

chief magistrate of the country, is harming the country.

Constitutional scholars are saying it. Over a thousand lawyers have said that, pursuant to the Mueller report, the President should be impeached. Anyone else would be locked up, would be charged. They said he would be charged if he were anyone else. That is what they said.

I want you to know that, wherever I go, I encounter people who are saying: Please, don't give up. Please, don't stop. Please, do something about what is happening to our country.

I get expressions of gratitude from people across the length and breadth of the country. And I don't do it to get expressions of gratitude. I do it because I love my country.

The weaponization of hate ought to be a part of this impeachment inquiry.

I have already prognosticated that the President will be impeached. And when the President is impeached, I hope that we will have expanded the articles such that the weaponization of hate will be included.

If Andrew Johnson could be impeached for his bigoted and hateful commentary, surely, we can do this again. Those were radical Republicans, by the way, who impeached Andrew Johnson—radical Republicans. If radical Republicans could impeach him on evidence rooted in his bigotry and hate, we can impeach this President for similar reasons.

I do believe that, if you read the Articles of Impeachment with reference to Andrew Johnson, you will gain a greater appreciation for what I say.

There have been only two Presidents impeached, Andrew Johnson in 1868 and William Clinton in 1998. Only two. Nixon was not impeached.

We need not try to debate this issue of whether the President has to commit a statutory offense. Constitutional scholars know better.

Unfortunately, you have had to cope with a person who is not said to be a constitutional scholar, didn't finish number one in his class, didn't finish from an Ivy League school. But he did bring you truth, and that truth is being recognized.

I stand here in the well of the House of Representatives tonight. I believe that comments comparable to what the President has said with reference to lynching, comparing lynching to impeachment, is but a continuation of his weaponization of hate, bigotry, racism, xenophobia, homophobia, Islamophobia, all the invidious phobias. That is all it is.

It will not cease. He is only going to continue.

If the House of Representatives does not impeach, we will have a President who will have no guardrails because we are the bar of justice. We are where it is initiated, right here. It is not initiated anywhere else.

The Justice Department is not going to do it. There is no place else. This is where it is initiated, right here, the House of Representatives.

If we do not impeach, no guardrails. If we do not impeach, we will have a de facto monarch, a person who does pretty much what he chooses, who believes that he is beyond the reach of any person or persons on this planet.

If we do impeach and the Senate does not convict, that will send another message. The President will perceive himself to be a de facto monarch. We will have a de facto monarchy.

We have a duty to do this. Our country—our country—is what this is all about.

□ 2100

The Constitution is the last word. We are the first line of defense against a reckless, ruthless President who would weaponize hate. We are the first line of defense, the Members of this august body. We have a duty to take up the cause of justice for the country that we love.

I respect anyone who differs with me. Do what you may. But I do believe that, in time, I will be vindicated. I believe that, in time, the 58 who voted initially to impeach will be, again, vindicated. We have already been vindicated to a certain extent, but they will be further vindicated.

The 66 who voted the second time, they are going to be vindicated, too. The 95 who voted the third time, they will get additional vindication. They are already vindicated because we are moving toward impeachment. They were just a part of the avant-garde, already vindicated.

And the question remains, where do we go from here? Do we limit the impeachment to Ukraine and issues related to Ukraine only?

It is my opinion that we should expand it, and I have explained why—because of hatred and bigotry.

Finally, this: We are talking about the original sin of this country; and there are those who would make the argument that, well, the Ukraine circumstance deals with national security; it is a threat to national security.

Well, it is a threat to national security when you have white nationalists who are murdering people in the streets of this country, in the schools, to a certain extent, in various places where you would assume that you are safe. That is a threat to national security as well.

It is time for us to deal with the original sin. We have the opportunity. It is impeachable.

I don't want him impeached because of some election. I want him impeached because he has committed impeachable offenses. I want him impeached because we need to deal with our original sin.

I believe that those who look through the vista of time upon this time are going to realize how right we were, those of us who have moved to impeach for the bigotry, the racism, all of the invidious phobias that we have had to endure from our President.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak. I love

this facility. I love my country. This country means something to me. I stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. I salute the flag.

But I also respect those who choose not to and will respect their rights and defend their right if they choose not to.

But I do. This is my country. I love it. I love it. I stand alone, but it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 724, the PACT Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 835, the Rodchenkov Anti-Doping Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2704. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Bank Advisory, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Stress Testing Rule for National Banks and Federal Savings Associations [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0035] (RIN: 1557-AE55) received October 18,