



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2019

No. 98

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 12, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN SEE THROUGH THIS FACADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise some 56 days since the Mueller report was made public; 56 days, according to some, and I have been among them, to say that the President has been above the law for 56 days pursuant to the Mueller report.

But the truth is the President has been above the law for more than 2

years because, more than 2 years ago, I stood at this podium and called for the impeachment of the President of the United States of America for his obstruction that we now acknowledge was obstruction—more than 2 years. More than 2 years, now, of analysis paralysis. As Dr. King put it, the paralysis of analysis—more than 2 years.

What does this mean, paralysis analysis? Well, I have my mnemonic notes.

It means that we are allowing the perfect to be an enemy of the good, that we are waiting for the perfect opportunity to do what we should rather than doing that which is good, which we can do now.

It also means overthinking a problem and not analyzing to the extent that you never make a decision, and in some cases, it means allowing perfection protection.

Some people will do it simply because knowing you cannot achieve perfection, it becomes a means by which they can achieve perfection—perfection protection.

And along the way, over these 2 years, Mr. Speaker, here is what we have had to deal with.

The first question was: What crime has the President committed? Well, we know now that you don't have to commit a crime to be impeached. Constitutional scholars have finally acknowledged it publicly, and others have accepted it—no crime necessary. Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868 in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him, and it was not for commission of a crime.

Then we had to deal with outsourcing of the investigation. Let's not do it ourselves. Let's not do what the Framers of the Constitution intended Congress to do. Let's give it to somebody else. Let's have some special counsel do it.

And then, of course, thereafter, there was: Wait for the Mueller report. "Wait for the Mueller report," a constant re-

frain. We waited for the Mueller report. The Mueller report has been presented, some 56 days it has been made public.

And now we are dealing with the whole notion of some of these votes may be hard votes. I know a little bit about hard votes. I have got some ministers who are not as friendly as they used to be because of some hard votes that I have taken right here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

And then, of course, we have this notion that we have to have a rock-solid case. Maybe not in these words, but we have to have a rock-solid case. Again, to some extent this is analysis by paralysis.

And finally, I will mention today, this, the whole notion that "I am against impeachment, although I am for it. I am against it, but I am for it." Realizing that, in the final analysis, if we don't impeach, "Well, I was always against it"; if we do impeach, "Well, I was for it, but I just want to make sure we do it right."

"I am against it, but I am for it."

Don't you know that the American people can see through this facade? This is but a veneer. People can see beyond the veneer. People understand that you can't be for it and against it at the same time. What a paradox.

At some point, to impeach, you have to use the term "impeach." At some point, the Judiciary Committee has to be the powerful Judiciary Committee that has been of old. At some point, we have to stand up. Either we will hold a ruthless, reckless, lawless President accountable, or we are all going to be held accountable.

People are worried about the general election. Well, there is a primary before the general election. It is time for us to do our jobs. Paralysis analysis cannot prevent us from doing that which the Framers of the Constitution have accorded us as our responsibility.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4435