

From: Americans for Limited Government [media@limitgov.org]
Sent: 3/23/2018 1:30:37 PM
To: Abboud, Michael [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b6f5af791a1842f1adcc088cbf9ed3ce-Abboud, Mic]
Subject: Omni-bust: Congress fails to secure border as President Trump risks heading into 2020 without any new concrete wall being built

The President has a rapidly diminishing window of opportunity to get the wall built. It may be now or never.

The Power Beat Daily

All The News That Doesn't Fit the Page

March 23, 2018

Permission to republish original op-eds and cartoons granted.

Omni-bust: Congress fails to secure border as President Trump risks heading into 2020 without any new concrete wall being built

A year late, Congress has finally approved the President's supplemental request to begin construction of the southern border wall at \$1.6 billion. But because Congress did not get started with the supplemental last year, the odds they were going to get to full funding for the wall for fiscal year 2018, that is, spending levels for Oct. 1, 2017 through Sept. 30, 2018, dropped markedly. Now, a year later, the southern border wall is still not fully funded, and time is running out to get it done before the midterm elections, after which Republicans might no longer be in control of Congress. What are they waiting for?

Scott Pruitt is bringing transparency to the EPA. Why is the Church of Man-made Climate Change angry about that?

Earlier this week Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt announced a policy change that is driving several "scientists" mad. Pruitt announced the EPA would no longer use "science" from outside groups that refuse to share data. This has become a problem for the agency because previous administrations would receive reports from outside groups and make decisions based on the report without reviewing the data. Any data scientists will tell you junk data going in means junk results coming out.

Mollie Hemingway: McCabe's Bogus Witch Hunt of Jeff Sessions Confirms Worst Fears About FBI/DOJ Politicization

Thousands upon thousands of media reports over the last year and a half have intimated, suggested, or flat-out asserted that President Donald Trump is a traitor who colluded with Russia to steal the 2016 election from Hillary Clinton. What this widely held theory lacks in evidence, its diehard

supporters in the media and other anti-Trump bastions make up for with their faith-filled conviction of its truth.

Omni-bust: Congress fails to secure border as President Trump risks heading into 2020 without any new concrete wall being built



By Robert Romano

[Click here to tell Congress to build the wall now!](#)

A year late, Congress has finally approved the President's supplemental request to begin construction of the southern border wall at \$1.6 billion.

The supplemental was requested in March 2017. It was supposed to be included in the May 2017 omnibus spending bill affecting spending levels for Oct. 1, 2016 through Sept. 30, 2017.

This would have paved the way for the full funding for the wall being included this year.

Unfortunately, it didn't happen. Because Congress did not get started with the supplemental last year, the odds they were going to get to full funding for the wall for fiscal year 2018, that is, spending levels for Oct. 1, 2017 through Sept. 30, 2018, dropped markedly.

Now those who were warning of precisely this outcome have been vindicated.

This was a broken promise from the get-go. After the election, House Speaker Paul Ryan and Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell were promising \$12 billion to \$15 billion for the wall.

On Jan. 27, 2017, Ryan told the American people that, "This is something, [the wall], we want to get on right away. And so we do believe this is urgent. We believe this is one of the most important promises the President made running for office. It's a promise he's going to keep and it's a promise we're going to help him keep."

Ryan added, "We anticipate a supplemental coming from the administration on defense and the border" and "I'm hoping in the first quarter we can get this done. But again, it's getting [Mick Mulvaney confirmed as Office of Management and Budget Director and] up and running so they can send us the supplemental."

Mulvaney was confirmed on Feb. 16 and the supplemental request was proposed on March 14 by Mulvaney and then formally put in on March 16 by President Trump to Speaker Ryan. So far, so good.

Unfortunately for the President and his supporters, by March 30, Ryan had kicked the can down the road, telling CBS News, "The big chunk of money for the wall really is... next fiscal year's appropriations because they literally can't start construction even this quickly." So, the wall, which Ryan had described as "urgent" was now being put off at least a year.

But then that was wrong, too. Instead, the spending bill Congress approved this week only includes the supplemental that was supposed to pass last year. The down payment includes bollard fencing and some levees and some secondary fencing, plus replacing some existing fencing. No concrete walls like the prototypes the President was surveying earlier this month.

Meaning, not only is the wall part of the wall still not fully funded, it's not even been begun. To be fair, the supplemental request last year was always going to be that fencing. It was thought that the wall portion would be passed this year. That was Congress' failure.

It was not for a lack of opportunities. Both the supplemental and the fully funded wall could have been included in the September 2017 continuing resolution. Didn't happen.

Or they have been included in the December 2017 continuing resolution. Didn't happen.

See a pattern? Because Congress waited a year to approve the President's initial down payment on the wall, the American people are still waiting for the "big chunk of money for the wall" Ryan promised a year ago.

Now, there are one, maybe two vehicles left to get the wall funded before the 2018 midterm Congressional elections. The fiscal year ends Sept. 30. So the full funding for the wall could be done there. But it doesn't seem likely.

Where is the urgency Ryan spoke of? Are Republicans trying to lose the midterms?

Most likely, Congress will just pass a continuing resolution that would put funding into the lame duck period after the election but prior to the swearing in of the next Congress. Assuming Republicans lose the midterms, what will the Democrats' incentive be to allow funding for the wall then?

Meaning it's do or die in September, which literally could be President Trump's last chance to get the wall done. Why? Because come Jan. 2019, he might not be dealing with a Speaker Ryan, but instead, a House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and perhaps even a Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, both of whom are emphatically opposed to any southern border wall.

Optimists might say that Republicans could still get it all done in 2019, because they might not lose either house of Congress this year. Maybe. Unfortunately, the omnibus spending bill also failed to defund sanctuary cities. It did not expand funding for interior enforcement. It passed an expansion of the FBI's criminal background database but did nothing to advance reciprocity and concealed carry. And it spends so much money it is possible we'll see a \$1 trillion budget deficit this year.

In addressing illegal immigration, protecting gun rights and the \$20 trillion national debt, issues Republican voters deeply care about, the record in this Congress is less than stellar. This could make it difficult for Republicans to turn out their voters for the 2018 midterms, which are already tough enough for incumbent parties.

Now, Republicans are less likely to keep the House and Senate in November, making it far less likely that the wall will be ever fully funded. The GOP should be running scared right now. It's their majorities that are stake.

What does all this mean? Headed into 2020, Trump could be coming back to voters empty-handed on his signature campaign promise of the southern border wall. There is still time to get it done by September, but in reality, the President has a rapidly diminishing window of opportunity to get the wall built. It may be now or never.

Robert Romano is the Vice President of Public Policy at Americans for Limited Government.

Scott Pruitt is bringing transparency to the EPA; why is the Church of Man-made Climate Change angry about that?



By Printus LeBlanc

Earlier this week Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt announced a policy change that is driving several “scientists” mad. Pruitt announced the EPA would no longer use “science” from outside groups that refuse to share data. This has become a problem for the agency because previous administrations would receive reports from outside groups and make decisions based on the report without reviewing the data. Any scientist will be able to tell you junk data going in means junk results coming out.

In an interview given to The Daily Caller, Pruitt stated, “If we use a third party to engage in scientific review or inquiry, and that’s the basis of rule-making, you and every American citizen across the country deserve to know what’s the data, what’s the methodology that was used to reach that conclusion that was the underpinning of what—rules that were adopted by this agency.”

Pruitt continued, “When we do contract that science out, sometimes the findings are published; we make that part of our rule-making processes, but then we don’t publish the methodology and data that went into those findings because the third party who did the study won’t give it to us.”

Many climate change alarmists are already howling at the moon because of the decision. They feel like they should be able to submit work to the government without having to show their work, makes you wonder if they’ve ever taken a high-school math class. What is not up for debate is the enormous weight given to the studies and the potential harm to the U.S. economy the studies present.

Michael Bastasch, reporting for the Daily Signal, notes, “The EPA has primarily relied on two 1990s studies linking fine particulate pollution to premature death. Neither of the studies have made their data public, but the EPA used their findings to justify sweeping air quality regulations.” These air quality regulations end up putting thousands of people out of work, without ever having to show the data that led to the regulations.

Another of the more famous “studies” is Michael Mann’s hockey stick graph. Al Gore even used it in his film an Inconvenient Truth, you may remember it as a documentary that hasn’t gotten one prediction right. The “hockey stick” graph has been used by just about every environmental group in the world to prove man-made climate change. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has used the graph in the past to justify its barbaric environmental recommendations.

Mann just lost a libel lawsuit in Canada. Mann initiated the suit against Canadian Climatologist, Dr. Tim Ball after Ball, using more reliable and publicly available data, disproved Mann’s famous hockey stick graph. In fact, Tim Ball’s graph looks nothing like Mann’s graph. The twist in the case had Mann failing to meet a court-ordered deadline to hand over the data he used to get his graph. What was Mann trying to hide?

One of the U.S. government’s own agencies has even been caught manipulating climate data. A former principal scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA), John Bates, accused his former agency of manipulating data to erase the global warming pause. Bates blasted the agency for the faulty science because he believed the 2015 report was rushed to get President Obama’s desk before the Paris Climate Summit. Science that impacts thousands of jobs and millions of families should not be rushed.

Americans for Limited Government President Rick Manning stated, “transparency about the scientific method used to come to conclusions that have major public policy impacts, is essential in order for others to evaluate and attempt to replicate the findings. Every grade school child learns that for

science to be legitimate, someone doing the exact same process have to come up with the same results. It's called falsifiability. Data that cannot be examined and potentially falsified simply must not be accepted by the government. Transparency is the key to ending politically driven science."

It is important to note, Pruitt is not ruling out the studies. All the studies have to do is show their work. Provide the raw data to ensure there has been no data manipulation to reach a preconceived conclusion. Considering most of the scientists perform the studies using federally funded research grants, the data belongs to the American taxpayer. If the "scientists" have nothing to hide, they should have nothing to fear.

U.S. Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Texas), Chairman of the Space, Science, and Technology Committee, has been fighting the transparency battle for years. Chairman Smith has introduced H.R. 1430, the Honest and Open New EPA Science Treatment Act of 2017. The bill states:

"The Administrator shall not propose, finalize, or disseminate a covered action unless all scientific and technical information relied on to support such covered action is—(A) the best available science; (B) specifically identified; and (C) publicly available online in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results, except that any personally identifiable information, trade secrets, or commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential, shall be redacted prior to public availability."

Doesn't seem like too much to ask. Every student from the third grade to a Ph.D. must do the same thing, show your work so that it can potentially be falsified. Otherwise it's not really scientific.

Scott Pruitt is to be commended for this action, but more can be done. The Senate must act to ensure secret science is no longer used to justify job-killing regulations. The House has already done its job; it is now up to the Senate to ensure transparency.

Printus LeBlanc is a contributing editor at Americans for Limited Government.



ALG Editor's Note: In the following column from The Federalist, Mollie Hemingway details how the Attorney General was the target of the politicized FBI:



McCabe's Bogus Witch Hunt of Jeff Sessions Confirms Worst Fears About FBI/DOJ Politicization

By Mollie Hemingway

Thousands upon thousands of media reports over the last year and a half have intimated, suggested, or flat-out asserted that President Donald Trump is a traitor who colluded with Russia to steal the 2016 election from Hillary Clinton. What this widely held theory lacks in evidence, its diehard supporters in the media and other anti-Trump bastions make up for with their faith-filled conviction of its truth.

An alternate storyline has been unfolding over that same time. The basic contour is that claims Trump stole the election by treasonously colluding with Russia are the result of a coordinated campaign that was bought and paid for by the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee, weaponized by the federal government, and promulgated by a completely compliant media.

This week ABC News reported that former FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe personally authorized a criminal investigation into Attorney General Jeff Sessions over his alleged ties to Russians. Sessions fired McCabe last week after the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Inspector General (IG) reported his misconduct to the FBI's Office of Professional Responsibility. These internal overseers determined McCabe had made unauthorized disclosures to the news media and not been truthful when asked about it on multiple occasions, including when he was under oath. McCabe was long considered one of the bureau leadership's many leakers while still employed.

This latest leak to ABC News was viewed by many in the media as bad for Sessions. For the people who still cling to the Russia conspiracy theory, this news was proof of that theory.

For the people who have trouble believing that Jeff Sessions — yes, that Jeff Sessions — is a Russian agent meriting a criminal investigation by the FBI, the second storyline continues to bear fruit.

How In The World Did This Story Get Going?

Of all the Russian conspiracy angles, the one alleging Sessions is working on behalf of the Russians is easily the most outlandish. The former U.S. senator from Alabama, Sessions is a southern conservative who supported Trump in part because of shared views on the need to fix U.S. immigration policy.

In January 2017, Sessions was undergoing his confirmation hearings in the midst of the initial Red Panic gripping DC. Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) asked Sessions, "Several of the President-elect's nominees or senior advisers have Russian ties. Have you been in contact with anyone connected to any part of the Russian government about the 2016 election, either before or after election day?" Sessions responded "No."

Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.) asked him a convoluted question about a brand-new CNN report claiming that Obama intelligence chiefs were taking the Steele dossier extremely seriously. Then-FBI Director James Comey had briefed Trump about the dossier's salacious claims of compromising information held by Russians shortly before the fact of that briefing was leaked to CNN by a mysterious someone with knowledge of that briefing.

Franken: Now, again, I'm telling you this as it's coming out, so you know. But if it's true, it's obviously extremely serious and if there is any evidence that anyone affiliated with the Trump campaign communicated with the Russian government in the course of this campaign, what will you do?

Then-Sen. Jeff Sessions: Senator Franken, I'm not aware of any of those activities. I have been called a surrogate at a time or two in that campaign and I didn't have — did not have communications with the Russians, and I'm unable to comment on it.

We now know the dossier turned out to not only be riddled with errors and falsehoods, but was also an operation of the Clinton campaign. But that was not known when Franken asked his questions about collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia.

[Click here for the full story.](#)

*Americans for Limited Government
10332 Main Street # 326None
Fairfax Virginia 22030
United States*

This email is intended for abboud.michael@epa.gov.
[Update your preferences](#) or [Unsubscribe](#)