

July 12, 2022

Chairman Mike Barnes
Office of Congressional Ethics
U.S. House of Representatives
425 3rd St. SW
Suite 1110
Washington, DC 20024

Dear Chairman Barnes,

This letter serves as an official ethics complaint with the Office of Congressional Ethics against Representative Katie Porter (CA-45). Rep. Porter violated House Ethics Rule XXIII, clause 1, by knowingly and intentionally defaming Ms. Amy Swearer, a congressional witness, falsely accusing her of perjury during a June 8, 2022, hearing before the House Oversight and Reform Committee. This accusation of perjury lacked any reasonable basis in fact, did not constitute fair comment, and amounted to defamation per se. Rep. Porter grossly abused her privileges under the Speech and Debate Clause to publicly slander Ms. Swearer with impunity, affording her no recourse or ability to defend herself and her reputation. Such unethical conduct reflects discreditably on the House and undermines the integrity of its proceedings. Rep. Porter's accusation of perjury was an incredible departure from decorum and deserving of further investigation and rebuke. As far as can be ascertained, it was the first time in congressional history that a voluntary expert witness was ambushed with accusations of criminal misconduct by a member of Congress acting in his or her official capacity during a hearing.

Factual Background

On June 8, 2022, Ms. Swearer testified as a witness before House Oversight and Reform Committee in a hearing titled, "The Urgent Need to Address the Gun Violence Epidemic." During her five-minute period of questioning, Rep. Porter brought up an exchange Ms. Swearer had three years earlier with Rep. Jim Jordan, during a House Judiciary Committee hearing on so-called assault weapons. The relevant interactions between Rep. Porter and Ms. Swearer, and between Rep. Jordan and Ms. Swearer, are attached in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively. In summary, Rep. Porter twice asserted—in an exchange that went "viral," in part by her own subsequent promotion of it—that Ms. Swearer "falsely testified under oath" during her 2019 hearing, a clear accusation of perjury for which she refused to allow Ms. Swearer an opportunity to respond. The basis for this accusation was that Ms. Swearer had testified that, in her opinion, assault weapons bans would result in millions of otherwise law-abiding citizens becoming "felons overnight for nothing more than having scary-looking features on firearms." Rep. Porter argued that because an assault weapons bill introduced by Rep. David Cicilline in 2019 contained a so-called "grandfather clause," there was absolutely no way that millions of Americans could have become felons for possessing them, and Ms. Swearer had therefore perjured herself in suggesting otherwise.

Argument

(1) Rep. Porter knowingly and intentionally accused a congressional witness of serious criminal conduct, amounting to defamation per se.

Rep. Porter twice asserted during the July 2022 hearing that Ms. Swearer “falsely testified under oath” during her 2019 exchange with Rep. Jordan. This assertion did not constitute a mere opinion about the veracity of Ms. Swearer’s testimony, or amount to a simple disagreement with her informed assessment of the potential impacts of certain policies. It was an accusation of perjury, a serious crime for which Ms. Swearer could face up to 5 years imprisonment, the loss of her civil rights, and disbarment.¹

The fact that Rep. Porter accused Ms. Swearer of serious criminal conduct was evident not just to Members in the room who immediately objected, or to Ms. Swearer, who multiple times requested the opportunity to respond to the charge. It was clearly evident to countless members of the public who have since viewed the viral exchange, many of whom, as a direct result of Rep. Porter’s actions, felt confident in directing insulting posts about “perjury” to Ms. Swearer.² In fact, more than a month after being public defamed in this manner, Ms. Swearer continues to receive comments and even physical mail from strangers repeating Porter’s clear accusation that she is a “perjurer.”³

Rep. Porter is not a layman. She is a highly educated lawyer with multiple Ivy League degrees, who graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School and clerked for a federal circuit court judge. She is a tenured law professor at the UC-Irvine School of Law. She knew what her words meant when she said them and knew what effect they would have on listeners.

Her understanding of the serious nature of this accusation—and the fact that it would be legally actionable if said in a context not covered by the Speech and Debate Clause—is clear from the fact that she subsequently walked back the accusation, downgrading it to an assertion that Ms. Swearer merely “mischaracterized” a statute.⁴

Nor should Rep. Porter be given the benefit of the doubt that the accusation was a mistake or a slip of the tongue, despite the fact that she made the assertion twice. An entire section of her Wikipedia page is dedicated to gloating over the national media attention she has received for her questioning of congressional witnesses. No, her accusation of perjury was perfectly in line with previous intentional conduct, of which she is evidently very proud.

¹ 18 U.S.C. § 1621; 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

² See Appendix C, showing just some of the many examples of social media users clearly understanding that Rep. Porter’s accusation amounted to one of perjury.

³ See Appendix C, final photo, showing an anonymous hate-filled letter received by Ms. Swearer weeks after her exchange with Rep. Porter.

⁴ See *infra*, note 9.

(2) *Rep. Porter knew or should have known that such an accusation was unfounded.*

Rep. Jordan unambiguously solicited an opinion from Ms. Swearer—“*do you think law-abiding people will be less safe...?*” Ms. Swearer responded with language plainly offering just that—an opinion, predictive of an outcome: “*I think worse, sir. You will see millions of otherwise law-abiding citizens become felons overnight for nothing more than having scary looking features on their firearms.*”

At no point did Ms. Swearer make a materially false statement of fact to Congress. Perhaps a layman could argue that he or she should not be expected to know the basics of perjury before leveling a charge of its commission against a congressional witness. But whatever the merits of that argument for a layman, it is not one that Rep. Porter can make as a member of the legal profession or as a Congresswoman who ought to be held to higher standards. She knew or should have known that Ms. Swearer did not—indeed, could not, under the circumstances—commit perjury for expressing a predictive opinion as to the effects of a bill. And yet, she very publicly accused her of perjury, using the Speech and Debate Clause and the reclamation of her time to ensure Ms. Swearer would have no recourse or rebuttal.

Far from Ms. Swearer misleading the public, it was Rep. Porter who sought to hide materially relevant information and prevent the accused witness from bringing this to light. The 2019 House Judiciary hearing was not about Rep. Cicilline’s bill, as Porter implied, or any other specific piece of legislation.⁵ It was, rather, far more broadly about the dangers posed to the American public by so-called “assault weapons.” There were, in fact, two different “assault weapon” bills that had been introduced in the House at the time of the hearing, including one by Rep. Eric Swalwell that did not contain a “grandfather clause” like Rep. Cicilline’s bill.⁶ While Rep. Swalwell’s bill was never referenced by name during the 2019 hearing, other members and witnesses clearly alluded to it and other proposals far more expansive than the ones in Rep. Cicilline’s bill.⁷ Ms. Swearer, in her response to Rep. Porter, was on the verge of explaining this before she was cut off, specifically clarifying that the presence of a grandfather clause “was the case, in *that* bill,” meaning Rep. Cicilline’s bill.

⁵ Consider the opening remarks by Chairman Nadler during the hearing, which do not mention any particular bill but instead characterize the hearing as “about whether America will tolerate weapons of war on our street and in our neighborhoods.” Transcript, Protecting America From Assault Weapons, Hearing Before The House Judiciary Committee, Serial No. 116-52 at page 2 (Sept. 25, 2019), <https://www.congress.gov/116/chrg/CHRG-116hhrg44091/CHRG-116hhrg44091.pdf>.

⁶ H.R. 2959, Freedom From Assault Weapons Act, 116th Congress (introduced May 23, 2019), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/2959/text?r=1&s=4>; H.R. 1296, Assault Weapons Ban on 2019, 116th Congress (introduced Feb. 15, 2019), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/1296/text>.

⁷ For example, Chairman Nadler throughout his opening remarks lamented the “shortcomings” of (and called for Congress to address the “loopholes” found in) the 1994 federal assault weapons ban, which, like Rep. Cicilline’s bill, contained a “grandfather clause” for current possessors of such weapons. Witness Kristen Rand explicitly referred to grandfathered weapons as a “major flaw” of the 1994 bill and said, “we must find a way to grapple with [them].” Rep. Swalwell also brought up his proposed bill and explicitly stated his desire to see an Australia-style mandatory “buyback” scheme instead of a grandfather provision.

Additionally, Rep. Jordan never specified in his question which bill he was referring to, and arguably seemed to refer to both bills by repeating himself: “Do you think law-abiding people will be less safe to protect themselves, their family, their property if this law that the Democrats are proposing actually--or this bill that the Democrats are proposing actually becomes law?” Even if Rep. Porter did not understand the greater context of the hearing (and can be excused for her negligence in making perjury accusations based on that misunderstanding), she cannot be excused for hiding the immediate context of Rep. Jordan’s question and unfairly summarizing his words as referring specifically to Rep. Cicilline’s bill. And she certainly cannot be excused for refusing multiple efforts on the part of Ms. Swearer to correct her blatant mischaracterizations.

Not only could Ms. Swearer not have committed perjury when merely stating an opinion, but her opinion as a Second Amendment expert was eminently reasonable *even if it was presumed to be solely about Cicilline bill*. As Ms. Swearer explained in an op-ed after the hearing:

And, as I was trying to explain to Porter before she cut me off, Cicilline’s bill—grandfather provision and all—nonetheless posed serious dangers to peaceable citizens and made it very likely that, as with Swalwell’s bill, many would quickly be turned into felons.

That bill’s two primary problems stemmed from vague wording that seemed poised to make anyone a felon for letting another person so much as handle their pistol-gripped firearm or standard capacity magazine.

The bill made it a felony to transfer the grandfathered firearm to ANY person without first going through a federal firearms licensee and having a background check conducted. The sole exceptions were for the (1) “temporary custody of the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon for purposes of examination or evaluation by a prospective transferee,” and (2) “temporary transfer of possession for the purpose of participating in target shooting in a licensed target facility or establish range if the [firearm] is, at all times, kept with the premises of the target facility or range.” Meanwhile, the “grandfathering” of magazines applied only to “possession,” and the law provided no means of legally transferring those magazines to the possession of another.

In other words, the moment any person other than the gun-owner takes physical possession of a grandfathered gun outside of the confines of a gun range without a background check, or takes physical possession of a gun with a standard capacity magazine under any context, multiple felonies have been committed. The moment that law would have gone into effect, countless Americans would have become felons in the literal blink of an eye, countless numbers of times every day. And they’d be felons based on nothing more than the temporary changed possession of a standard capacity magazine or gun with “scary looking features.

Perhaps Katie Porter doesn't realize how many peaceable citizens would very quickly be turned into felons under that bill. Perhaps she does, and just doesn't care. But either way, her characterization was and is objectively wrong.⁸

Importantly, no one at the time of the 2019 exchange—including the authors and co-sponsors of the bill, who were present at the hearing—raised any concerns about Ms. Swearer's answer to Rep. Jordan's question. Indeed, no one in the three years between Ms. Swearer's comments and Rep. Porter's malicious accusation so much as hinted that Ms. Swearer's characterization was objectively incorrect, much less that it amounted to a serious crime.

If Rep. Porter truly believed that Ms. Swearer, a fellow lawyer, had committed a crime, then she had a moral and ethical responsibility to subsequently report her actions to the relevant state bar and to further press for criminal charges to be brought against her. But she has not done so, more than a month after the accusation. Instead, rather than double down on the accusation outside of the "protected" confines of a House hearing, she walked it back just enough to avoid repeating her defamatory statements—though without ever acknowledging the original defamation or discouraging countless others from repeating it. Consider Rep. Porter's subsequent revision of the accusation in a tweeted clip of the exchange to social media with the following text:

Special interests are lying to the American people to block gun violence prevention legislation. The same witness who misled Congress in 2019 is back today to advocate against sensible measures that would keep Americans safe. I called out her BS.⁹

Rep. Porter dropped the accusation of falsely testifying under oath and replaced it with an accusation of misleading Congress. Those words have major legal effect, with the former implicating a perjury claim and the latter implicating something less than perjury. The former statement was also made under parliamentary privilege. The second would be subject to common tort claims. Rep. Porter has yet to address this timely change in position, which suggests she was fully aware of the legal significance of her original accusation.

(3) The House Ethics Committee has found that substantially similar types of misconduct violate House Ethics Rule by failing to reflect creditably on the House.

The House Ethics Committee has, in recent years, found that conduct substantially similar to Rep. Porter's perjury accusation violates House ethics rules by failing to reflect creditably on the House.

In January of 2020, the House Ethics Committee published a memorandum warning House members and their staff against sharing "deepfakes" or "intentional distortions of audio or visual

⁸ Amy Swearer, *The Time Katie Porter Can't Reclaim*, NATIONAL REVIEW (June 13, 2022), <https://www.nationalreview.com/2022/06/the-time-katie-porter-cant-reclaim/>.

⁹ <https://twitter.com/RepKatiePorter/status/1534603566056235008>

representations,” noting that the sharing of such items “could erode public trust [or] affect public discourse.”¹⁰ While members have a First Amendment right to contribute to public discourse, they “are expected to take reasonable efforts” to consider whether the representations they share are “intentionally distorted to mislead the public.”

Rep. Porter’s baseless accusation of criminal wrongdoing amounts to something far worse than the reckless or negligent sharing of “deepfakes.” While deepfakes may at times be protected under the First Amendment as satire or parody, slander and defamation receive no such protections. Rep. Porter’s accusation went far beyond legitimate contribution to public discourse and instead constituted a distorted view of a past hearing, intentionally misleading the public by asserting criminal wrongdoing on the part of a congressional witness.

In August of 2020, the House Ethics Committee issued a report admonishing Rep. Matt Gaetz for a tweet directed at President Trump’s former attorney, Michael Cohen, on the eve of Mr. Cohen’s scheduled testimony before a congressional committee.¹¹ That tweet read:

Hey @MichaelCohen212 – Do your wife & father-in-law know about your girlfriends? Maybe tonight would be a good time for that chat. I wonder if she’ll remain faithful when you’re in prison. She’s about to learn a lot...

The Committee noted Florida Bar Grievance Committee’s determination that these comments were “unprofessional, reckless, insensitive, [demonstrated poor judgement... [and were] not consistent with the high standards of the profession.” It also echoed the Investigative Special Committee Report finding that Rep. Gaetz’s conduct violated House Rule XXIII, clause 1, by reflecting discreditably on House. These determinations were made despite the fact that the Committee also determined Rep. Gaetz had not violated any laws, and despite the fact that the assertions of infidelity and criminal wrongdoing by Cohen were substantially true. Contrast that with this case, where Rep. Porter knew or should have known that her accusations of criminal wrongdoing on the part of Ms. Swearer were patently false. Just as Gaetz later admitted that he was “uncomfortable with the language I used,” Porter evidenced that she, too, was uncomfortable repeating her defamatory remarks when no longer protected by the Speech and Debate Clause, and subsequently recharacterized Ms. Swearer’s statements as something less than perjury, but still deplorable.

¹⁰ Memorandum For All Members, Officers, and Employees Regarding Intentional Use of Audio-Visual Distortions & Deep Fakes, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ethics (Jan. 28, 2020), https://ethics.house.gov/sites/ethics.house.gov/files/wysiwyg_uploaded/Deep%20Fakes%20Pink%20Sheet%20Guide-Final.pdf.

¹¹ U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ethics, *In Re Allegations Relating to Representative Matt Gaetz*, House Report 116-479 (Aug. 21, 2020), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-116hrpt479/html/CRPT-116hrpt479.htm>.

Similarly, in 2009, the House voted by a large margin to formally rebuke Rep. Joe Wilson for interrupting President Obama's remarks during a joint session by shouting, "You lie."¹² The resolution asserted that Rep. Wilson committed a "breach of decorum and degraded the proceedings of the joint session, to the discredit of the House."¹³ Rep. Porter's accusation, like Rep. Wilson's interjection, was a very public assault on a person's character in a manner that fell outside the scope of normal partisan politics. Both actions were intentionally designed to interrupt serious proceedings with circus-like distractions that undermined the integrity of congressional proceedings. Unlike Rep. Wilson, who personally reached out to the President to apologize, Rep. Porter has never publicly or privately sought to address her wrongful conduct, despite her clear awareness that the accusation was baseless and crossed several ethical lines. To the contrary, she crowed about her behavior, sending out a tweet bragging that she had "called out" Ms. Swearer's "BS"—recharacterizing her perjury accusation yet still proudly sharing to her over one million followers the video wherein she originally made it.

Desired Outcome

Based on the above facts, which clearly evidence a violation of House Ethics Rule XXIII, clause 1, by Rep. Katie Porter for making intentionally false and defamatory accusations of criminal misconduct against a congressional witness without affording that witness any chance to defend herself, the Office of Congressional Ethics should consider taking the following actions:

- Reprimand or admonish Rep. Porter for reflecting discreditably on the House by knowingly and intentionally defaming a congressional witness, in clear abuse of the privileges outlined in the Speech and Debate Clause.
- Remind all Members that while they may disagree with a congressional witness's testimony, they have a duty to refrain from, at the very least, falsely accusing them of perjury for political gain.
- Recommend that Rep. Porter's accusation be stricken from the record.
- Recommend that Rep. Porter either apologize for falsely accusing a witness of perjury when she knew it to be false, or publicly clarify that she did not intend to accuse Ms. Swearer of a federal crime and should have chosen her words more carefully.

Ms. Swearer cannot, despite the clear commission of an actionable tort against her, seek civil remedy because Rep. Porter's accusation—however baseless and intentionally defamatory—is covered by the Speech and Debate Clause. That does not mean this Committee cannot or should not reprimand Rep. Porter for her egregiously unethical conduct and abuse of constitutional

¹² Carl Hulse, *House Rebukes Wilson for Shouting 'You Lie'*, NY TIMES (Sept. 15, 2009), <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/16/us/politics/16wilson.html>.

¹³ *Text of Rep. Joe Wilson Resolution*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE (Sept. 15, 2009), <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sdut-us-health-care-heckling-text-091509-2009sep15-story.html>.

protections to grossly defame a congressional witness. This conduct was precisely the type envisioned within Rule XXIII, clause 1, as an “abuse of one’s official position” that reflects poorly on Congress as a whole, but which “might otherwise go unpunished.”

Congressional hearings are an important tool for Congress to obtain information that has the potential to help them form legislation. While congressional witnesses are to expect a certain level of hostility and antagonism in high-profile hearings about contentious subjects like gun control, they retain, at a bare minimum, a reasonable expectation that members of Congress acting in their official capacity will not falsely accuse them of crimes on national television, then afford them no opportunity to defend themselves from such accusations. Subjecting witnesses to very public and obviously false perjury charges over policy disagreements—or worse, for the mere political purpose of creating “viral” click-bait videos—injures the ability of Congress to obtain witnesses willing to share their policy expertise. If this became a pattern of practice, few witnesses would willingly participate in hearings.¹⁴ Member conduct during hearings must reflect creditably on the House of Representatives, and Rep. Porter’s conduct at the June 8, 2022, hearing certainly did not.

Should the Office of Congressional Ethics wish to contact Ms. Swearer or any other witnesses, I am happy to help arrange a meeting. I look forward to your investigation and resolution of this matter.

Sincerely,

Kevin Roberts
President
The Heritage Foundation

Appendix A

Transcript of exchange between Rep. Porter and Ms. Swearer on June 8, 2022:¹⁵

Ms. PORTER. Ms. Swearer, in 2019, you testified on Representative Cicilline’s bill, the assault weapons ban, before Congress. At the 2019 hearing, Representative Jim Jordan asked you if law-abiding people will be less safe to protect themselves if that bill was passed. Do you remember your response?

Ms. SWEARER. I have a general idea of what I would have said under that circumstance, but, no, I don’t remember my specific words.

Ms. PORTER. You said, “I think worse than that, sir, you will see millions of otherwise law-abiding citizens become felons overnight”——

Ms. SWEARER. Yes.

Ms. PORTER [continuing]. “for nothing more than having scary looking features on firearms.”

Ms. SWEARER. It is true.

Ms. PORTER. I was quite surprised by your answer. You read the bill before you came to Congress to testify against it, yes?

Ms. SWEARER. If we are referring to the ban on assault weapons, correct, yes.

Ms. PORTER. So, you knew that the bill would allow any gun owner to maintain possession of any semiautomatic assault weapon that was lawfully possessed before the bill became law?

Ms. SWEARER. No. So, that is the case under that bill. The problem is anytime that is transferred to anybody else——

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, would you please instruct the witness that the time belongs to me?

Ms. SWEARER. If you don’t want to hear an answer to my question, I am not sure what is being asked.

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentlelady has reclaimed her time.

Ms. PORTER. You said “yes” in response to my question that you knew the bill would allow the gun owner to maintain possession of any semiautomatic assault weapon that was lawfully possessed before the bill becomes law. Ms. Swearer, I respect that we have different opinions on

¹⁵ <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20220608/114858/HHRG-117-GO00-Transcript-20220608.pdf>

Representative Cicilline’s assault weapons law, but we cannot have different facts. We have a duty to debate the merits of proposal. You falsely testified under oath for that bill——

Ms. SWEARER. Would you like to hear the explanation of why I said that?

Ms. PORTER. No, I have not yielded, Ms. Swearer.

Chairwoman MALONEY. Suspend.

Mr. COMER. Madam Chair, if she is going to ask questions, shouldn’t she let the witness have——

Chairwoman MALONEY. The gentleman is not recognized.

Ms. PORTER. You falsely testified under oath——

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order. Point of order.

Chairwoman MALONEY. What is the gentleman’s point of order?

Ms. SWEARER. I have been accused of falsely testifying under oath, and I would like address it.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentlewoman has accused her of perjury. Is she going to hold to that, or are you going to allow the witness to respond to that accusation of criminal conduct?

Chairwoman MALONEY. You have not come forward with a significant point of order. Ms. Porter will continue.

Ms. PORTER. I asked you if that bill was correct, if the bill would allow any gun owner to maintain possession, and you said “yes,” yet you testified that the bill would allow people to become felons overnight. Earlier today you testified that you hoped that this was the last time you testify before Congress for the sake of our Nation and the integrity of this Congress——

Ms. SWEARER. I said Congress, after a mass shooting, trying to figure out how to solve a problem, that we are all heavily invested in solving——

Ms. PORTER. Ms. Swearer, I have not asked the question.

Ms. SWEARER. How dare you.

Ms. PORTER. Reclaiming my time. How dare you misstate the law——

Ms. SWEARER. How dare you ask a question——

Ms. PORTER [continuing]. as legislation——

Ms. SWEARER [continuing]. that you do not even want an answer to.

Ms. PORTER. Ms. Swearer, I am moving on.

Appendix B

The testimony Rep. Porter was referring to was from September 25, 2019 House Judiciary Hearing.¹⁶ The relevant exchange is below:

JORDAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ms. Swearer, did I pronounce that right?

SWEARER: Yes, sir.

JORDAN: All right, Ms. Swearer, define--define the type of guns that Democrats want to ban?

SWEARER: It appears to me common semi-automatic firearms that just happened to have certain features like pistol grips and barrel shrouds even though they are functionally the equivalent of other commonly-owned semi-automatic firearms.

JORDAN: Semi-automatic weapons with a magazine capacity of 10 rounds or more with scary features. Is that right?

SWEARER: Yes, sir, that is my understanding.

JORDAN: How many types of guns does that entail? Is that a lot?

SWEARER: A lot. Yes, sir.

JORDAN: All kinds of them.

SWEARER: Yes, sir.

JORDAN: I think in your opening remarks you talked about the scary features but they're just features they don't--I don't--they--other than--than the look, they don't change the way the weapon--the impact the weapon may have on a bad guy trying to do someone harm, right?

SWEARER: No, sir, they don't change the function. In fact, some of them like barrels shrouds actually protect lawful users from things like serious burns.

JORDAN: And as I read the Second Amendment, it doesn't say the right to bear arms shall not be infringed unless the gun has scary features. It doesn't say that now?

SWEARER: No, sir, it does not.

JORDAN: You think bad guys are going to follow this law.

SWEARER: Sir, they--they already fail to follow many of our laws.

¹⁶ <https://plus.cq.com/doc/congressionaltranscripts-5734205?3>

JORDAN: Yeah, only good guys, only--only law-abiding people like yourself, others are going to follow this law. Right?

SWEARER: Yes. Do you think law-abiding people will be less safe to protect themselves, their family, their property if this law that the Democrats are proposing actually--or this bill that the Democrats are proposing actually becomes law?

SWEARER: I think worse than that, sir. You will see millions of otherwise law-abiding citizens become felons overnight for nothing more than having scary looking features on firearms.

Appendix C

 **Capt. Hyman Shocker, Ret.** @thompsonjayyma1 · Jun 8 ...
Replying to @AmySwearer
Perjury is a crime
🗨️ 🔄 ❤️ 5 📤

 **Matt Has Feelings Too** @foodisfunny · Jun 8 ...
Replying to @AmySwearer
Why did you commit **perjury**?
🗨️ 🔄 ❤️ 3 📤

 **Mark Down** @MarkDow45876215 · Jun 8 ...
Replying to @AmySwearer and @RepKatiePorter
P.S. Keep pushing and those **perjury** charges could be heading your way.
🗨️ 🔄 ❤️ 7 📤

 **Jeffrey Shallit** 🇺🇸 @shallit43 · Jun 8 ...
When will @AmySwearer be charged with **perjury**?
🗨️ 🔄 ❤️ 📤

 **John Villegas** @javdvd · Jun 9 ...
You are a complicit murderer @AmySwearer. I hope I'll see you behind bars for **perjury** & conspiracy mass shooting. You have blood on your hands. Your children as adults through karma will receive the energy of the crying parents that lost their children. Asesina!! #UvaldeMassacre

 **Amy Swearer** @AmySwearer · Jun 8
Nah, it's fine, it's @BusinessInsider proving my point - too many people will do ANYTHING to shut down voices they don't want to hear.

I called this out and struck a nerve. So they are all, predictably, doubling down. twitter.com/KevinRobertsTX...

🔒 You can reply to this conversation

🗨️ 🔄 ❤️ 📤

 **docrod2008** @docrod2008 · Jun 13 ...
People don't listen to folks like @AmySwearer whom @RepKatiePorter had to call out for **perjury**!

 **Heritage Foundation** 🇺🇸 @Heritage · Jun 13
We Have Effective Gun Violence Solutions. You Just Won't Listen.
@AmySwearer herit.ag/3986cDP

 **Claire Fraser** @highlanderCF1 · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer and @Heritage
 As a lawyer and mom, I had a busy day..unlike you though I didn't commit **perjury**...so all in all a good day.

1 ↻ 23 ↗

 **Mitch_McConnell (Parody)** @MITCH_MCCONELL · Jun 8
 Here's the proof @AmySwearer is another right wing Heritage/Federalist nutcase who committed **perjury** under oath. She should be in prison.

 **MC2020** @CM20207 · Jun 8
 Replying to @LorenCollins and @Acyn
 Swearer demagogued under oath that the bill would 'make felons overnight of millions of lawful gun owners'. Because they'd be in possession of a now-banned gun. Porter asked her if she'd read the law, and knew there was a provision to grandfather those guns. She replied 'yes'.

🗨 ↻ ❤ ↗

 **Fed Up Mom** @StevieMack1 · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer
 How does it feel, after all that prep work, to have your ass handed to as you admitted to **perjury**. **Perjury!** Tsk, tsk

🗨 ↻ ❤ ↗

 **UndeadHermanCain** @CainUndead · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer
 Does it contain your **perjury**?

🗨 ↻ ❤ ↗

 **Blue (he / him / his)** @haydendavidblue · Jun 8
 @AmySwearer lmao remember when you committed **perjury** and everyone became aware of it at the same time? 🤔

🗨 ↻ ❤ ↗

 **Anita Kaur** @GershIrma · Jun 8
 Replying to @RepKatiePorter
 @AmySwearer came across as a two faced, lying, RAT confused and lashing out angry because her so called facts are just horse manure and she got caught committing **perjury**.

🗨 ↻ ❤ ↗

 **On my fith booster, keep up plebs** @Nolagggggg · Jun 8
 Replying to @ALind1986 @Heritage and 2 others
 Yeah, let me know when she gets her on **perjury** charges 🤔

🗨 ↻ 1 ↗

 **Michelle** @vanonnax4 · Jun 8
 Replying to @KeithOlbermann and @AmySwearer
 Representative Porter knows her stuff. **Swearer** became outraged because the Congresswoman called her out on her lies. She committed **perjury**. No surprise there. They're professional liars.

   3 

 **Dirt | Слава Україні!** 🇺🇦💙🇺🇦 @Dirt_11B · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer
 Was the quote that Rep. Porter referenced incorrect? If not, then it seems like you did commit **perjury**.

If you stated that responsible gun owners would become felons overnight, fully knowing the contents of the bill you were there to argue against then you lied under oath.

FOH.

   2 

 **Jean Luc** @JeanLucKnows · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer
 If there was any justice you'd be charged with **perjury** for bald-faced lying today.

  1  4 

 **Brooklyn Flowers** @BrooklynFlowe15 · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer and @BusinessInsider
 Representative Katie Porter OWNED you today at that hearing, and called you a PERJURER you to boot! 🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔

   15 

 **Andrea Chamblee** @AndreaChamblee · Jun 8
 Replying to @ndelriego
 She's not an idiot. @AmySwearer is a highly-paid **perjurer** for the @NRA and the groomers at the @Heritage who support child murderers.

 1   1 

 **MLC** @MLCintheHills · Jun 8
 Replying to @AmySwearer
PERJURER!!!

   8 

 **Open Your Replies Thiru!** @mattgonter · Jun 9
 Replying to @AmySwearer
Perjurer says what?

   3 

 **Advocake** @CakeAdvocate · Jun 9
 Replying to @AmySwearer
Perjurer says what?

   



Caroline Orr Bueno, Ph.D
@RVAwonk



Rep. Katie Porter just accused a gun advocate (Amy Swearer of Heritage Foundation) of giving false testimony under oath (!!), adding:

“I respect that we have different opinions, but we cannot have different facts.”

1:19 PM · Jun 8, 2022 · Twitter for iPhone

7,615 Retweets 239 Quote Tweets 55.6K Likes



Do you always throw childish tantrums that would put a petulant 3 year old to shame to everyone who is asking you questions in a calm manner or is your lack of professionalism, maturity and emotional stability only present when you are testifying before Congress on national television?

Your conduct was shameful and disgraceful by ANY standard (regardless of political party) and you should immediately RESIGN!

Jun 8, 2022, 3:52 PM



FYI, falsely testifying under oath is a crime. Committing perjury (even if you did not do so on national television in front of millions of viewers) is ALWAYS subject to consequences — and you are not exempt.

Instead of whining and repeatedly interrupting a member of Congress who was attempting to cite indisputable facts and ask you questions about your OWN conduct you should have thought about the consequences associated with your actions BEFORE you committed perjury.

For the benefit of all law abiding Americans (regardless of political party) you need to immediately resign and focus on hiring a defense attorney to represent you — which you clearly need.

Jun 8, 2022, 6:36 PM

Amy Swearer
214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002

You are a lying perjuring tool. Representative Porter caught you in a lie and you should be ashamed.
The stipulation that a gun seller "know[s] or [has] reasonable cause to believe" is a FUCKING JOKE.
Go fuck yourself.

Reasonable gun owner

GRAND RAPIDS MI 493
29 JUN 2022 PM 2 L



Amy Swearer
The Heritage Foundation
214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington DC 20002

20002-499999

