



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2019

No. 173

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TONKO).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 31, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PAUL TONKO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

Give them generosity to enter into their work. May they serve You in the work they do as You deserve; give of themselves and not count the cost; fight for what is best for our Nation and not count the political wounds; toil until their work is done and not seek to rest; and labor without seeking any reward, other than knowing they are doing Your will, and serving the people of this great Nation.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ELIAS "SKIP" ASHOOH

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of all Granite Staters to recognize the life and legacy of Elias "Skip" Ashooh who passed away this week. He embodied the spirit of the Queen City and left this world too soon.

As a lifelong Manchester resident and Saint Anselm College alum, Skip dedicated his career and life to bettering his community. He was a successful businessman, local leader, and philanthropist who never gave up on the potential of Manchester and all its residents. He was a community fixture who loved taking in the downtown area he helped revitalize.

As chair of the Manchester Development Corporation, Skip was instrumental in making the civic center

project a reality, one of the city's most consequential economic development projects since the industrial revolution. His immense impact was known by all, which is why he was named Citizen of the Year in 2000.

I hope we can honor Skip Ashooh's legacy by continuing to work together to move Manchester and New Hampshire forward.

I offer condolences to his wife, Gail, the Ashooh family, friends, and all who knew him.

May Skip's memory be eternal.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF U.S. ARMY SERGEANT THOMAS COLE WALKER OF CONNEAUT, OHIO

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the life and service of U.S. Army Sergeant Thomas Cole Walker of Conneaut, Ohio.

Sergeant Walker, who enlisted after graduating from Conneaut High School in 2016, was tragically killed on October 20 during a training exercise at Fort Stewart.

Just 22 years old, he had been awarded the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Korea Defense Service Medal, and the Army Service Ribbon.

His dedication to protecting this Nation was nothing short of heroic and serves as an inspiration to us all. But Sergeant Walker was more than a patriot. He was also a son, a brother, and a husband. His loss is felt by many.

Madam Speaker, please join me in extending condolences to the friends, fellow soldiers, and family of Sergeant Walker, especially his wife, Taylor; his brother, Jared; his sisters Payton, Whitney, and Wendy; and his father, Thomas.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8681

I pray that the outpouring of support from the Conneaut community will help ease their sorrow during this difficult time. I know this entire Chamber joins me in thanking Sergeant Walker for his service, honoring his life, and praying for his family.

LIMOUSINE SAFETY STANDARDS

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, this month marked the painful anniversary of one fateful afternoon in Schoharie, New York, when 20 precious souls were lost in the preventable crash of a limousine that should never have been allowed on the road.

The families of those lost—many from my hometown of Amsterdam, New York—the families of eight young people devastated by the Cutchogue crash on Long Island in 2015, and countless others touched by these preventable tragedies have raised their voices to demand action.

Last week we introduced bipartisan legislation that answers their call. It is important, I believe, to respond to that call and to that request. The SAFE Limos, the Take Unsafe Limos Off the Road Act, and the End the Limo Loophole Act have responded to them with great sensitivity.

I thank my friend, ANTONIO DELGADO, for joining me in sponsoring this lifesaving legislation, and I thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have signed on in support. These commonsense measures will save lives and ensure that this never happens to another family.

Madam Speaker, I urge this body to raise our Nation's limousine safety standards without delay.

SKILLED NURSING SHORTAGE

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the House for passing H.R. 728, the bipartisan Title VIII Nursing Workforce Reauthorization Act.

My wife, Mary, was a critical care nurse for over 45 years, and we could tell you firsthand the role that nurses play in patient care.

But America is facing a shortage of skilled nurses. Our nursing workforce in America is aging, and the average age is 50 years old. By 2022 there will be 1 million nursing jobs open and available.

We must find a way to encourage people to go into nursing. This bill helps not only to recruit nurses but to provide rural and underserved communities a competitive way to attract and keep talent.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 728 is a step forward in addressing our Nation's growing need for nurses.

VENTURE ACADEMY: MOCK TRIAL WORLD CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a group of talented students in my district who recently earned the title of Mock Trial World Champions.

Venture Academy's mock trial team was one of 38 teams that traveled to New York to compete for this honor in the Empire Mock Trial World Championship. They successfully argued a fictional case involving a construction company that was accused of failing to take proper safety precautions by portraying the prosecutors and defendants as well as the witnesses in the case. They ended up bringing back the top prize to Stockton.

This isn't Venture Academy's first big success. Last year the team placed fifth in the Empire contest, and for the past 6 years they have won first place in the San Joaquin County mock trial competition.

One day some of these students could come here and stand at this podium, putting their debate skills to work while arguing for or against important legislation.

So, Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Venture Academy's mock trial team, the Mock Trial World Champions.

PHONY IMPEACHMENT INQUIRIES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, today we will vote on a resolution that will somehow try to legitimize the last 5 weeks' worth of phony impeachment inquiries going on downstairs in a secure room.

Instead of voting on and taking up the issues that matter to the American people, we continue to chase this witch hunt trying to take down the accomplishments of our President, Donald J. Trump. Indeed, the economy we have, the low unemployment we have, and the success we are having in the Middle East and other areas around the world aren't good enough.

When my colleagues on the other side of the aisle admit that they probably won't win another election and they have to try to use the impeachment process to try to take the President down, that shows how phony this process is.

So to try today to pass a resolution to somehow legitimize the last 5-plus weeks' worth of work and, indeed, really 2½ years' worth of attacking this President shows that this place has a misplaced set of priorities.

Instead of doing the work of the American people, they are using this as a political process to attack what we have all been able to accomplish.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of my district, California's central coast, who are worried about healthcare and the high cost of prescription drugs.

Earlier this month at home, I spoke with people at retirement communities, town halls, and at their doorsteps delivering food for Meals on Wheels. Throughout these conversations, one thing was made clear: We need to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

I am proud the House passed H.R. 987 to strengthen health protections and bring down drug costs. I am excited that we are looking ahead to do more to ensure people never have to choose between lifesaving medicine and putting food on the table.

That is why I cosponsored H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act. When we give the power to Medicare to negotiate prices directly with drug companies and make these lower prices available to everyone, we all win.

H.R. 3 gives power back to the patients. It is what people in my district are working for, and I am proud to support it.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution that attempts to justify the sham impeachment process that I have personally witnessed. The majority claims this resolution will ensure a "fair, open, and transparent process."

Madam Speaker, do you want to know how fair this process is?

The resolution names the Financial Services Committee as part of the investigation. Earlier this month, the chairwoman of that committee said that President Trump should be "placed in solitary confinement."

Further, Republicans will only be allowed to subpoena witnesses with Chairman SCHIFF's approval, as deemed necessary to the investigation.

If we have learned anything from the investigation so far, we know the majority does not think due process is necessary. They don't even think basic fairness is necessary.

A "yes" vote on this resolution today gives a stamp of approval to a process that has been damaged beyond all repair and is a blatant and obvious coup to unseat a sitting President of the United States. I will not support a resolution that promises an open and fair process without the basic, fundamental procedures necessary to ensure it.

□ 0915

AFFIRMING U.S. RECORD ON ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 296, which is an important resolution affirming the United States record on the Armenian genocide that the House overwhelmingly passed on Tuesday. This historic resolution makes clear that our Nation unequivocally recognizes the Armenian genocide and encourages education and understanding of these tragic events.

Madam Speaker, the Armenian genocide, the first genocide in the 20th century, took place from 1915 to 1923. During this tragedy in history, 1.5 million Armenians were killed—men, women, and children.

I was privileged to visit Armenia earlier this year and talk to many Armenians about this tragic history. We must remember and acknowledge the lives that were taken and the pain that was inflicted. We can neither forget the atrocities that took place then, or other examples of ethnic cleansing, nor allow them to continue.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the body passed this critical resolution on Tuesday for constituents in my district, across the Nation, and the world.

DIRECTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO CONTINUE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 660 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 660

Resolved, That the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, are directed to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. OPEN AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (referred to in this resolution as the "Permanent Select Committee") is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Permanent Select Committee shall designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives,

upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or a Permanent Select Committee employee if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Permanent Select Committee in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

(6) The Permanent Select Committee is directed to issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Permanent Select Committee may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution. The chair shall transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. The

report required by this paragraph shall be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

SEC. 3. TRANSMISSION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS.

The chair of the Permanent Select Committee or the chair of any other committee having custody of records or other materials relating to the inquiry referenced in the first section of this resolution is authorized, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transfer such records or materials to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY PROCEDURES IN THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

(a) The House authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct proceedings relating to the impeachment inquiry referenced in the first section of this resolution pursuant to the procedures submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on Rules, including such procedures as to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel.

(b) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to promulgate additional procedures as it deems necessary for the fair and efficient conduct of committee hearings held pursuant to this resolution, provided that the additional procedures are not inconsistent with the procedures referenced in subsection (a), the Rules of the Committee, and the Rules of the House.

(c)(1) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(A) by subpoena or otherwise—

(i) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(ii) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(B) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(2) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to paragraph (1), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(3) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(d) The Committee on the Judiciary shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the professionalism that my friend from Oklahoma has demonstrated throughout this process. We don't see eye to eye on this impeachment inquiry, but he has always conducted himself with integrity and defended this institution.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon, the Committee on Rules marked up and favorably reported H. Res. 660, directing certain committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, this is a sad day for our country. Over 230 years ago, when the Founders of our country wrote the Constitution, they entrusted us with the gift of self-government, but they knew the persistence of this gift was not assured.

It may be taken for granted today, but having just shaken off a tyrant, the Founders knew better. They understood that the very foundations of our country are dependent on safeguarding against one branch of government encroaching on the others. That is what the idea of checks and balances is all about.

Within that system, the Framers gave only this Congress the power, if need be, to impeach a President over possible wrongdoing. This fact—that no one is above the law—is what separates this country from so many others.

Because of its seriousness, the impeachment process has been rarely used for Presidents. For just the fourth time in our Nation's history, Congress is now investigating whether to impeach a President of the United States. Our authority to do so under Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States and the Rules of the House of Representatives is clear, and the courts have recently agreed.

For all the disagreements I have with President Trump, for all of his policies, his tweets, and his rhetoric that I deeply disagree with, I never wanted our country to reach this point. I do not take any pleasure in the need for this resolution.

We are not here in some partisan exercise. We are here because the facts compel us to be here.

There is serious evidence that President Trump may have violated the Constitution. This is about protecting our national security and safeguarding our elections. That is why the Intelligence Committee has been gathering evidence and hearing testimony.

Like any investigation, reasonable confidentiality has been paramount. Witnesses should not be able to coordinate testimony in advance. The truth must be allowed to prevail.

Republicans have been a part of every single proceeding conducted so far. Republicans conducting these depositions, along with their staffs, have had an opportunity to question each and every witness.

Now, Madam Speaker, we are entering the public-facing phase of this process, and I commend the investigative committees and their staffs for the professional manner in which they have conducted themselves.

I would also like to commend the courageous public servants that have bravely come forward to tell the truth. Without their courage, this possible wrongdoing would never have seen the light of day.

The public should not be left in the dark. They should see the facts about the President's conduct firsthand.

That is why I introduced this resolution. It establishes the next steps of this inquiry, including establishing the procedure for public-facing hearings conducted by the Intelligence Committee and the process for transferring evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is about transparency, and it is about due process for the President. Some on the other side will never be satisfied with any process that uncovers the truth of what the President did.

Madam Speaker, none of us know whether or not President Trump will be impeached or convicted. Only the facts, and how we respond to them, will dictate the outcome. But I truly believe that, 100 years from now, historians will look back at this moment and judge us by the decisions we make here today.

This moment calls for more than politics. It calls for people concerned not about the reactions of partisans today but of the consequences of inaction decades from now. If we don't hold this President accountable, we could be ceding our ability to hold any President accountable.

At the end of the day, this resolution isn't about Donald Trump. It isn't about any of us. It is about our Constitution. It is about our country.

I urge my colleagues to not just think about the political pressures of the moment. These will pass. Please consider the heavy responsibility you have today to this institution, the Constitution, and to our country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by thanking my friend for his kind words and for the professionalism with which he handled last night's hearing.

But before I begin, Madam Speaker, I would ask the chairman if he would withdraw his resolution, at which time I will ask unanimous consent that the

House immediately proceed to the consideration of H.R. 668 instead, which provides for consideration of H. Res. 660, under a rule.

Madam Speaker, this would in no way prevent consideration of the resolution before us today; however, it would provide us with an opportunity for all Members to participate in the process.

My proposed rule would provide for 4 hours of general debate on H. Res. 660, allow for amendments under an open process, and provide for a motion to recommit.

On an issue as important as this, Madam Speaker, 1 hour of debate on a resolution written in the dark of night and marked up in a process where no Republican amendments were accepted is simply insufficient.

Additionally, it would allow all Members to offer amendments to improve the process to get to the truth, which I am sure is the goal of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, with that, I would ask the chairman to accept my request.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, I do not.

REQUEST TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate time on H. Res. 660 be expanded to 4 hours so every Member could participate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has yielded all time for debate only. The gentleman from Massachusetts would have to yield for that request.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by echoing my friend's words. It is a sad day for all of us, for me personally, I am sure for all of my colleagues on the Rules Committee, and for the institution as a whole.

Today's resolution sets forth a process for impeaching the President of the United States. It is not a fair process; it is not an open process; it is not a transparent process; but, instead, it is a limited and a closed process with a preordained outcome.

Impeachment of the President is one of the most consequential acts that the House of Representatives can do, and it should only be done after the fullest consideration. Yet, over the last month, without a vote and with only the Speaker's say-so, committees have been engaged in a closed impeachment inquiry on what amounts to nothing more than a partisan fishing expedition.

At least today the majority is admitting what we have known all along: that the House was not following an appropriate process for impeachment.

But I do not think the process we are setting forward in this resolution is a fair one either. It is not fair to the President of the United States; it is not fair to the House of Representatives; and it is not fair to the American people.

The process laid out in the resolution before us is different from the process used for both President Nixon in 1974 and President Clinton in 1998. Today's resolution provides fewer process protections and fewer protections for minority rights than what we have seen in previous impeachment efforts.

At our markup yesterday, Republicans tried to change that. We tried to offer constructive amendments that made the process more fair, that would give rights to the minority, that would give rights to the accused, and that would ensure due process for everyone.

Republicans offered 17 amendments, and not one—not one, Madam Speaker—was accepted. Not one.

We offered amendments that would align the subpoena powers in this resolution with the subpoena powers used for President Clinton.

Unlike the Clinton inquiry, today's resolution does not provide for coequal subpoena power. Instead, it grants the minority the right to subpoena witnesses and materials only with the concurrence of the chair, with no such limitation on the rights of the chair to issue subpoenas. We offered amendments that would change that, but the majority rejected each of them in turn.

We offered an amendment that would allow all Members the right to fully access committee records. This is common sense. If you are doing something as serious as impeaching the President, then Members should have the right to see what records the committee produced so that they will know what they are voting on. Yet the majority rejected that.

We offered an amendment that would require the chairman of the Rules Committee to promulgate procedures to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel in proceedings of the Intelligence Committee, the Oversight and Reform Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee. This right was granted to President Clinton in 1998, yet it is not present here. And the majority, again, rejected the amendment.

I think the difference is clear: Today's resolution fails to give the minority the same rights as were present during the Clinton impeachment, and it fails to offer the same due process protections that were given to Presidents Nixon and Clinton.

And, in the latter case, I note those rights were given by a Republican House to a Democratic President. Today's resolution shows a Democratic House failing to give these same protections to a Republican President.

Madam Speaker, the unfairness is clear. This is not a fair process, nor was it ever intended to be. It was preordained from the beginning.

Without due process and without a fair process that respects minority rights, I do not believe the American people will regard that process as legitimate. A legitimate process is one that offers protections for everyone involved. Without those protections, this will be seen as just another partisan exercise, one the majority has been

pushing since the very first days of the 116th Congress.

We can do better than that, Madam Speaker. The Rules Committee should have done better than this. But since the Rules Committee didn't, the House must.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say, briefly, that this resolution provides better protections for the President than those Presidents Nixon and Clinton received. And just like under Nixon and Clinton, in the Judiciary Committee, the President's counsel can submit additional testimony or evidence for the committee to consider. The President and his counsel can attend all hearings and raise objections. They can question any witness.

This is going beyond Nixon and Clinton. This resolution allows the President's counsel to ask questions at the presentation of evidence.

Under our procedures, the ranking minority members of the Judiciary Committee and the Intelligence Committee may issue subpoenas if authorized by a committee vote. These are the same subpoena powers that the ranking minority member was given during Clinton and Nixon.

Our resolution allows for greater Member participation than under past impeachment procedures, including a robust process for the minority to propose witnesses and even issue subpoenas if authorized by committees.

And let me just say, I think the fact of the matter is I don't think there is any process that we can propose that Republicans who prefer to circle the wagons around this President and prevent us from getting to the truth would accept.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD H. Res. 581 from the 105th Congress, the Clinton impeachment inquiry resolution that contains the same minority subpoena powers as this resolution.

Authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist for the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with the rules of the committee, is authorized and directed to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

- (1) by subpoena or otherwise—
 - (A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and
 - (B) the production of such things; and
- (2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

(b) Such authority of the committee may be exercised—

(1) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

(2) by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them. The chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them (or, with respect to any deposition, answer to interrogatory, or affidavit, any person authorized by law to administer oaths) may administer oaths to any witness. For the purposes of this section, "things" includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, recordings, tapes, transcripts, printouts, data compilations from which information can be obtained (translated if necessary, through detection devices into reasonably usable form), tangible objects, and other things of any kind.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I also include in the RECORD H. Res. 803 from the 93rd Congress, the Nixon impeachment inquiry resolution, which also contains the same minority subpoena powers as this resolution.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with the rules of the committee, is authorized and directed to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

- (1) by subpoena or otherwise—
 - (A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

(B) the production of such things; and

(2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

(b) Such authority of the committee may be exercised—

(1) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

(2) by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be issued over the signature of the

chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them. The chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them (or, with respect to any deposition, answer to interrogatory, or affidavit, any person authorized by law to administer oaths) may administer oaths to any witness. For the purposes of this section, "things" includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, recordings, tapes, transcripts, printouts, data compilations from which information can be obtained (translated if necessary, through detection devices into reasonably usable form), tangible objects, and other things of any kind.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee, and any subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act, without regard to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

Sec. 4. Any funds made available to the Committee on the Judiciary under House Resolution 702 of the Ninety-third Congress, adopted November 15, 1973, or made available for the purpose hereafter, may be expended for the purpose of carrying out the investigation authorized and directed by this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Assistant Speaker.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution on the floor.

We are here today because of the rule of law. This resolution, the inquiry, is Congress upholding the oath we pledged to the Constitution.

We are here because of the President, his actions, his jeopardizing our national security for his own political gain.

We are here because we know the White House and the President admitted that President Trump used the power of the Presidency to pressure and strong-arm the President of a foreign country for his political gain. He called it "a favor." "Do us a favor," he said. But it wasn't a favor. It was a coordinated attempt to undermine the rule of law.

Because of those actions, Congress is compelled to be here to uphold the rule of law; to make sure Americans hear the truth; to say that no one, not even a President, can abuse the system without fair and just consequences.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the distinguished ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, we are not here to run a show trial in an effort to impeach the President of the United States.

It is clear that, since the Democrats took control of the House of Represent-

atives, they have always intended to transform the Intelligence Committee into the impeachment committee. Every one of their actions, from the staff they hire to the Trump conspiracy theories they investigate, their willful neglect of our basic oversight duties, demonstrate that this has been their plan from day one.

And now this is further confirmed by the adoption of these rules, which simply give the House approval for the Intelligence Committee Democrats to continue pursuing their bizarre obsession with overturning the results of the last Presidential election.

Nevertheless, after spending 3 years trying to manufacture a crime they can attribute to President Trump, they have come up empty.

First, they insisted that the President is a Russian agent. Then they claimed he is a money launderer and a tax cheat and a fraudulent businessman. And now they have decided they don't like the way he talks to foreign leaders.

But they have no evidence and no argument to support impeachment. All they have is the unconditional cooperation of the media to advance their preposterous narrative.

If they had a real case, they wouldn't be wasting time spoon-feeding ridiculous attacks that include defamation and slander on both current and former Republican staff of the Intelligence Committee.

What we are seeing among Democrats on the Intelligence Committee down in the SCIF right now is like a cult. These are a group of people loyally following their leader as he bounces from one outlandish conspiracy theory to another.

And the media are the cult followers, permanently stationed outside the committee spaces, pretending to take everything seriously, because they, too, support the goal of removing the President from office.

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

Mr. COLE. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds to close.

Mr. NUNES. After today, The House Intelligence Committee ceases to exist. Oversight is not being done, and we now have a full-fledged impeachment committee in the basement of the Capitol.

Think about that, America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, the House impeachment inquiry has discovered a substantial body of evidence that the President of the United States has violated the Constitution by placing his political interests above the interests of the country, thereby putting both our democracy and the Nation's security in jeopardy.

In light of this evidence, the House of Representatives must fully investigate.

We have sworn a sacred oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We will honor our oath by countering all high crimes and misdemeanors committed against the American people and our Constitution.

Today's resolution sets the table for the next phase of the inquiry. This phase includes open hearings, led by the Intelligence Committee, to allow the American people to hear from witnesses who have personal knowledge of the President's actions. Relevant materials will then be transferred to the Judiciary Committee so we may fulfill our solemn and time-honored duty to determine whether to recommend Articles of Impeachment.

The majority has conducted hearings up to this point in a scrupulously bipartisan way, giving professional staff counsel for both the majority and the minority precisely equal time to question witnesses and equal opportunities for members of the majority and the minority to question them, too.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. We will afford the President all the due process protections that were afforded to his predecessors in a similar situation. That includes the ability to attend hearings, question witnesses, and submit evidence.

As recently as Friday, the Federal courts have reaffirmed that the House is the sole judge of impeachment, and we set the rules here. These rules are fair and strong and will make sure that we can and we will defend the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the distinguished ranking member of the House Oversight Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, trying to put a ribbon on a sham process doesn't make it any less of a sham. Never forget how this whole thing started.

Democrats are trying to impeach the President of the United States 13 months before an election based on an anonymous whistleblower with no firsthand knowledge, who has a bias against the President and who worked with Vice President Biden.

The day after the now famous phone call between President Trump and President Zelensky, the so-called whistleblower gets a readout from somebody on that call, writes a memo. In the memo, he uses terms like "this call was scary," "frightening."

But what does he do? He waits 18 days before he files a complaint.

And who is the first person he goes to see, the first people he goes to see in that 18-day timeframe? Chairman SCHIFF's staff. Chairman SCHIFF's staff.

Madam Speaker, 435 Members of Congress and only one individual, one Member of this body, knows who this person is who started this whole darn crazy process: Chairman SCHIFF.

And what does this resolution do? It gives him even more power to run this secret proceeding in a bunker in the basement of the Capitol.

□ 0945

This resolution continues the unfair and partisan process. Just 2 days ago, 2 days ago, we were prevented from having the witness answer our questions in one of these depositions. And this resolution is going to give more power to the person who made that decision in the bunker in the basement of the Capitol.

We have less than 13 months before the next election. Americans understand that this is unfair. Americans get fairness. They instinctively know this is an unfair and partisan process. They will see how unfair and partisan it is today when the vote happens on the floor of this House. We can do a lot better than this. We can do a lot better than this, and the American people see through it.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I thank the gentleman on the Rules Committee for his work and his leadership.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a New York Times article entitled "Army Officer Who Heard Trump's Ukraine Call Reported Concerns" in which Colonel Alexander Vindman, an Army officer who was on the call, said, "I did not think it was proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen," and "This would all undermine U.S. national security."

[From the New York Times, October 28, 2019]
ARMY OFFICER WHO HEARD TRUMP'S UKRAINE
CALL REPORTED CONCERNS

(By Danny Hakim)

THE TOP UKRAINE EXPERT AT THE WHITE HOUSE WILL TELL IMPEACHMENT INVESTIGATORS HE TWICE REPORTED CONCERNS ABOUT PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PRESSURE TACTICS ON UKRAINE, ACTING OUT OF A "SENSE OF DUTY."

WASHINGTON—A White House national security official who is a decorated Iraq war veteran plans to tell House impeachment investigators on Tuesday that he heard President Trump appeal to Ukraine's president to investigate one of his leading political rivals, a request the aide considered so damaging to American interests that he reported it to a superior.

Lt. Col. Alexander S. Vindman of the Army, the top Ukraine expert on the National Security Council, twice registered internal objections about how Mr. Trump and his inner circle were treating Ukraine, out of what he called a "sense of duty," he plans to tell the inquiry, according to a draft of his opening statement obtained by The New York Times.

He will be the first White House official to testify who listened in on the July 25 telephone call between Mr. Trump and President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine that is at the center of the impeachment inquiry, in which Mr. Trump asked Mr. Zelensky to investigate former Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr.

"I did not think it was proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen, and I was worried about the implications for the U.S. government's support of Ukraine," Colonel Vindman said in his statement. "I realized that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens and Burisma it would likely be interpreted as a partisan play which would undoubtedly result in Ukraine losing the bipartisan support it has thus far maintained."

Burisma Holdings is an energy company on whose board Mr. Biden's son served while his father was vice president.

"This would all undermine U.S. national security," Colonel Vindman added, referring to Mr. Trump's comments in the call.

The colonel, a Ukrainian-American immigrant who received a Purple Heart after being wounded in Iraq by a roadside bomb and whose statement is full of references to duty and patriotism, could be a more difficult witness to dismiss than his civilian counterparts.

"I am a patriot," Colonel Vindman plans to tell the investigators, "and it is my sacred duty and honor to advance and defend our country irrespective of party or politics."

He was to be interviewed privately on Tuesday by the House Intelligence, Foreign Affairs and Oversight and Reform Committees, in defiance of a White House edict not to cooperate with the impeachment inquiry.

The colonel, who is represented by Michael Volkov, a former federal prosecutor, declined to comment for this article.

In his testimony, Colonel Vindman plans to say that he is not the whistle-blower who initially reported Mr. Trump's pressure campaign on Ukraine. But he will provide an account that corroborates and fleshes out crucial elements in that complaint, which prompted Democrats to open their impeachment investigation.

"I did convey certain concerns internally to national security officials in accordance with my decades of experience and training, sense of duty, and obligation to operate within the chain of command," he plans to say.

He will testify that he watched with alarm as "outside influencers" began pushing a "false narrative" about Ukraine that was counter to the consensus view of American national security officials, and harmful to United States interests. According to documents reviewed by The Times on the eve of his congressional testimony, Colonel Vindman was concerned as he discovered that Rudolph W. Giuliani, the president's personal lawyer, was leading an effort to prod Kiev to investigate Mr. Biden's son, and to discredit efforts to investigate Mr. Trump's former campaign chairman, Paul Manafort, and his business dealings in Ukraine.

His account strongly suggests that he may have been among the aides the whistle-blower referred to in his complaint when he wrote that White House officials had recounted the conversation between Mr. Trump and Mr. Zelensky to him, and "were deeply disturbed by what had transpired in the phone call."

Colonel Vindman did not interact directly with the president, but was present for a series of conversations that shed light on his pressure campaign on Ukraine.

He will also testify that he confronted Gordon D. Sondland, the United States ambassador to the European Union, the day the envoy spoke in a White House meeting with Ukrainian officials about "Ukraine delivering specific investigations in order to secure the meeting with the president."

Even as he expressed alarm about the pressure campaign, the colonel and other officials worked to keep the United States rela-

tionship with Ukraine on track. At the direction of his superiors at the National Security Council, including John R. Bolton, then the national security adviser, Colonel Vindman drafted a memorandum in mid-August that sought to restart security aid that was being withheld from Ukraine, but Mr. Trump refused to sign it, according to documents reviewed by the Times. And he drafted a letter in May congratulating Mr. Zelensky on his inauguration, but Mr. Trump did not sign that either, according to the documents.

Colonel Vindman was concerned after he learned that the White House budget office had taken the unusual step of withholding the \$391 million package of security assistance for Ukraine that had been approved by Congress. At least one previous witness has testified that Mr. Trump directed that the aid be frozen until he could secure a commitment from Mr. Zelensky to announce an investigation of the Bidens.

While Colonel Vindman's concerns were shared by a number of other officials, some of whom have already testified, he was in a unique position. Because he emigrated from Ukraine along with his family when he was a child and is fluent in Ukrainian and Russian, Ukrainian officials sought advice from him about how to deal with Mr. Giuliani, though they typically communicated in English.

On two occasions, the colonel brought his concerns to John A. Eisenberg, the top lawyer at the National Security Council. The first came on July 10. That day, senior American officials met with senior Ukrainian officials at the White House, in a stormy meeting in which Mr. Bolton is said to have had a tense exchange with Mr. Sondland after the ambassador raised the matter of investigations he wanted Ukraine to undertake. That meeting has been described in previous testimony in the impeachment inquiry.

At a debriefing later that day attended by the colonel, Mr. Sandland again urged Ukrainian officials to help with investigations into Mr. Trump's political rivals.

"Ambassador Sondland emphasized the importance that Ukraine deliver the investigations into the 2016 election, the Bidens and Burisma," Colonel Vindman said in his draft statement.

"I stated to Ambassador Sondland that his statements were inappropriate" and that the "request to investigate Biden and his son had nothing to do with national security, and that such investigations were not something the N.S.C. was going to get involved in or push," he added.

The colonel's account echoed the testimony of Fiona Hill, one of his superiors, who has previously testified behind closed doors that she and Mr. Bolton were angered by efforts to politicize the interactions with Ukraine.

The colonel said that after his confrontation with Mr. Sandland, "Dr. Hill then entered the room and asserted to Ambassador Sondland that his statements were inappropriate."

Ms. Hill, the former senior director for European and Russian affairs, also reported the incident to Mr. Eisenberg.

The colonel went to Mr. Eisenberg a couple of weeks later, after the president's call with Mr. Zelensky. This time, the colonel was accompanied by his identical twin brother, Yevgeny, who is a lawyer on the National Security Council.

The picture painted by Colonel Vindman's testimony has been echoed by several other senior officials, including William B. Taylor Jr., the top American diplomat in Ukraine, who testified last week that multiple senior administration officials had told him that the president blocked security aid to

Ukraine and would not meet with Mr. Zelensky until he publicly pledged to investigate Mr. Trump's political rivals.

While the White House has urged witnesses subpoenaed by Congress not to participate in the impeachment inquiry, failing to comply with a congressional subpoena would be a risky career move for an active-duty military officer.

As tensions grew over Ukraine policy, the White House appears to have frozen out Colonel Vindman. Since early August, he has been excluded from a number of relevant meetings and events, including a diplomatic trip to three countries under his purview: Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.

Colonel Vindman said he had reported concerns up his chain of command because he believed he was obligated to do so.

"On many occasions I have been told I should express my views and share my concerns with my chain of command and proper authorities," he said. "I believe that any good military officer should and would do the same, thus providing his or her best advice to leadership."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Over the last month, the impeachment inquiry has built a powerful body of evidence around President Trump's call with President Zelensky of Ukraine when he told a foreign leader, "I'd like you to do us a favor, though." We have learned so much about that call and things that followed it because some dedicated public servants have demonstrated patriotism to this great country by coming forward and testifying and giving us the information as they know it.

These brave patriots, career diplomats, have been called "radical unelected bureaucrats." They have been called that by a group of people who Thomas Paine would call summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. He warned us that these people will, in a "crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands by it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

We are here today because brave, dedicated public servants and patriots are standing up for their country.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Yesterday the Rules Committee reported an impeachment resolution that was hastily drafted without Republican input with just 24 hours' notice for review. Last night we offered, on the Republican side, 17 amendments. Unsurprisingly, none were adopted.

Despite assurances that all Members will have access to materials supporting the Articles of Impeachment, to date, Chairman SCHIFF has ignored

72 bipartisan requests to view Ambassador Volker's transcript, but pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(e)(2), committee records are the property of the House, and thus, Members of the House should have access.

Last night at the Rules Committee, it was stated that perhaps Republicans were not requesting the information at the right time, so we have to ask: When is the right time to ask to view our own House records? Republicans requested an authorizing vote, and now we will have one. However, this process has not been open and transparent, and it diverts from precedent set in the two most recent Presidential impeachment investigations. As a result, this investigation will be conducted with no minority input.

A Presidential impeachment investigation is a national trauma. All Members must take this constitutionally vested power seriously, and Americans deserve to be represented in this process. Unfortunately, neither serious nor equal consideration, nor full access to records appear to be a criteria under which the Democrats are willing to conduct this investigation. That is a shame, and it renders this process a sham.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I take no joy in contemplating the impeachment of a President because, in contemplating it, we must acknowledge a threat to our Constitution and the values that bind us not only as Members of Congress but as Americans.

We have tried to work within traditional means to get to the bottom of serious allegations of misconduct so that we can deliver the truth to the American people. Committees have called witnesses and requested evidence, only to be stonewalled. The President's defenders have tried to distract the American people by falsely claiming to have been excluded from the investigation while their stunts and smears have hindered the constitutional process.

This resolution outlines ground rules for the House as we move forward, granting the same or greater due process rights to the President and the minority as they themselves drafted when they were in the majority. We will have open hearings. They can question witnesses. They can propose subpoenas. They can present evidence.

I am proud to sponsor this resolution. Our Constitution requires it, and our democracy depends on it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my good friend and distinguished Republican ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, no matter what is said by the other side today, this is a dark day,

and a cloud has fallen on this House. It has been falling for 10 months, and it is showing itself today.

What we are seeing is this: If the gentleman, who is a friend of mine from the Rules Committee, would actually have wanted to talk about whether these are the same rules as Clinton and Nixon, then we would have had a much longer period of debate, because he knows and I know it is not. There are similarities—some better, some not—but they are not the same. Let's get that out of the way first.

The problem I am having here is the resolution before us today is not about transparency; it is about control. It is not about fairness; it is about winning. It isn't about following the facts. This resolution is about delivering results. You know how I know this? Because the resolution gives no proper way for how these abilities or transferring of documents from the Intelligence Committee to the Judiciary Committee will happen. It doesn't even give a timeframe.

And I have heard a lot of discussion today about maybe we didn't know how to properly ask last night in Rules Committee. I guarantee you, my staff and I know how to properly use rule XI 2(e) to ask for information, and we were told yesterday by one of the committees that we couldn't have access to that because the Parliamentarian said we couldn't. That is just false. It needs to stop.

This House is developing and shredding procedures every day. And if Members on the minority or the majority cannot have the rights that they are given, then we are in a sad situation.

And, in fact, in the haste to put this together they didn't even exempt, as was done in Clinton and Nixon, the rule XI 2(e). They didn't exempt it out. Even in those two impeachments, it was known that maybe we don't let every Member come see this while this is going on. We didn't even exempt it during this time. We were so hurried to impeach this President, we don't really give a darn about the rules.

But here is my biggest concern: As ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I have a question. We have been here 200-plus years as a committee, and our committee has been neutered. Our committee who handles impeachment—we are the reason in that committee; that is our jurisdiction—we have been completely sidelined. Our chairman and others have been sidelined, so I have been sidelined. It is so bad that they had to have the Rules Committee write the Presidential due process and give it to us. This is not right.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I do not know what happened to our committee, but we still exist. Due process only kicks in at Judiciary

for the President. It does not kick in in the closed-door, secret hearings of ADAM SCHIFF. This is a travesty.

No one should vote for this. This is a sad day. The curtain is coming down on this House because the majority has no idea about process and procedure. They are simply after a President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I get it. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about process, process, process, but it is interesting that not one of them wants to talk about the President's conduct, and that speaks volumes.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), another distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COLE for the manner in which you all are shepherding us through this difficult process.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the American people to see how the administration put our national security on the auction block in exchange for political favors.

At the heart of this scandal is the White House's decision to slam the brakes on nearly \$400 million of military aid for Ukraine, military aid for a vital partner, military aid that was desperately needed to beat back Russian aggression, military aid that was key to our own national security and essential in keeping an adversary at bay.

We know what our Ukrainian friends thought about this. They were horrified. The facts are clear. Our top national security experts viewed it as a grave and dangerous mistake. And as we have seen time and time again from the Trump administration, this decision played right into Vladimir Putin's hands.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I support pushing ahead with this inquiry because I swore an oath to defend the Constitution against America's enemies. The American people deserve the facts about how this abuse of power betrayed our national security and put our country at risk.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, before I proceed, I yield myself such time as I may consume to quickly respond to my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN.

We are debating process here because that is what this is. This is a process resolution to impeach the President of the United States. You didn't accept a single amendment last night. You didn't confer with us when you did it, so that is why we are talking process. It is an unfair process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative COLE for yielding.

This impeachment process is a total sham. This resolution, which seeks to legitimize it, misleads the American public. Section 2 of this bill is titled, "The Open and Transparent Investigative Proceedings by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence," but the process set forth in this resolution is far from open and far from transparent. In fact, it is the exact opposite.

The resolution continues the closed-door meetings that blocks entry to Members of Congress and prohibits the President's due process rights. And it merely authorizes, but does not require, Chairman SCHIFF to make transcripts public.

Last night Republicans offered 17 amendments to add some fairness into the process, but Democrats rejected them all.

I had an amendment to ensure minority witnesses could call an equal number of witnesses as the majority. Democrats said no.

I had an amendment to require the Intel chairman to turn over exculpatory materials to the Judiciary Committee. Democrats shot it down.

I had an amendment to give ranking members the same authority as the chairman to submit materials to the Judiciary Committee. Democrats rejected that, too.

The process set forth by this resolution violates basic standards of fairness.

I urge opposition to this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The gentlewoman wants to talk about a sham process; let's talk about a sham process.

Instead of respecting the constitutional authority of the House of Representatives, the White House has obstructed our investigation, ignored our duly authorized subpoenas, withheld key documents, prevented witnesses from testifying, and intimidated witnesses. They have tried to disparage Members of Congress who are trying to fulfill their responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

Article I of the Constitution gives the House the right to investigate the President, and we are taking our responsibility seriously.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, the House impeachment inquiry is about abuse of power. It is about betrayal. It is about corruption. It is about national security. It is about the undermining of our elections. It is about defending our democracy for the people.

The House is a separate and coequal branch of government. We don't work for this President or any President. We work for the American people. We have a constitutional responsibility to serve as a check and balance on an out-of-

control executive branch. Our job is to ask difficult questions on behalf of the American people.

What we are doing right here is consistent with the words of James Madison who, in Federalist 51, said the House should be a rival to the executive branch. Why did Madison use the word "rival"? The Founders didn't want a king. They didn't want a dictator. They didn't want a monarch. They wanted a democracy, and that is exactly what we are defending right now. No one is above the law.

□ 1000

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my good friend, the distinguished Conference chair for the Republican Party.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank our Republican leader of the Rules Committee for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot this morning already, a desire, a desperation almost, on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the Nation take this body seriously. They need to start acting like they take themselves seriously, Madam Speaker.

When we are here gathered, discussing this most grave and solemn obligation we have, addressing impeachment, we know, Madam Speaker, what a serious process would look like. We have seen it before. We have seen Members on both sides of this aisle in the past when we have been engaged in the impeachment of a President act in a way that is serious, reflects the dignity of this body, and reflects the importance of the Constitution. That is the opposite, Madam Speaker, of what we have seen so far.

No matter what my colleagues say about this legislation, no matter what my colleagues say about the process they have been engaged in to date, it is absolutely the case that it has been a secret process that has denied rights to the minority, that has involved leaking selectively things that the majority would like to have leaked, in which rights have absolutely been denied, and they cannot fix that. They cannot fix what has been a tainted record and a tainted process by now suddenly pretending they are opening it up.

Madam Speaker, let me say one other thing. Every time I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about efforts to somehow undermine national security for political gain, I can't help but think about what they are doing precisely this morning.

When we are facing the threats we are facing as a Nation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—Speaker PELOSI, Chairman SCHIFF, and others—take what is arguably the single most important national security committee in this body, the House Intelligence Committee, and they tell the House Intelligence Committee: Turn away from those threats. Do not focus on oversight. Do not focus on the challenges

we face. Instead, we are going to consume you in a political, partisan process to impeach the President of the United States.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle will be held accountable by history for what they are doing.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, they will be held accountable by history for what they are doing. They have absolutely no right to talk about threats to this Nation if they are diverting the full attention, resources, and focus of the House Intelligence Committee onto a sham political process run by Chairman SCHIFF and Speaker PELOSI.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, having been through this before, I know how painful impeachment investigations can be. I also know that I am not alone in saying that supporting this continuing inquiry is not a decision that any of us makes lightly.

None of us ever hoped to consider investigating our own President for compromising our national security and obstructing justice. Regardless of political ideology, we all understand our constitutional duty.

It is with profound sadness and disappointment that we have to continue this investigation. The accusations the House is investigating go straight to the heart of our Constitution.

Our Constitution endows us with not only the authority but also the duty to hold our colleagues in the Federal Government accountable if they fail to act in the best interest of our Nation. I don't think anyone here believes that domestic politics should interfere with foreign policy.

I hope we will all vote to continue this investigation simply so that we can be clear on all the facts. More than anything, I am confident that all of us possess a capacity for fairness and a commitment to doing what is right for the country we love.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), my good friend, the distinguished Republican ranking member on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, the impeachment and removal of the President is a serious matter. At its heart, it lets a small, partisan group in Washington overturn the will of the entire American people.

Above all, Americans believe in fairness and, when accused, the right to due process. This sham impeachment offers neither.

It is secret. It is partisan. It is being conducted behind closed doors to hide information from the American people, all with one goal in mind: take down President Trump by any means necessary.

I will not legitimize this unprecedented and unfair charade with this vote today.

Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF long ago abandoned the due process and fairness that was guaranteed during the Clinton impeachment. I know because I was here in Congress for it.

There is simply no cause for this impeachment inquiry—none. It is shameful to create a constitutional crisis for purely partisan reasons.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 660.

I rise in strong support, but I do not take any pleasure in the events that have made this process necessary. I rise in strong support of the resolution, but I do so with an understanding that the task before us is a solemn one.

How each Member of this Chamber approaches the vote this morning, and the days and weeks ahead, may be the most important service as Members of Congress we will ever pay to the country and Constitution that we all love and have pledged to defend.

For the past several weeks, the Intelligence Committee, the Oversight and Reform Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee have engaged in an intensive investigation. That work, which has been conducted with equal opportunities for both parties to question witnesses, has added a great deal to our understanding of the President's conduct, as evident in the July 25 call record and the events that both preceded and followed that call.

That work has necessarily occurred behind closed doors because we have had the task of finding the facts ourselves, without the benefit of the investigation that the Justice Department declined to undertake.

Despite attempts to obstruct, we have interviewed numerous witnesses who have provided important testimony about the efforts to secure political favors from Ukraine. We have reviewed text messages among key players which show how securing political investigations was placed at the forefront of our foreign policy toward Ukraine.

This resolution sets the stage for the next phase of our investigation, one in which the American people will have the opportunity to hear from the witnesses firsthand.

We will continue to conduct this inquiry with the seriousness of purpose that our task deserves, because it is our duty and because no one is above the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my good friend.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, what began with a rallying cry of, "We are going to impeach the 'expletive deleted,'" to a crowd of liberal activists and young children by my colleague from Michigan on the very first day of this new Congress is now the majority's flagship initiative. What a shame, and what a waste of time in the people's House.

In my view, our President was doing his job, ensuring that if taxpayer dollars from my constituents and yours were going to the other side of the world, that it would be paired with a commitment to crack down on corruption at all levels, no matter who someone's daddy is or what their political ambitions are.

I think we all know that this was inevitable. From the moment Donald J. Trump was elected, the ends of harassment and impeachment have just been waiting for the means, and they think that they have found them. They are wrong.

There is, however, one small measure we can take as one House to bring a shred of dignity to these disgraceful proceedings. I can stand and be counted. We can stand and be counted, one by one, and announce our "yea" or "nay" with a vote by a call of the roll.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to begin my remarks with some of the most beautiful words in our country's history: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

It goes on immediately to establish Article I, the legislative branch; Article II, the executive branch; Article III, the judiciary—the genius of the Constitution, a separation of powers, three coequal branches of government to be a check and balance on each other.

It is to that that we take the oath of office. We gather here on that opening day with our families gathered around to proudly raise our hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. And that is exactly what we are doing today.

Sadly, this is not any cause for any glee or comfort. This is something that is very solemn, that is something prayerful, and that we had to gather so much information to take us to this next step.

Again, this is a solemn occasion. Nobody, I doubt anybody in this place or anybody that you know, who comes to Congress to take the oath of office

comes to Congress to impeach the President of the United States unless his actions are jeopardizing our honoring our oath of office.

I am grateful to our committee chairs for all the careful and thoughtful investigation they have been doing as this inquiry has proceeded.

Today, the House takes the next step forward, as we establish the procedures for open hearings conducted by the House Intelligence Committee so that the public can see the facts for themselves.

This resolution ensures transparency, advancing the public disclosure of deposition transcripts, and outlining the procedure for the transfer of evidence to the Judiciary Committee to use in its proceedings.

It enables effective public hearings, setting out procedures for the questioning of witnesses, and continuing the precedent of giving the minority the same rights in questioning witnesses as the majority, which has been true at every step of this inquiry, despite what you might hear fomenting there.

It provides the President and his counsel opportunities to participate, including presenting his case, submitting requests for testimony, attending hearings, raising objections to testimony given, cross-examining witnesses, and more.

Contrary to what you may have heard today, we give more opportunity to his case than was given to other Presidents before.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCHIFF for making that point so clearly.

These actions—this process, these open hearings, seeking the truth and making it available to the American people—will inform Congress on the very difficult decisions we will have to make in the future as to whether to impeach the President.

That decision has not been made. That is what the inquiry will investigate. Then, we can make the decision based on the truth. I don't know why the Republicans are afraid of the truth.

Every Member should support allowing the American people to hear the facts for themselves. That is really what this vote is about. It is about the truth.

What is at stake? What is at stake in all of this is nothing less than our democracy.

Madam Chair, I proudly stand next to the flag, and I thank the gentleman from New York for providing it for us. So many have fought and died for this flag, which stands for our democracy.

When Benjamin Franklin came out of Independence Hall—you have heard this over and over—on September 17, 1787, the day our Constitution was adopted, people said to him: “Dr. Franklin, what do we have, a monarchy or a republic?” As you know, he said: “A republic, if you can keep it.” If we can keep it.

This Constitution is the blueprint for our Republic and not a monarchy.

□ 1015

But when we have a President who says Article II says “I can do whatever I want,” that is in defiance of the separation of powers. That is not what our Constitution says.

What is at stake? Our democracy.

What are we fighting for? Defending our democracy for the people.

In the early days of our Revolution, Thomas Paine said, “The times have found us.” The times found our Founders to declare independence from a monarchy, to fight a war of independence, to win, to write our founding documents—and, thank God, they made them amendable so that we can always be expanding freedom.

And the genius—again, the genius—of that Constitution was the separation of powers. Any usurping of that power is a violation of our oath of office.

So, proudly, we all raised our hand to protect, defend, and support the Constitution of the United States. That is what this vote is about.

Today, we think the times found our Founders. The times have found others in the course of our history to protect our democracy and to keep our country united.

The times have found each and every one of us in this room—and in our country—to pay attention to how we protect and defend the Constitution of the United States: honoring the vision of our Founders who declared independence from a monarch and established a country contrary to that principle; honoring the men and women in uniform who fight for our flag, for our freedom, and for our democracy; and honoring the aspirations of our children so that no President, whoever he or she may be in the future, could decide that Article II says they can do whatever they want.

Again, let us honor our oath of office. Let us defend our democracy. Let us have a good vote, today, and have clarity—clarity—as to how we proceed, why we proceed, and, again, doing so in a way that honors the Constitution.

We must honor the Constitution in how we do this; we must respect the institution we serve; and we must heed the further words of our Founders, “*e pluribus unum*,” “out of many, one.” They didn't know how many it would be or how different we would be, but they knew that we needed to always be unifying.

Hopefully, as we go forward with this with a clarity of purpose, a clarity of procedure, a clarity of fact, and a clarity of truth—it is about the truth; it is about the Constitution—we will do so in a way that brings people together that is healing rather than dividing, and that is how we will honor our oath of office.

Madam Speaker, I urge an “aye” vote.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), my good friend and ranking Republican member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I would also argue that Article I does not say you can do whatever you want to do. The Constitution says that, and our Founding Fathers said that, as well.

Madam Speaker, for 38 days, I have objected to this impeachment probe because it denies due process, fundamental transparency, and basic fairness to Republicans, the White House, and the American people.

From day one, Democrats have ignored the rules and 45 years of historic impeachment precedent.

Without any authorization, ADAM SCHIFF has conducted a secret probe outside of his committee's jurisdiction. He has blocked us from calling our own witnesses. His witnesses are being interviewed behind closed doors in the most secretive room in the United States Capitol.

That is not democracy.

He has muzzled Republicans—I have been in the room—placing a gag order on depositions, while leaking cherry-picked facts to the press. He refuses to even allow us to read the transcripts without being babysat by a Democrat staffer.

He has refused to let us hear from the most important witness who brought this entire thing: the whistleblower.

He has barred White House counsel from any participation.

And now, 38 days into the Democrats' rush to impeachment, Speaker PELOSI claims she wants to establish “rules” and transparency. You cannot make your game fair by allowing the opposing team onto the field at the 2-minute warning.

The bipartisan precedents from Nixon and Clinton still must be followed, and they are not being followed under this resolution. White House counsel remains shut out of this process. This is unacceptable.

Only three times in our Nation's history has Congress exercised its grave power of impeachment.

Our Founding Fathers, in Federalist Paper No. 65, Alexander Hamilton warned us of abusing this power because they saw a future Congress abusing it.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCAUL. They foresaw a Congress at one point in history abusing this process for partisan political gain.

Madam Speaker, instead of overturning an entire election with a partisan weapon, we should just allow the American people to vote.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 660.

Madam Speaker, impeachment is not something that we take lightly, but

when the President endangers our national security, he gives us no other choice.

We now know from Trump's own call record that he pressured a foreign government to interfere in our elections and investigate his political opponent.

We now know that Trump potentially sought to apply leverage on Ukraine, first with a coveted White House meeting and, second, by withholding security assistance to fend off Russian aggression.

Today's resolution allows us to present these facts in a clear, professional, and fair way.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of H. Res. 660 so the American people can, too, learn the truth.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my good friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I have heard today how much my colleagues on the other side wish to make this an open and transparent process and "this is for we, the people." I would really like to believe that.

Yet, after they introduced the resolution, they have another full week of hearings behind closed doors, and they have scheduled another full week of hearings behind closed doors.

If this is about transparency, then open it up. If you want the American people to see it, open it up. Give Members access to the transcripts. Let the media into the room. Let us participate. Failing to do so denies transparency.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, from the very start of this inquiry, the White House has obstructed the House of Representatives. The White House has ignored duly authorized subpoenas and has tried to prevent witnesses from testifying.

The White House has also directed other agencies to do the same. The Department of State, the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and the Office of Management and Budget all have refused to produce a single document in response to valid subpoenas.

This is an unprecedented cover-up. The White House and its defenders in Congress have tried to justify it with baseless procedural claims that contradict the Constitution and historical precedent.

History will judge us all.

After today, there are no more excuses for those who want to focus on process instead of substance. After today, there are no more excuses for those who want to ignore the facts instead of defending the Constitution. And there are no more excuses for

those who turn a blind eye while the President pressures foreign actors to interfere with our democracy.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), another distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 660.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply troubled that this process has become necessary at all, but we have no choice. We must continue to investigate alarming allegations of misconduct by the President, and we continue with a public process through which all Americans will have the ability to access and to assess the evidence.

This has been and will continue to be a fair and sober inquiry. Members on both sides will continue to have the opportunity to question witnesses, seek evidence, and refute testimony presented during these proceedings. Indeed, the President will have strong protections as we weigh the evidence during our deliberations.

Our only goal is uncovering the truth: Did the President pressure Ukrainian leaders with the threat of withholding critical military assistance in order to serve his political interests? Has the President endangered American interests abroad by engaging in domestic political intrigue? These are serious issues, not of politics, but of national security.

This inquiry is our solemn obligation, but it is our obligation, nonetheless.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution so we may uphold our oath to the Constitution and preserve a transparent process on behalf of our Republic and the citizens it serves.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished whip of the House Republican Conference and my good friend.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. COLE, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Unfortunately, we have seen, since the day that President Trump was inaugurated, some people who made it public that they wanted to impeach him—not because there are high crimes and misdemeanors, which is the constitutional standard, but just because they don't agree with the results of the 2016 election.

That, Madam Speaker, is not why you impeach a president. There is precedent.

This has only happened three times in the history of our country. Every time, it not only started with a full vote of the House, but it also started with actual fairness. We are not getting that fairness today.

When you look through this resolution, in multiple places, it gives veto authority by the chair to literally reject any witness who is brought forward by the minority. So no rights for the minority unless the chair so designates.

In fact, in this resolution, it allows the chair to veto even the ability for the President to have legal counsel in the room. If the chair chooses, at his whim, they can literally kick out the President's legal counsel.

This is unprecedented. It is not only unprecedented, this is Soviet-style rules.

Maybe in the Soviet Union you do things like this: where only you make the rules, where you reject the ability for the person you are accusing to even be in the room to question what is going on, for anybody else to call witnesses, when only one person has the right to call witnesses.

And as we saw just the other day, the chairman was literally directing the witness to not answer certain questions by the Republicans. What kind of fairness is that?

Maybe you think it is fairness if you can run roughshod over somebody because you have got the votes, but that is not how impeachment was supposed to go. In fact, Alexander Hamilton himself, during the debate on the Constitution, in the Federalist Papers, warned of days like this, that the greatest danger is that the decision on impeachment "will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt." Alexander Hamilton warned about days like today.

This is not what we should be doing, clearly, when you ask the American people, who know that they are paying higher drug prices and they see that there is legislation, bipartisan legislation, to lower drug prices that won't come to this floor because of the infatuation with impeachment.

We don't even have a bill to formally pay our troops and make sure they have the tools they need to defend this country because there is such an infatuation with impeachment.

□ 1030

Madam Speaker, when you look through this resolution, you see how one-sided, how Soviet-style this is running. This is the United States of America. Don't run a sham process, a tainted process like this resolution ensures.

It ought to be rejected, and I think you will see bipartisan rejection of this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I support this resolution because it is the solemn duty of the Congress to investigate the serious allegations against the President.

I support this resolution because it is indefensible for any official to demand an ally—one depending on our support in an existential struggle with Russia—investigate his or her political adversaries.

I support this resolution because no person, Republican or Democrat, should be permitted to jeopardize America's security and reputation for self-serving political purposes.

I support this resolution because if, after a fair and thorough inquiry, the allegations against President Trump are found to be true, they would represent a profound offense against the Constitution and the people of this country.

I support this resolution because I believe it is the duty of this House to vindicate the Constitution and to make it crystal clear to future Presidents that such conduct, if proven, is an affront to the great public trust placed in him or her.

I support this resolution, not because I want the allegations to be true—they sadden me deeply—but because, if they are true, the Constitution demands that we take action.

I support this resolution because it lays the groundwork for open hearings. The House and the American public must see all of the evidence for themselves.

I support this resolution because I know we must overcome this difficult moment for the Nation. This resolution is necessary to ensure that our constitutional order remains intact for future generations.

I support this resolution because we have no choice.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am waiting for a speaker to come. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and rise to support moving forward to the next open phase of this impeachment inquiry so that the American people can hear from witnesses, see the evidence, and understand the troubling story of what has taken place in this administration.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my priorities are supporting American diplomats and diplomacy, working with partners and allies, and ensuring that our foreign policy advances America's interests.

This administration has, unfortunately, undermined all of those priorities since its first day. But in the last month, we have learned more and more about just how deep this goes.

The facts are clear: The White House launched a shadow foreign policy that circumvented and undermined our normal diplomatic channels.

A distinguished career ambassador was publicly smeared and pushed aside.

Critical military aid for Ukraine, a valued partner—locked in a life-or-

death struggle with Russia—was blocked.

The goal? Not some foreign policy priority; not an effort to make our country safer or stronger—quite the opposite, as delaying these resources hurt Ukraine and directly benefited Vladimir Putin.

Why, then? To pressure a foreign government to interfere in our 2020 elections. It is what the Framers feared most.

The President's own words say it best from the record of the call with President Zelensky as he sought the tools to push back against Russia. Mr. Trump's answer: "I would like you to do us a favor, though."

Since that first damning piece of evidence came to light, the Intelligence, Oversight, and Foreign Affairs Committees have worked to fill in the pieces of the puzzle, thanks to the courage of public servants who obeyed the law and testified, even in the face of bullying and intimidation from the administration and of ugly, baseless smears from the President's allies.

I condemn the shameful efforts to identify and harass the whistleblower whose life may be jeopardized for coming forward to tell the truth.

I salute all of those patriots, and I salute my fellow committee chairs Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MALONEY, and the late Mr. Cummings—

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for yielding.

I rise in support of H. Res. 660 and the process that is set forth within it by which the impeachment inquiry will continue to be conducted.

To be clear, contrary to what these desperate Republicans have claimed, the Constitution imposes no requirement that a procedural resolution, such as H. Res. 660, should be voted on by the House. Claiming otherwise is but a fabrication meant to distract from the mountain of growing evidence that demonstrates this President abused his power for personal benefit.

However, while not necessary, this resolution provides for impartial procedures similar to those used during the past impeachment proceedings.

Because Republicans requested a formal procedural vote, I expect nothing less than their full support for H. Res. 660. Anything less would be shameful.

As chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, we have been conducting credible investigations into the conduct of this administration. And this work—

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

Ms. WATERS.—will continue in the manner outlined by H. Res. 660. I look forward to Democrats and Republicans alike—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, "I would like you to do us a favor, though."

President Trump said those 10 words on July 25 to Ukraine's President before asking Ukrainian President Zelensky to investigate a potential political opponent.

For the past month, the Intelligence Committee has led an investigation into what happened around that phone call. In this early investigative stage, we have heard powerful, corroborating evidence that President Trump led an extortion shakedown scheme over the Ukrainians, leveraging \$391 million of taxpayer dollars to have a foreign power assist him in his upcoming campaign.

Just as powerful as the evidence we heard is the courage of the people who have come forward to provide it, defying lawless White House orders to obstruct and, instead, adhering to lawful congressional subpoenas.

The evidence, however, is not a conclusion. At this stage, we must move now to a public process with due process protections for the President to secure and test that evidence.

When our Founders designed the Constitution, they considered a lawless President and how to hold that person accountable. James Madison said the Constitution needed a provision for defending the community against lawlessness. Now we must solemnly embark upon this journey.

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

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire from my friend if he has additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we do.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, in that case, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today is a serious and solemn day for our country. The House's impeachment inquiry has exposed the truth and uncovered significant evidence that the President abused his power.

To honor the oath to defend the Constitution that each of us took, we must move forward with this impeachment inquiry. As Thomas Jefferson once said hundreds of years ago: "A sacred respect for the constitutional law is the

vital principle, the sustaining energy of a free government."

Let us honor the Constitution and defend it today by voting "yes" on this resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I did not come here to launch an impeachment process. However, the facts demand it. "A Republic, if you can keep it."

What we decide today will say more about us than it says about the conduct of the President.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, on opening day, we take an oath of office. We take an oath not to a king, not to a President, but to protect and defend the Constitution. It is our solemn duty.

In fact, this resolution sets forth the procedures for the next phase of our impeachment inquiry. We know substantial evidence has been presented that the President abused his power, undermined our national security, and undermined the integrity of our elections.

We are duty-bound to proceed. It is a sad day, but not because Congress has the courage to stand up for our democracy, but because the President's conduct has forced this action.

I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close for our side, so I will yield to the gentleman.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the resolution to ensure transparency for the American people.

My amendment will do three very simple things:

First, it will require the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to publicly release the transcripts of all depositions and interviews in a timely manner to allow any necessary redactions to protect classified or sensitive information.

My colleagues on the other side have been operating in secret and behind closed doors. They have been violating standing House rules by preventing Members access to documents, let alone sharing anything with the people who elected them to serve.

Second, my amendment requires the Intelligence Committee chairman to transfer all records or materials, including exculpatory records or materials, to the Judiciary Committee. The

chairman is instructed to, again, make the necessary redactions to protect any classified or sensitive information. In contrast, the Democratic majority's resolution lets the chairman choose what information he will share.

Finally, my amendment requires the Intelligence Committee's records and reports, as well as any material received from any other committee involved, be made available at least 72 hours prior to the Judiciary Committee considering any Articles of Impeachment or other recommendations.

The resolution before us today does absolutely nothing to guarantee that the American people will see this vital information.

The procedures my Democratic colleagues set up for this impeachment inquiry are fundamentally unfair and fundamentally partisan. They reject due process. They reject minority rights, and they reject adequate public disclosure.

The American people will not respect a process that is not fair, Madam Speaker. I urge the House to reject this measure, and I urge the House to insist on bipartisan procedures that respect the rights of the minority and the right of due process.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, elections have consequences. Our fellow Americans used their vote to choose who will work for them. So I ask you all a simple question—especially to my colleagues: Is that what is happening here today?

Are we gathered in these final moments, before we depart for a week, to fund our government or to pay our troops?

Are we gathered today to approve a new trade deal? Or are we gathered to debate the critical national security issues regarding China or Iran?

That answer would be unanimously "no." We are not working for the American people.

□ 1045

Those items would resemble the achievements of a productive Congress, a Congress that truly works for the people.

But do you know what this Congress counts?

This Congress' record is more subpoenas than laws. That is the legacy. It is not just devoid of solutions for the American people; it is now abusing its power to discredit democracy.

By using secret interviews and selective leaks to portray the President's legitimate actions as an impeachable offense, Democrats are continuing their permanent campaign to undermine his legitimacy.

For the last 3 years, they have predetermined the President's guilt, and they have never accepted the voters' choice to make him President. So for

37 days and counting, they have run an unprecedented, undemocratic, and unfair investigation. This resolution today only makes it worse.

I have heard Members on the other side say they promise rights to the President, but only if he does what they want. That is the equivalent of saying in the First Amendment that you have the right to the freedom of speech, but you can only say the words I agree with. That is what you call due process, Madam Speaker.

The amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. COLE, would help correct some of the transparency concerns we have witnessed over the last few weeks. But today is about more than the fairness of the impeachment process. It is about the integrity of our electoral process. Democrats are trying to impeach the President because they are scared they cannot defeat him at the ballot box. Those are not my words. Those are the words from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have offered impeachment three different times.

This impeachment is not only an attempt to undo the last election, it is an attempt to influence the next one as well.

This is not what Democrats promised when they entered the majority 11 months ago. In this Chamber, we heard from our Speaker. While we all sat here, we heard what the Speaker said when she talked about words of optimism and cooperation.

It was said that we would work together to make America stronger, more secure, and more prosperous. We were told our mission was to return power to the people. In fact, our new colleagues on the other side of the aisle were sent to Washington with a mandate to do just that.

So what has happened?

There is nothing like that today.

Not long ago, Democrats recognized that a partisan impeachment would put politics over people and harm our Nation.

That exact same Speaker talked about cooperation and talked about and promised the American people that they would be different if you trusted them with the majority.

Madam Speaker, you have failed in that promise.

That Speaker said: "Impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there's something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan"—the word bipartisan—"I don't think we should go down that path, because it divides the country."

What has changed since those words have been spoken?

Alexander Hamilton wrote that:

There will always be the greatest danger that the decision to use the impeachment power would be driven by partisan animosities instead of real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.

This sham impeachment by Democrats has proven Hamilton right, and it betrays the Speaker's own words.

I know emotions are high. I know Members would even run for positions of chair simply on the fact that they would be a better chair for impeachment right after the election. But when we all stood that day and listened to the words of the Speaker of cooperation, we all raised our hand to uphold the Constitution.

Tomorrow is November 1. We are 1 year away from an election, not just for this House but for the highest office of Presidency.

Madam Speaker, why do you not trust the people?

Why do you not allow the people to have a voice?

Why, in a process that America lends their voice to all of us, do you deny us the opportunity to speak for them?

Has animosity risen that high?

Has Hamilton been proven correct again?

Madam Speaker, there is a moment in time that you should rise to the occasion. This is that moment. This is the moment that history will write. History will ask you, Madam Speaker, when you cast this vote to justify something that has gone on behind closed doors, I want you to ask the historian and answer the question: What do you know that happened there?

Madam Speaker, have you read anything that took place that you just justified?

What do you believe the definition of "due process" is?

What do you think the First Amendment is, that you have the right to have a voice or only say the words that you agree with?

Madam Speaker, you may get elected in a primary, but in a general election, you are elected to represent the people of America, not to deny their voice.

This House is so much better than what is transforming today. I believe everyone who runs for this office runs to solve a problem. But when you go back to the American public with the achievement of more subpoenas than laws, that is not why you ran. That is not why we are here.

That is why I agree with my colleague, Mr. COLE, who believes in the power of the people and people before politics, that we believe and know we can do better, that we believed the Speaker when she spoke about cooperation, we believed her when she said that if you trusted them with the majority then they would be different.

Madam Speaker, I guess it is only fitting you take this vote on Halloween.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are directed to address their remarks to the Chair.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 minute remaining.

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

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

Let me assure the distinguished minority leader that this Democratic majority can legislate and also fulfill our constitutional responsibilities to hold

this President to account because it is our job. We took an oath to do that.

In terms of our legislative accomplishments, they are second to none. When the Republicans were in the majority, they shut the government down. Today the Education and Labor Committee just reported out the higher education bill, we passed a bill to deal with gun violence, we passed the Dream Act, and we raised the minimum wage. We are working on a bill to lower prescription drugs, and we passed a bill to protect our elections so Russia doesn't interfere in our elections ever again.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues that I am proud of the process we are following here today that brought us this resolution.

Madam Speaker, past Congresses under the impeachments of Presidents Nixon and Clinton found it prudent to have a resolution in place laying out the path forward, and that is what we are doing here today.

This resolution before us today is based on precedent. It includes protections for President Trump. The President's counsel is given the right to ask questions when the evidence is presented. The rules here expressly provide his counsel the chance to be invited to offer a concluding presentation. Neither of these things were guaranteed to President Nixon or President Clinton.

It lays out a clear path forward so that the American people know what to expect going forward.

Madam Speaker, the obstruction from this White House is unprecedented. It is stunning. We don't know whether President Trump will be impeached, but the allegations are as serious as it gets, endangering national security for political gain.

Madam Speaker, history is testing us, and I worry, based on what we have heard from the other side today, that some may be failing that test.

There are no kings and queens in America. That is what separates this country from so many other nations. No one is above the law. Let me repeat that: No one is above the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee and one of only 5 members and one of three Democrats to serve on that House Judiciary Committee during the impeachment of 1998, I rise in strong support of the Rule governing debate for H. Res. 660, as well as the underlying legislation—a resolution directing committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise the constitutional power, solely vested in the House of Representatives, to impeach Donald John Trump, the current President of the United States of America.

This is a somber and solemn time.

Today we choose our beloved nation over individual self-interest and a political party.

We choose due process, regular order and fairness.

And as the founding fathers crafted a document, which 230 years later, from 1789 to 2019, we can abide by, we choose the Constitution.

When the Framers of our Constitution designed our government, they bifurcated power between the federal and state governments, and divided power among the branches.

Indeed as the Framers debated ratification of the Constitution, they knew of the need to remove an individual who breached the public trust.

James Madison of Virginia argued in favor of impeachment stating that some provision was "indispensable" to defend the community against "the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the chief Magistrate."

With a single executive, Madison argued, unlike a legislature whose collective nature provided security, "loss of capacity or corruption was more within the compass of probable events, and either of them might be fatal to the Republic."

They wrote Article I and vested in the Congress the capacity to make the laws.

They wrote Article II, and in the Executive vested the power to faithfully execute those laws.

Because the House enjoyed a natural superiority, as most representative of the passions of the populace, the Framers vested in the House of Representatives the sole power of impeachment, and made the Senate the judges.

In Article II, they specified the standard by which a president or any constitutional officer is to be removed from office: for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

It is against that backdrop that we debate this resolution.

In support this resolution because it protects our interests, holds us responsible, protects the American people and gives the president ample opportunity to try to justify his conduct.

In September, members of the House of Representatives learned of a complaint filed by a whistleblower within the Intelligence Community.

The whistleblower alleged that on July 25, 2019, in a telephone conversation with the President of Ukraine, the American President sought to withhold foreign military aid from the besieged and beleaguered nation of Ukraine unless and until the Government of Ukraine produced or manufactured produced political dirt against a person he deemed his most formidable political rival.

The allegation suggests an effort and intent to extort the assistance of a foreign power to help the current president retain his office.

This is similar to the allegations surrounding his 2016 election victory, which were at the heart of the Special Counsel's Report regarding Russian election interference.

After the whistleblower's details were made public, the White House engaged in a series of untenable defenses, all designed to discredit the courageous whistleblower's account, which the Intelligence Community Inspector General found credible.

First, the White House indicated that the whistleblower should not be trusted because it referenced secondhand information, forgetting that much of the information in the Whistleblower's complaint was corroborated by the White House itself.

Next, the White House claimed, without proof, that the whistleblower was a liar.

Then, the White House spread a lie that it was a “perfect” call between the two leaders. Outrageously, the White House then claimed that Chairman ADAM SCHIFF is lying and had helped the Whistleblower draft his complaint.

That was before the President said that the whistleblower’s complaint is a lie made up by the “Deep State.”

And that was before the President said that he made the call at Rick Perry’s urging and that the phone conversations with the Vice President are more problematic than his.

The President and his last defenders are now trying to denigrate the life and accomplishments of Ambassador Bill Taylor, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, and decorated soldier, and dismissing him as a Never Trumper, as if that is a demerit.

This past Tuesday, Lt. Colonel Alexander Vindman, a member of the National Security Council who immigrated from Ukraine when he was three-years old and was dismissed by the President as insufficiently loyal to him, before one of the President’s acolytes suggested Lt. Col. Vindman held a greater loyalty for Ukraine over the United States.

Lt. Col. Vindman has loyally served our country and our Constitution. He was injured in the war in Iraq, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

It is thus fitting that when Lt. Col. Vindman appeared to testify in this impeachment inquiry, he did so wearing his Army class A uniform, and had inside his leg shrapnel from the attack that wounded him, and won him the commendation of his superior officers in the Army.

And when he began his testimony, he indicated just what service to this nation meant.

He stated:

I have dedicated my entire professional life to the United States of America. For more than two decades, it has been my honor to serve as an officer in the United States Army. As an infantry officer, I served multiple overseas tours, including South Korea and Germany, and a deployment to Iraq for combat operations. In Iraq, I was wounded in an IED attack and awarded a Purple Heart.

An immigrant to this country, Lt. Col. Vindman stated:

The privilege of serving my country is not only rooted in my military service, but also in my personal history. I sit here, as a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army, an immigrant. My family fled the Soviet Union when I was three and a half years old. Upon arriving in New York City in 1979, my father worked multiple jobs to support us, all the while learning English at night. He stressed to us the importance of fully integrating into our adopted country. For many years, life was quite difficult. In spite of our challenging beginnings, my family worked to build its own American dream. I have a deep appreciation for American values and ideals and the power of freedom. I am a patriot, and it is my sacred duty and honor to advance and defend OUR country, irrespective of party or politics.

When Lt. Col. Vindman testified, he spoke of the horror he felt when he realized that our country’s national security apparatus was being manipulated for the president’s personal and political gain.

He stated in his testimony:

On July 21, 2019, President Zelensky’s party won Parliamentary elections in a land-

slide victory. The NSC proposed that President Trump call President Zelensky to congratulate him. On July 25, 2019, the call occurred. I listened in on the call in the Situation Room with colleagues from the NSC and the office of the Vice President. As the transcript is in the public record, we are all aware of what was said. I was concerned by the call. I did not think it was proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen, and I was worried about the implications for 6 the U.S. government’s support of Ukraine. I realized that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens and Burisma, it would likely be interpreted as a partisan play which would undoubtedly result in Ukraine losing the bipartisan support it has thus far maintained. This would all undermine U.S. national security. Following the call, I again reported my concerns to NSC’s lead counsel.

Throughout the last five weeks, Congressional Republicans have presented a series of strawman arguments designed to deflect but not delve into the very serious charges against the President.

Congressional Republicans’ claims that the whistleblower complaint was hearsay are specious because its contents have been independently and repeatedly confirmed.

Similarly, there is no merit to the claim that there was no quid pro quo when the evidence adduced to date confirms there was.

In their perverse logic, Congressional Republicans decried the lack of due process for a man who once suggested that the Central Park Five should be summarily executed for a crime for which they were later exonerated, and could shoot someone in broad daylight with impunity.

Despite these specious arguments, it is likely that these process arguments are only made because the substance of the president’s allegations are utterly indefensible.

The American people and their elected representatives cannot be distracted; they are paying close attention to the substantial wrongdoing emanating from this White House.

They know what the President, which is why a clear majority support impeachment and removal of this President.

As the House of Representatives continues its impeachment inquiry, H. Res. 660 is an especially timely piece of legislation, which squarely addresses the concerns of the President’s most fervent supporters.

Specifically, this legislation reaffirms that the six investigating committees—including the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a senior member and which has exclusive jurisdiction to draft Articles of Impeachment—announced by Speaker NANCY PELOSI have been engaged in an impeachment inquiry and directs them to continue their vital work.

That we have been engaged in an ongoing impeachment inquiry was ratified by the Article III branch when Judge Beryl Howell, the Chief Judge for the United States District court for the District of Columbia, recently held that the House is conducting an impeachment inquiry, which does not require a formal floor vote.

Second, H. Res. 660 authorizes the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) to make public transcripts of recent depositions with appropriate redactions made for classified or other sensitive information.

This legislation, too, establishes procedures for all investigating committees to transmit their evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary for use in their proceedings.

The resolution is also prospective, as it relates to these hearings moving from secure intelligence facilities to public view. H. Res. 660 also serves to enable effective public hearings as it permits staff counsels to question witnesses for up to 45 minutes.

This is consistent with precedent established in 1998 of having staff counsel conduct initial questioning, followed by Member questions, by Republicans used to question Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr in 1998.

The resolution also continues the precedent of giving the minority the same rights to question witnesses that was afforded the majority. This has been true at every step of the inquiry.

Additionally, H. Res. 660 also permits the President opportunities to participate in this inquiry, in a manner consistent with past participation by Presidents.

The resolution establishes opportunities for the President or his counsel to participate in impeachment proceedings held by the Committee on the Judiciary, including to present his case and respond to evidence.

The President can submit written requests for additional testimony or other evidence.

The President can attend hearings, including those held in executive session, raise an objection to testimony given and cross-examine witnesses.

But, if the President unlawfully refuses to cooperate with Congressional requests, the Chair shall have the discretion to impose sanctions to enforce appropriate remedies, including by denying specific requests by the President or his counsel.

H. Res. 660 explicates the procedure that applies after testimony is adduced in the HPSCI.

H. Res. 660 directs the Committee on the Judiciary to review the evidence and, if necessary, to report Articles of Impeachment to the House.

Following the precedent of every modern impeachment inquiry, the Committee on the Judiciary will decide whether Articles shall be reported to the House.

H. Res. 660 is important legislation that specifies the parameters and the terms this body will follow as it undergoes its solemn and constitutional task.

It affords equal time to the Chairman and Ranking Member to question witnesses and it treats the President and his counsel fairly.

And, importantly, it lays out for the American people the manner in which this inquiry will proceed to the House Judiciary Committee—the committee of jurisdiction for impeachment and where I will bring to bear my decades of experience on Capitol Hill, including the lessons learned in the impeachment of 1998.

Unlike that occasion, the allegations at the heart of this matter are serious, and damning of the president’s conduct and fitness to serve and his ability to safeguard our national security.

These allegations represent a violation of his oath, a betrayal of our national interests, a repudiation of Americans’ cherished Democratic Values, and a violation of federal campaign finance laws.

When the President stated that Article II permits him to do whatever he wants, he was invoking a fear of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence.

As the author of one of our nation’s enduring documents, Jefferson was well-versed with

what troubles would merit the erosion of public trust in its leaders.

After all, the Declaration of Independence was a list of grievances of a lawless King, who felt impunity.

But, almost 50 years after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote to another of our nation's founders: Nathaniel Macon.

In 1821, Jefferson wrote: "Our government is now taking so steady a course, as to shew by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit, by consolidation first; and then corruption, it's necessary consequence."

It is clear that the consolidation that Jefferson feared—and the corruption which he said would be its necessary consequence—has now been realized in the actions of this President.

We will not permit this to continue and we will put a stop to it.

The President will be held to account. H. Res. 660 is the first step towards that accountability, and I am proud to support it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 660, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. COLE

In section 2, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) Not later than 15 days after the Permanent Select Committee conducts a deposition or an interview in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the chair shall make publicly available in electronic form the transcript of such deposition or interview, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

In section 3, strike "is authorized" and insert "shall".

In section 3, strike "to transfer" and insert "transfer".

In section 3, insert after "records or materials" the following: " , including exculpatory records or materials, with appropriate redactions for classified or other sensitive information."

In section 4, strike subsection (d) and insert the following:

(d) In the case that the Committee on the Judiciary proceeds to consideration of a resolution, article of impeachment, or other recommendation, the chair shall, at least 72 hours prior to committee consideration, make available to the public, the report received from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and any and all records or materials, including exculpatory records or materials, with appropriate redactions for classified or other sensitive information, that were transferred from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or any other committee involved in the inquiry referenced in the first section of this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam 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. COLE. Madam 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 196, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—231

Adams	Garcia (TX)	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Golden	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gomez	Omar
Amash	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Axne	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Bass	Grijalva	Pascarella
Beatty	Haaland	Payne
Bera	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Beyer	Hastings	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Phillips
Blumenauer	Heck	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Himes	Pressley
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Houlahan	Raskin
Bustos	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Huffman	Richmond
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Case	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Khanna	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kildee	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schneider
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schrader
Clay	Kind	Schrier
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Serrano
Connolly	Lamb	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Langevin	Shalala
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Courtney	Lawrence	Sires
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Craig	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Crist	Lee (NV)	Soto
Crow	Levin (CA)	Spanberger
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Speier
Cunningham	Lewis	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Stevens
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Suozzi
Davis, Danny K.	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
Dean	Lofgren	Takano
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján	Titus
DeBene	Luria	Tlaib
Delgado	Lynch	Tonko
Demings	Malinowski	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney	Torres Small
Deutch	Carolyn B.	(NM)
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Trahan
Doggett	Matsui	Trone
Doyle, Michael F.	McAdams	Underwood
Engel	McBath	Vargas
Escobar	McCollum	Veasey
Eshoo	McGovern	Vela
Españat	McNerney	Velázquez
Evans	Meeks	Visclosky
Finkenauer	Meng	Wasserman
Fletcher	Moore	Schultz
Foster	Morelle	Waters
Frankel	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wexton
Gallego	Nadler	Wild
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
García (IL)	Neal	Yarmuth
	Neguse	
	Norcoss	

NAYS—196

Abraham	Bishop (NC)	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Chabot
Allen	Bost	Cheney
Amodei	Brady	Cline
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cloud
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Babin	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Buck	Comer
Baird	Bucshon	Conaway
Balderson	Budd	Cook
Banks	Burchett	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bergman	Byrne	Curtis
Biggs	Calvert	Davidson (OH)
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney

DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Duncan	King (IA)	Rouzer
Dunn	King (NY)	Roy
Emmer	Kinzing	Rutherford
Estes	Kustoff (TN)	Scalise
Ferguson	LaHood	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Latta	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Lesko	Simpson
Fox (NC)	Long	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Gaetz	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Gianforte	Marchant	Spano
Gibbs	Marshall	Stauber
Gohmert	Massie	Stefanik
Gonzalez (OH)	Mast	Steil
Gooden	McCarthy	Steube
Gosar	McCaul	Stewart
Granger	McClintock	Stivers
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Taylor
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Thornberry
Green (TN)	Meuser	Tipton
Griffith	Miller	Turner
Grothman	Mitchell	Upton
Guest	Moolenaar	Van Drew
Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Wagner
Hagedorn	Mullin	Walberg
Harris	Murphy (NC)	Walden
Hartzler	Newhouse	Walker
Hern, Kevin	Norman	Walorski
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Waltz
Higgins (LA)	Olson	Watkins
Hill (AR)	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Holding	Palmer	Pence
Hollingsworth	Pence	Perry
Hudson	Perry	Peterson
Huizenga	Peterson	Posey
Hunter	Posey	Ratcliffe
Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe	Reed
Johnson (LA)	Reed	Reschenthaler
Johnson (OH)	Reschenthaler	Rice (SC)
Johnson (SD)	Rice (SC)	Riggleman
Jordan	Riggleman	Roby
Joyce (OH)	Roby	Rodgers (WA)
Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)	Roe, David P.
Katko	Roe, David P.	Rogers (AL)
Keller	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
McEachin	Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1119

Messrs. TURNER and VAN DREW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Miss RICE of New York changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 196, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 604]

YEAS—232

Adams	Allred	Axne
Aguilar	Amash	Barragán

Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)

Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—196

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook

Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher

Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta

Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford

Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Hice (GA)
McEachin
Rose, John W.
Timmons

□ 1127

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.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I request permission to speak for 1 minute out of turn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 656 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 823.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) kindly take the chair.

□ 1130

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

further consideration of the bill (H.R. 823) to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, with Mr. AGUILAR (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday October 30, 2019, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-264 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. TIPTON of Colorado.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 240, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

AYES—180

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

Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood

LaMalfa Olson
Lamborn Palazzo
Latta Palmer
Lesko Pence
Long Perry
Loudermilk Posey
Lucas Ratcliffe
Luetkemeyer Reed
Marchant Reschenthaler
Marshall Rice (SC)
Massie Riggleman
Mast Roby
McCarthy Rodgers (WA)
McCaul Roe, David P.
McClintock Rooney (FL)
McHenry Rouzer
McKinley Roy
Meadows Rutherford
Meuser Scalise
Miller Schweikert
Mitchell Scott, Austin
Moolenaar Sensenbrenner
Mooney (WV) Shimkus
Mullin Simpson
Murphy (NC) Smith (MO)
Newhouse Smith (NE)
Norman Smucker
Nunes Spano

NOES—240

Adams Finkenauer
Aguilar Fitzpatrick
Allred Fletcher
Amash Foster
Axne Frankel
Barragán Fudge
Bass Gabbard
Bera Gallego
Beyer Garamendi
Bishop (GA) Garcia (IL)
Blumenauer Garcia (TX)
Blunt Rochester Golden
Bonamici Gomez
Boyle, Brendan Gonzalez (TX)
F. Gottheimer
Brindisi Green, Al (TX)
Brown (MD) Grijalva
Brownley (CA) Haaland
Bustos Harder (CA)
Butterfield Hastings
Calvert Hayes
Carbajal Heck
Cárdenas Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN) Hill (CA)
Cartwright Himes
Case Horn, Kendra S.
Casten (IL) Horsford
Castor (FL) Houlihan
Castro (TX) Hoyer
Chu, Judy Huffman
Cicilline Jackson Lee
Cisneros Jayapal
Clark (MA) Jeffries
Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA)
Clay Johnson (TX)
Cleaver Kaptur
Clyburn Katko
Cohen Keating
Connolly Kelly (IL)
Cooper Kennedy
Correa Khanna
Costa Khanna
Courtney Kildee
Cox (CA) Kilmer
Craig Kim
Crist Kind
Crow King (NY)
Cuellar Kirkpatrick
Cunningham Krishnamoorthi
Davids (KS) Kuster (NH)
Davis, Danny K. Lamb
Dean Langevin
DeFazio Larsen (WA)
DeGette Larson (CT)
DeLauro Lawrence
DelBene Lawson (FL)
Delgado Lee (CA)
Demings Lee (NV)
DeSaulnier Levin (CA)
Deutch Levin (MI)
Dingell Lewis
Doggett Lieu, Ted
Doyle, Michael Lipinski
F. Loeb sack
Engel Lowenthal
Escobar Luján
Eshoo Luría
Españillat Lynch
Evans Malinowski

Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Beatty
Carter (TX)
Davis (CA)
Gohmert
González-Colón (PR)

Hice (GA)
Hudson
Lofgren
Lowey
McEachin
Plaskett

NOT VOTING—17

□ 1135

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 231, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

AYES—185

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw

Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Portenberry
Foa (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth

Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Roy

Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton

NOES—231

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans

Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Luján
Luría
Lynch
Napolitano
Neal

Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky

Wasserman	Watson Coleman	Wild
Schultz	Welch	Wilson (FL)
Waters	Wexton	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Beatty	Lofgren	Sires
Bishop (NC)	Lowey	Smucker
Brady	McEachin	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Mitchell	Timmons
González-Colón	Plaskett	Wagner
(PR)	Radewagen	Walberg
Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)	
Hudson	Rose, John W.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1140

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I
was momentarily indisposed and unable to
cast my vote on this amendment.

Had I been present, I would have voted
“yea” on rollcall No. 606.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 410, noes 6,
not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

AYES—410

Abraham	Buck	Cook
Adams	Bucshon	Cooper
Aderholt	Budd	Correa
Aguilar	Burchett	Costa
Allen	Burgess	Courtney
Allred	Bustos	Cox (CA)
Amodei	Butterfield	Craig
Armstrong	Byrne	Crawford
Arrington	Calvert	Crenshaw
Axne	Carbajal	Crist
Babin	Cardenas	Crow
Bacon	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Baird	Carter (GA)	Cunningham
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Curtis
Banks	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Barr	Case	Davidson (OH)
Barragán	Casten (IL)	Davis, Danny K.
Bass	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Bera	Castro (TX)	Dean
Bergman	Chabot	DeFazio
Beyer	Cheney	DeGette
Bilirakis	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	DelBene
Bishop (NC)	Cisneros	Delgado
Bishop (UT)	Clark (MA)	Demings
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Clay	DesJarlais
Bonomici	Cleaver	Deutsch
Bost	Cline	Diaz-Balart
Boyle, Brendan	Cloud	Dingell
F.	Clyburn	Doggett
Brindisi	Cohen	Doyle, Michael
Brooks (AL)	Cole	F.
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Dunn
Brown (MD)	Comer	Emmer
Brownley (CA)	Conaway	Engel
Buchanan	Connolly	Escobar

Eshoo	LaMalfa	Roby
Espallat	Lamb	Rodgers (WA)
Estes	Lamborn	Roe, David P.
Evans	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rooney (FL)
Finkenauer	Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rouda
Fleischmann	Lawrence	Rouzer
Fletcher	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Flores	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Fortenberry	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lesko	Rush
Foxx (NC)	Levin (CA)	Rutherford
Frankel	Levin (MI)	Ryan
Fudge	Lewis	Sablan
Fulcher	Lieu, Ted	San Nicolas
Gabbard	Lipinski	Sánchez
Gaetz	Loeb sack	Sarbanes
Gallagher	Long	Scalise
Gallego	Loudermilk	Scanlon
Garamendi	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Garcia (IL)	Lucas	Schiff
Garcia (TX)	Luetkemeyer	Schneider
Gianforte	Luján	Schrader
Gibbs	Luria	Schrier
Gohmert	Lynch	Schweikert
Golden	Malinowski	Scott (VA)
Gomez	Maloney,	Scott, Austin
Gonzalez (OH)	Carolyn B.	Scott, David
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner
Gooden	Marchant	Serrano
Gottheimer	Marshall	Sewell (AL)
Granger	Massie	Shalala
Graves (GA)	Mast	Sherman
Graves (LA)	Matsui	Shimkus
Graves (MO)	McAdams	Simpson
Green (TN)	McBath	Slotkin
Green, Al (TX)	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Griffith	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Grijalva	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Grothman	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Guest	McGovern	Smucker
Guthrie	McHenry	Soto
Haaland	McKinley	Spanberger
Hagedorn	McNerney	Spano
Harder (CA)	Meadows	Speier
Harris	Meeks	Stanton
Hartzler	Meng	Staubert
Hastings	Meuser	Stefanik
Hayes	Miller	Steil
Heck	Moolenaar	Steube
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Stevens
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Stewart
Higgins (LA)	Morelle	Stivers
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Suozzi
Hill (AR)	Mucarsel-Powell	Swalwell (CA)
Hill (CA)	Mullin	Takano
Holding	Murphy (FL)	Taylor
Hollingsworth	Murphy (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Thompson (PA)
Horsford	Napolitano	Thornberry
Houlahan	Neal	Tipton
Hoyer	Neguse	Titus
Huffman	Newhouse	Tlaib
Huizenga	Norcross	Tonko
Hunter	Norman	Torres (CA)
Hurd (TX)	Norton	Torres Small
Jackson Lee	Nunes	(NM)
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Trahan
Jeffries	Ocasio-Cortez	Trone
Johnson (GA)	Olson	Turner
Johnson (LA)	Omar	Underwood
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Upton
Johnson (SD)	Pallone	Van Drew
Johnson (TX)	Palmer	Vargas
Jordan	Panetta	Veasey
Joyce (OH)	Pappas	Vela
Joyce (PA)	Pascarell	Velázquez
Kaptur	Payne	Visclosky
Katko	Pence	Walden
Keating	Perlmutter	Walker
Keller	Perry	Walorski
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Waltz
Kelly (MS)	Peterson	Wasserman
Kelly (PA)	Phillips	Schultz
Kennedy	Pingree	Waters
Khanina	Pocan	Watkins
Kildee	Porter	Watson Coleman
Kim	Posey	Weber (TX)
Kind	Pressley	Webster (FL)
King (IA)	Price (NC)	Welch
King (NY)	Quigley	Wenstrup
Kinzie	Raskin	Westerman
Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe	Wexton
Krishnamoorthi	Reed	Wild
Kuster (NH)	Reschenthaler	Williams
Kustoff (TN)	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
LaHood	Richmond	Wilson (SC)
	Riggleman	Wittman

Womack	Yarmuth	Zeldin
Woodall	Yoho	
Wright	Young	

NOES—6

Amash	Duncan	Rice (SC)
Biggs	Gosar	Roy

NOT VOTING—21

Beatty	Lofgren	Sherrill
Brady	Lowey	Sires
Davis (CA)	McEachin	Thompson (MS)
González-Colón	Mitchell	Timmons
(PR)	Plaskett	Wagner
Hice (GA)	Radewagen	Walberg
Himes	Rogers (AL)	
Hudson	Rose, John W.	

□ 1149

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. KELLY of Illi-
nois). There being no further amend-
ments, under the rule, the Committee
rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
AGUILAR) having assumed the chair,
Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Acting Chair of
the Committee of the Whole House on
the state of the Union, reported that
that Committee, having had under con-
sideration the bill (H.R. 823) to provide
for the designation of certain wilder-
ness areas, recreation management
areas, and conservation areas in the
State of Colorado, and for other pur-
poses, and, pursuant to House Resolu-
tion 656, she reported the bill, as
amended by that resolution, back to
the House with sundry further amend-
ments adopted in the Committee of the
Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or-
dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
further amendment reported from the
Committee of the Whole? If not, the
Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a
parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman will state his parliamentary in-
quiry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when a
Member of the minority rises to object
to a motion to lay on the table, the
motion to reconsider to lay on the
table, whose discretion is it to recog-
nize that standing Member making the
objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman is not making a proper par-
liamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a
parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the
gentlemen seek a recorded vote?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I seek a
parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman will state his parliamentary in-
quiry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when a
Member of the minority party rises to
object to the motion to lay on the
table, not to reconsider a resolution,

whose discretion is it to recognize that standing Member making the objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is engaged in debate. The gentleman is not recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, that is a parliamentary inquiry. That is absolutely a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek a recorded vote?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under the rules, when a Member of the minority party rises to object to the motion to lay on the table the reconsideration of a resolution, under the rules, whose obligation is it, or at whose discretion is that Member recognized, under the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating an inquiry about the pending proceedings.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek a recorded vote?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of House deliberations, what options do we have to reconsider the amendments or to consider the vote on the amendments on this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair finds that the gentleman is referencing a previous resolution that was adopted by the House.

Mr. HARRIS. No, Mr. Speaker. I am referencing the piece of business that is in front of the House right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to the amendments?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek a recorded vote?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. What options are available to a Member standing asking for recognition to seek a vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek a recorded vote on these amendments? That is the pending matter before the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek a recorded vote?

Mr. HARRIS. No. I actually seek an answer to my first parliamentary inquiry, and you can have your choice which one the Chair wants to answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tipton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 823 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—EFFECT OF ACT

SEC. 501. EFFECT OF ACT.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act restricts or precludes—

(1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this Act or an amendment made by this Act, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within such an area;

(2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1);

(3) the use or establishment of—

(A) any new unit of special use airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area; or

(4) military aircraft from deviating from service level requirements if oxygen requirements, icing levels, engine power limitations, cloud clearances, or turbulence prevent such aircraft from safely transiting an area described in paragraph (1) while maintaining such service level requirements.

Mr. TIPTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, my district is home to the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, or HAATS. It is both a privilege and an honor representing the U.S. Department of Defense's lone training site where special aviators in the Nation's Armed Forces and the militaries of our foreign allies learn how to fly safely in mountainous, high-altitude environments. HAATS is a vital asset to our national security.

Proposed wilderness expansions in this bill around HAATS are creating concerns about the future of the site's ability to be able to ensure military readiness for the men and women who may be deployed in combat zones in the Middle East.

The sponsors of the CORE Act have indicated that their goal is to protect HAATS. The DOD looks to the Colorado-specific language of DOD's flight guidance, as published in the DOD AP/1 handbook, with regard to how to operate under the CORE Act.

While I appreciate the DOD's guidance, I know all too well that regulatory changes do not provide certainty. We cannot risk the guidance being overturned by future administrations.

So, in conversations with DOD, I asked if they had any objections to the Colorado language that is laid out in the AP/1 handbook being codified. Subsequently, in direct correspondence with my office on both May 13 and June 4 of this year, DOD both times stated no objection to the codification.

The only way to be able to provide certainty for HAATS is to ensure the implementation of the Colorado guidance by codifying that in this bill.

So, what is that guidance? Current law requires DOD aircraft to be able to fly at a minimum of 2,000 feet above designated wilderness areas. However, in Colorado, the terrain conditions make maintaining the 2,000-foot minimum altitude challenging and dangerous.

The Colorado guidance indicates that if oxygen requirements, icing levels, engine power limitations, cloud clearance, or turbulence prevent the DOD aircrews from meeting the 2,000-foot requirement, the aircraft are authorized to be able to deviate from the requirement to safely transit the wilderness areas.

You can see, clearly, why it is important that the CORE Act includes provisions to be able to codify the Colorado guidance. I do not understand the resistance of the majority to make this commonsense change to the bill.

Perhaps it is because some of my colleagues remain supportive of other pending wilderness legislation that, as drafted, would, among other things, have a direct and negative impact on HAATS, affecting aviators utilizing 71 landing zones amounting to 40 percent of the HAATS training area.

Perhaps the rejection of this commonsense idea thus far is yet another example of the need to be able to reach out to all stakeholders and hear the concerns and ideas from the district most impacted by it, not allowing important amendments even to be considered by this House. We let eight amendments, Mr. Speaker, sit in the Rules Committee, not allowing Members to be able to vote on them. These are voices from our communities in the Third District directly impacted by the bill.

It is important to be able to seek broad community support outreach. This is needed to be able to build true consensus for a successful public lands effort.

I will also note that calling up the ghosts of past failed public lands proposals that never had broad community consensus or got off the ground to begin with is not an adequate substitute for direct community outreach and consensus building, and also the compromise needed for a bipartisan success story. It is an unfortunate missed opportunity in the House to be able to get it right.

My good friend from Colorado's sense-of-Congress amendment that was just adopted is a good message on HAATS, but, after all, that is what a sense of Congress is: just a message with no legislative teeth.

Given wilderness legislation being considered by the House today concerning federally designated wilderness in Colorado, HAATS needs more than just a good message. It deserves something codified in law.

This MTR will do just that, at least in H.R. 823. We will be able to codify this and ensure that nothing in this bill will override the important Colorado guidance critical to the mission and operation of HAATS and the safety of our men and women in the United States military.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this motion to recommit that promotes our national security, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, this bill that we are considering today, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act, is about more than partisan debate. This bill is about hiking; it is about hunting; it is about fishing; it is about skiing—some of you all might not think I ski, but I do—it is about camping; and it is about a Colorado way of life and preserving our public lands.

The experiences we have outdoors with our loved ones bond us together. And, for me, that was hiking with my father in Rocky Mountain National Park.

Yesterday, my wife called me to let me know that our 1-year-old daughter walked for the first time. I cannot wait to go back to Colorado and be able to hike with my daughter in the iconic public lands that are protected under this bill.

Ultimately, this bill is about ensuring that we protect our most pristine and treasured places for generations long after we are gone. That is the essence of our service: leaving a better world for those who come next.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said: “Here is your country. Cherish these national wonders, cherish the natural resources, cherish the history and the romance as a sacred heritage, for your children and your children’s children. Do not let selfish men or greedy interests skin your country of its beauty, its riches, or its romance.”

At the end of the day, we have an obligation to protect these public lands, which is why I am so honored to lead this bill. And I will just say that we have worked incredibly hard to make this bill something that our State can be proud of.

I am proud that the House has voted to accept two of my colleagues’ amendments, because in Colorado we get things done by collaboration and consensus.

I am proud that every local jurisdiction impacted by a title of this bill supports those very same titles—Republican and Democrat.

I am proud that this bill has bipartisan support back in the State of Colorado.

It is unfortunate that this motion to recommit is not about any of those things: It is not about improving the bill; it is not about reaching consensus. It is purely political, and here is why.

Just a few moments ago, over 400 Members in this Chamber voted in favor of an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Colorado (Mr. CROW), who bravely served in our Armed Forces—fought for our country in Afghanistan and Iraq—and he offered an amendment to stress the importance of Colorado’s Army National Guard High Altitude Aviation Training Site.

That measure passed unanimously—or almost unanimously; I guess seven or eight folks voted against it—because they recognized that the HAATS program is something we must protect.

But the truth of the matter is this bill already addresses the concerns offered by my colleague.

I will quote from the bill on page 37, subparagraph (f): “Military Overflights. Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title restricts or precludes any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this title or an amendment made by this title. . . .”

I could go on, but you also are going to have to take my word for it.

I have a letter from the Colorado National Guard. As my colleague, Mr. CROW, said yesterday during floor debate, we ought to listen to our troops, to our commanders and what they have told us:

It is through the diligent efforts of staff within the Department, the offices of the bill sponsors, and the Department of Defense we have mitigated prior concerns related to military overflight over the potential wilderness areas identified in this bill, and I appreciate the efforts of Congressman NEGUSE and yourself.

The letter from the Colorado National Guard concludes by thanking the delegation for their effort to preserve Colorado’s natural beauty and looking forward to the passage of this important legislation. Those are not my words, those are the words of the Colorado National Guard.

It is important for us not to lose sight of the bigger picture. The CORE Act presents an opportunity for us to come together to show that we can still govern on issues that are so important to all of our constituents.

While I may be new to Congress, Mr. Speaker, the components of this bill that we are slated to vote on in just a few short minutes are not new to this Congress:

Title I of this bill has been introduced for five straight Congresses;

Title II of this bill dates back to 2009;

Local advocates have been asking for the withdrawal of the Thompson Divide since 2010;

Title IV of this bill was introduced in 2009.

Mr. Speaker, these bills have been around since George W. Bush was President. When those bills were being

drafted, the Washington Nationals had not yet played their first game in Nationals Park.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we all vote against this motion to recommit and support our public lands.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 210, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

AYES—199

Abraham	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Aderholt	Fox (NC)	Marchant
Allen	Fulcher	Marshall
Amash	Gaetz	Massie
Amodei	Gallagher	Mast
Armstrong	Gianforte	McAdams
Arrington	Gibbs	McCarthy
Axne	Gohmert	McCauley
Babin	Golden	McClintock
Bacon	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Baird	Gooden	McKinley
Balderson	Gosar	Meadows
Banks	Gottheimer	Meuser
Barr	Granger	Miller
Bergman	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Biggs	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Bishop (NC)	Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Newhouse
Bost	Grothman	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Guest	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Palazzo
Buchanan	Hagedorn	Palmer
Buck	Harris	Pence
Bucshon	Hartzer	Perry
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Porter
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Hill (AR)	Reed
Calvert	Holding	Reschenthaler
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Horn, Kendra S.	Riggleman
Chabot	Houlahan	Roby
Cheney	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Cline	Hunter	Roe, David P.
Cloud	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rose (NY)
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Conaway	Jordan	Roy
Cook	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Cox (CA)	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crawford	Katko	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Keller	Scott, Austin
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Simpson
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Slotkin
Diaz-Balart	Kinziger	Smith (MO)
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Dunn	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Lamb	Smucker
Estes	Lamborn	Spanberger
Ferguson	Latta	Spano
Finkenauer	Lesko	Staubert
Fitzpatrick	Long	Stefanik
Fleischmann	Lucas	Steil

Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, on rollcall no. 608, I mistakenly voted no when I intended to vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KELLY of Illinois). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 182, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—227

NOES—210

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Cabajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)

Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster

Adams
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Cabajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster

Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynd
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood

Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—182

Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Aguilar
Beatty
Brady
Davis (CA)
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Hice (GA)
Hudson
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowey
McEachin
Mitchell
Norman
Rogers (AL)
Rose, John W.

□ 1220

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 605, "yea" on rollcall No. 606, "yea" on rollcall No. 607, "yea" on rollcall No. 608, and "nay" on rollcall No. 609.

NOT VOTING—22

Beatty
Brady
Davis (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.
Hice (GA)
Hudson
LaMalfa

Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowey
McEachin
Mitchell
Norman
Rogers (AL)
Rose, John W.

Sherrill
Sires
Thompson (MS)
Timmons
Wagner
Walberg
Welch

□ 1214

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker. I was not present for the following votes due to the passing of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 603, "nay" on rollcall No. 604, "yea" on rollcall No. 605, "yea" on rollcall No. 606, "yea" on rollcall No. 607, "yea" on rollcall No. 608, and "nay" on rollcall No. 609.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE AMENDMENT TEXT IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO VOTE ON PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 660

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from the Rules Committee, Ranking Member COLE from Oklahoma, be permitted to insert the text of the amendment he would have offered had the House rejected the previous question on H. Res. 660, along with extraneous material, into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 660.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LEE of Nevada). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 30, 2019, at 1:32 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1678.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LLOYD HORWICH,
Legal Counsel.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2505

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representatives WELCH, KIRKPATRICK, TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and WESTERMAN from H.R. 2505.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, on of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING WASHINGTON NATIONALS ON WINNING WORLD SERIES

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, today is a serious day. Last night was an extraordinary night.

I rise for the millions of people who live in the Washington metropolitan area to congratulate and to exalt with all of our region on the extraordinary achievement of the Washington Nationals.

This morning in Washington, the heavens are crying tears of joy. In other words, it is raining. But there is no rain in any of our hearts or minds today. It may be raining, but the faces of Nationals fans are shining with pride and happiness.

For the first time in 95 years—we have waited a long time, Madam Speaker—the Major League Baseball team from our Nation's Capital is bringing home a World Series Championship. My colleague Ms. NORTON is here, being urged to put on a sweater, over her pride.

With the might of their bats and the lightness of their feet, the Nats pushed through to a hard-won victory in game seven last night against the Houston Astros—arguably, the best team in either league this year—who won the most games.

While I congratulate the Houston Astros on an extraordinary season, they just didn't count on the Washington Nationals.

But, today, the Houston Astros and the Washington Nationals are in absolute agreement. It is my understanding that they are sending a joint letter to Major League Baseball, saying: "We want all of our games to be road games from now on."

In case you didn't get that, neither team won at home. They all won games on the road. The good news was, the Washington Nationals had four games in Houston, and the Astros had only three games in Washington.

So there is joy in Washington this day. It is sustained by a spirit of camaraderie and sportsmanship. Our Nats grew strength from their dedicated fans across this region, including, of course, my district.

We have been waiting a very long time for this day, so I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the 2019 Nationals, led by their extraordinary manager Dave Martinez, who played earlier in his career for the

team that moved from Montreal to become the Nats. How appropriate. How wonderful.

I hope my colleagues will also join me in congratulating this year's most valuable player. Very frankly, there were a lot to choose from on the Washington Nats, who started out with a 19-wins-and-31-losses season.

What an extraordinary achievement to come that far that quickly, to meet, arguably, as I said at the beginning, the best team in baseball, the Houston Astros.

I also want to mention, as I said, the most valuable player. There were a lot to choose from. Stephen Strasburg was recruited and signed by the Washington Nationals some years ago as a very young man. He pitched extraordinarily, then got his elbow and had to be operated on, a Tommy John operation, they call it, and he has come back to be one of the best pitchers in the major leagues. He won three games. What an extraordinary achievement. So let's congratulate, as well as Stephen Strasburg, all the members of the team on this victory.

To paraphrase the old poem: "Oh, somewhere in this favored land the sun is shining bright;

The band is playing somewhere, and somewhere hearts are light;

And somewhere men are laughing, and somewhere children shout."

Today, Madam Speaker, that somewhere is the Nation's Capital.

Congratulations, Nationals. We love you.

□ 1230

SOVIET-STYLE IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, last week I joined several dozen of my colleagues at the SCIF in protest of the secret impeachment inquiry.

Seventy-five percent of the elected Members of Congress have been shut out of this impeachment inquest. This whole inquiry is a sham led by the Speaker of this House and her impeachment czar, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Their attempt today to try and open these proceedings is nothing short of Soviet glasnost—a fake transparency that only leads to less participation, more secrecy, and less due process.

Madam Speaker, this is too little too late. You can't unring the bell on this sham process that is your high watermark in seeking to undo the 2016 election at all costs.

Case in point: while saying there will be a resolution to try and bring transparency to these proceedings, this inquiry has continued to take depositions in secret. Democrats in this Chamber have been acting like bank robbers after they have tripped an alarm and they are trying to shove as much money in the bag as they can before the police get there.

We demand due process.

LAW AND ORDER IMPEACHMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a somber and solemn time.

I rise in support of H. Res. 660, a resolution establishing procedures for the impeachment of the President. I do it with a heavy heart.

But today we choose our beloved Nation over individual self-interest and political party. We choose due process, regular order, and fairness. We choose this little document called the Constitution, lasting for over 200 years.

We are reminded of the words of James Madison who argued in favor of impeachment, stating that some provision was indispensable to defend the community against the incapacity or negligence of the chief magistrate.

We do not do this in a rush, and we do not do it eagerly.

We are reminded of Lieutenant Colonel Vindman who came here at 3 years old. He said he had dedicated his entire professional life to the United States of America. And he said about the call that he was on: I realized that this was troubling, that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens, it would be heavy and wrong. I do not think it is proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen.

Again, we stand on the Constitution. We must do it right and do it fairly.

This is a somber and solemn time.

Today we choose our beloved nation over individual self-interest and a political party.

We choose due process, regular order and fairness.

And as the founding fathers crafted a document, which 230 years later, from 1789 to 2019, we can abide by, we choose the Constitution.

When the Framers of our Constitution designed our government, they bifurcated power between the federal and state governments, and divided power among the branches.

Indeed as the Framers debated ratification of the Constitution, they knew of the need to remove an individual who breached the public trust.

James Madison of Virginia argued in favor of impeachment stating that some provision was "indispensable" to defend the community against "the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the chief Magistrate."

With a single executive, Madison argued, unlike a legislature whose collective nature provided security, "loss of capacity or corruption was more within the compass of probable events, and either of them might be fatal to the Republic."

They wrote Article I and vested in the Congress the capacity to make the laws.

They wrote Article II, and in the Executive vested the power to faithfully execute those laws.

Because the House enjoyed a natural superiority, as most representative of the passions of the populace, the Framers vested in the House of Representatives the sole power of

impeachment, and made the Senate the judges.

In Article II, they specified the standard by which a president or any constitutional officer is to be removed from office: for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

It is against that backdrop that we debate this resolution.

I support this resolution because it protects our interests, holds us responsible, protects the American people and gives the president ample opportunity to try to justify his conduct.

In September, members of the House of Representatives learned of a complaint filed by a whistleblower within the Intelligence Community.

The whistleblower alleged that on July 25, 2019, in a telephone conversation with the President of Ukraine, the American President sought to withhold foreign military aid from the besieged and beleaguered nation of Ukraine unless and until the Government of Ukraine produced or manufactured produced political dirt against a person he deemed his most formidable political rival.

The allegation suggests an effort and intent to extort the assistance of a foreign power to help the current president retain his office.

This is similar to the allegations surrounding his 2016 election victory, which were at the heart of the Special Counsel's Report regarding Russian election interference.

After the whistleblower's details were made public, the White House engaged in a series of untenable defenses, all designed to discredit the courageous whistleblower's account, which the Intelligence Community Inspector General found credible.

First, the White House indicated that the whistleblower should not be trusted because it referenced secondhand information, forgetting that much of the information in the Whistleblower's complaint was corroborated by the White House itself.

Next, the White House claimed, without proof, that the whistleblower was a liar.

Then, the White House spread a lie that it was a "perfect" call between the two leaders. Outrageously, the White House then claimed that Chairman Adam Schiff is lying and had helped the Whistleblower draft his complaint.

That was before the President said that the whistleblower's complaint is a lie made up by the "Deep State."

And that was before the President said that he made the call at Rick Perry's urging and that the phone conversations with the Vice President are more problematic than his.

The President and his last defenders are now trying to denigrate the life and accomplishments of Ambassador Bill Taylor, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, and decorated soldier, and dismissing him as a Never Trumper, as if that is a demerit.

This past Tuesday, Lt. Colonel Alexander Vindman, a member of the National Security Council who immigrated from Ukraine when he was three-years old and was dismissed by the President as insufficiently loyal to him, before one of the President's acolytes suggested Lt. Col. Vindman held a greater loyalty for Ukraine over the United States.

Lt. Col. Vindman has loyally served our country and our Constitution. He was injured in the war in Iraq, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

It is thus fitting that when Lt. Col. Vindman appeared to testify in this impeachment inquiry, he did so wearing his Army class A uniform, and had inside his leg shrapnel from the attack that wounded him, and won him the commendation of his superior officers in the Army.

And when he began his testimony, he indicated just what service to this nation meant.

He stated:

I have dedicated my entire professional life to the United States of America. For more than two decades, it has been my honor to serve as an officer in the United States Army. As an infantry officer, I served multiple overseas tours, including South Korea and Germany, and a deployment to Iraq for combat operations. In Iraq, I was wounded in an IED attack and awarded a Purple Heart.

And immigrant to this country, Lt. Col. Vindman stated:

The privilege of serving my country is not only rooted in my military service, but also in my personal history. I sit here, as a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army, an immigrant. My family fled the Soviet Union when I was three and a half years old. Upon arriving in New York City in 1979, my father worked multiple jobs to support us, all the while learning English at night. He stressed to us the importance of fully integrating into our adopted country. For many years, life was quite difficult. In spite of our challenging beginnings, my family worked to build its own American dream. I have a deep appreciation for American values and ideals and the power of freedom. I am a patriot, and it is my sacred duty and honor to advance and defend OUR country, irrespective of party or politics.

When Lt. Col. Vindman testified, he spoke of the horror he felt when he realized that our country's national security apparatus was being manipulated for the president's personal and political gain.

He stated in his testimony:

On July 21, 2019, President Zelenskyy's party won Parliamentary elections in a landslide victory. The NSC proposed that President Trump call President Zelenskyy to congratulate him. On July 25, 2019, the call occurred. I listened in on the call in the Situation Room with colleagues from the NSC and the office of the Vice President. As the transcript is in the public record, we are all aware of what was said. I was concerned by the call. I did not think it was proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen, and I was worried about the implications for the U.S. government's support of Ukraine. I realized that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens and Burisma, it would likely be interpreted as a partisan play which would undoubtedly result in Ukraine losing the bipartisan support it has thus far maintained. This would all undermine U.S. national security. Following the call, I again reported my concerns to NSC's lead counsel.

Throughout the last five weeks, Congressional Republicans have presented a series of strawman arguments designed to deflect but not delve into the very serious charges against the President.

Congressional Republicans' claims that the whistleblower complaint was hearsay are specious because its contents have been independently and repeatedly confirmed.

Similarly, there is no merit to the claim that there was no quid pro quo when the evidence adduced to date confirms there was.

In their perverse logic, Congressional Republicans decried the lack of due process for

a man who once suggested that the Central Park Five should be summarily executed for a crime for which they were later exonerated, and could shoot someone in broad daylight with impunity.

Despite these specious arguments, it is likely that these process arguments are only made because the substance of the president's allegations are utterly indefensible.

The American people and their elected representatives cannot be distracted; they are paying close attention to the substantial wrongdoing emanating from this White House.

They know what the President, which is why a clear majority support impeachment and removal of this President.

As the House of Representatives continues its impeachment inquiry, H. Res. 660 is an especially timely piece of legislation, which squarely addresses the concerns of the President's most fervent supporters.

Specifically, this legislation reaffirms that the six investigating committees—including the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a senior member and which has exclusive jurisdiction to draft Articles of Impeachment—announced by Speaker NANCY PELOSI have been engaged in an impeachment inquiry and directs them to continue their vital work.

That we have been engaged in an ongoing impeachment inquiry was ratified by the Article III branch when Judge Beryl Howell, the Chief Judge for the United States District court for the District of Columbia, recently held that the House is conducting an impeachment inquiry, which does not require a formal floor vote.

Second, H. Res. 660 authorizes the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) to make public transcripts of recent depositions with appropriate redactions made for classified or other sensitive information.

This legislation, too, establishes procedures for all investigating committees to transmit their evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary for use in their proceedings.

The resolution is also prospective, as it relates to these hearings moving from secure intelligence facilities to public view. H. Res. 660 also serves to enable effective public hearings as it permits staff counsels to question witnesses for up to 45 minutes.

This is consistent with precedent established in 1998 of having staff counsel conduct initial questioning, followed by Member questions, by Republicans used to question Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr in 1998.

The resolution also continues the precedent of giving the minority the same rights to question witnesses that was afforded the majority. This has been true at every step of the inquiry.

Additionally, H. Res. 660 also permits the President opportunities to participate in this inquiry, in a manner consistent with past participation by Presidents.

The resolution establishes opportunities for the President or his counsel to participate in impeachment proceedings held by the Committee on the Judiciary, including to present his case and respond to evidence.

The President can submit written requests for additional testimony or other evidence.

The President can attend hearings, including those held in executive session, raise an objection to testimony given and cross-examine witnesses.

But, if the President unlawfully refuses to cooperate with Congressional requests, the

Chair shall have the discretion to impose sanctions to enforce appropriate remedies, including by denying specific requests by the President or his counsel.

H. Res. 660 explicates the procedure that applies after testimony is adduced in the HPSCI.

H. Res. 660 directs the Committee on the Judiciary to review the evidence and, if necessary, to report Articles of Impeachment to the House.

Following the precedent of every modern impeachment inquiry, the Committee on the Judiciary will decide whether Articles shall be reported to the House.

H. Res. 660 is important legislation that specifies the parameters and the terms this body will follow as it undergoes its solemn and constitutional task.

It affords equal time to the Chairman and Ranking Member to question witnesses and it treats the President and his counsel fairly.

And, importantly, it lays out for the American people the manner in which this inquiry will proceed to the House Judiciary Committee—the committee of jurisdiction for impeachment—and where I will bring to bear my decades of experience on Capitol Hill, including the lessons learned in the impeachment of 1998.

Unlike that occasion, the allegations at the heart of this matter are serious, and damning of the president's conduct and fitness to serve and his ability to safeguard our national security.

These allegations represent a violation of his oath, a betrayal of our national interests, a repudiation of Americans' cherished Democratic Values, and a violation of federal campaign finance laws.

When the President stated that Article II permits him to do whatever he wants, he was invoking a fear of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence.

As the author of one of our nation's enduring documents, Jefferson was well-versed with what troubles would merit the erosion of public trust in its leaders.

After all, the Declaration of Independence was a list of grievances of a lawless King, who felt impunity.

But, almost 50 years after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote to another of our nation's founders: Nathaniel Macon.

In 1821, Jefferson wrote: "Our government is now taking so steady a course, as to shew by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit, by consolidation first; and then corruption, it's necessary consequence."

It is clear that the consolidation that Jefferson feared—and the corruption which he said would be its necessary consequence—has now been realized in the actions of this President.

We will not permit this to continue and we will put a stop to it.

The President will be held to account.

H. Res. 660 is the first step towards that accountability.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee and one of only 5 members and one of three Democrats to serve on that House Judiciary Committee during the impeachment of 1998, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 660, a resolution directing committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Rep-

resentatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise the constitutional power, solely vested in the House of Representatives, to impeach Donald John Trump, the current President of the United States of America.

USMCA

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my support for the United States-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, a commonsense deal that supports farmers and workers.

However, USMCA sits unratified even as President Trump, Mexico, and Canada signed the agreement over a year ago. Each day that the USMCA is not ratified, we are losing out on valuable jobs and opportunities. Speaker PELOSI must get serious about bringing this legislation to a vote in Congress.

My Republican colleagues and I are ready to vote on the deal, but House Democrats setting their sights on the baseless impeachment of the President choose to neglect important opportunities like this.

I just voted against an impeachment resolution against the President when I should be voting on issues like USMCA.

I implore Speaker PELOSI to bring USMCA for a vote so we can finally deliver for American farmers and manufacturers. Let's get back to what we promised the American people we would do.

I hope that my colleagues across the aisle can agree that expanding access to markets, remaining competitive, and growing our economy is what is best for Americans instead of engaging in political shams that do nothing to move this country forward.

SAN PEDRO PACKAGES FOR PATRIOTS

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, currently military families who send all-important care packages to their loved ones overseas have to pay some postage. These families are already paying a lot just by enduring the absence of their loved one. That is why I am reintroducing the Military Care Package Program Act which would waive these postal fees for family-sent care packages.

In this spirit, I would like to take a moment to recognize an organization in my district called San Pedro's Packages for Patriots. Packages for Patriots have been sending care packages, letters, and comfort items to our Armed Forces members overseas since 2008.

These packages symbolize love and hope. For some soldiers, it truly means the world. This amazing organization was started by San Pedro residents

Mike Walker and his wife, Shirley Vojkovich. Together, along with their group of dedicated volunteers, Packages for Patriots has shipped over 16,000 care packages with over 200,000 pounds of supplies to American servicemembers deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I am sure every Member of this body would like to join me in applauding their efforts in support of our servicemembers overseas.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS BRYAN JENKINS

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, Michel de Montaigne once said: "Valor is stability, not of legs and arms, but of courage and the soul."

This quote describes Sergeant First Class Bryan Jenkins of Gainesville, Florida, who tragically lost his life during a military exercise last week in Georgia.

Throughout his 18-year military career, he has distinguished himself as a true patriot. Sergeant First Class Jenkins has a long list of accomplishments. He went on two tours in Iraq and also earned 14 different military awards.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Shana; his three children, Branson, Bryanna, and Delilah, as well as the families of the other two colleagues, Corporal Thomas Walker and Private First Class Antonio Garcia who were also killed during this exercise.

The impact that Sergeant First Class Jenkins had on those around him will not soon be forgotten. We thank him for all the sacrifices he made for this great Nation. He truly was a man of honor.

INTRODUCING THE THREE SEAS RESOLUTION

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution supporting the Three Seas Initiative to bolster energy infrastructure security in Central and Eastern Europe. I am pleased to co-lead this bipartisan effort with the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment, ADAM KINZINGER.

Energy security is national security. For years, Russia has sought to undermine liberty and security in Europe by forcing Central and East European nations into reliance on Russia for their energy needs. They do this through projects including the Nord Stream 2 and TurkStream, Russian gas pipelines.

Thankfully, 12 of our closest allies in Central and Eastern Europe have banded together to increase their energy

autonomy through collective financing of energy infrastructure projects: the Three Seas Initiative.

This resolution makes clear U.S.'s strong support for the initiative and encourages member nations to take action on joint financing of future projects. Additionally, it encourages the member nations to consider financing of clean energy projects as the world addresses our dire climate change crises.

In the face of increased Russian aggression, the U.S. must play a leading role in energy security in Europe, and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

CONGRATULATING OWEN ALLEN

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, 15 years ago a future gridiron star named Owen Allen was born. He was born with a gift, and that gift was superior athletic ability.

At 15 he is already a standout running back for the Southlake Carroll varsity football team. In last week's game alone, he rushed more than 200 yards and scored four touchdowns.

Madam Speaker, Texans love competition, we love champions, and we love winners. We find the best of all these things in high school football. If you want to know why Texans are crazy about those Friday night lights, look no further than Owen Allen. His performance on the field excites and inspires.

Running back Allen was just named the Dallas-Fort Worth High School Offensive Player of the Week. But athleticism is only one of young Mr. Allen's qualities. He is also a young man of great character, integrity, and decency.

As a Member of Congress, I congratulate Mr. Allen and wish him many years of success as an athlete and as a human being. I have prayed God's blessings on him and his family.

ACCIDENTAL SHOOTINGS

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

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, every single day, eight kids are killed or injured by unintentional shootings with guns found in the home. Last week a 9-year-old child accidentally shot their 4-year-old sibling in the face at their home in Tennessee. Earlier this year a 4-year-old boy in Oakland barely survived after accidentally shooting himself in the head with a gun he found under the pillow.

These accidental shootings are preventable. That is why I am introducing the Prevent Family Fire Act of 2019, a bipartisan bill to reduce gun violence by providing a modest tax credit to incentivize the sale of things like gun

safes. If we expand safe storage, we can reduce accidental shootings by 73 percent.

It is not just accidental shootings. Over 75 percent of school shootings involve kids and teens having access to unsecured guns at home, and more than 80 percent of guns used by youth in suicide attempts were kept in the home of a victim, a relative, or a friend.

There is much more we need to do to address gunfire, but this commonsense bill is a step we can take to save lives.

VOTERS ARE ANGRY AT MEDIA

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, a Rasmussen poll conducted on October 2 of 2019 found that a sky-high 69 percent of independent voters were "angry" at the media, and over 60 percent of all voters share that anger.

These voters are not upset at the media because they are balanced and fair, they are upset because the media is biased and telling them what to think—or not telling them at all.

The results of this astounding poll didn't appear in the Nation's largest newspapers or the most watched TV news programs and was hardly mentioned on social media.

The media's credibility is already at a record low. The road back to credibility for the media is to give the American people the truth and let them make up their own minds.

AMERICA'S GROWING AGING POPULATION

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

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to praise the House for unanimously passing the Dignity in Aging Act. This act includes two bipartisan bills that I led to respond to challenges facing a growing aging American population: social isolation and younger onset Alzheimer's.

As I heard from seniors and their families in my district at my seniors workshop, we need to do more to support caregivers, improve economic opportunities for older individuals, and ensure Americans can age with dignity, security, and quality of life. This act does that.

This week Democrats and Republicans worked together in Washington to pass the Dignity in Aging Act. That is a win for Congress, a win for seniors, and a win for the American people.

□ 1245

PASS LEGISLATION FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, Congress exists to serve the American people by passing legislation that will protect their rights and promote their welfare.

Since January of this year, House Democrats have been vigorously legislating for the people and have passed more than 200 bills—200 bills—bills to secure a living wage for American workers, bills to protect pensions and fight discrimination in the workplace, bills to expand access to healthcare and lower the cost of prescription drugs. We have passed bills to safeguard our elections, the bedrock of our democracy, from both foreign and domestic interference.

In contrast, the Republican-controlled Senate has offered little but obstruction and inaction. Their leader proudly calls himself the “grim reaper” for laying waste to our 200 bills.

So, I rise today to implore Senate lawmakers: Do your job. Take up these House-passed measures and start serving the American people.

HONORING FIL BAKE SHOP DURING FILIPINO AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on the last day of Filipino American Heritage Month, to honor the Fil Bake Shop in Delano, California, and to congratulate them on becoming the Delano Business of the Year.

Owner Tessie Patricio, or Auntie Tess, and workers of the Fil Bake Shop have been dedicated to hard work and unconditional love for their business for nearly 30 years. As a result, Fil Bake Shop has become a staple of the Delano community and a personal favorite of mine.

One-third of the 52,000 residents of Delano are Filipino, and Fil Bake Shop has been a steadfast supporter of our community in Delano and across the Pacific.

When the Philippines are struck by natural disasters, Fil Bake Shop sends care to the islands. They collect donations in times of disaster to support families back in the Philippines, while still providing the hardworking farmworkers and families of Delano with their delicious sweetbreads.

As this local gem is honored as Business of the Year by the Delano Filipino community, I am proud to represent such a tremendous place in the 21st District of California.

CELEBRATING A DOUBLE WIN FOR D.C.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, with the impeachment inquiry vote, the House made history today, but the Washington Nationals made unprecedented history just last night.

Our D.C. Nats won the World Series for the very first time in American history. Our Nats were the underdogs throughout the series, just like their hometown, the District of Columbia, has been for 218 years.

But hold on, America. We are about to make it a double: Nats' victory last night; House passage of H.R. 51, the D.C. statehood bill, during the 116th Congress.

Watch for how I make my friend, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, pay up on our bet against the Houston Astros.

Go Nats! Long live D.C. statehood!

HONORING OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, on Veterans Day, we remember the devotion of the brave men and women of the military who have honorably served our Nation. Our veterans have fought to preserve this Nation, its ideals, democracy, freedom, and prosperity.

American veterans not only have helped maintain the rights that were established by our Founding Fathers, but they have also set an example of enduring patriotism, returning home to become leaders in their communities, States, and Nation. Back home, they have helped advance our country by embodying the American spirit of hard work and preservation.

Today, we acknowledge these men and women who have served our Nation as members of our military. We thank them for their many contributions to our country. We remember in prayer those men and women who never returned home from foreign soil.

SPEAK OUT AGAINST GENOCIDE

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, the history of the United States has been intertwined with that of the Armenian people and the Armenian genocide.

It was American missionaries and diplomats who let the world know that the Ottoman Empire was attempting to cleanse itself of the Armenian and Christian populations. The U.S. became home to many survivors.

Their experience inspired Raphael Lemkin to create the term “genocide,” only to see his Jewish family suffer the same fate at the hands of Nazi Germany.

The denial of the Armenian genocide has had contemporary consequences. I have visited both Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I saw that a Turkey which denies genocide has no fear of committing it again. In fact, Turkey has begun an ethnic cleansing of the Syrian Kurds in northern Syria.

I have long called for our government to officially recognize the Armenian genocide. I am an original cosponsor of H. Res. 296.

The House has spoken with a clear voice, breaking the silence, recognizing the Armenian genocide. We call on the Senate and President Trump to do the same.

We cannot allow history to repeat itself.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in observance of Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Over 25 years ago, I was in an abusive relationship with my ex-husband. I became a single mother to a young daughter, working just to survive day to day. I never dreamed in a million years that I would be standing here before you today as a Member of Congress, speaking on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. But I not only survived, I thrived.

I share my story in hopes of helping others. I hope they find strength in our efforts to acknowledge their suffering and recognize the many organizations that exist to help them today.

TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON AS A BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY UNDER AGOA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-77)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 506A(a)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)(B)), I am providing notice of my intent to terminate the designation of the Republic of Cameroon (Cameroon) as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA).

I am taking this step because I have determined that the Government of Cameroon currently engages in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, contravening the eligibility requirements of section 104 of the AGOA.

Despite intensive engagement between the United States and the Government of Cameroon, Cameroon has

failed to address concerns regarding persistent human rights violations being committed by Cameroonian security forces. These violations include extrajudicial killings, arbitrary and unlawful detention, and torture.

Accordingly, I intend to terminate the designation of Cameroon as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under the AGOA as of January 1, 2020. I will continue to assess whether the Government of Cameroon engages in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, in accordance with the AGOA eligibility requirements.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 31, 2019.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-78)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Sudan declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2019.

Despite recent positive developments, the crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13067; the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006; and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, and Executive Order 13804 of July 11, 2017, has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067, as expanded by Executive Order 13400, with respect to Sudan.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 31, 2019.

IMPEACHMENT: THEN AND NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we had a vote today. Some would say it was very important, but actually, it didn't do so much. In fact, it revoked some of our history, some of our precedent, some of our rules to take an unusual step toward supposed impeachment.

I still continue to be of the opinion that we will not end up having a vote in this Chamber on whether or not to actually impeach President Trump because if that happens, it goes to the Senate. It gets slam-dunked down in the Senate, both on the basis of a massive failure of due process as well as no direct evidence of any wrongdoing, unless we are talking about someone who is a Democrat and has held the second-highest office before. But this is not due process.

By the way, of course, once it gets to the Senate, they vote it down, and then it ensures a repeat of 1996, where the current President is reelected. I am sure my friends across the aisle don't want to do that.

I am still of the opinion that I don't think we will end up with a vote to actually impeach or not impeach President Trump. We will see how that plays out. But it is worth looking at precedent, as an old history major who has never quit studying history.

If we look at the impeachment committee authorizations in 1974 and 1998, back then, when there was bipartisan concern about due process, not just one-sided concern, the authorization by the House directed the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate if there were sufficient grounds for impeachment.

Currently, though, the Speaker directed six different committees, with the House Intelligence Committee at the forefront, to continue their ongoing investigations as part of what was called an impeachment inquiry.

Regarding the subpoena power in 1974 and 1998, what was authorized in the resolution back in the days when there was concern about due process and fairness and ensuring justice would be done, the resolution authorized both the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary to issue subpoenas acting jointly or unilaterally.

□ 1300

If either the chairman or the ranking member declined to act, then the other had the right to refer the decision to the full committee.

Currently, under what we voted on today, it authorized the chair of the Intelligence Committee, Chairman SCHIFF, and Judiciary Committee to issue subpoenas, but the authorization to the ranking member only is with the consent or approval of the chairman. It is incredible.

I mean, basically, our friends have said, well, it is like a grand jury. Well,

I have been a prosecutor in front of grand juries. I have been a judge who impaneled grand juries, answered their questions, and dealt with issues that arose over grand juries. I am quite familiar with them.

With a grand jury, every single person on the grand jury who is going to get a vote gets to hear every witness, gets to ask any question they wish, and they could even send the prosecutor out of the grand jury if they wish. He is only there as an adviser.

But what we have had not only was a sham impeachment inquiry, but they actually had armed guards outside of the Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility, the SCIF. They had armed guards with guns to try to keep us out, people like me, on the Judiciary Committee, who is fully authorized, under the current rules, to sit in on any impeachment inquiry, participate, because the rules, through precedent, have made clear it is the Judiciary Committee that does that.

The Speaker can't just stand up and say: "I am changing all the rules unilaterally"—except for the fact that, in this case, that is exactly what happened. "Forget the rules. I am decreeing these are the committees that will do an investigation."

And I didn't realize until we went into the SCIF, which I am authorized to do and which, under the rules, Judiciary having jurisdiction, I should have a right to hear each one of those witnesses.

I didn't know until we got in there, it turns out, Chairman SCHIFF, each time a witness was about to begin to speak to the Intelligence Committee, the committees, he would instruct, now, this is unclassified, so if a question is asked that you think might end up revealing something classified, then you can just say you can't answer, it might reveal classified information.

It sounds to me like that was instruction, when the Republicans ask you a question you don't want to answer, just say, well, it may reveal classified information, and you don't have to answer their questions.

Except that then we find out that, in the more recent depositions, the witnesses were actually instructed not to answer questions.

Well, this metaphor of a grand jury totally breaks down. It doesn't apply. There has never been a grand jury where one grand juror could tell the witness you don't have to answer these other grand jurors' questions, and we are going to put armed guards where people that are on the grand jury can't get in to hear the testimony if we don't want to hear the testimony.

Sure, they will have to vote at some point, but we are going to put armed guards to keep the biggest part of the grand jury out of being able to see the witnesses, to see their countenance as they answered questions.

It is why in military courts martial that I participated in, in Federal trials, in State trials we have an aversion to

having depositions. Yes, you have a lot of depositions in civil trials.

But in criminal trials, something as important as liberty—and I would submit, a President being thrown out that was duly elected is just as important. In such a case, you get to ask the questions, see the questions; you get to hear the answers; and you get to observe the witnesses. It is important.

Yet, under orders of the Speaker and Chairman SCHIFF, this so-called comparative grand jury kept the huge majority out of those hearings where we could hear and see for ourselves.

Now we find out, through the vote today, that, yes, the Judiciary Committee is ultimately going to get this from the Intelligence Committee. But never in the history of this country have we had such gross unfairness that one party would put armed guards with guns to prevent the duly authorized people from being able to hear the witnesses and see them for themselves.

Then, oh, we hear from this resolution today, we are going to send you the depositions after we get through doctoring and looking at and editing the transcripts. We will send you those so you have the evidence you need.

That is not the kind of evidence that a coup should be based on. If we are going to have what they are trying to legalize as a coup, we ought to have a right to see each of those witnesses. And the only potential use for the depositions should be impeachment of those witnesses, nothing else, not for anything substantive.

The President's attorneys, unlike in 1974 and 1998, were not allowed to be there or even see and hear the witnesses. So the references to this being a Star Chamber are not inappropriate. It is outrageous what has been going on for people who truly care about due process.

Regarding the procedures now, the Judiciary Committee must operate pursuant to the procedures imposed by the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Well, previously, one of the oldest committees in the House of Representatives, the Judiciary Committee, in prior impeachments made the rules for the impeachment hearing. We didn't have it dictated by the Rules Committee, no, because this is the Judiciary Committee. These are people who are supposed to have expertise in constitutional issues.

So when you have the committee that has more expertise in constitutional issues, what did the majority do? We don't want the committee with the most expertise on constitutional issues dealing with these constitutional issues. We want to put armed guards outside a hearing and have it in a Secret Compartmented Information Facility.

And we are not going to let the other side call their own witnesses so we get a fair picture of what actually went on, and we are not even going to let them ask questions we don't want them to ask. We will instruct the witnesses not

to answer because, you see, they want it to be a one-sided, non-due process, sham court.

It is about to push this country to a civil war if they were to get their wishes. And if there is one thing I don't want to see in my lifetime, I don't want to ever have participation in, it is a civil war.

Some historian—I don't remember who—said guns are only involved in the last phase of a civil war. What is going on here has not protected the Constitution. It has not protected the institutions. It has not protected this little experiment in self-government. No.

What it has done is put it all at risk because what some people in this body don't seem to understand is, when you set a precedent as dangerous as what we have been watching for the last 3 years, it won't be me, but there will be Republicans, if this isn't stopped, there will be Republicans who will take the precedent of what the Democrats have done here and use it against a Democratic President, try to set him up and create a coup.

Like I say, it won't be me, but that is the way history works. When somebody sets a precedent, then eventually somebody also not concerned about due process is going to try to mimic that and go one further.

In 1974 and 1998, the committee procedures during the Nixon and Clinton impeachment processes, they included the ability of the President's counsel to attend all hearings, including those in executive session; question any and all witnesses called before the committee; submit written questions for additional testimony; provide summaries of what he would propose to show; and respond to evidence received and testimony presented, either orally or in writing, as determined by the committee. The President's counsel could also review all evidence obtained in the course of the impeachment inquiry.

Not only has the President's counsel not been allowed to do any of those things that have been done in the past to ensure due process and fairness, even the rest of this voting body that will have to vote on an impeachment were not allowed to see the witnesses, to hear the witnesses, to review the transcript until after they are through working with the transcripts.

This resolution today, it bifurcates the impeachment, only allows the President's counsel to participate in Judiciary Committee proceedings. It provides no ability to participate in the ongoing Intelligence Committee investigation.

If we presume that the procedures the Rules Committee has dictated to us on high allow the President's counsel to participate in Judiciary Committee proceedings at all, they will only have access to documents transmitted to the Judiciary Committee and not all the material obtained in the course of the Intelligence Committee's hearings.

I just happen to have H. Res. 803 from 1974 that involved—well, it was from

Chairman—Democratic Chairman Rodino, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

See, that is the way it is supposed to be done. That is the way it has been done in the past, 1974, 1998.

Under the rules that the Democrats passed earlier this year, in January, the rules say, if a rule is not specific about a matter, then precedence is the rule. That is the rule, and it has been ignored repeatedly.

So we voted today basically rubberstamping the secret Star Chamber hearings, the one-sided questioning of the witnesses. Oh, we did hear today Republicans have equal time to the Democrats. It is just that Democrats could ask whatever they wanted and get answers, and Republicans couldn't.

Impeachment in the past, when we have impeached Federal judges before, came through our Judiciary Committee, very bipartisan, because, even as recent as the last 10, 12 years, even ADAM SCHIFF realized, when you are going to remove a Federal officer from a position he is duly placed in, you have got to make sure you provide due process, and you allow buy-in on both sides.

There was no buy-in today because, even though there are some Republicans who are not big fans of the President, to put it mildly, they realize this process is an outrage, and it is a threat to our little experiment in self-government.

□ 1315

So an article comes out yesterday by Paul Sperry, entitled: "The Beltway's 'Whistleblower' Furor Obsesses Over One Name."

To my knowledge, I have not ever talked to this Paul Sperry with RealClearInvestigations, but he brings out a name that has been bandied about on the internet. A lot of people are speculating this guy was the whistleblower.

Regardless of whether this guy is the whistleblower or not, it is important to look at what has been going on with him. Just forget about the claim he is a whistleblower; look at what he has been doing.

The more you find out, the more you realize, wow, President Trump should have revoked clearances for prior potential conspirators long before he did.

But then, in the article, it mentions a 33-year-old—we already knew he was a male, that he worked for Vice President Biden, this guy. He was held over from the Obama White House.

And one of the things that President Obama was able to do so much better than President Trump was make sure that the people who worked in the White House, in the CIA, in the DOJ, the FBI, but especially in the White House, in the Old Executive Office Building for the Vice President, they made much better certainty that everybody there was going to be loyal to President Obama and Vice President Biden. They did a magnificent job of that.

So anybody who is held over—in fact, I understand H. R. McMaster, great Obama Democrat loyalist that was working, continuing to work in the Trump administration, made clear that he didn't want to hear any of his people ever say again that someone was an Obama holdover. I guess he didn't want people outed in front of people loyal to the President as being loyal to President Obama.

But McMaster also was a boss of this guy. He did work for Biden. He worked for CIA Director John Brennan.

Brennan, as the article said, was "a vocal critic of Trump who helped initiate the Russia 'collusion' investigation of the Trump campaign during the 2016 election."

Further, this guy "left his National Security Council posting in the White House's West Wing in mid-2017. . . ."

This guy was working in the White House; Loved Brennan, loved McMaster, and he is in President Trump's White House and part of the National Security Council. They get to see everything that concerns anything on foreign policy and our own national security.

But there were "concerns about negative leaks to the media. He has since returned to CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia."

The article says: "'He was accused of working against Trump and leaking against Trump,' said a former NSC official, speaking on condition of anonymity to discuss intelligence matters."

Alas, this guy "huddled for 'guidance' with the staff of House Intelligence Committee Chairman ADAM SCHIFF, including former colleagues also held over from the Obama era whom SCHIFF's office had recently recruited from the National Security Council."

This guy "worked with a Democratic National Committee operative who dug up the dirt on the Trump campaign during the 2016 election, inviting her into the White House for meetings, former White House colleagues said. The operative, Alexandra Chalupa, a Ukrainian American who supported Hillary Clinton, led an effort to link the Republican campaign to the Russian Government. 'He knows her. He had her in the White House,' said one former coworker. . . ."

"Documents confirm the DNC opposition researcher attended at least one White House meeting with" this guy "in November 2015. She visited the White House with a number of Ukrainian officials lobbying the Obama administration for aid to Ukraine."

And that is the aid we know we have seen, heard former Vice President Biden bragging: Hey, I am leaving in 6 hours, and if they want this \$1 billion, then they are going to have to fire the prosecutor, who just happened to be investigating the gas company that was giving millions of dollars to his son.

The article says: "'Everyone knows who he'" —the whistleblower—"is. CNN knows. The Washington Post

knows. The New York Times knows. Congress knows. The White House knows. Even the President knows who he is," said Fred Fleitz, a former CIA analyst and National Security Advisor to Trump, who has fielded dozens of calls from the media.

"Yet a rare hush swept across the Potomac."

You know, normally, The New York Times and The Washington Post, they can't wait to out a whistleblower, can't wait, don't mind seeing them destroyed. But you look at a real whistleblower, not a fake one like we have here, a real whistleblower with direct information like Adam Lovinger, who, working in the Defense Department—I didn't know that this scheme went that far.

But Lovinger is supposed to investigate improper payments by the Defense Department, and he saw hundreds of thousands of dollars being paid at different times to a guy named Stefan Halper, who is a professor, and he couldn't see anything in return for all the money.

Then we have this investigation about President Trump and find out that, actually, Halper was getting paid by the Defense Department to help set up Trump campaign people so they could use that information to go before a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court and get a warrant to spy on the Trump campaign.

Phenomenal. The Defense Department is paying a guy to help set up the Trump campaign before President Trump was ever elected so they could get warrants to spy on the campaign.

It is incredible. The article says, "Trump supporters blame the conspiracy of silence on a 'corrupt' and 'biased' media trying to protect the whistleblower from due scrutiny about his political motives. They also complain Democrats have falsely claimed that exposing his identity would violate whistleblower protections, even though the relevant statute provides limited, not blanket, anonymity, and doesn't cover press disclosures."

"His Democrat attorneys meanwhile have warned that outing him would put him and his family 'at risk of harm,' although the government security personnel have been assigned to protect him."

And I come back to the facts. There are lots of people that have testified adversely to President Donald J. Trump. As far as I know, they are all still living, breathing, and saying nasty things about him. Their health is not put in jeopardy in any way. Their personal safety is not a problem.

Now, that is not true of some other people that have been in high positions in this town where people end up dead in the morgue. I am not saying they caused it. I am just saying, if you are worried about outing some incident, somebody, President Trump is not the one you need to worry about.

Fleitz said, "They're hiding him. They're hiding him because of his po-

litical bias. A CIA officer specializing in Russia and Ukraine," this person, "was detailed over to the National Security Council from the agency," meaning CIA, "in the summer of 2015, working under Susan Rice, President Obama's national security adviser. He also worked closely with the former vice president."

That is the same Susan Rice—according to a book a few years after—according to that book it reported that Secretary Clinton called her husband and said, they are wanting me to go out there and say this attack in Benghazi was all about a video. And the advice was, you know, you can't be the one that goes on the Sunday shows because nobody is going to buy that.

So Susan Rice was picked to go out and tell people the attack in Benghazi was based on a video, when most everybody, maybe not Susan Rice, but most people who had looked into it at all knew it was not about a video at all. And the Obama administration had been warned repeatedly of the threat that was coming and didn't give them the security they needed, nor did they allow anyone to go lift a finger to help the people at Benghazi.

And I love hearing people on the other side say, oh, you investigated Benghazi for so long and you had nothing. Yes, that is because the Obama administration wouldn't produce anything that we asked for, the important things we asked for. They covered things up. Same on Fast and Furious, and we didn't have a Speaker on the Republican side that would allow us to go to court and get those things released.

So the more important things that got released were a result of Judicial Watch, Tom Fitton's folks going to court and getting the court order to get things produced, but still there was so much that was not produced we don't know all the facts about what happened.

By the way, I do know that Intelligence people lied to the Republican chairman of Intelligence back then and he never would wake up and realize it. Because he reported to our Republican conference after Benghazi about 6 months after, well, guys, some of you have asked me, isn't there somebody at Walter Reed that was injured? We keep hearing rumors. And Mike said, no, I can tell you, there is no one who was injured at Benghazi that is at Walter Reed.

I couldn't sit still anymore. It was in one of my trips to Walter Reed I met such a person. He was on the roof with Tyrone Woods and the other heroes. He had much of his leg blown off. And I had met him, and I honored his request for anonymity being out there.

But I couldn't sit there and listen to the Republican chairman of Intelligence perpetrating what he thought was true but was not, and I knew it wasn't. I said, That is not true. He got red faced and said, That is true. I said, No, I had lunch with the one yesterday. He said, That is not true.

And he told me later after the meeting, I have talked to our intelligence people, and they tell me that the guy you must have seen, he is not at Walter Reed, he comes there for physical therapy. And I said, No, I can tell you the building number and where his apartment is, and it adjoins the physical therapy. It is right there on Walter Reed.

□ 1330

Anyway, he didn't believe it.

I had emailed this great hero and didn't hear from him for a couple of weeks. He later emailed back that: Gee, the strangest thing happened. I had the most painful surgery on my leg.

He had numerous surgeries, but this was the most painful since half of it got blown off on that rooftop in Benghazi. He said: They medicated me because of all the pain. That night, in the middle of the night, these guys show up at our apartment there, and they moved my wife, my kids, all of us immediately off the hospital property. It doesn't make sense.

Well, it made sense to me because we had intelligence people that were covering up the lie that they had told the chairman of the Intelligence Committee because he was a Republican chair. I bet they don't lie like that to ADAM SCHIFF.

Anyway, Federal records, according to the article, show that Biden's office invited this guy "to an October 2016 state luncheon the Vice President hosted for Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi. Other invited guests included Brennan, as well as then-FBI Director James Comey and then-National Intelligence Director James Clapper."

Several U.S. officials told RealClearInvestigations that the invitation that was extended to this guy, who was a relatively low-level GS-13 Federal employee, "was unusual and signaled he was politically connected inside the Obama White House."

Former White House officials said this guy "worked on Ukrainian policy issues for Biden in 2015 and 2016, when the Vice President was President Obama's 'point man' for Ukraine." He is a Yale graduate, speaks Russian, Ukrainian, as well as Arabic.

"He had been assigned to the NSC by Brennan. He was held over into the Trump administration and headed the Ukraine desk at the NSC," under President Trump, "eventually transitioning into the West Wing, until June 2017. 'He was moved over to the front office,' to temporarily fill a vacancy, said a former White House official, where he 'saw everything, read everything.'"

The official added that it soon became clear among NSC staff that this guy "opposed the new Republican President's foreign policies. 'My recollection . . . is that he was very smart and very passionate, particularly about Ukraine and Russia. That was his thing, Ukraine,' he said. 'He didn't ex-

actly hide his passion with respect to what he thought was the right thing to do with Ukraine and Russia, and his views were at odds with the President's policies.'"

In May 2017, this guy went "'outside his chain of command,' according to a former NSC coworker, to send an email alerting another agency that Trump happened to hold a meeting with Russian diplomats in the Oval Office the day after firing Comey, who led the Trump-Russia investigation. The email also noted that Russian President Vladimir Putin had phoned the President a week earlier. Contents of the email appeared to have ended up in the media, which reported Trump boasted to the Russian officials about firing Comey, whom he allegedly called 'crazy, a real nut job.'"

In effect, this guy "helped generate the 'Putin fired Comey' narrative, according to the research dossier making the rounds in Congress."

Anyway, it is a mess.

Now, one of the things about whistleblower protections, though, is if you were to be prosecuted for committing a crime, then the whistleblower status could be used to help hold off potential prosecution. It is my understanding that it would not likely win the day, but it could delay a prosecution.

Say, hypothetically, you worked for somebody like Brennan, or say, hypothetically, you worked for somebody like McMaster and Brennan, and you helped come up with a conspiracy to oust a duly-elected sitting President by alleging some conspiracy with Russia, and you found out that the Attorney General and the U.S. attorney assigned to investigate the origins of the Russia hoax were closing in on participants of your conspiracy.

Well, if you had a really smart lawyer, he might just tell you, if you could get whistleblower status, if they start closing in on you, then we can start filing motions to keep you out of that prosecution because if you are a whistleblower, you are in a protected status. It shouldn't prevent the ultimate prosecution, but it could delay things for a while.

So it could make sense, if you are a coconspirator and trying to bring down a duly-elected President, that you might want that whistleblower status.

The problem with that is—and this is a problem for a tainted inspector general who would protect such a whistleblower—if you are complaining, it has to be, to get that status, somebody in your chain of command. The President, we were told, is not in the whistleblower's chain of command because that is outside, the CIA.

It has to be within that leadership ladder, and the President is outside of that. So he wasn't a real whistleblower. Plus, a whistleblower has to have direct evidence.

What we have seen with this march of the gossipmongers, as it is best described, that have been paraded into the secret Star Chamber with the

armed guards outside of it so that other members of this grand jury can't get to see and hear the witnesses, it really appears to be a march of those who don't like President Trump and are willing to sully in some cases valiant military service, a great career. They are willing to have that tarnished and sullied by becoming gossipmongers.

For example, one person who apparently had a great career in the Army, William Taylor, I understand he was in the infantry for 6 years. I was at Fort Benning for 4 years, and I can tell you, anybody who was a commander in the infantry didn't last any time at all if he allowed gossipmongers, like he has become, to come before him and say: Captain, Captain, I heard that somebody else heard something that was said.

He would throw him out of the office: I am not going to be running a gossip column here. If somebody knows something directly, send them to me, but don't you come in here being a gossipmonger.

Well, now he has become the gossipmonger. "Well, I heard that somebody else heard that they heard the President say. . . ."

I just come back to this, as someone who had to sit and listen and evaluate evidence and make life and death decisions in a courtroom, you analyze what kind of person this is before me as a witness. If you have a witness before you that is willing to try to destroy and remove a President from office who was duly elected under our Constitution, and they are now willing to use secondhand, thirdhand, fourth-hand gossip, it tells you they are not the great person that they once were. They are not the patriot they once were. They are nothing but gossipmongers.

If you are going to be a fair arbiter of truth and justice, it should dramatically diminish your evaluation and analysis of what they have to say. This is not a classy person. This is a gossipmonger.

That is what William Taylor became for the Intelligence Committee, and that is what Vindman became.

Some have said: Oh, gee, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, he is the ultimate American. He even came in uniform.

Well, I was trained that if you are going to say bad things about someone in your chain of command, including the Commander in Chief—because a lot of us were not happy with President Carter when I was at Fort Benning, but we all knew you can't say anything negative about President Carter, especially not in uniform. It doesn't matter if it is true. You can't do it.

He comes parading in, in his uniform, to try to take down a sitting President, and he uses gossip to do that.

We also have to wonder, okay, so whistleblower number one, this great patriot, we are told—who he is not. He is a gossipmonger. Where did he get that information since he didn't get it

firsthand? He was not allowed to receive information about those telephone calls the President made to the leader of another country, so somebody violated the law by telling him. We don't know who that was. Whoever it was, Vindman or anybody else, there is a good chance they committed a crime.

That crime and all the surrounding information about their crime should be admissible in helping impeach and analyze that witness's testimony. You ought to be able to pursue it, but we are told, when Republicans were asking Colonel Vindman who he told about this, who did he transfer information to, they were shut down by the chairman.

That tells you the chairman must know what the answers were, and he didn't want the Republicans to have them. It sounds to me like there is a chance he committed a crime, and that was being covered up. Otherwise, if you want due process, if you want a fair process, if you want justice, then we have to hear the good, the bad, the ugly, so we can make a fair determination.

Every person elected as a Member of Congress is going to have a right to vote on that impeachment, if it ever comes up, and we have a right to hear the witnesses. Anything else is a sham.

By the way, this Colonel Vindman, it turns out, it has been published, he went to the stenographers. We had heard previously from the President there were four stenographers who take down everything.

Well, I have used court reporters my whole adult life, and they miss a word from time to time. I have had to fix transcripts where they have missed something. We have that problem here. They are amazing. These stenographers are absolutely incredible, but they miss a word from time to time.

But they have four. Apparently, we are told, the reason is that they don't want to tape it so that no foreign leader has to worry about ever hearing his own voice say things that he said in a private conversation with the President of the United States. So they have four stenographers so that they make sure they get exactly what was said.

And this guy Vindman goes to the stenographers and tells them: I want to get these words inserted in the transcript, Burisma—the name of the gas company they are trying to go after President Trump and say he demanded information on them.

Apparently, none of the stenographers heard that. It sounds like not only is he a potential criminal for leaking information to people who weren't supposed to get it, but there is also potential there that this is part—when you go to prove a conspiracy in Federal court, you have to prove not only that you plotted but that there was an overt act. His overt act of going to stenographers and trying to get words embedded into the transcript that the President didn't say could potentially be such an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

□ 1345

There is a lot we don't know here, but this process has the possibility to bring this Nation's constitutional Republic to the brink of the end on our watch.

This ought to be a bipartisan thing. You can hate a President; you can disagree with him; but let's make sure that we have due process so we don't get drug into a third world status.

We know no country lasts forever, no country ever will. If we are going to perpetuate this any further, we have got to have some bipartisan concern for justice, for due process, for making sure that all of the protections to protect against a Star Chamber-type thing are not what we use here. Unfortunately, that is what we have been seeing for nearly 3 years.

One of the things I was taught in law school is what separates us is that we don't just take somebody and try to find a crime. That is unconstitutional. You have a crime that you find was committed, and then you try to find out who probably committed it. When you get probable cause, you can get them indicted, then you can have a trial.

What we have seen clearly is that, over 3 years ago, some people in Justice, FBI, Intelligence, maybe Defense, maybe somebody in the White House, decided: Here is Donald J. Trump. Let's find a crime, whether he committed it or not, that we can wrap around his throat.

That is what we have been watching happen. They found somebody. Now let's find a crime that we can allege.

The problem with this one about the quid pro quo, demanding something, they are going to have to prosecute Vice President Joe Biden. They are going to have to prosecute some U.S. Senators who have sent letters that have said: Gee, if you don't do this or that, we are going to cut off funding to you.

Whoa, Joe Biden bragged about it: I told him that, if you want this billion dollars, you better fire that prosecutor.

They are going to have to prosecute all of those people before they go after President Trump, and he didn't do anything nearly like he was accused of.

There is nothing wrong with a President saying to a foreign leader: Your country apparently was involved in a conspiracy to affect our election. Could you help us out by giving us information about what happened? We just need to know.

There is nothing wrong with it.

And you look at the transcript not amended by somebody who was trying to set up the President, but by four stenographers who were intent on having everything in there that was said, and you see there was nothing wrong with this phone call. What was wrong was the process of trying to commit a coup d'etat and take out a duly elected President.

It is time we wake up and we do what is right for this country.

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

RISE AND MAKE TOMORROW BETTER THAN TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, this is the last speech that I will give from this floor as a Member of Congress. I wasn't ready for my time here to come to an end so soon. It is a reality I am still grappling with, and I will be for a long time to come.

I expected, or I at least hoped, to be here for as long as the voters of California's 25th District deemed me worthy of the honor of representing them. I thought I could make a difference here in making our community, our great country, and the world a better place for generations to come.

I, like so many of my colleagues, ran for office because I believed that our political system was broken, controlled by the powerful and the wealthy, ignoring and failing the regular people that it is supposed to serve. I came here to give a voice to the unheard in the halls of power.

I wanted to show young people, queer people, working people, and imperfect people that they belong here because this is the people's House. I fell short of that, and I am sorry.

To every young person who saw themselves and their dreams reflected in me, I am sorry.

To those who felt like I gave them hope in one of the darkest times in our Nation's history, I am sorry.

To my family, my friends, my staff, my colleagues, my mentors, and to everyone who has supported and believed in me, I am sorry.

To the thousands of people who spent hours knocking on doors in the hot summer Sun, who made countless phone calls, and who sacrificed more than I could ever know to give everything they could in every possible way so that I could be here, I am so, so sorry.

And to every little girl who looked up to me, I hope that one day you can forgive me.

The mistakes I made and the people I have hurt that led to this moment will haunt me for the rest of my life, and I have to come to terms with that.

Ever since those images first came out, I barely left my bed. I have ignored all the calls and the texts. I went

to the darkest places that a mind can go, and I have shed more tears than I thought were possible.

I have hidden from the world because I am terrified of facing the people that I let down. But I made it through because the people who loved me most dragged me back into the light and reminded me that I was stronger than that.

To those of you who were by my side in my worst moments—you know who you are—I love you. I am so grateful, and I will never forget.

And I am here today because so many of the people I let down—people close to me, supporters, colleagues, people I have never even met—told me to stand back up and that, despite all of my faults, they still believed in me and they were still counting on me. And I realized that hiding away and disappearing would be the one unforgivable sin.

I will never shirk my responsibility for this sudden ending to my time here, but I have to say more because this is bigger than me.

I am leaving now because of a double standard.

I am leaving because I no longer want to be used as a bargaining chip.

I am leaving because I didn't want to be peddled by papers and blogs and websites, used by shameless operatives for the dirtiest gutter politics that I have ever seen and the rightwing media to drive clicks and expand their audience by distributing intimate photos of me taken without my knowledge, let alone my consent, for the sexual entertainment of millions.

I am leaving because of a misogynistic culture that gleefully consumed my naked pictures, capitalized on my sexuality, and enabled my abusive ex to continue that abuse, this time with the entire country watching.

I am leaving because of the thousands of vile, threatening emails, calls, and texts that made me fear for my life and the lives of the people that I care about.

Today is the first time I have left my apartment since the photos taken without my consent were released, and I am scared.

I am leaving because, for the sake of my community, my staff, my family, and myself, I can't allow this to continue, because I have been told that people were angry when I stood strong after the first article was posted and that they had hundreds more photos and text messages that they would release bit by bit until they broke me down to nothing, while they used my faults and my past to distract from the things that matter most.

I am leaving because there is only one investigation that deserves the attention of this country, and that is the one that we voted on today.

Today, I ask you all to stand with me and commit to creating a future where this no longer happens to women and girls.

Yes, I am stepping down, but I refuse to let this experience scare off other

women who dare to take risks, who dare to step into this light, and who dare to be powerful.

It might feel like they have won in the short term, but they can't in the long term. We cannot let them.

The way to overcome this setback is for women to keep showing up, to keep running for office, and to keep stepping up as leaders; because the more we show up, the less power they have.

I am leaving, but we have men who have been credibly accused of intentional acts of sexual violence and remain in boardrooms, on the Supreme Court, in this very body, and, worst of all, in the Oval Office.

So, the fight goes on to create the change that every woman and girl in this country deserves. Here in the Halls of Congress, the fight will go on without me.

I trust so many of my colleagues to be strong on this front while I move on to one of the many other battlefields, because we have an entire culture that has to change, and we see it in stark clarity today:

The forces of revenge by a bitter, jealous man, cyber exploitation and sexual shaming that target our gender, and a large segment of society that fears and hates powerful women have combined to push a young woman out of power and say that she doesn't belong here; yet a man who brags about his sexual predation, who has had dozens of women come forward to accuse him of sexual assault, who pushes policies that are uniquely harmful to women, and who has filled the courts with judges who proudly rule to deprive women of the most fundamental right to control their own bodies sits in the highest office of the land.

And so today, as my last vote, I voted on impeachment proceedings, not just because of corruption, obstruction of justice, or gross misconduct, but because of the deepest abuse of power, including the abuse of power over women.

Today, as my final act, I voted to move forward with the impeachment of Donald Trump on behalf of the women of the United States of America. We will not stand down; we will not be broken; and we will not be silenced. We will rise, and we will make tomorrow better than today.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time for now, but not forever.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives this 502nd anniversary of Reformation Day.

Madam Speaker, prior to discussing immigration policy and the other issues of the day, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Budget Committee, and I thank him for his patriotism, his love of this country, and for his desire to do what is right for our country, first and foremost.

Madam Speaker, today was a sad day, I believe, for our country. We have got, now, round two of this phony impeachment process.

It is purely political. It is not based in facts, not based in the pursuit of truth and justice. There is no openness; there is no fairness; and there is, really, no credibility.

The American people are not buying this bologna, not a single bit.

That is why we are seeing round two of putting lipstick on a pig, as we say in Texas. But, listen, the nature of this phony process is what it is, no matter how you dress it up.

It is sad because we are allowing this institution to be degraded. We are making a mockery out of this Chamber, the serious business of this country, and the serious nature of impeachment.

I would say, first and foremost, that the claim that this President has committed a high crime, treason, or impeachable offense is absurd, really.

From the outset, I would say that this is a baseless claim that only firsthand knowledge, the only primary source of evidence, is his conversation with President Zelensky. Unlike the cherry-picked leaks from Chairman SCHIFF, he let it be known what he said, what their conversation was about, in the full sunshine, for all the public to see.

And it was clear that the President not only didn't have a quid pro quo, the President not only didn't commit some impeachable offense, for heaven's sake, he was ensuring that taxpayer dollars, as the fiduciary, the chief fiduciary of this country, weren't going to be wasted or abused or misspent on anything except for what they were intended for and that every stone would be turned over to root out graft and corruption.

□ 1400

Now, that is not just appropriate; that is to be commended for any chief executive, especially for our President.

I think that this process is purely political and aimed, again, not at truth and justice, but at a distraction from what is not happening on trade, on prescription drugs, and a whole host of things that we have to address if we are going to have a real impact on our fellow countrymen and move this country forward.

I think it is a distraction from the socialist policies that have been advanced through this Chamber that have no chance of having any real effect on mainstream America.

I think, ultimately, it is to discredit this President; and instead of actually doing battle for hearts and minds the old-fashioned way in the public squares and at the ballot box, they are doing it

by weaponizing this serious constitutional provision of impeachment.

Again, it is a sad day. But what I would say in closing, to my dear friend from Wisconsin, is that it is one thing to take the oxygen out of this Chamber for actually doing things that are going to have a real impact and make a real difference in the lives of our fellow Americans, it is one thing to take this President down yet another rabbit hole, another Russian collusion hoax, but another thing to do irreparable harm to our democracy.

The Presidency, how is it ever going to be the same after this? How will a President ever have a phone call with a foreign leader where they can have the candor that is necessary to build relationships and to do the people's business.

Madam Speaker, I say to my fellow Americans: This isn't about truth and justice. This is about fear and hate, hate for our President and for what he stands for, for his agenda, and fear that they can't beat him at the ballot box, so they are going to do it by weaponizing our congressional oversight responsibility and abusing the power of this great institution for their political objectives. I say that is wholly un-American.

For my children's sake, they are doing irreparable harm to not only the Presidency, but to all of our democratic institutions. If you lose that, you lose the ability to govern, Republican or Democrat; you lose the ability to govern functionally for the American people.

What a sad day. History will judge cruelly those who participated in this instead of doing it the old-fashioned American way, from house to house in the neighborhoods, in the public squares, and at the ballot box.

God save our great country, and God help us all if this political railroad job and farce continues any longer.

I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding to me. I am grateful for the opportunity.

God bless America, and go, West Texas.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I realized that a lot of what has been said here the last few days focuses on an impeachment inquiry, and one has to ask oneself why we have so many people who have been wanting to try to impeach President Trump immediately.

It was, obviously, a very important vote today, but it is the fourth vote I have taken, I believe, since President Trump has been sworn in on impeachment. So far, nothing has turned up. I don't expect anything to turn up in the future.

But I think one of the motivations for this impeachment inquiry is to keep other stories off the page, to keep other stories out of the mainstream media. And that is why, today, I want to address what I think is the biggest threat to America in the short term

and a threat, unless we deal with it, which will ultimately destroy our country, and that is the threat of illegal immigration, of people flowing across the southern border.

I have been at the southern border three times this year to see for myself what Border Patrol and other people in charge of securing our border have to put up with, and I would like to say that they have done a tremendous job.

Yesterday, in this building, while so many people were focused on the impeachment inquiry, we had a hearing in the subcommittee of the Oversight and Reform Committee in which Ken Cuccinelli, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services office head, and Matthew Albence, Acting Director of ICE, were testifying before our subcommittee.

It was interesting, the appalling comments that they had to put up with from Members of this House, being called white supremacists, just doing their job trying to secure the border. Those are the type of things that every American should be aware of what is going on in this building.

But I would like to update people on the good job that President Trump has been able to do in the last 6 months, why he has been able to do this job, and the hatred which it has brought our President.

In May, over 145,000 people were processed trying to get into this country, and we allowed over 100,000 people in this country.

About a year ago, there was a study put out by MIT and Yale which increased the estimated number of people in this country illegally from 10 to 11 million to 20 to 22 million people. That is a lot of people.

Obviously, we could not forever go on, May after May after May, in which 100,000 people were allowed in this country.

That, by the way, is in addition to people who sneak in the country without being detected because we have no wall and we have not adequately funded our Border Patrol. I think experts believe another 10,000 people probably came in, at least 10,000 came into this country in May undetected.

Since that time, President Trump has reached agreements with Mexico, in part by threatening tariffs, in part by just general suasion, and we have reduced the number of people coming into this country from over 100,000 in May to, I am told by the Border Patrol, perhaps under 5,000 in September after processing 40,000 to 50,000. This is because President Trump reached an agreement with Mexico that they will hold asylum seekers down there.

He has reached out and reached agreements or received help from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, in addition to Mexico, in not only keeping more of their citizens there, but if people try to leave other countries for asylum, more are being kept in places like Mexico, El Salvador, and Honduras.

I want to point out, too, that this is not something that Congress helped

him with. These are things that he has had to do on his own.

There are other things that he is trying to do that Congress should be taking up, but isn't.

He has been trying to keep people from coming into this country if they are a public charge. We have enough people who we are taking care of in our country—some through their own fault, some through no fault of their own—on various welfare programs.

President Trump tried to say: Hey, we will maybe take people who are working. We will take people who want to come here legally. But courts, including a prominent judge appointed by President Clinton, struck that down. So President Trump was denied the opportunity to prevent people from coming here who are going to be a public charge.

President Trump is still waiting—and I hope he does—to do something about birthright citizenship, another situation that I saw when I was on the border in which, obviously, America, being 1 of only 2 of the 40 wealthiest countries in the world to say, if you have a child here, you get to be a citizen.

His Border Patrol has been acting with inadequate funding. They have had, up until recently, 2,000 vacancies. They could use more people in addition to that.

We are in the process of building 500 miles of wall. It is not going to be enough. But we like to believe we are going to be able to get that done by the end of December.

But, in any event, after doing all of these actions, we have done a much better job—I would say the best job we have had in years—of holding down the number of immigrants in this country.

Like I said, the sad thing is, largely, this is President Trump acting on his own while Congress tries to remove the immigration crisis from the headlines by spending day after day talking about impeachment, trying to chase some rumor down, or maybe somebody operating under the guidance of a Congressman making charges against President Trump.

But I will just ask the American public to keep their eye on the ball, and that ball is immigration. We cannot go back to the days of 100,000 people being allowed in this country every month.

We have to make sure that the policies that President Trump has implemented in the last 5 months continue to be implemented.

We have to demand from Congress action on the variety of things that they should be doing instead of filling up the press with stories on impeachment.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1678. An Act to express United States support for Taiwan's diplomatic alliances

around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 1, 2019, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2810. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Company-Run Stress Testing Requirements for FDIC-Supervised State Nonmember Banks and State Savings Associations (RIN: 3064-AE84) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Restricting Additional Exports and Reexports to Cuba [Docket No.: 191011-0062] (RIN: 0694-AH90) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2812. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2018-0030; FF09M21200-189-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BD10) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2813. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2019-20 Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2018-0030; FF09M21200-189-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BD10) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2814. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Fokett Speckled Dace From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2017-0051; FXES11130900000-178-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BC09) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2815. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing Policy and Support, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Interagency Cooperation [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2018-0009; FXES11140900000-189-FF09E300000; Docket No.: 180207140-8140-01; 4500090023] (RIN: 0648-BH41; 1018-BC87) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2816. A letter from the National Species Status Assessment Team Lead, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Barrens Topminnow [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2017-0094; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BC52) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2817. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Kirtland's Warbler From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2018-0005; FXES11130900000] (RIN: 1018-BC01) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2818. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Monito Gecko (*Sphaerodactylus micropithecus*) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2017-0082; FXES11130900000C2-178-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB76) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2819. A letter from the Branch Chief, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2018-0030; FF09M21200-189-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BD10) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2820. A letter from the Branch Chief, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Regulations Concerning a Depredation Order [Docket Number: FWS-HQ-MB-2018-0225; FF09M29000-190-FXMB12320900000] (RIN: 1018-BB77) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2821. A letter from the Supervisory Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska-2019-20 and 2020-21 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2017-0096; FXFR13350700640-190-FF07J00000; FBMS #4500133004] (RIN: 1018-BC06) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2822. A letter from the Supervisory Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, De-

partment of the Interior, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska-Cook Inlet Area Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2018-0003; FXFR13350700640-190-FF07J00000; FBMS# 4500133005] (RIN: 1018-BB99) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2823. A letter from the Fish and Wildlife Administrator, Policy Lead, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Assistance: Wildlife Restoration, Sport Fish Restoration, Hunter Education and Safety [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-WSR-2017-0002; 91400-5110-POLI-7B; 91400-9410-POLI-7B] (RIN: 1018-BA33) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2824. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 50 Feet Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XY024) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2825. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XY047) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2826. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RIN: 0648-XY022) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2827. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 180713633-9174-02] (RIN: 0648-XY040) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2828. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Center for Innovation for Care and Payment (RIN: 2900-AQ56) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2829. A letter from the Director RMD, RD Innovation Center, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Development Environmental Regulation for Rural

Infrastructure [RUS-18-Agency-0005, RBS-18-None-0029, RHS-18-None-0026] (RIN: 0572-AC44) received October 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Financial Services.

2830. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Simplification: Rescinding the Adoption of the Standard Unique Health Plan Identifier and Other Entity Identifier [CMS-0054-F] (RIN: 0938-AT42) received October 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 35. A bill to amend section 249 of title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a hate crime act (Rept. 116-267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 4936. A bill to establish a grant program to provide temporary housing to homeless individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to make permanent a grant program to promote and assist in the reentry of justice-involved individuals into the workforce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend title XVIII to strengthen ambulance services furnished under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACON (for himself and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 4939. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to combat straw purchases of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4940. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first statewide investigative law enforcement agency, the Ranger Division of the Texas Department of Public Safety; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the Transition Assistance Program by allowing certain veterans' service organizations to contact veterans regarding benefits and to better inform

veterans of employment opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4942. A bill to direct the Transportation Security Administration to develop and disseminate best practices for rental companies and dealers to report suspicious behavior to law enforcement agencies at the point of sale of a covered rental vehicle to prevent and mitigate acts of terrorism using motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 4943. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide that children who have relocated from Puerto Rico to the States are fully considered for purposes of State allotments under the English Language Acquisition grants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 4944. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to issue licenses under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 within particular time frames, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4945. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude ventilators from competitive acquisition programs under the Medicare program for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the deduction for qualified business income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4948. A bill to provide for the effective use of immigration detainers to enhance public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 4949. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish qualifications for the human resources positions within the Veterans Health Administration of the De-

partment of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina):

H.R. 4950. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study on Federal data collection related to student participation and performance in career and technical education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen school security; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 4952. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to revise title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to require an air carrier to permit eligible service animals to accompany eligible veterans during travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax rate for excise tax on investment income of private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and expand eligibility for childless individuals, homeless youth, and qualified foster youth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the meaning of a new chemical entity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina (for herself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 4956. A bill to provide that the Executive order entitled "Establishing a White House Council on Eliminating Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing" shall have the force and effect of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to tax bona fide residents of the District of Columbia in the same manner as bona fide residents of possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4959. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for cost estimates of major legislation; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4960. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis relating to the decline in the business formation rate in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. TLAI, and Ms. BARRAGAN):

H.R. 4961. A bill to limit financial support for certain international energy projects; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4962. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for cybersecurity curriculum for secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 4963. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues that are imported or offered for import are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4964. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the employer credit for paid family and medical leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SIRE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROW, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4965. A bill to promote effective registered apprenticeships, for skills, credentials, and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4966. A bill to require the chief executive officers of global systemically important bank holding companies to provide annual testimony to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to re-

store and protect the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4968. A bill to provide for the basic needs of students at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 4969. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Las Cruces, New Mexico, as the "Las Cruces Bataan Memorial Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4970. A bill to restrict the authority of the Attorney General to enter into contracts for Federal correctional facilities and community confinement facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 4971. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 East Market Street in Leesburg, Virginia, as the "Norman Duncan Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Syrian Arab Republic that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution urging all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade and to enforce existing laws against such trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE:

H. Res. 668. A resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 660) directing certain committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 669. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of November 3 through 9, 2019, as National Family Service Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H. Res. 670. A resolution commemorating the 30th annual event of the All Souls Pro-

cession in Tucson, Arizona, and calling for an end to migrant deaths along the United States-Mexico border; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H. Res. 671. A resolution urging the United Arab Emirates to immediately end any activities enabling money laundering in violation of United States sanctions against Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HECK, Mr. TURNER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 672. A resolution expressing support of the Three Seas Initiative in its efforts to increase energy independence and infrastructure connectivity thereby strengthening the United States and European national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 673. A resolution expressing appreciation during "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month" to all providers working tirelessly to educate communities, provide shelter and assistance to victims, and end the scourge of domestic violence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H. Res. 674. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the achievements of Edgar Ricardo Arjona Morales, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GUEST, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SPANO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 675. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that socialist proposals such as Medicare for All, student loan forgiveness, and the Green New Deal with a guaranteed job for all, are antithetical to American foundational values of self-responsibility and opportunity, and by guaranteeing these programs as "rights", we risk abandoning our actual rights; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Miss RICE of New York introduced A bill (H.R. 4972) for the relief of Ted Simonson and Reoforce, Inc; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 4936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 4938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 4939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 4941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce among the several states, the power to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, and the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 4944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the

United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 4946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina:

H.R. 4948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BOST:

H.R.. 4949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 4951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 4952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:

H.R. 4956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 4957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, US Constitution:

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings

By Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 4960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises; to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 4965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 4967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 4969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 4971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 7

By Miss. RICE of New York:

H.R. 4972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 35: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 40: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 180: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 230: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 566: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 838: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 849: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 935: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1043: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. JOHN-SON of Ohio.

H.R. 1049: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1092: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1110: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 1133: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1155: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1171: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1175: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1188: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1254: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1257: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1289: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1309: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1367: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1383: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1418: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1468: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1498: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1528: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1652: Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1673: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1680: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1705: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1748: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1754: Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. KIND, Ms. BASS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1765: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1777: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1923: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 2051: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2075: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 2086: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 2117: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2147: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2210: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2222: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2235: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2279: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2283: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 2301: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2411: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 2433: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2498: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2501: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2521: Mr. SOTO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2584: Mr. OLSON and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2645: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2653: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2656: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2668: Mr. YOUNG and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2693: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 2746: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2747: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2788: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2802: Ms. FINKENAUER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2825: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2862: Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 2867: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2985: Mr. NUNES and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 2986: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2990: Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3048: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3062: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3080: Mr. BRINDISI and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 3127: Mr. WELCH and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 3138: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3155: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. REED, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. MCCINTOCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. RESCIENTHALER.

H.R. 3157: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3165: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 3166: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3192: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3195: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 3212: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 3214: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3224: Ms. MENG, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3235: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 3250: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3328: Ms. TLAIB and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3461: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3495: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 3497: Mr. STEIL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BACON, Mr. KIND, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3502: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3516: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 3584: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3598: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 3637: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3654: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3657: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3708: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 3762: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3772: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 3801: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 3814: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3836: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3910: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3911: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3934: Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3957: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3961: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3969: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4019: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 4065: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4104: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4138: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4148: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 4162: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 4189: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 4194: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4206: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 4230: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4266: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4269: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 4304: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4347: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4426: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4438: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4524: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 4540: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4547: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4553: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 4607: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 4640: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4665: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 4681: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4684: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4691: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4697: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 4707: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4708: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4709: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4719: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4724: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 4777: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4779: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4782: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4789: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4790: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4807: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4823: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4890: Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4914: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 4924: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4928: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma and Mr. STEUBE.
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 54: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. YOHIO.
H. Res. 250: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H. Res. 255: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. BANKS.
H. Res. 399: Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 517: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 540: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CASE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. TRONE,

Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILD, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 621: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 641: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. OMAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H. Res. 649: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2505: Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. WELCH.