I remember after listening to one of the Democrats who was opposed to it, a guy who was actually running for governor at the time, but was in the state senate, and did his long speech. And then I got up afterwards and said, well, I want you to think about this when you're thinking about concealed carry. I said, remember that fundamental principle. Bad guys aren't stupid. They're just bad.

[ 33 : 08 ] And the idea behind concealed carry is to now allow good people to carry a firearm to protect themselves. And so I want you to think how this works.

So I said, tonight there's a bad guy walking down the street, and he's trying to figure out which house he's going to rob. And there are two houses, side-by-side houses there, and he's looking at the first one.

And in the first one, there's a pickup truck with a gun rack and a bumper sticker that says, I love the NRA and Donald Trump for president.

And I said, and the very next house in the driveway is a Volkswagen with a bumper sticker that says, you know, coexist and Barack Obama for president.

Which house do you think the guy's going to rob, right? And that's sort of the point. If the bad guy has to stop and think, now this school, as an example, is not a gun-free zone, but actually has good people who are trained and are ready to defend themselves and their students, you may get less of this.

[ 34 : 16 ] And so I think that's something we've got to keep in mind as we move through this debate. Last one, this is probably where I spent the bulk of my time right now. And part of that's driven by the committee assignments I have.

I'm on the Judiciary Committee and the Oversight Committee. And so we always seem to be in the middle of these investigations. But I will tell you what the Federal Bureau of Investigation did in relation to this whole Russia-Trump investigation is as wrong as it gets.

And probably the easiest way to understand this whole saga is through the eyes of one individual. And that's the, some of you may have heard of the FBI agent, former deputy head of counterintelligence at the FBI, Peter Strzok.

And this guy is, he's sort of the central player in so much of this. But he was the guy who ran the Clinton investigation, and to her use of classified information on her server, he interviewed Cheryl Mills, who was former Secretary Clinton's chief of staff.

He interviewed Huma Abedin, who was her top aide. He interviewed Secretary Clinton. He was the central guy in that entire investigation. And then he becomes the central guy.

[ 35 : 32 ] He becomes the guy who launches the Russia-Trump investigation in July of 2016. And then, of course, he's the guy we learn about in these text messages that he has between himself and Lisa Page, one of the FBI legal counsel at the FBI.

And we learn a lot through those text messages. In fact, there was, I said this the other day, there's kind of four things that happened that I think are sort of interesting. Remember, on July 5th, 2016, James Comey, FBI director at the time, does his famous press conference where he says, we're not going to bring charges against Secretary Clinton.

A few weeks later, Peter Strzok opens the Russia-Trump investigation. And, you know, again, I think it's interesting. The same guy who ran the Clinton investigation is the guy who launches and opens the Trump-Russia investigation and on possible coordination.

Two weeks after that, we have this now famous text message between Page and Strzok where they talk about an insurance policy. In case the American people actually elect Donald Trump, we need an insurance policy. We're not exactly sure what that means because we haven't deposed Lisa Page yet or Peter Strzok.

And then two weeks after that, we have this other text message from Lisa Page to Peter Strzok where she says, I talked to Director McCabe, who is deputy director of the FBI, and he said that, quote, POTUS wants to know everything we're doing.

[ 37 : 05 ] POTUS, of course, refers to President of the United States, President Obama. So it's interesting. July 5th, Clinton's acquitted or no charges are going to be brought. Late July, they opened the Trump-Russia investigation. August 14th, 2016, two weeks after that, we have the text

message, we need an insurance policy.

And two weeks later, September 2nd, 2016, we have this text message that says, POTUS wants to know everything. Pretty broad category. POTUS, sorry, everything we're doing. And again, may be innocent, but it certainly looks suspicious and something that I think underscores why we need to look into all this.

Other thing that has just come out on this issue is, of course, this, well, not just come out, but we've been talking about a lot, this whole dossier and the idea that this, what we call dossier, was taken to the secret court, this FISA court, and used to get a warrant to spy on an individual associated with the Trump campaign.

First of all, I think there are concerns in general. When you have a secret court where you can go in and get a warrant to spy on a fellow American citizen, and they don't get their representative there, they don't get an adversarial, it's not where they can make their argument why this shouldn't happen.

So there's just sort of that fundamental concern. But then the fact that the FBI took one campaign's opposition research and dressed it all up and made it look like it was legitimate intelligence and took that to the court as the basis to secure this warrant, that is a big problem.

[ 38 : 35 ] And I'm convinced they did just that. You get a chance to read the two memos. There was the Republican memo from about five weeks ago. There was the Democrat memo that came out two weeks ago.

And I think you'll see that the Democrats try to argue that the FBI was looking at Christopher Steele, the guy who wrote this dossier, was looking at him long before the dossier was in their possession and before they knew about it, and my response is, well, if that's the case, why did you wait until you had the dossier to go get the warrant?

Why didn't you get the warrant beforehand? And why did you lead in the application with the warrant itself? So lots of concerns there. And I guess maybe, well, I think something we have called for, and the only way we're going to get any type of closure to this entire escapade is to have a second special counsel.

So we called for this probably a little bit back in July, so seven, eight, nine months ago. A number of us called for a second special counsel. I don't particularly like special counsels, but I see no other remedy.

I don't think the FBI can investigate itself. I think Robert Mueller, who's the special counsel now looking into this, is compromised because of his past involvement with the FBI and some of these same people who need to be investigated.

[ 39 : 56 ] I don't think Jeff Sessions will do it because I'm not sure he knows where his recusal stops and starts. So I see no other remedy other than a second special counsel.

The one thing I've been talking a lot about is I think it would be important that that individual not be from the swamp, not be from Washington, but find some retired federal judge from Oklahoma, somewhere in the middle of the country, and let that individual put together a team, do this.

And then whatever conclusion they reach, I think there's a much better chance that the American people will actually have some buy-in and accept the outcome there. Again, I would encourage you to – well, I wanted to close with this.

I wanted to close with this book because you know how you are. When you just finish a book, you like it and you want others to read it, and I liked what Mr. Carey said at the end of his book. I wanted to finish with that and then I did save some time for questions.

And then we'll take some questions from all of you. But this is what, again, Paul Carey, seven and a half years as a POW in Vietnam, says at the end of his book, and I think it ties into what Nathan sang about.

[ 41 : 10 ] And it always just gives me – sometimes you walk through all the bad news, you know, \$20 trillion debt, government having one standard for the politically connected, a different standard for us regular people, and it's not supposed to work that way, and the tax on the First Amendment, Second Amendment, Fourth Amendment, fundamental liberty.

I mean, you could get depressed, but I think it's important to remember what Nathan sang about and what Mr. Carey writes about it now that he's 80 years old and been through the things he's been through.

And he closes – these are the last few sentences in the book. At times in life, we are all battered by events around us, by war, by hardship, by loss. But we're not controlled by them.

What's important is what's inside us, where God is our hope and strength. No matter what challenges we are called to endure, God's grace is sufficient. For that, I will rejoice in the Lord, because he has delivered me from hardships, from events, from heartaches.

I want to exalt his name. If we keep that in mind as just regular ordinary folks, like we all are, but ordinary folks who are saved by grace, if we keep that in mind, we'll be all right.

[ 42 : 20 ] It's still the greatest country ever where, you know, ordinary people – maybe I shared this with you before, too. My favorite statement is a baseball player.

Hirschizer pitched for the Dodgers. Took him to the World Series championship. They call him the Bulldog. And I read his book a few years ago, and he said – he had a great line. He said, great things happen to ordinary people who work hard and never give up.

And my favorite word in there is ordinary. Great things happen to ordinary people who work hard and never give up. Because when you think about it, we're all just ordinary people. Nobody's any better than anybody else.

We're all in need of God's grace. But in this country, ordinary people don't have to do ordinary things. They can do extraordinary things if they're willing to work hard and never quit.

And if we keep that mindset in mind, like Paul Perry obviously did, particularly when he was a POW, we keep that positive attitude in mind. It's an attitude that has always been present in the United States and has served us well and made us the greatest nation ever.

[ 43 : 25 ] I think we can still handle the adversities that we see and the problems that we have. And that's my attitude. Sometimes it gets frustrating in Washington, but what the heck, can't quit.

You've got to keep fighting. So we'll keep doing it. All right, your chance for questions. The gentleman on the front row who also served our country is recognized.

Yes. I think they're going to bring the mic, this young man. Run right up here to the front row. We'll start up here. We'll keep you running back and forth. Is it on?

Testing. Okay. Yeah, it just breaks my heart that what's going on in Syria. When I see every night, you see the kids bandaged up, bloody, laying in the street, or just sitting in the street, or just crying, or looking for some help.

And then it shows the planes flying over, just destruction everywhere. I remember, I think my heart goes out to them because I remember in Vietnam going into villages.

[ 44 : 41 ] And all the kids knew was war. Yeah. That's all that existed in their lives so far. And when you would come into a village, they didn't know if you were going to give them food or you're going to kill them.

You know, they didn't know. And I see these kids, you know, growing up the way they are, and it's just, it's devastating. I didn't know, I don't know what we're doing. Yeah.

Or anything like that. No, I mean, look, you can see it, war's terrible, and you've been in them. So, you know. Yeah, Syria's tough.

I'll tell you one story, and this is, I think, gives you a little bit of insight into the president who, maybe I said this before as well. I wish everyone, I wish everyone can meet the president.

You may not agree with all his policies, but I wish everyone can meet him. You cannot help but like the guy when you're around him. You cannot. There's a charisma and there's just a genuine love you can see that he has for the country, for our military, for law enforcement, for hardworking regular folks.

[ 45 : 48 ] He just, it comes across, and it comes across clearly. But Polly and I had a chance probably, I don't know, six, eight months ago.

We had dinner with Mike Pompeo, CIA director, and his wife and a couple other couples. Polly was in a Bible study with Susan, Mike's wife. And so we got to go out there. And we'd never been to the CIA.

It's kind of neat because they gave me this tour, and I'd never been out there. And you learn some things about the CIA that you didn't know. Then we had dinner with Mike and Susan and some of our friends.

And, of course, we just, Mike and I served together on the Benghazi committee. We were pretty close in the house. But I just wanted to hear the story. I'm like, Mike, not every day you get a friend who's direct from the CIA.

I said, you know, tell us some stories. And he told us about when Assad used chemical weapons on his citizen. And Mike gets called into the room, you know, where with him and the Joint Chiefs and the president and the vice president, the top people in the government are going to make decisions about what kind of response, if any, the United States is going to have.

[ 46 : 56 ] And he said it was one of those moments where he so appreciated the president because he said the President Trump turned to him that first meeting and says, Mike, did he do it?

And, you know, Mike's an accomplished guy. He was number one in his class at West Point, number one on Harvard Law Review at Harvard Law School, member of Congress, successful lawyer, successful business.

And I mean, just what Mike said, you know, you're kind of intimidated. It's the first time in this room and the president of the United States is asking you a direct question. And you've got to give him a yes or no. And he says, well, Mr. President, we think he did.

And he said, the president turns to him and says, you've got 24 hours to tell me whether he did or not, whether you know for sure or not whether he did. Mike's like, yes, sir. And so he said, we went back, busted our tail.

And we had all these sharp people working on things and analyzing things. Look at maps, look at pictures, look at the analyze, all this. And they come back the next day and he said, the meeting, he said, the president turns to him and goes, Pompeo, what do you got?

[ 48 : 00 ] And he says, Mr. President, we know that he did. He said, okay. And he said, then the president just turned to the military people and says, all right, now what are we going to do? And, of course, they decided to use some big bomb and let him have it.

And you may not agree with what they did. I actually do. I think you had to send a message when someone uses weapons that bad on civilians or on anybody, frankly.

But what I like is the way the president made the decision. It was like, you know, in previous administrations, you know what happened. Well, we'll think about it. We'll talk about it.

We'll set up this red line. That get across. We'll think about it. We'll talk about it. And months later, nothing ever gets done. So I appreciate it. I appreciate what Mike shared with us about how that decision was made.

The gentleman right there. This young man right there. I didn't think that the purpose of this gun control is that I'm just trying to get the garage door open a little bit and maybe get an assault weapon ban through and eventually single-shot .22s and just take it from there.

[ 49 : 17 ] I'm always nervous about the left wanting to take away your liberties and expand this scope and size of government. So, yes, I do believe that.

And I've always felt that there's a slippery slope. And, you know, we see it on the life issue. You know, who would have thought that, you know, once you allow a certain type of unborn children's lives to be taken, then where that would lead to, well, is there talk now and some countries have done this, some states have passed right-to-die legislation and euthanasia-type legislation.

So I always say there's a slippery slope and it's steep and it's slippery. So be careful. And so I'm very nervous about any – there are common sense things that make sense.

But I would argue they're in the law right now. We don't need more government infringing on any type of Second Amendment rights or any other rights, frankly. Yeah.

Okay. Regarding the special counsel. Yeah. And you're thinking of making another counsel.

[ 50 : 39 ] Yeah. To perhaps investigate the first counsel. This can go on and on, can't it? No. Great point. I would not have it investigate.

I do not want a second special counsel to analyze and critique special counsel Mueller's work. He's going to do what he's going to do. That's going to come out. Hopefully sooner rather than later.

What I want is – I think there needs to be someone – someone outside the Justice Department, outside of the FBI. Because, again, I don't think they can investigate themselves.

I think you have to have someone look at the whole – because this all works together. Clear back from when Secretary Clinton was – that investigation into her use of – her sending classified information over a personal server.

All of that bleeds into the Russia-Trump investigation. And everything associated with this use of the dossier to get the warrant at the FISA court.

[ 51 : 44 ] And everything associated. I think you need someone to look at the full picture, go through it all, and then have their conclusion, have their report for the American people to see. Plus,

what the Attorney General announced last week, which was to allow the Inspector General – every federal agency has what's called an Inspector General.

And they can look at inefficiencies and wrongdoing within the agencies. But they don't have the right to prosecute. They can't send people to – take people to grand jury. They can't, you know, recommend prosecution and that kind of thing.

So, Attorney General Sessions said he was going to turn this over to Inspector General Horowitz to look into. But I just don't – I just don't think that's – that's going to get the job done.

I think you've got to have a special counsel who does have the right to compel a grand jury and bring charges against people. So, I have a question.

Through all this – through all this, right, is anyone over there thinking about how much this is costing the American people? The special counsel?

[ 52 : 53 ] No, everything. The investigation. Oh. Digging into this. Yeah. But, I mean, there's a cost, certainly. I mean, I think Mueller has – I forget – 12, 13, 14 people on staff and a bunch of lawyers, and they're all making pretty good money.

So, yeah, there's a cost. But, relatively speaking, in the scope of government and all the programs and everything else – this bill that – a reference that we – that was passed that we conservatives oppose increased just government, just government, basic programming, \$63 billion.

We're not talking about what the so-called entitlement programs or Social Security, Medicaid, or Medicaid, but just government programs or various agencies outside the military, \$63 billion increase in one year.

Ridiculous. So, that's the bigger concern. There's a cost with Mr. Mueller's investigation, but, frankly, in the big picture, it's not a whole lot of money. I still want it to get over.

Gary in the back and then – Yeah, I guess a whole lot of questions, but try and cut it down. First of all, I guess – I think a lot of people are thinking that it would help the debt if they would really do a good job in cutting spending on unnecessary expenditure.

[ 54 : 17 ] Yeah. Because there's so much out there that's just wasted money. That's one thing.

Then the other thing is the FISA court credibility, the one – I guess I've heard, anyway, that several times that they've approved, like, 99.5% of the indictment brought to them.

That doesn't sound – 39,000 applications taken to the FISA court in, I think, 50. And since it's been created in the – oh, it's been – I forget how many years ago, maybe 30, 40 years ago, only, like, 54 have been turned down.

And they'll give you the argument, well, it's because we're so good at putting together the application and only doing it when we really need it. Okay. I'm not buying it. And the other thing is that one of the things that I wonder about is people like Flynn and the other guy that laundered money, or at least they say he did, it seems like it's almost legal blackmail to be able to take Flynn and say, okay, you're guilty of this as far as we're concerned, but we're going to let you off the hook if you do this.

Yeah. That doesn't sound right. I mean, if he did something that's against the community of interest of our people, why should he be let off? Yeah.

No. That happens all the time. They – in prosecution, someone who will help them down the road, they get a lesser sentence. Mike Flynn was probably also – I mean, I don't know, but probably also concerned about just the overall cost of his family.

[ 55 : 56 ] I mean, legal fees and everything else. Because fundamentally, it's why in this country you don't investigate people. You investigate crime. Because if you investigate people, I mean, that's the way it works in all kinds of other places around the world.

Start investigating people, we'd all be guilty of something. Right? Back to the fundamental point. We're all regular sinful folk in need of God's grace. So if the federal government investigated any American, they could find something.

Or they put you under oath and they're doing a deposition and you're going to say something wrong about something because you can't remember everything. So that's the part that scares me. Again, this is this – the rule of law and fundamental liberties.

It does keep me up at night when you think about a government, particularly in this high-tech world we live in now where they got access to all kinds of information. It's scary.

You're supposed to investigate crime and you're only supposed to investigate crime when there's probable cause. You've committed it and you go to a judge and you get a warrant to start looking

into it. And that doesn't seem to be what's going on here.

[ 57 : 01 ] So that's my fundamental concern and why it makes me so mad. I didn't think I could – I was more mad about this IRS thing. I thought, this is unbelievable. The Internal Revenue Service is going after people because they're conservative and because they're speaking out.

And Lois Leonard – I could remember Lois Leonard quotes and speeches and different things she gave. And then this FBI thing come along, this is much worse. This is the Federal Bureau of Investigation that's considered the premier law enforcement agency in the world.

And frankly, the rank and file members are. They're great people. But it's a top – people at the top who are a problem. Think about what's happened here. James Comey's fired.

Andy McCabe just stepped down. Jim Rubicki, former chief of staff, is leaving. Jim Baker, former chief counsel at the FBI, has been demoted and reassigned. Lisa Page has been demoted and reassigned.

Peter Strzok, deputy head of counterintelligence, has been demoted and reassigned. These are the top people at the FBI. Are they all in trouble? They've all been demoted? They're all leaving? That's scary.

[ 58 : 05 ] These people were running this agency, not to mention folks over at the Justice Department who may or may not have been involved. We know Bruce Orr was involved, and he was a top lawyer in the Justice Department when all this was going on.

Well, I'm not a big fan of, frankly, what Mr. Rosenstein's been up to. So this is – it's not supposed to work that way. And this is why we have got to – some people are like, oh, get past this.

Let's focus on, you know, making sure the economy is moving in the right direction, taxes, spending, some of these – and I agree. We've got to do that. But you cannot let fundamental things like this go unanswered.

I'll make this the last one. Is that all right? Are we got – these will be the last two, then I'll – And I'll be around if you want to yell at me privately. You can do that, too. So under the previous administration, apparently there were unmasking – there was unmasking going on.

And it was – it seems like, from what I've heard, a lot of it was coming from the UN ambassador.

Yeah, power, Samantha Powers. So has there been any thought or consideration of maybe the fact that the UN is meddling in our affairs?

[ 59 : 09 ] Interesting question. I – you know, we pray that that's not the case. I don't think so. But – and I didn't even get into that because – but that at some point is going to happen.

Because, remember, it wasn't just unmasking. It was unmasking at an unprecedented rate, particularly Samantha Powers. But an interesting thing that happened two weeks ago, Chairman Nunes, who chairs the House Intelligence Committee, sent a letter to 24 – approximately 24 individuals, and most of them in the previous administration.

Some may still work in the government, but the vast majority don't. And he sent it to State Department people, intelligence agencies, and folks in the FBI and Justice Department.

So he's sending that letter to people like Samantha Powers, Susan Rice, Ben Rhodes, some of these same people that we dealt with on the Benghazi Committee who, frankly, misled the American people as far as what actually caused that fight and tragedy to – you know, what was the catalyst for that terrible, terrible night.

So they're supposed to give us answers. They were supposed to give answers to Chairman Nunes by Friday past. My guess is I haven't talked to Devin this weekend, but I'll call him later tonight and see who sent responses back and who didn't.

[ 60 : 30 ] And Chairman Nunes has said if they didn't send responses back, we're going to subpoena them. So this is traveling – so remember, just think about the dossier for a second.

We first learned that the FBI had access to the dossier. This opposition research material that Christopher Steele put together. Remember, Christopher Steele was Democrat committee, Clinton campaigned, paid the law firm, who paid Fusion GPS, who paid Christopher Steele to put this together.

The FBI first gets access to this in July. And we thought initially, okay, the FBI had it and they used it. We subsequently learned to go to the FISA court. Well, we also learned – well, wait a minute, it wasn't just the FBI, it was also the Justice Department, namely Bruce Orr and who else is the Justice Department.

And then we learned about six weeks ago, well, it wasn't just the FBI and the Justice Department. It was also the State Department. There's a couple stories that talked about foreign informant gave information to Clinton confidants, namely Sidney Blumenthal, Cody Shearer, who gave information to the State Department, who gave it to Steele.

Or as I like to say, the Clinton campaign not only hired Steele to produce the dossier, they told him what to put in it. They just laundered it through the State Department. And now the question becomes, so if the FBI had the dossier, the Justice Department also, we now learn, had the dossier. [ 61 : 46 ] And now the State Department, we also learn, had access and information, participated in this dossier. The big question becomes, did the White House, right? The people at the White House. And that sort of gets to your question, was Samantha Power, Susan Rice, Ben Rhodes, these key people in the intelligence and top foreign policy people at the White House, did they also have access?

I don't know the answer to that, but I think it's a question worth exploring, and we're beginning to move in that direction. Last one. Roger. Are executive orders unconstitutional?

Depends. Depends. Depends. Depends on the order. The DACA one certainly was, evidenced by what courts have said. It depends on how far you say prosecutors have discretion.

Every county prosecutor can say certain crimes he's going to go after, certain crimes he's not going to push as hard, and he has limited resources. So the same thing sort of exists. There's discretion with the executive branch on what they can, what kind of executive orders they can do.

But there are some that obviously aren't square with the Constitution, separation of powers, and all those hallmarks that, again, make us the greatest country. So some are, some aren't.

[ 62 : 53 ] And the DACA one, which has been in the news, is certainly one that isn't. Yeah. The board that you have to take. Okay. That's from your dad. Oh, okay. I thought I was going to say your wife.

You're not going to say that. Jim, this came up at a prayer meeting the other night. Why, since we, the Republicans, conservatives, control the White House, the Senate, and the House, can't we defund Planned Parenthood taxpayer dollars going to pay for abortion?

No, good question. Well, in simple terms, it's lack of political will. We just don't, it's back to what I referenced when I was talking about the spending.

We just don't have the political will to engage in the debate and win the fight. Now, there's a practical concern that makes it more difficult to actually win the debate and exercise the political willpower to get it done.

And that is the crazy rules in the Senate, which basically require a supermajority to do anything. And certainly to do something that significant, you can't find 60 votes because you wouldn't find enough Democrats to support Republicans to do it.

[ 64 : 05 ] And frankly, you don't even have 50 Republicans because there's Susan Collins and a few others in the Senate who, on that specific issue that dad raised, wouldn't support it. But that's the frustration that so many of us in Freedom Caucus, I'll give you an example on that issue.

When the story first broke a few years ago that Planned Parenthood was engaged in all this disgusting behavior. We saw those videos, remember? So, the first video comes out and is just that disgusting.

The doctor, I still remember her name, Dr. Nukatola, is in that video sipping wine and talking in such a cavalier fashion about taking the life of on-board kids. And then, you know, what they were doing with fetal body farming.

And so, we had a hearing in the oversight committee to kind of bring this to light. And Cecile Richards, head of Planned Parenthood, came in to testify.

And so, I spent five minutes asking her one question. And I asked it to her as many times as I could in five minutes. But the question was, the day that first video came out, Planned Parenthood the next day issued an apology.

[ 65 : 19 ] And then, subsequently, they started to back away and go on the offense and say, well, the videos were altered and all this and edited and everything. It wasn't true. Of course, they were edited.

But it wasn't. They didn't change what was, you know, faking. It was real, you know, real footage. Interestingly enough, you know, the agency who was, who talked about how, who was hired to discredit those videos put out by the Pro-Life organization, the people that went undercover and got

the videos.

There was an agency hired by Planned Parenthood to discredit those videos. You know who the agency was? Fusion GPS, Glenn Simpson. Same agency hired by the Clintons on this dossier. So, back to the hearing. Cecile Richards is there. And I asked her one question. I said, well, if the videos were heavily edited, they weren't accurate, da-da-da-da-da, why'd you issue an apology? Right? If it wasn't true, why'd you apologize? And I spent five minutes asking her that question in every different way. I said, you know, normally people don't apologize unless they've done something wrong.

[ 66 : 23 ] Why'd you apologize? Well, we didn't really. It was just back and forth. But imagine this. Our leadership wouldn't allow us to show the videos in the committee hearing. And it ticked me off because, you know, the old adage of a picture's worth a thousand words.

So, imagine when I'm asking Cecile Richards, why, and she wouldn't answer the question, why'd you apologize if you did nothing wrong? Imagine if I could have put the video up and said, were you apologizing for that statement?

When Dr. Nukatola said that? I mean, that is how you can, you know, hearing really carry the day.

But our leadership prohibited us from using the video because, oh, it's too controversial.

Because we're afraid to go on the office and just have the debate and win. So, the Senate rules need to change. But, more importantly, we just got, it's political will.

We just got to do it. And so, pray for that. Pray for that we get a little more political will and win these fights. All right, thank you all very much. Have a great, great week. And don't forget, come down.

Polly Jordan is the best tour guide in the history of the Capitol.

[ 67 : 27 ] And she will show you around. Thank you.