

## "Special Order w/ Louie Gohmert" - Ep. 2

“Well, I'm in Washington here in my office, and we had a hearing, and judiciary committee just recently, and I was here for that. It was about a bill that the Democrats had prepared, this is my copy of the bill. I like to go through and mark and tag issues we have. For example, you don't have to go very far in this bill, and it's about law enforcement in view of the George Floyd murder, we have this bill, and apparently the Democrats can't help themselves, if there's a crisis, even if it's something as tragic as the death of George Floyd, we have got to have some money going to Democratic groups. So page 15, they tell you upfront community –based organizations, if Acorn were still good, they would be listed here, but instead it's the ACLU, it's La Raza, it's the National Urban League, some other staunchly Democratic organizations. But then, I just got that tag too, over here page 20, that's where they tell you there's going to be millions of dollars going to these community organizations, and they point out too that it's going to be these groups that are mentioned and others as well. So they're not letting this crisis go to waste: money going to Democrat groups that help them get elected, just as you would expect.

“At our hearing, you had George Floyd's brother, and I thought he did a very good job. But we also had Angela Underwood Jacobs who lost her brother, a law enforcement officer, and she came in person to testify and she did a marvelous job. We didn't have representatives from other people who have been killed as a result of the riots and looting; we didn't have people that owned the stores that were burned, destroyed, looted, and they've lost their life's work because of the violence in the aftermath of George Floyd's death. I certainly hope that those people are caught and they are punished because just as George Floyd deserves justice, those people whose places were looted and burned, they deserve justice as well.

“So in this bill, it's the last part of the bill here, they brought back Bobby Rush's bill that he had and named after Emmett Till and it's exactly the bill that was brought to the floor, but you come down here to page 135, and it puts a limit on conspiring to lynch someone – put a limit of 10 years and I've said before, ‘That's ridiculous.’ It's an insult to anybody who has ever been lynched – you know, to have a lynching you've got to actually, first you have a kidnapping and there may be torture involved, and then this horrendous murder through lynching, hanging somebody and being a part of that, trying to be part of that, isn't going to have anything more than a 10 year sentence?

“I'd be okay with the death penalty, a jury would have to decide that, but for heaven's sake at least a life sentence, and in talking to Bobby Rush about this on the House floor after or the day it was being voted on. I said, ‘Bobby, this is too serious to have a 10 year maximum’ – that's the most anybody... that's just ludicrous, it's an insult to people's families, those that have been lynched and he said, ‘I know, I know’ and Bobby Rush, we disagree on some politics, but let me tell you, he's a good decent guy, he's got a big heart, and he said, ‘Actually, I had a life sentence in there originally, but I was told by their leadership,’ the Democratic leadership apparently, he

had to change it to 10 years maximum or they wouldn't bring it to the floor for a vote, he said, 'I wish it were more than that.'

"Well, they've got it here. We pass it in the house already as a 10-year maximum sentence, but I have a bill prepared and I'm hoping that Bobby will come on board with me, that would change and it would draw more of a federal nexus, but it would create a maximum sentence of life in prison if you're involved in a lynching, and so I would think that surely we could get support for that from the Speaker Pelosi, and that hopefully we could get support for that from Republicans and Democrats in the Senate.

"Now, I thought Mr. Floyd's brother, George Floyd's brother, made a good point, and I put it down that he said that 'We should make law officers the solution, not the problem.' And he's exactly right. These people are not saying we got to defund the police, get rid of the police.

That brings you to anarchy, and there are people behind this. They want anarchy because they want a socialist society where you have a totalitarian Orwellian government, and they think they're going to be the ruling class, because it's tiny, but it's not likely. But the problem is no middle class, no upward mobility, to move from being poor up. It's the rulers and then it's everybody else, and you don't have freedom because they don't recognize your freedom came from God, they say they gave it to [you].

"And I thought, I love Pastor Darrel Scott and I'd known him before, and he testified today, and he did a great job, and he pointed out that his hope is not in some present, his hope is in Jesus Christ, and although Nadler generally let Democrat witnesses go on and on. As soon as he heard, I guess Jesus Christ, he cut him off, couldn't go over by even one second to finish his answer, and then the very next Democrat that asked questions, he let their witnesses go on and on, so I'm not sure why he was afraid of having Pastor Scott testify about that.

"Let's also not forget, we've paid tribute to George Floyd; we paid tribute to Officer Underwood, that was killed, the council woman's brother who was killed; David Dorn. There's so many who have been killed or harmed through all of this, but we also should never forget the law officers who have laid down their lives so that we can have the freedoms we have. We shouldn't forget them.

"And somehow, and all this long drawn out hearing the Democrats have had with, over a bill that they did not let us provide any input whatsoever, we reached out, we wanted to participate, they didn't want our opinion, they didn't want our input, they did it themselves, but I'm afraid the law officers that have laid down their lives for our freedom, they're getting lost in the mix. And I'm telling you, I've been to too many funerals, too many memorials recognizing the heroic sacrifices of our law enforcement officers: they should not be forgotten, and Jesus himself said, 'Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' And how about for law officers laying down their lives for people they don't even know, they're not even their friends, yet they go into harm's way, and I'll tell you back, not long after law school, when I was assistant

D→A, I did some ride→ alongs and yeah, I was in the army for four years, but we never were in combat during those four years,

But I went on the ride alongs and there was a guy who was threatening to kill people in the area, and if anybody came out there and I went with some deputies out there, it was a remote area, and I'm telling you I had some hair back then, and it was standing on end and the hair on my neck was standing up and I had a weapon and the Deputies around me had a weapon, and we were spread out, but just a few feet away from the door, and not knowing if that door was going to open and one of us was going to get shot, really is quite sobering. And that's the only time that I had a ride along where there was a potential death threat, now I've been threatened many times as a judge, but this one, I was right there at the door to help if I could, and it turned out the guy was not there, but you don't know that, when you yell and the hand reaches up to open the door. These guys do that all the time. They put their lives at risk all the time, so let's not defund them.

“And one other thing, everybody acknowledges there are some bad cops, and I've submitted for decades that the percentage of bad cops to good cops is minuscule compared to problem people compared to the general population, but there are some. Well, how do they stay? Most law officers know who the bad guys are. They know who the bad cops are.

And they don't want to ride on patrol with them, they don't want to work with them.

Well, how do they get to stay? Well, the unions step in and defend them, and they go to bat for them, and in fairness to unions, I know times when there have been whistle blowers, who blew the whistle on a top cop who was a problem, and then they had revenge brought to bear against them and the union stepped in and defended the whistle blower. Great, but there's got to be another way to do that.

And the unions have defended these bad cops, and actually, there was a story from a few years ago in Dallas, where a man was down and he did have drugs in his system, and he had a knee in his back, and 30 times on the video, he asked... he said he couldn't breathe, he couldn't... and he ended up dying as a result. Well, those officers were indicted, but then last year, the charges were dropped by the DA who happens to be a Democrat, but what was amazing about it is, it apparently, from the story I saw, it must have been the union organization that went to bat for him and got the charges dismissed.

“Well, there's got to be a better way than that, and some are saying, ‘Oh, the way we do it,’ and Democrats are saying ‘We gotta remove the immunity they have from lawsuits,’ well, it's a qualified immunity, meaning that if you're violating the law or you're violating somebody's civil rights, you can be sued and that's the way it should be. But if you're doing your job, you're not violating someone civil right, you're not committing a crime, you can't be individually sued, and as judges, we had judicial immunity, otherwise, every inmate and every prison would be constantly suing the judges, you've got to have some immunity there, qualified immunity, and many Democrats want to get rid of that so that you can sue every law officer

“Well, that might help the plaintiff's bar, but who it would help more than anything would be the police unions. Just like the educators' unions, they would be able to make huge money as the education unions do, selling liability insurance to their members.

“I guess it was back in 2005. I had this bill here where I filed it December of 200–5, and it would have provided teachers with educational immunity, and my thought was, you know when I was growing up in East Texas, if you had a problem with... if you had a real problem teacher, well you didn't sue them – you went to the school board, tried to get them fired and if they wouldn't fire him, you would run for the school board, get elected, and then get them fired, but then we became so litigious as a society, it's taken away from teacher's ability to just do their job, so I thought, let's give them a qualified immunity like police have, like judges have. And I pitched that to some of the top people here from the, I believe that was the NEA, and they said, ‘Well, we can't support the bill, and I couldn't understand ‘why wouldn't you be in favor protecting your members?’ And then later, I was so naive, I found out they make truckloads of money by the liability insurance that they endorse, so I'm sure the law enforcement unions would make a fortune through the liability insurance that would be purchased for the officers. But we don't even need to go there.

Let's leave them qualified immunity, if they're not breaking the law, not breaking civil rights of somebody, then they can't be sued. That's what we ought to do.

So that's not fake news. That's the real story in Washington DC.