

Mr. Chair, Americans shouldn't have to wait for lower healthcare costs. We need to pass the Health Care Affordability Act now.

HONORING WOMEN'S U.S. NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM GOALKEEPER, ALYSSA NAEHER

(Ms. DeLAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Alyssa Naeher, the Connecticut-born U.S. Women's National Soccer Team goalkeeper.

The United States team once again proved that they are the best in the world. And throughout the World Cup, Alyssa—who grew up in Stratford, Connecticut, in my district, and played at Christian Heritage School in Trumbull—provided crucial play after crucial play. None was more important or heart-stopping than her save against England.

By stopping a penalty kick with time winding down, she single-handedly saved the United States' championship hopes.

And Alyssa is more than just a champion. She is a role model as the team champions the issue of equal pay for them and for millions of women and families nationwide.

Clearly, the time is now for the United States Senate to pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which has said men and women in the same job deserve the same pay.

What better tribute, my friends, to the talent, to the determination, and to the commitment of these outstanding young women.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate Alyssa. Connecticut could not be more proud.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3494, DAMON PAUL NELSON AND MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018, 2019, AND 2020; RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 116-125 AND AN ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION; RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES DISAPPROVING OF SALES, EXPORTS, OR APPROVALS PURSUANT TO THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.RES. 489, CONDEMNING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S RACIST COMMENTS DIRECTED AT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 491 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 491

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3494) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-22, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. If House Report 116-125 is called up by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform: (a) all points of order against the report are waived and the report shall be considered as read; and (b)(1) an accompanying resolution offered by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a point of order; and (2) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

SEC. 3. (a) A joint resolution described in section 4 shall be privileged if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or a designee on the day after the calendar day on which the Majority Leader or a designee announces an intention that the House consider the joint resolution. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be con-

sidered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except: (1) 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit (or commit, as the case may be). A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(b) On demand of the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or a designee, debate pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

SEC. 4. A joint resolution referred to in section 3 is a Senate joint resolution, or a House joint resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, prohibiting any of the following under section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776):

(1) a proposed sale pursuant to subsection (b);

(2) a proposed export pursuant to subsection (c); or

(3) an approval pursuant to subsection (d). SEC. 5. Sections 36(b)(3), 36(c)(3)(B), and 36(d)(5)(B) of the Arms Export Control Act shall not apply in the House during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 489) condemning President Trump's racist comments directed at Members of Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 491, providing for consideration of H.R. 3494, authorizing intelligence community programs for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 and retroactively authorizing fiscal year 2018 appropriations under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SCHIFF that makes technical and conforming changes and adds additional language that authorizes the CIA to expand death benefits to cover officers killed abroad. The rule makes in order 31 amendments and provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of House Report 116-125 and its accompanying resolution recommending that the House find Attorney General Barr and Secretary Wilbur Ross in contempt of Congress for refusing to comply with congressional subpoenas under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 489 under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Finally, included in this rule is a process for consideration of committee-reported or Senate-passed joint resolutions disapproving of certain transactions under section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act. This process allows for the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee to call up such a joint resolution 1 day after it is noticed by the majority leader and provides 20 minutes or an hour of debate and a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the Intelligence Authorization Act, H.R. 3494, authorizes programs at 16 intelligence community agencies and offices, including the Director of National Intelligence, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the DIA, the National Security Agency, and the FBI.

This authorization prioritizes the intelligence community's collection and analytic capabilities against hard-target countries such as China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea.

This bill will help us better understand and counter Russian interference in our elections. It requires reports to Congress on the intentions and the designs of Russian political leadership with respect to potential military action against NATO members and on the most significant Russian influence campaigns taking place around the world.

This bill also creates a Climate Security Advisory Council to ensure that the intelligence community prioritizes the threat of climate change. Specifically, the bill requires analysts to incorporate climate change into intelligence analysis and encourages collaboration with executive branch departments focused on climate policy.

Finally, this legislation takes care of our intelligence community workers by providing 12 weeks of paid parental leave for all employees, in addition to the 12 weeks of unpaid leave Federal employees are allowed to take under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Mr. Speaker, on contempt, the Constitution of the United States requires us to conduct a Census every 10 years, an actual enumeration of the American people, everyone who is present in the country.

Secretary Wilbur Ross engaged in a process in order to add a citizenship question to the Census for the first time in 70 years.

This was struck down by multiple Federal courts because of the blatant violation of essentially every principle of the Administrative Procedure Act. They did not conduct notice and comment; they did not assemble substantial evidence; and they did not provide a reasoned justification for why they wanted to do this completely outside of the process that had been set up under the Census Act that had been running for several years.

On June 27, the Supreme Court found that the Commerce Department's argument for including the citizenship question in the 2020 Census was "contrived," according to Chief Justice John Roberts, who wrote: "Several points, taken together, reveal a significant mismatch between the Secretary's decision and the rationale he provided."

Democrats on the Oversight and Reform Committee have been raising questions about Secretary Ross' proffered justification for several years now. We started asking questions back in 2017. Secretary Ross had testified that the Department of Justice letter that he received was the basis for changing the policy and imposing a citizenship question on the Census. He said that this change was solely motivated by the Department of Justice's request.

In fact, overwhelming evidence has surfaced completely contradicting this account. We know from multiple different sources now that this was a political effort designed to promote the electoral plans of the GOP.

The gerrymandering mastermind of the Republican Party, Thomas Hofeller, was the one who first raised this question several years ago. It was talked about during the Trump campaign. It was talked about within days of the inauguration. We have substantial evidence suggesting that Wilbur Ross, as Secretary of Commerce, was shopping around for a justification for doing this when the motivations were nakedly political.

The Oversight and Reform Committee began its investigation into the administration's decision to add the citizenship question on March 27, 2018. Yet, the majority of the committee has been stonewalled at every turn by the Departments of Justice and Commerce, which have refused to turn over key documents requested by the Oversight and Reform Committee, even after the committee, its members and staff, have worked diligently to resolve the impasse by narrowing the scope of the request to a very small subset of documents.

We know exactly the documents we need. Yet, still, we get nothing but defiance, obstruction, and stonewalling from this administration.

Democrats requested documents from the Department of Commerce on April 4, 2018. None of the requested documents were submitted.

On January 8, 2019, Chairman CUMMINGS renewed the request, and the Commerce Department responded by providing thousands of pages of documents, most of which were already publicly available or completely irrelevant, nonresponsive, or heavily redacted.

On February 12, 2019, Chairman CUMMINGS renewed the request for documents again, this time identifying a specific memo and note from the Department of Commerce to the DOJ. The DOJ did not provide the requested documents but, rather, produced several other documents that were heavily redacted and off point, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, this is intolerable. The Congress of the United States has a constitutional duty to conduct a fair Census.

Six former Census Bureau Directors wrote a letter denouncing the imposition of this citizenship question and telling Wilbur Ross that this would lead to a far less accurate account. The chief scientist of the Census Bureau testified that this was going to overlook and undercount as many as 6 million Hispanic Americans. We know that potentially millions of other Americans too would not be counted.

The purpose of adding the citizenship question was not to get a more accurate count. It was to get a far more inaccurate account. All the Census experts agree with that.

We have an act, the Census Act, which was violated and ignored. We have the Administrative Procedure Act, which was violated and ignored. Now we have issued a series of subpoena requests to the Departments of Commerce and Justice in order to get the information about what really took place, and again, we are being defied, ignored, and essentially belittled by the executive branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close my remarks on this with this point. The Constitution begins with the beautiful phrase: "We, the people . . . in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility," and so on, do create this Constitution in this country.

The very next sentence says that all the legislative powers are vested in us. In other words, the powers of the people flow right through the preamble of the Constitution into Article I.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly said, along with other Federal courts, that integral and essential to the law-making function is the factfinding function of Congress.

James Madison said, "Those who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power that knowledge gives."

The people armed us with that power by creating the legislative function in Congress. But we can't legislate and we can't govern if we can't get the information that we need, which is why the Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized our power is broad and it is expansive.

Our friends across the aisle, they know that. They know that from their Benghazi hearings that went on for years and cost tens of millions of dollars. They know that from the inquiry into Hillary Clinton's emails, and so on.

Congress has the power to get the information that it wants.

Mr. Speaker, the Census is serious business. It goes right to the heart of who we are as "we, the people."

Every 10 years, the Founders told us we have to go back and count everybody up in order to conduct the reapportionment process and decide how many Members of Congress are granted to each State, and, then, hundreds of billions of dollars follow in the wake of the Census. So, we have to make sure that every person is counted.

What we had was this rearguard, sneak ambush attack on the Census. They got caught doing it. The courts blew the whistle. The Supreme Court blew the whistle. But we want to know precisely what happened to make sure it doesn't happen again, to make sure that there has been no damage, and to make sure we can go forward with a real Census.

If you act with contempt of the Congress, if you act with contempt for the Congress, if you act with contempt for the American people, we will find you in contempt of Congress and the American people. We are given no choice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on the resolution condemning the President's recent remarks, the President of the United States told four Americans who are Members of Congress to "go back" to the countries they came from. Three of them, Representatives AYANNA PRESSLEY, RASHIDA TLAIB, and ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, are native-born Americans, and one of them, Representative ILHAN OMAR, was born abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this is an affront, not just of four American citizens who are Members of Congress. It is an affront to 22 million naturalized American citizens who were born in another country and made the journey to America and made the journey to becoming full-blown, equal, and free American citizens, 22 million American citizens.

□ 1245

Indeed, if you think about it, it is an affront to the hundreds of millions of Americans who understand and love how American democracy and citizenship work. We are not a nation defined by race and blood as the neo-Nazis and Klansman chanted in Charlottesville as they marched down the street terrorizing the people of Charlottesville. We

are defined by our Constitution, which belongs to all of us, and we are defined by the patriotism and by the service of our people.

Is there something wrong with being a naturalized citizen under our Constitution, Mr. Speaker? No, there is not. This is something to be honored and celebrated.

All Americans are equal in the eyes of the law. This is the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. We have no kings here. We have no queens here. We have no titles of nobility. We have no monarchy. We have no taints of blood. We have no hereditary offenses. We have no racial caste system. We have no slaves, and we have no slave masters.

It is true that there are those in our history who have wanted America to be defined as a White man's compact, and that is, indeed, precisely what the Supreme Court found it was in the infamous Dred Scott decision in 1857.

President Lincoln, a great and glorious Republican President, rejected the Dred Scott decision from the beginning as the product of a racist ideology and a racist political conspiracy, and it took a Civil War, the blood and the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of Americans, to defend the Union and to guarantee the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to overthrow and destroy the Dred Scott decision and the poisonous idea that America is a White man's compact. It is not.

All persons born in the United States are citizens of the United States, we said, in the 14th Amendment, which guaranteed equal protection of the law to all persons who are here. All of us are equal, whether you are a naturalized citizen who was born in Ireland, as our colleague Congressman SEAN CASTEN was; or in Ecuador, as our colleague DEBBIE MUCARSEL-POWELL was; or in Mexico, as our colleague CHUY GARCIA was; or in France, as our good friend and colleague MARK MEADOWS was; or Thailand, as our colleague TAMMY DUCKWORTH was; or in Guatemala, as our colleague NORMA TORRES was; or in Taiwan, as our colleague TED LIEU was; or in Canada, as our colleague TED CRUZ was; or in Poland, as our colleague and author of this resolution, TOM MALINOWSKI, was.

If these Americans and many more like them—we have 29 foreign-born Members of Congress. If these Americans and many more like them don't belong in Congress, tell it to the millions of people who elected them, and tell it to the Founders of our country who specifically said that you can run for the House of Representatives if you are a naturalized citizen if you have been naturalized for 7 years, or you can run for the Senate of the United States if you are a naturalized citizen if you have been naturalized for 9 years.

Mr. Speaker, to tell naturalized American citizens to go back to the countries they came from is nativist and antithetical to everything that America stands for. It is the opposite

of what we believe about the values of the country.

To tell native-born American citizens who are people of color to go back to the country they came from is antithetical to everything we stand for, and it will be up to the House of Representatives today to determine whether or not that is a racist statement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I don't want to put any pressure on you, Mr. Speaker, but it comforts me to see you as the Chair up there today. There are those days where you need particular leaders to be there at a particular time, and I will tell you that I am not telling anybody in this Chamber anything they don't already know: You have made an entire career in this institution reaching out, building unlikely alliances, making it work where other folks said it could not work. And when my friend from Maryland, whom I thank for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, talks about what it is our constituents expect, what it is our citizenry expects, I think they expect that, Mr. Speaker, and we have one of those bills before us today in the intelligence reauthorization act.

There is more in this rule, Mr. Speaker, than I believe I have seen in any rule in my 9 years in Congress and years serving on staff here. We packed it all in there last night, and I don't want to miss the lead on this rule, which is an intelligence bill that is named after two congressional staffers who passed away last year. They spent their lives in service to this institution and to the intelligence community, and we are grateful for that service.

If you have not looked at the intelligence community recently, Mr. Speaker, you will see DEVIN NUNES on the Republican side of the aisle and ADAM SCHIFF leading it on the Democratic side of the aisle. I can picture those two faces because I usually see them on split screens on FOX or MSNBC, and I can't think of many things they have had to say where they agreed with one another over the past 4, 5 years, and yet we have a bill today in sharp contrast to the partisan nonsense that was the NDAA operation last week.

We have a bill that has come out of the Intelligence Committee with two strident, passionate Republican and Democratic leaders there on the Intelligence Committee, that came out unanimously, that they presented unanimously in front of the Rules Committee last night and we have a chance to pass here on the floor of the House.

You also find in this rule, Mr. Speaker, 31 amendments that have been made in order to that intelligence reauthorization bill. Even though we found bipartisanship in the committee, even though we found unanimity in the committee, the Rules Committee, in its wisdom, last night, decided to make 31 more ideas available to be considered here on the floor of the House.

You see in this rule, Mr. Speaker, the ability for the House to take up Arms Export Control Act measures. These are also measures you are going to find bipartisan support for, also measures that you will find, again, as my friend from Maryland referenced, the House doing what you would expect the House to do, what our bosses back home sent us here to do.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are times when folks feel their deeply held beliefs cannot be compromised for the sake of bipartisanship. I find that trying to find a way to get to yes is better than trying to find a way to get to no. There is always a reason to get to no.

Instead of looking for ways to oppose our political rivals, we have to act as the Intelligence Committee did, in a manner where we can find issues on which we agree. It is the only way to move this process forward.

Mr. Speaker, America's national security and that of our allies, which is what the intelligence community helps to protect and support every day, is about more than scoring political points.

I mentioned those split screens on the TV where you do see folks lobbing accusations back and forth. Sometimes it seems to be political sport instead of serious legislating.

The measure we have before us today is not political sport; it is serious legislating. And we are going to have a chance to come together as a House not just to discuss it, not just to improve it, but to implement it.

Mr. Speaker, among the things that you will find in this bill, the foreign influences around the globe, and we have talked about them in all of their various incarnations here on the floor of the House over the last 2 weeks. This bill requires a report on China's influence over Taiwanese elections.

Chinese influence around the globe is at an unparalleled high. We are now rivaled by the Chinese in every single aspect of international influence and policy, but they have outsized influence in Taiwan, and we require that report.

We require a report not just on Russian interference in our elections, Mr. Speaker, but in elections across the globe. It would be naive to suggest that the Russians would limit their influence in elections to trying to manipulate the greatest and freest country in the world. They are working across the globe to influence elections wherever free people live.

Combating Chinese and Russian aggression in elections, Mr. Speaker, is not something, as is so often told in the media, that divides us; it is something that unites us. We saw that in the Intelligence Committee, and we are going to see that here on the floor of the House, and I am very proud of that. I wish we could have continued that effort, Mr. Speaker.

I agree with every word my friend from Maryland said about standing up for Article I. Of all of my frustrations of 9 years in this institution, the def-

erence of the United States Congress to the executive branch has been my greatest frustration. It exists for one reason and one reason only, and that is that men and women, colleagues like my friend from Maryland and I, have been unable to find a way to speak with one voice on issues that are Article I versus Article II issues.

Go down the list in your time in Congress, Mr. Speaker, whether it is the contempt resolution this institution passed for former Attorney General Eric Holder, that contempt resolution that passed on party-line votes in committee and party-line votes here on the floor of the House and went down to the executive branch where absolutely no action was taken on it whatsoever; take production of papers, whether on Fast and Furious or whether on the Census, production of papers, whether from the President's counsel or from the President's press secretary, we have these discussions and we cannot—no, we have not found a way to come together to speak with one voice.

We have an opportunity, a model. You will remember some number of weeks ago—now, months ago, Mr. Speaker—where we were very concerned in this Chamber about anti-Semitic remarks that were broadcast in the public domain. We came together as an institution to speak out against anti-Semitism.

It didn't happen overnight. In fact, my friend from Maryland authored that resolution, to his credit. But he didn't sit down with a pen and put some words on a page and bring it here to the floor for consideration. He had to work it. And I don't mean work it a little bit; I mean work it hard: it was coming; it was not coming; it was coming again; it was not coming. To find a pathway forward so that this House speaks with one voice instead of divided voices was an effort that was put in.

Now, granted, at the end of the day, it was a little more milquetoast than the resolution that I would have drafted, but sometimes that is the trade you make to be able to expand the acceptance of a resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Every single time in this Chamber, as it comes to reining in Article II or reining in the judicial branch, every single time we speak with a divided voice, we weaken this institution.

I have never seen a resolution that tried to hold two Cabinet Secretaries in contempt at the same time. Maybe that has happened historically; I don't know that answer. I have not seen it in my time.

I heard last night from the chairman of the House Oversight Committee and the ranking member of the House Oversight Committee, and the ranking member was unwavering in his commitment to Article I and our pre-eminence in the constitutional model. But he was also unwavering in his commitment to there is more that we could do to work with the administration as opposed to begin to poke that sharp

stick, and so this resolution does not have his support.

Well, if we begin our effort to do oversight over the administration and we are already divided before that bill even leaves committee, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to have the outcome that we want here on the floor of the House.

And then, of course, this rule in those contempt efforts is targeting a United States citizenship question that would have gone on the Census. We talk about that as if that is an outrageous thing.

I appreciate the kind words my friend from Maryland had to say about President Lincoln. I am going to have to get the Clerk to read them back to me because I am going to use that over and over again about a wonderful Republican President, but I want to use the words that Mr. RASKIN used.

But when President Lincoln was presiding over this land, it was common practice to have a citizenship question on the United States Census.

□ 1300

In fact, every single Census from 1820 to 1950 had a citizenship question on it. It was noncontroversial. In 1950, we took it off of the short form; it moved to the long form. And so from 1970 to 2000, that question was on the long form every single Census. And then in 2000, we took it off the long form and we put it onto the American Community Survey, that half-decade measure that goes out to create the data that Mr. RASKIN rightly noted is so important to all of our communities back home.

If, for the first time in American history, in the history of the Census, we decide that citizenship is somehow now a forbidden topic, that we can't find a way to discuss it, that it is not important to who we are as a Nation and how it is that we look at ourselves, fair enough.

That is not what the Supreme Court case was about, Mr. Speaker. As we well know, the Supreme Court case simply said: You can put a question about citizenship on the Census if you want to. You just didn't do it the right way, and so we are going to ask you not to do it that way. There are those ways and means of getting that done. You just didn't do it the right way.

I raise that, Mr. Speaker, not because I am a Census guru. I am not. I don't serve on any of those relevant committees. But in this era of outrage, where folks have begun to confuse civility with weakness—and that is a confusion that I think is to all of our detriments—the desire to have a question about citizenship on the Census has nothing to do with this President, this administration, Republicans, Democrats. It has been that way since 1820.

Thoughtful men and women, concerned men and women, serious legislators have been interested in this information for over 100 years.

If we want to have the conversation that somehow citizenship can't be discussed anymore and we should ban it

from all Census documentation forever, I don't think that would succeed, but it is certainly a legitimate topic of debate. But what is not legitimate is to suggest that the only reason that anyone would ask about citizenship is to pursue some sort of nefarious, xenophobic purpose. It is simply not true.

I represent a majority minority constituency, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-six percent of my bosses are first-generation Americans. You want to find folks who love America, come down to where I live, find folks who have waited in line, folks who have paid their money, folks who pinned all their hopes and dreams to, "If and only if I can get there, my children and my grandchildren will have a better life."

That is what brought us all here at one generation or another. Whether you came in 1650 or whether you came in 1950 or whether you came yesterday, those are the dreams that bring us here.

There is a lot to be outraged about in today's culture, but I haven't seen any of it get fixed by being more outraged.

I have seen it get fixed by men and women like yourself, Mr. Speaker, who value trust, who value candor, who value honesty, and who value real relationships.

Anything that is hard, I can't solve with someone I don't trust. If one side is good and one side is evil, where do you go from there? What does that negotiation look like? That is not a conversation; that is you have got to now destroy one another. That seems to be the path that folks too often opt for in politics today.

There is more that unites us than divides us in this constitution and in this country, Mr. Speaker. You might not know that by the parts of this rule that are going to get the most attention today.

ADAM SCHIFF, DEVIN NUNES, there are not two Members in this institution who feel more strongly and differently about the direction of public policy than those two men, and they came together, not to advance themselves, but to advance the Nation. They came together, not because it was easy, but precisely because it was hard and necessary, and brought us this bipartisan package we have today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for bringing that resolution to the floor, and I hope we will have ample time to celebrate those successes.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for his very thoughtful and moving remarks, which are very appealing to me, especially since I am a law professor first and only a politician thereafter.

And, you know, we all have to deal with the political party system as it

exists in the America of today, but I like to think of the Presidents who kept a kind of dual mind about it. They knew that they had to be part of it in order to operate, as all of us do, but also to try to think about the broader whole.

You know, Jefferson in his first inaugural address in 1800 said that we are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. And he also said:

If I could only go to heaven with a political party, I would prefer not to go.

George Washington said to us:

We have to keep in mind that the word party comes from the French word *partie*, a part, and when we govern, we should try to keep in mind the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for at least the one cheer of a potential three hip hip hoorays you might have given us on the Intelligence Authorization Act.

We do think that the contempt citation is necessary precisely for the reason you suggest: to uphold the institutional integrity of Congress.

We have gotten together in the past across party lines to demand that the executive branch gives us the information we need, and we believe that we are completely on that course.

Finally, as to the resolution about the remarks telling U.S. citizens to go back to the country they came from; it is hard for me not to see something that could be more unifying than that; that it is an essential value that I know every Member of this body holds, that we do not make a distinction in the legal or political rights or entitlements or responsibilities of natural-born citizens and naturalized citizens, and that it is utterly offensive to our system of government to tell people to go back to where they came from just because you have a political disagreement with them. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chair of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for yielding me the time and I want to thank him for his service on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the rule, but I want to speak on one underlying bill in particular, H. Res. 489.

Mr. Speaker, what we saw this week used to be reserved for the darkest corners of the internet, some chat room somewhere where people would be too ashamed to even use their real name when spewing vile rhetoric.

But this isn't some online troll. We are not talking about using dog whistles or speaking in some kind of secret alt-right code, Mr. Speaker.

This is proudly using Twitter as a megaphone to attack fellow Americans.

These are American citizens being turned into some kind of scary "other," not because of their party, but because of their background, their race, and their opinions. This is the

same type of attack the President has used against immigrants and refugees for years.

I have seen this administration carry out some deeply troubling policies. I have heard some deeply offensive things. And I know I am not alone in this, because when the cameras are off and the press isn't around, some of my colleagues on the other side have told me the same thing, that they are sickened by what is going on.

Well, these recent comments are in a completely different category. This type of language isn't just offensive. It could lead to violence. It is corroding our discourse. It undermines our values, and it doesn't reflect who we are as a country.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle, more sternly worded press releases and disappointed tweets aren't going to cut it. The only thing that matters here is votes. Press statements are not enough.

This House needs to speak with unity and vote to condemn the President's comments for what they are.

Now, I believe in the adage from Maya Angelou: "When someone shows you who they are, believe them."

The President told us who he was long before he rode that escalator down to announce his campaign.

It is time Republicans told the American people with their votes what they whisper to one another in the Cloakroom, what many of them have told me behind closed doors, because this dark world view is what will be on the ballot.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to think twice before they follow the President off a cliff. Our credibility matters and their credibility matters.

A Presidency lasts, at most, just 4 to 8 years. Some of us will get the chance to serve here long after this administration ends, and we will have to live with our conscience for a lifetime, but silence is an endorsement, equivocation is an endorsement, blaming both sides is an endorsement.

There is no gray area here. There is a very clear right and wrong. So supporting this resolution isn't about standing with Democrats; it is about standing up for decency.

The President showed us who he is. Now we have the chance to show the American people who we are.

Now, it is no secret that I have profound policy disagreements with this President. His economic policies favor the rich and his foreign policy completely ignores human rights, but in all the time I have been alive, I have always respected the office of the President and the occupant.

I feel differently now. I feel embarrassed. I feel ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues, our children are watching us. So do the right thing. Do the moral thing. Condemn President Trump's hateful and blatantly racist rhetoric.

And I don't care if it is out of order, but we need to be clear, we need to call

it what it is, and we need to condemn it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think I misunderstood my friend from Massachusetts. I think what my friend said is he does not care whether his words coarsen this institution, he does not care whether or not his positions diminish us as an institution, he does not care about the rules of this institution, which prohibit exactly the kind of words that he knows they prohibit and yet he uses anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask my friend if he believes that his cause of admonishing this President is going to be advantaged by diminishing this institution?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that what I am saying on the House floor supports the truth. I believe every word I said, and I feel strongly about it. I would only wish my colleagues on the other side would feel equally strong about condemning these horrific remarks.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. If the President believes every word that he said, does that excuse his behavior, in the gentleman's mind? Does it excuse his behavior to believe it?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the President can say whatever he wants. I think we have a moral obligation to call out racism wherever it exists.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. It is a perfectly legitimate assertion and attestation my friend from Massachusetts makes, and of course we all share that belief.

Mr. Speaker, when I was down here for the rule last week with my friend from Massachusetts, the other side was admonished, not once, but twice for violating the House rules for coarsening our debate, for diminishing our civility, for violating our rules; not a social contract about how we ought to treat each other, but rules where we have committed about how we will treat each other.

Today during 1 minute speeches, Mr. Speaker, not once, but twice the Chair admonished the other side to say: You are breaking our rules of civility. You are violating our standards of decorum. Our children are watching, and your behavior doesn't pass muster.

And now my friend—and he is my friend and I admire his work—he is passionate in the causes for which he advocates, and I believe that it is his passion, not his contempt for this institution, that leads him to say those things that he says. I believe he loves this institution, but he is misguided, when the Chair admonishes him again today

now, and he has no apologies for his colleagues, no apologies for this institution.

We do have serious issues. I am not meaning serious like Russia and China, which those are serious, I don't mean serious like the hate that is fomenting in this country, which is serious. I mean all of it that is serious that nobody in this institution can solve unless we solve it together, and I want to find that pathway forward. This isn't it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but I would ask him: Where was he when President Trump was spreading lies about President Obama's birth? Where was he when Representative JOE WILSON shouted, on the House floor, "You lie," to President Obama in 2009?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman remember when JOE WILSON apologized, which is more than what my friend from Massachusetts has done when the House has condemned him from the Chair today?

I remember when my friend Mr. WILSON lost his temper. I do remember it. And I remember him apologizing for it because he didn't want to bring shame on this institution.

I would welcome any time the Chair admonishes either side of the aisle for violating our rules, coarsening our debate, doing those things that we all agree we don't want our children to see on TV, I welcome folks to correct that behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I fear my comments are falling on deaf ears, but I hope I am mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, before I go into my time, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, do we take it to be against the rules of the House to describe statements made by the President as racist as a violation of House rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, launching into my time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his scholarship and his passion, the chairman of the Rules Committee, my good friend from Georgia, and all those who have come to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is a somber moment. It is not a moment that I cherish. My privilege in serving the greatest country in the world has allowed me to serve with three previous Presidents. Not one time from the three previous Presidents have I ever heard the words that were uttered this weekend.

I believe in harmony. I just came out of a Helsinki Commission meeting, an organization that deals with peace around the world. We were talking about how we can impress upon the world to not use religion for hatred. Religion is love.

One of the answers I gave was to show the examples here in the United States, where religions from all different perspectives come together in a time of disaster and need. It is something that touches our heart.

When we vote for a President, we want that President to touch our hearts, to lift us up, and to make us better people.

I cannot argue with the fact that 49 percent of the American people believe that this President is a racist. It hurts my heart because I come in a skin color where I have been at the sad end of racist tactics and words. I am a product of busing. But it does not diminish my love for this Nation.

So it disturbs me for this wonderfully diverse group of new Members who have come to the United States Congress from all over the Nation, including the LGBTQ community, and among the 40 Representatives who came was the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Massachusetts, the State's first African American woman; the Representative of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, the first Palestinian woman; the Representative from the 14th Congressional District of New York, the youngest woman; and the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota, the first Somali American elected to Congress.

In the discharge of their duties, they went to the border—their passion, their youth, just as I had done—and saw the appalling conditions that children were held in. They came back and expressed themselves, protected by the First Amendment.

They used no violence. They only wanted to wake up the Congress, as all of us who went and could not accept the pain did. In fact, wherever I go at home, people are asking: What are you doing for the children at the border?

So, they didn't do anything extraordinary, in terms of what Members should do, having the responsibility of oversight.

Then came, in the last 72 hours, these words: "So interesting to see 'progressive' Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt, and inept anywhere in the world, if they even have a functioning government at all, now loudly and viciously

telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful nation on Earth, how our government is to be run.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. “Why don’t they go back and help fix the totally broken and crime-infested places from which they came?”

I will be introducing a condemnation resolution that recounts the life and legacy of this President while 49 percent of the people believe that he is racist.

I only ask that we come together today to do the right thing, to do what the 16th President said right after the Civil War: “We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory” will swell when again touched, “as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.”

Today, if we condemn this language, it will say to America that we cannot accept this kind of behavior. That is what is bringing the country together, that we accept each other’s diversity.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise in support of the rule governing debate on H. Res. 489, a resolution condemning President Trump’s racist comments directed at Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on November 6, 2018, in an election widely regarded as a referendum on the performance and disapproval of the Administration of President Donald J. Trump, the American people voted to vest control of the U.S. House of Representatives in the Democratic Party to restore the system of checks and balances designed by the Framers in 1787 in Philadelphia.

The Representatives elected to the 116th Congress comprise the most diverse class in American history with respect to its racial, ethnic, and religious composition, and also includes the largest contingent of female Representatives and the most members ever of the LGBTQ community.

Among the cohort of the 40 Representatives first elected to the Congress in the November 2018 election are several whose membership is historic, including the Representative for the Seventh District of Massachusetts, the first African American woman elected from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; the Representative from the Thirteenth District of Michigan, the first Palestinian-American woman elected to Congress; the Representative from the Fourteenth District of New York, the youngest woman ever elected to Congress; and the Representative from the Fifth District of Minnesota, the first Somali-American elected to Congress.

In the discharge of their official duties as Members of Congress, these talented and dedicated Members of Congress traveled to the southern border of the United States to observe the living conditions and treatment received by migrants and refugees seeking asylum in the United States who are currently

being held in detention facilities operated under control or supervision of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), some consisting of nothing more than tent villages cordoned off under highways.

Upon their return to the Capitol, these Members of Congress reported their shock and horror regarding the appalling and inhumane conditions to which detainees were being subjected by CPB at a public hearing of a House Committee on Oversight and Reform.

On July 14, 2019, the President of the United States reacted to the criticism of his Administration’s treatment of detainees by these Members of Congress in a series of unhinged tweets that questioned their loyalty to the United States and implied that due to the circumstances of their birth they had no right to exercise the responsibilities and privileges of duly elected Members of Congress.

Specifically, the President tweeted that it was:

So interesting to see “Progressive” Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world (if they even have a functioning government at all), now loudly . . . and viciously telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth, how our government is to be run. Why don’t they go back and help fix the totally broken and crime infested places from which they came.

The President’s statements are false in that three of Members of Congress he impugned are in fact natural born citizens and the fourth is a naturalized citizen.

Although the recent statements of the President are inaccurate and offensive, they are consistent with prior statements he has made to stoke to division, discord, and disharmony among the American people.

Let us not forget that the current President of the United States burnished his political reputation by claiming falsely for more than 5 years that his predecessor was born in Kenya and not in the United States and thus was an illegitimate President.

The current President of the United States launched his 2016 campaign for the Presidency by saying of persons from Mexico seeking to immigrate to the United States: “They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”

The current President of the United States claimed that a Hispanic federal jurist could not preside over a court proceeding to which then presidential candidate Donald J. Trump and the Trump Organization were defendants accused of civil fraud because “He’s a Mexican!”

In January 2018 the current President of the United States is reported to have inquired of his advisors: “Why are we having all these people from (expletive deleted) countries come here?”, referring to persons from countries in Africa, the Caribbean, and Central and South America.

And most contemptible of all, on August 15, 2017 the current President of the United States said he regarded as some “very fine people,” the neo-Nazis, white supremacists, and Ku Klux Klansmen who descended on the peaceful community of Charlottesville, Virginia to advocate racism and who were met by peaceful counterprotestors in a clash that the white supremacists turned violent and resulted in the death of Heather Heyer and left injured

many other innocent persons who were gathered to affirm the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, and to honor the sacrifice of unsung American heroes who devoted their lives to the ongoing quest to continue perfecting our union.

Mr. Speaker, the recent and past statements and actions of the current President of the United States demean the office he holds and falls short of the standard set by the 16th President, whose administration was devoted to unity, healing, and ending racial division.

In his famous March 4, 1861, Inaugural Address, President Abraham Lincoln foretold the reasons why the efforts of the current President of the United States to rend our union are destined to fail:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory will swell when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to share my perspective on immigration and significant and positive impact it has in the development of this, the greatest nation in human history.

Like the Framers did in the summer of 1776, it is fitting that we gather in the nation’s capital on a sweltering July day to reflect upon America’s long and continuing struggle for justice, equality, and opportunity.

After all, all that any of us wants is an honored place in the American family.

I am often reminded that as I speak there is a family somewhere about to begin a dangerous but hopeful quest.

Somewhere south of the border, maybe across the Rio Grande from El Paso, Laredo, Corpus Christi, or Brownsville or maybe just south of Tucson or San Diego or Douglass, Arizona.

Somewhere there is a family in the Old Country anxiously about to embark on their own journey to the New World of America.

They come for the same reason so many millions came before them, in this century and last, from this continent and from every other.

They come for the same reason families have always come to America: to be free of fear and hunger, to better their condition, to begin their world anew, to give their children a chance for a better life.

Like previous waves of immigrants, they too will wage all and risk all to reach the sidewalks of Houston or Los Angeles or Phoenix or Chicago or Atlanta or Denver or Detroit.

They will risk death in the desert; they will brave the elements, they will risk capture and crime, they will endure separation from loved ones.

And if they make it to the Promised Land of America, no job will be beneath them.

They will cook our food, clean our houses, cut our grass, and care for our kids.

They will be cheated by some and exploited by others.

They work in sunlight but live in twilight, between the shadows; not fully welcome as new Americans but wanted as low-wage workers.

Somewhere near the borders tonight, a family will cross over into the New World, willed by the enduring power of the American Dream.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting H. Res. 489.

All American should take pride in and celebrate the ethnic, racial, and religious diversity

that has made the United States the leader of the community of nations and the beacon of hope and inspiration to oppressed persons everywhere.

And in addition to the love and pride Americans justifiably have for their country, all persons in the United States should cherish and exercise the rights, privileges, and responsibilities guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While my friend from Texas is sometimes known for running over the gavel at the end of her comments, it is only because it comes from the heart. When I think about Members in this institution who are unhampered by a lack of passion, I think of my friend from Texas. But when I look for an honest broker, who will be true to her word and partner when partnership is required, my friend from Texas embodies that, as well. I appreciate both her words and her restraint here this morning.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that my faith, my commitment to many people of different colors who respect the distinction or difference but also the greatness of this country, my love of those who serve, causes me to say, as many of my colleagues here are ready to say: Let us sit down at the table of peace and reconciliation.

I hope we will have some who will acknowledge that these actions—I will try to be generic—and words were certainly not becoming of the United States of America. The American people must see us work together on that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from Texas. I think that is a welcome invitation.

Mr. Speaker, thinking about the policies before us today, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to bring H.R. 3965 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, you have heard a lot about the controversial citizenship question in the Census. Whether or not it should be controversial is a different issue altogether.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Today, I introduce the Citizens Count Census Act of 2019, a

bill that would require a citizenship question on the United States Census.

If we defeat the previous question, as the gentleman from Georgia said, then we will be able to consider my bill.

It has always been common sense to include a citizenship question on our Nation's Census. The purpose of the Census Bureau and all Census surveys is to include data used for apportionment and to better inform the public about the population, business, and economics of the United States of America.

The collection of citizenship information during a population census is a common practice among countries. This is not new, and it should not be controversial. A citizenship question is asked on the census in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, and the United Kingdom, to name a few. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations recommends that countries gather citizenship information about their populations.

Knowing how many legal and nonlegal individuals are within our borders is a perfectly appropriate question to ask on our Census, and I hope we can pass this measure to see that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my congressional colleagues to vote for this commonsense legislation to ensure we know exactly how many citizens reside in this country.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend and the ranking member on the House Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice have given 31,000 pages of documents to the Congress. They provided witnesses. In fact, we have another one coming in for a transcribed interview later this month.

Secretary Ross came and testified for over 6 hours. He came in front of the committee, raised his hand, swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help him God. He testified for 6 hours.

Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr are doing their jobs. What is their reward? The Democrats are going to hold them in contempt, hold them in contempt because they are so focused on this citizenship question.

As Mr. COMER, who has introduced legislation, said just a few minutes ago, the citizenship question is nothing but common sense.

Listen to what Justice Alito said 2 weeks ago, "No one disputes that it is important to know how many inhab-

itants of this country are citizens." And the easiest way to figure it out is to ask a question on the Census.

That is about as common sense as it gets. It is so common sense, we have only been doing it for 200 years, in one form or another. The long form, the short form, the 10-year form, the annual form, we have been doing it for 200 years.

But somehow, this year: No, you can't do it this year. You can't do it this year.

As Mr. COMER said, the United Nations says it is a best practice. Lots of countries do it. But somehow, the Democrats don't want us to do it this year.

I support the legislation that the Representative from Kentucky has introduced. I support the good work of our Rules Committee member from Georgia. Certainly, I don't support the rule and the resolution that is going to hold Secretary Ross and Attorney General Barr in contempt. Again, doing their job and what do they get? A contempt resolution from the Democrats.

Ask yourself a question or, better yet, go ask your constituents a question. I would encourage Democrats to go to their districts and ask anyone in their districts: Do you think we should ask a question on the Census about whether you are a citizen of this country? My guess is just about every single person you talk to in your district will say: Heck, yeah, aren't we doing that already? Of course, my colleagues would have to respond: Yes, we are, and we have been doing it for 200 years.

This is common sense. This resolution is not appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the rule, defeat of the previous question, and if it gets to the floor, defeat of the resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of holding the Attorney General and Secretary of Commerce in contempt for refusing to turn over repeatedly requested documents and witnesses, our good friends now confuse two legal questions with a policy question.

The legal question is: Did they violate the law in imposing the citizenship question on the Census? Yes, they did violate the law. They violated the Census Act. They violated the Administrative Procedure Act. They violated pretty much every administrative principle we have in this country. Chief Justice John Roberts said it, someone who is beloved to my colleagues over there.

□ 1330

But the other legal question is: Can the executive branch decide willy-nilly that they are going to stop cooperating with congressional subpoenas and requests for documents? No, they can't, and I hope that that would be a unifying dictum for everybody in this body that we stand up for the right of the people's Representatives to obtain the information that we need.

Now, my dear friend from Georgia made the point that he wished that we could proceed in a more bipartisan fashion. I have actually been very cheered by the number of our GOP colleagues who have denounced the President's remarks over the weekend and this week.

For example, we get a statement from—I am not making it up. I know that they are out there. Here we go. Mr. FRED UPTON: "Frankly, I'm appalled by the President's tweets. There's no excuse. The President's tweets were flat-out wrong and uncalled for."

PETE OLSON: "The tweet President Trump posted over the weekend about fellow Members of Congress are not reflective of the values" of my district. "I urge our President immediately disavow his comments."

Senator MURKOWSKI: "There's no excuse for the President's spiteful comments—they were absolutely unacceptable and this needs to stop."

John Kasich: "What @realDonaldTrump said about Democrat women in Congress is deplorable and beneath the dignity of the office. We all, including Republicans, need to speak out against these kind of comments that do nothing more than divide us and create deep animosity."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I regret that there is so much that is packed into this rule. It is one of the reasons I urged defeat of the rule today.

Everyone in this Chamber wants to vote to have this debate on the national intelligence reauthorization bill. Everybody wants to be a part of that. Again, 31 amendments made in order will improve that bill, a bipartisan product coming out of a very contentious committee.

The rest of these issues are more complex. And I don't mean complex because we shouldn't discuss them. We should. I mean complex because we haven't discussed them.

I think I am prepared to yield time if the gentleman needs it. I know my friend from Maryland is not the author of the resolution condemning the President, but the gentleman mentioned my friend from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and Mr. OLSON's comments on the Republican side of the aisle.

I ask the gentleman, was Mr. OLSON consulted to try to create the language that we see before us today?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Does the gentleman mind repeating?

Mr. WOODALL. Was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) consulted as

we tried to draft this language that is before us today?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman was not, unfortunately, just because of the press of time.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, was Mr. UPTON, who the gentleman referenced as having sympathetic words to say, was the gentleman consulted about the drafting of this resolution?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. The vast majority of Members on both sides were not consulted in the manner—

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, so Mr. Kasich was also not consulted and Ms. MURKOWSKI also not consulted.

Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about a serious issue and we are going to craft a serious response and we want to speak with one voice from this institution, might it be a good idea for there to be at least one conversation between Democrats and Republicans about how to proceed?

Might it be a good idea to have more than one conversation?

Might it be a good idea to put partisanship aside and actually do those things that I know my friend from Maryland wants to do and I want to do arm in arm with him?

We keep missing opportunities in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, opportunities to make this institution stronger, opportunities to make this Nation stronger. We are missing them, and we are creating scars along the way.

What could be an operation in building trust has become an operation in building distrust.

What could be an operation designed to heal, I suspect, is going to be an operation that brings more needless pain.

We have a good bill in the intelligence reauthorization, Mr. Speaker. We have a good series of bills in arms export control. We could be down here talking about those because of the bipartisan work that has gone into it already.

Not one conversation has been had between tweets over a weekend and a resolution condemning those on the floor of the House, not one effort made to speak with one voice in the United States House. That tells you just about everything someone needs to know about why this resolution is on the floor with these two contempt resolutions in this place at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the rule. I urge defeat of the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

I will just take a second to say to my friend that there have been hundreds of conversations that have been taking place here, but, of course, the gentleman knows that the committee system works in such a way that legislation is put in and not everybody is consulted. The legislation he has praised so effusively today in the Intelligence

Committee, none of us outside of the Intelligence Committee were consulted about it.

So I think we have got a consensus here rejecting and repudiating the tenor and the meaning of the President's remarks, and I hope that this process of dialogue which has been so wonderful today with the gentleman from Georgia leads to an outcome where all of us will vote for the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 491

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3765) to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that any questionnaire used for a decennial census of population contains a question regarding citizenship, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3765.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—230

Adams	Axne	Beatty
Aguilar	Barragán	Bera
Allred	Bass	Beyer

Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Pappas	Graves (MO)	Marshall	Scott, Austin	Cunningham	Kind	Raskin
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pascrell	Green (TN)	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Davids (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Payne	Griffith	Mast	Shimkus	Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter	Grothman	McCarthy	Simpson	Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Hill (CA)	Peters	Hice (GA)	Guest	Smith (MO)	Dean	Lamb	Rouda
F.	Himes	Peterson	Guthrie	McClintock	Smith (NE)	DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Phillips	Hagedorn	McHenry	Smith (NJ)	DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Pingree	Harris	McKinley	Smucker	DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Pocan	Hartzler	Meadows	Spano	DelBene	Lawrence	Rush
Bustos	Hoyer	Porter	Hern, Kevin	Meuser	Stauber	Delgado	Lawson (FL)	Ryan
Butterfield	Huffman	Pressley	Herrera Beutler	Miller	Stefanik	Demings	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)	Hice (GA)	Mitchell	Steil	DeSaulnier	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Quigley	Hill (AR)	Moolenaar	Steube	Deutch	Levin (CA)	Scanlon
Cartwright	Jeffries	Raskin	Holding	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Dingell	Levin (MI)	Schakowsky
Case	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)	Hollingsworth	Mullin	Stivers	Doggett	Lewis	Schiff
Casten (IL)	Johnson (TX)	Richmond	Hudson	Newhouse	Taylor	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rose (NY)	Huizenga	Norman	Thompson (PA)	F.	Loeb	Schrader
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rouda	Hunter	Nunes	Thornberry	Engel	Lofgren	Schrier
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Hurd (TX)	Olson	Timmons	Escobar	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Cicilline	Kennedy	Ruiz	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Tipton	Eshoo	Lowey	Scott, David
Cisneros	Khanna	Ruppersberger	Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Turner	Espallat	Luján	Serrano
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Rush	Johnson (SD)	Pence	Upton	Evans	Luria	Sewell (AL)
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Ryan	Jordan	Perry	Wagner	Finkenauer	Lynch	Shalala
Clay	Kim	Sánchez	Joyce (OH)	Posey	Walberg	Fletcher	Malinowski	Sherman
Cleaver	Kind	Sarbanes	Joyce (PA)	Ratcliffe	Walden	Foster	Maloney,	Sherrill
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon	Katko	Reed	Walker	Frankel	Carolyn B.	Sires
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky	Keller	Reschenthaler	Walorski	Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Slotkin
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schiff	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)	Waltz	Gabbard	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Lamb	Schneider	Kelly (PA)	Riggelman	Watkins	McAdams	McBath	Soto
Correa	Langevin	Schrader	King (IA)	Roby	Weber (TX)	Garamendi	McCollum	Spanberger
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schrier	King (NY)	Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)	Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Speier
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)	Kinzinger	Roe, David P.	Wenstrup	Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Stanton
Cox (CA)	Lawrence	Scott, David	Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Westerman	Golden	McGovern	Stevens
Craig	Lawson (FL)	Serrano	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)	Gomez	McNerney	Suozi
Crist	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)	Wittman	Gonzalez (TX)	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Crow	Lee (NV)	Shalala	Lamborn	Rose, John W.	Womack	Gottheimer	Meng	Takano
Cuellar	Levin (CA)	Sherman	Lesko	Rouzer	Woodall	Green, Al (TX)	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Levin (MI)	Sherrill	Long	Roy	Wright	Grijalva	Morelle	Thompson (MS)
Cunningham	Lewis	Sires	Loudermilk	Rutherford	Yoho	Haaland	Moulton	Titus
Davids (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Slotkin	Lucas	Scalise	Young	Harder (CA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Tlaib
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Smith (WA)	Luettkemeyer	Schweikert	Zeldin	Hastings	Murphy	Tonko
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Soto				Hayes	Nadler	Torres (CA)
Dean	Lowenthal	Spanberger	Abraham	Doyle, Michael	Higgins (NY)	Heck	Napolitano	Torres Small
DeFazio	Lowey	Speier	Biggs	F.	Latta	Higgins (NY)	Neal	(NM)
DeGette	Luján	Stanton	Burgess	Gohmert	Lipinski	Hill (CA)	Neguse	Trahan
DeLauro	Luria	Stevens	Cárdenas	Granger	Marchant	Himes	Norcross	Trone
DelBene	Lynch	Suozi		Higgins (LA)	Williams	Horn, Kendra S.	O'Halleran	Underwood
Delgado	Malinowski	Swalwell (CA)				Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Van Drew
Demings	Maloney,	Takano				Houlihan	Omar	Vargas
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)				Hoyer	Pallone	Veasey
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)				Huffman	Panetta	Vela
Dingell	Matsui	Titus				Jackson Lee	Pappas	Pascrell
Doggett	McAdams	Tlaib				Jayapal	Payne	Perlmutter
Engel	McBath	Tonko				Jeffries	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Escobar	McCollum	Torres (CA)				Johnson (TX)	Kaptur	Peterson
Eshoo	McEachin	Torres Small				Kelly (IL)	Keating	Phillips
Espallat	McGovern	(NM)				Kennedy	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Evans	McNerney	Trahan				Khanna	Kilmer	Pocan
Finkenauer	Meeks	Trone				Kildee	Kilmer	Porter
Fletcher	Meng	Underwood				Kim	Kim	Pressley
Foster	Moore	Van Drew						Price (NC)
Frankel	Morelle	Vargas						Quigley
Fudge	Moulton	Veasey						
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Vela						
Galleo	Murphy	Velázquez						
Garamendi	Nadler	Visclosky						
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Wasserman						
Garcia (TX)	Neal	Schultz						
Golden	Neguse	Waters						
Gomez	Norcross	Watson Coleman						
Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran	Welch						
Gottheimer	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton						
Green, Al (TX)	Omar	Wild						
Grijalva	Pallone	Wilson (FL)						
Haaland	Panetta	Yarmuth						

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1402

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, due to being the ranking Republican on the Energy and Commerce Committee's Communication and Technology subcommittee, we were detained in a hearing during the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 478.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]
YEAS—233

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Budd	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Burchett	Duffy
Amash	Byrne	Duncan
Amodei	Calvert	Dunn
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Estes
Babin	Chabot	Ferguson
Bacon	Cheney	Fitzpatrick
Baird	Cline	Fleischmann
Balderson	Cloud	Flores
Banks	Cole	Fortenberry
Barr	Collins (GA)	Foxo (NC)
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Fulcher
Bilirakis	Comer	Gaetz
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Gallagher
Bost	Cook	Gianforte
Brady	Crawford	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gonzalez (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Curtis	Gooden
Buchanan	Davidson (OH)	Gosar
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)

Adams	Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)
Aguliar	Brownley (CA)	Clay
Alred	Bustos	Cleaver
Axne	Butterfield	Clyburn
Barragán	Bucshon	Cohen
Bass	Cardenas	Connolly
Beatty	Carson (NY)	Cooper
Bera	Cartwright	Correa
Beyer	Case	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Casten (IL)	Courtney
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cox (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Craig
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Crist
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Crow
F.	Cisneros	Cuellar
Brindisi	Clark (MA)	Cummings

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)
Allen	Collins (NY)	Green (TN)
Amash	Comer	Griffith
Amodei	Conaway	Grothman
Armstrong	Cook	Guest
Arrington	Crawford	Guthrie
Babin	Crenshaw	Hagedorn
Bacon	Curtis	Harris
Baird	Davidson (OH)	Hartzler
Balderson	Davis, Rodney	Hern, Kevin
Banks	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hice (GA)
Bergman	Duffy	Hill (AR)
Bilirakis	Duncan	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Hollingsworth
Bost	Emmer	Hudson
Brady	Estes	Huizenga
Brooks (AL)	Ferguson	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Buck	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Johnson (SD)
Budd	Foxo (NC)	Jordan
Burchett	Gaetz	Joyce (OH)
Byrne	Gallagher	Joyce (PA)
Calvert	Gianforte	Katko
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	Keller
Carter (TX)	Gonzalez (OH)	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Gooden	Kelly (PA)
Cheney	Gosar	King (IA)
Cline	Graves (GA)	King (NY)
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Kinzinger
Cole		Kustoff (TN)

LaHood	Perry	Steube
LaMalfa	Posey	Stewart
Lamborn	Ratchliffe	Stivers
Latta	Reed	Taylor
Lesko	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
Long	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Riggelman	Timmons
Lucas	Roby	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Turner
Marshall	Roe, David P.	Upton
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Mast	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
McCarthy	Rooney (FL)	Walden
McCaul	Rose, John W.	Walker
McClintock	Rouzer	Walorski
McHenry	Roy	Waltz
McKinley	Rutherford	Watkins
Meadows	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Meuser	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Miller	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Moolenaar	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Mooney (WV)	Simpson	Wittman
Mullin	Smith (MO)	Womack
Newhouse	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Norman	Smith (NJ)	Wright
Nunes	Smucker	Yoho
Olson	Spano	Young
Palazzo	Stauber	Zeldin
Palmer	Stefanik	
Pence	Steil	

NOT VOTING—9

Abraham	Gohmert	Lipinski
Biggs	Granger	Marchant
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Williams

□ 1411

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION OF HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 36, S.J. RES. 37, AND S.J. RES. 38 ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 491, I hereby give notice of intention that the House consider the following joint resolutions on Wednesday, July 17, 2019:

- S.J. Res. 36;
- S.J. Res. 37; and
- S.J. Res. 38.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The notice will appear in the RECORD.

□ 1415

CONDEMNING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S RACIST COMMENTS DIRECTED AT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 491, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 489) condemning President Trump's racist comments directed at Members of Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLEAVER). Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 489

Whereas the Founders conceived America as a haven of refuge for people fleeing from religious and political persecution, and Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and

James Madison all emphasized that the Nation gained as it attracted new people in search of freedom and livelihood for their families;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence defined America as a covenant based on equality, the unalienable Rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and government by the consent of the people;

Whereas Benjamin Franklin said at the Constitutional convention, "When foreigners after looking about for some other Country in which they can obtain more happiness, give a preference to ours, it is a proof of attachment which ought to excite our confidence and affection";

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Remember, remember always, that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists";

Whereas immigration of people from all over the Earth has defined every stage of American history and propelled our social, economic, political, scientific, cultural, artistic, and technological progress as a people, and all Americans, except for the descendants of Native people and enslaved African Americans, are immigrants or descendants of immigrants;

Whereas the commitment to immigration and asylum has been not a partisan cause but a powerful national value that has infused the work of many Presidents;

Whereas American patriotism is defined not by race or ethnicity but by devotion to the Constitutional ideals of equality, liberty, inclusion, and democracy and by service to our communities and struggle for the common good;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy, whose family came to the United States from Ireland, stated in his 1958 book "A Nation of Immigrants" that "The contribution of immigrants can be seen in every aspect of our national life. We see it in religion, in politics, in business, in the arts, in education, even in athletics and entertainment. There is no part of our nation that has not been touched by our immigrant background. Everywhere immigrants have enriched and strengthened the fabric of American life.";

Whereas President Ronald Reagan in his last speech as President conveyed "An observation about a country which I love";

Whereas as President Reagan observed, the torch of Lady Liberty symbolizes our freedom and represents our heritage, the compact with our parents, our grandparents, and our ancestors, and it is the Statue of Liberty and its values that give us our great and special place in the world;

Whereas other countries may seek to compete with us, but in one vital area, as "a beacon of freedom and opportunity that draws the people of the world, no country on Earth comes close";

Whereas it is the great life force of "each generation of new Americans that guarantees that America's triumph shall continue unsurpassed" through the 21st century and beyond and is part of the "magical, intoxicating power of America";

Whereas this is "one of the most important sources of America's greatness: we lead the world because, unique among nations, we draw our people -- our strength -- from every country and every corner of the world, and by doing so we continuously renew and enrich our nation";

Whereas "thanks to each wave of new arrivals to this land of opportunity, we're a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas, and always on the cutting edge", always leading the world to the next frontier;

Whereas this openness is vital to our future as a Nation, and "if we ever closed the

door to new Americans, our leadership in the world would soon be lost"; and

Whereas President Donald Trump's racist comments have legitimized fear and hatred of new Americans and people of color: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) believes that immigrants and their descendants have made America stronger, and that those who take the oath of citizenship are every bit as American as those whose families have lived in the United States for many generations;

(2) is committed to keeping America open to those lawfully seeking refuge and asylum from violence and oppression, and those who are willing to work hard to live the American Dream, no matter their race, ethnicity, faith, or country of origin; and

(3) strongly condemns President Donald Trump's racist comments that have legitimized and increased fear and hatred of new Americans and people of color by saying that our fellow Americans who are immigrants, and those who may look to the President like immigrants, should "go back" to other countries, by referring to immigrants and asylum seekers as "invaders," and by saying that Members of Congress who are immigrants (or those of our colleagues who are wrongly assumed to be immigrants) do not belong in Congress or in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 489.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the comments described in this resolution were not just offensive to our colleagues; they were inconsistent with the principles and values upon which this Nation was founded.

In urging four female Members of Congress of color to "go back" where they came from, these comments were not only factually incorrect, but they were also deeply hurtful and divisive.

These were shocking comments, even from an administration that rips children from the arms of their parents and warehouses asylum seekers in facilities under inhumane conditions. We cannot let this moment pass without a forceful condemnation.

Need I remind the Speaker that this is the same President who defended the "very fine people" at the neo-Nazi march in Charlottesville, who denounced the "s-hole countries" in Africa and the Caribbean, who claimed that Haitian immigrants "all have AIDS,"