

today to recognize the life and memory of a law enforcement professional who served the people of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for over two decades. Steven F. Hillias, chief of police to the Perkasio Borough Police Department, passed away on Sunday at the age of 49.

Born in Allentown, Chief Hillias was a graduate of Allentown Central Catholic High School and went on to receive a degree in management from Penn State. Chief Hillias later attended the FBI National Academy and received a master's degree in criminal justice from DeSales University.

Chief Hillias joined the Perkasio Borough Police Department in 1997 and was elevated to chief of police in 2014. Well-respected in the law enforcement community, Chief Hillias was a member of the Police Chiefs Association of Bucks County and the Fraternal Order of Police.

Chief Hillias was known as an approachable, community-oriented chief who cared deeply about the Perkasio community. He worked tirelessly and with empathy to combat the opioid epidemic and advocated for young offenders in diversionary programs. He was a man admired for his fairness and his compassion.

Madam Speaker, I send my deepest condolences to Chief Hillias' wife, Tracy, and his children, Michael and Lauren. We thank them for sharing him with our community.

May Chief Hillias enjoy his eternal reward for a life he spent serving others.

CONGRATULATING PROSPER HIGH SCHOOL MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team for bringing home their first State championship title by defeating the Smithson Valley Rangers 11-5.

The team proved their ability to stay composed while overcoming obstacles under pressure. Winning is not just about talent, skill, or the type of cleats you wear. Winning is about character, on and off the field, alongside hard work and dedication to one's team. The Prosper Eagles showed their commitment to these values from the very beginning.

I know I speak on behalf of the entire community when I say the city of Prosper is beaming with pride.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team on their successful season.

□ 1930

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my friends and colleagues in celebrating Juneteenth.

Madam Speaker, 154 years ago, on June 19, 1865, Texas became the final State in the U.S. to officially abolish slavery. This was a pivotal day in American history, one that represents both the checkered past of our Nation as well as the rising above it.

September 1862, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and it took effect on January 1, 1863, throughout all the formerly Confederate States.

Madam Speaker, 2 years later, Texas was the last stop on the road to the abolition of slavery in America on June 19, known as Juneteenth.

On a day like Juneteenth, we encourage everyone to come together and celebrate this occasion and recognize not what makes us different from one other, but what we all have in common, all that we share: the love of freedom and individual rights that we are one people.

There is still more to be done, but a lot of progress has been made the last 150 years, and we will continue to make that together as a society.

SEVEN FACTORS IMPEDING IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. It is a preeminent privilege to stand here and address this august body—to address those who are within the sound of my voice would probably be more appropriate—and those who are onlookers by way of various means of telecommunications. It is an honor and a privilege to do so, and I am grateful to the leadership of this House for extending and allowing the privilege. I believe that it is one of the great honors of being a Congressman, to be able to stand and address the Nation, if you will.

So tonight, as a Member of this body, it is my honor to speak on a topic very near and dear to my heart and the hearts of a good many Americans. I would like to talk about some of the current factors that are impeding impeachment.

I have mnemonic notes that I will refer to from time to time so as to address seven different topics that are factors currently impeding impeachment.

The first that I shall address is the belief by many that not enough bipartisanship exists as it relates to impeachment, not enough persons from both sides of the aisle, and, more specifically, not enough persons who are representative of the Republican Party.

There is this belief that impeachment must be an effort that is bipar-

tisan, and it must be to some significant amount of bipartisanship. That amount has not been announced, so it is hard to say what the significant amount of bipartisanship is that is being sought.

But I think that at this point, so as to address the question of bipartisanship, which I believe in, would hope for—I think that bipartisanship is a wonderful thing. But to address it, I believe we will have to go to Federalist 65.

For those who are interested, the Federalist Papers consists of some 85 articles that were published between 1787 and 1788, published by the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay. He was also assisted by the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. And, of course, the third part of this group of persons was Madison, the fourth President of the United States.

These persons, the three of them, the trio, were to, if you will, present reasons to the country why the Constitution should be ratified; and in presenting reasons for ratification, they published Federalist 65.

Federalist 65 explains what impeachment is all about. It does a little bit more than just explains what it is about. It explains what one might expect, what we might expect if impeachment is sought.

And I must say, at this point, that these three Framers of the Constitution were prophetic, absolutely persons who could see into the future, one might think, because they prognosticated what we are having to concern ourselves with currently in terms of what will happen among the people and in society should we move toward impeachment.

Prophetic—they had their flaws; they were not perfect; but on this issue, they seemed to have been prophetic, because they prognosticated that at a time such as this, there would be division, that you would have parties separating in their own corners, if you will, that the people among us in society, that they would have very hard opinions; that people would sometimes base their opinions upon the circumstances, and others, just based upon the knowledge that they might have of the person who is being impeached.

They prognosticated that this would not be a time of great unity, that it is more likely to be a time of division. And they knew, however, that the Constitution could survive this.

The Constitution survived the impeachment of Andrew Johnson in 1868. It was rancorous; there was a lot of divisiveness; but the Constitution survived. The Constitution is capable of surviving it, and the people, more importantly, are capable of surviving. And society is capable of surviving, which means the country can survive impeachment.

But it is there for a reason. It is there because there is a belief that, from time to time, you may have one