

Last year in the United States, the energy sector ranked ninth in industries most targeted by cyberattacks. In fact, IBM estimated that cyberattacks against vital energy sector technologies, like industrial control and operational systems, increased by more than 2,000 percent—2,000 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we must be prepared to address this threat as we continue to build on the success of our clean energy future and long-term international competitiveness. Every single aspect of our daily lives in each economic sector in our Nation is dependent on the uninterrupted flow of power. I like to say that the things that make America great are the things that America makes.

How do we do that? With an uninterrupted, affordable flow of power.

Therefore, we must focus heavily on early-stage research into new technologies that will improve the resilience, the reliability, and the emergency response capabilities of our electric grid.

H.R. 5760 does that by authorizing a multi-agency research and development program to bolster the cyber and physical security capabilities of the energy sector.

It authorizes key Federal agencies, like the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation, to support early-stage research, development, and demonstration activities that will advance critical cybersecurity technologies and enhance the security of energy sector information systems.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to say, as the ranking member did, that this bill is truly bipartisan. We worked closely together to develop good legislation, and we included a key Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Republican priority; that is, a critical infrastructure research program and test facility.

This provision, originally offered by my good friend, Ranking Member LUCAS' bill, H.R. 5685, the Securing American Leadership in Science and Technology Act, was accepted as an amendment at committee markup.

In coordination with the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security, the DOE-led research program and test facility will allow for U.S. researchers to conduct a variety of high-priority tests on critical infrastructure systems at the industry scale. This facility is a perfect example of the research asset that the Federal government is best suited to provide.

As recent events have shown us, it is not a question of if the U.S. power grid will face a significant physical or cyber threat, it is only a matter of when. In order to improve the cyber and physical security of our Nation's energy sector, we, in Congress, must continue to prioritize R&D to modernize and strengthen the national electricity system.

We can't agree on everything—I get that—especially when wish lists and

partisan messaging exercises rule the day. However, when we identify our shared goals and work together in good faith, we can put together real legislation and find a path forward for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Dr. BERA for introducing this legislation, and Members and staff of both sides of the aisle for working in a collaborative manner to reach a consensus on this standalone bill.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. There is real power in doing so.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, also want to recognize the bipartisan nature of this bill. It shows what we can do when we get together. I recognize the hard work of the staff from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we must invest in the long-term, early-stage research that will strengthen our energy infrastructure against a range of emerging threats.

The Department of Energy is uniquely qualified to lead this endeavor, and the partnerships that exist between its national laboratory systems, universities, and industry has the potential to modernize and transform U.S. energy delivery systems.

H.R. 5760 authorizes the advanced grid security R&D activities that will make the future U.S. electrical grid reliable, resilient, and secure for all Americans.

I, again, thank my friends across the aisle for working with us on this bill. We need to come together and have serious conversations about how to make real progress on next-generation energy issues. I am glad to see us doing that today.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge support of this common-sense, important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5760, the Grid Security Research and Development Act. I want to thank Mr. BERA for his leadership in introducing this bipartisan bill and for his commitment to developing legislation that will strengthen America's electricity grid. I also want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have recognized the importance of these investments and have joined me in supporting this important legislation.

The Grid Security Research and Development Act is updated version of a bill that Mr. BERA and I introduced, along with many of my Science Committee colleagues, in the previous two Congresses. This bill provides legislative guidance to the activities carried out by

the recently established Department of Energy Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response by authorizing a cross-agency research and development program to advance electric grid cybersecurity and physical security. In particular, the bill authorizes activities on grid resilience and emergency response efforts, cybersecurity test beds, and education and workforce training for the energy sector.

The passage of this bill is particularly important now, as states all over the U.S. are experiencing unprecedented extreme weather events, ranging from historic hurricanes in Texas to the ongoing wildfires in California and Oregon. In California specifically, utilities are shutting off power to millions of customers when there are high winds in certain areas to prevent the onset of wildfires sparked by trees and other vegetation near critical grid infrastructure. This bill contains provisions to help address these important issues by directing the Department of Energy to conduct research on technologies to assist with the safe planning and execution of emergency power shut-offs, offer technical assistance on related topics, and establish a training program to improve grid resilience, among other provisions.

That's why I am proud to rise today in support of H.R. 5760. It would make important investments to improve the security and ensure the safety and resilience of our electric grid infrastructure. I also urge my colleagues to make a wise investment for our nation by joining me in supporting this bipartisan bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5760, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAFFIRMING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' COMMITMENT TO THE ORDERLY AND PEACEFUL TRANSFER OF POWER CALLED FOR IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1155) reaffirming the House of Representatives' commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1155

Whereas the United States is founded on the principle that our Government derives its power from the consent of the governed and that the people have the right to change their elected leaders through elections;

Whereas our domestic tranquility, national security, general welfare, and civil liberties depend upon the peaceful and orderly transfer of power; and

Whereas any disruption occasioned by the transfer of the executive power could

produce results detrimental to the safety and well-being of the United States and its people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States; and

(2) intends that there should be no disruptions by the President or any person in power to overturn the will of the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my resolution, H. Res. 1155, reaffirming the commitment of the House of Representatives to the peaceful transfer of power. This is identical to the resolution which passed the Senate last week by unanimous consent.

The peaceful transition of power is not only a bedrock principle of America's founding; it is a living ideal that we must exercise and pass down to our children.

In the United States of America, the Federal Government has always had a peaceful transition of power, and it is a collective responsibility of this body to ensure that continues. I doubt anyone here needs to be reminded of that.

Everyone in America knows this is what makes us American. Everyone, that is, except President Trump. Last week, he was asked a simple question: Will you commit to making sure there is a peaceful transfer of power after the election? His answer: Well, we are going to have to see what happens.

No, we are not going to have to see what happens.

Then he was asked again: Do you commit to making sure there is a peaceful transfer of power?

Here was his answer, in part: Get rid of the ballots, and you will have a very—we will have a very peaceful—there won't be a transfer, frankly. There will be a continuation.

During his remarks, he also made bogus and unsupported claims of election fraud. Just in case people were not listening, he said the same thing the next day.

President Trump, like any President, wields enormous power, with Federal law enforcement and the military at

his disposal. It is beyond unsettling to hear him suggest that the only result he will accept is the one where he wins.

That sentiment is one of dictators and despots. Sadly, the world is replete with examples of dictators and despots and their refusal to leave office and the chaos it causes.

In late 2016, Gambia's President threatened to refuse to leave office, even though he had lost the election. Thousands fled the country fearing violence. Only when other countries' troops massed at the border was he forced to leave office in early 2017.

Congo's President refused to leave office in 2016, even though his term had expired. He cracked down on dissent and killed people when they protested the election results. That election finally took place two years late.

Last year in Bolivia, the President declared himself the winner before the vote counting was even finished. After days of civil unrest and protest, the President was forced to resign.

Belarus remains in crisis even now as the longtime President holds onto power through an obviously rigged election. Mass protests have gone on with many injured, gassed, or killed.

In America, however, it is not one person, but we, the people; we, the people, who rule. As this resolution says, the people have the right to change their elected leaders through elections. Fortunately, there is no shortage of leadership in America's past to show us the way.

I was born in November of 1980, right after Jimmy Carter lost to Ronald Reagan. I was born the son of two Republican parents who were excited for the peaceful transfer of power to take place. One of my earliest memories of American politics, though, was when I was 11 years old and President George H. W. Bush lost to President Clinton. My parents were not as excited about the peaceful transfer of power.

But I remember, as a boy, watching the results come in and seeing the statements from outgoing President George H. W. Bush and commentators and anchors saying, "This is what makes our country so special" and my own family moving on and accepting the results.

In a poignant recognition of this, listen to part of what former President George Herbert Walker Bush wrote to President Bill Clinton, the man who had defeated him, in a note that he left for him in the Oval Office dated January 20, 1993. And it is just here to my left.

"You will be our President when you read this note. I wish you well. I wish your family well. Your success now is our country's success. I am rooting hard for you."

After the 1824 election was decided here, in this House, with Henry Clay throwing his support to John Quincy Adams, thus defeating Andrew Jackson who had won the popular vote, Jackson was understandably outraged and denounced the result as a corrupt bar-

gain. That type of language sounds familiar. But he accepted the outcome and returned to Tennessee.

On the evening of the day he lost the Presidency, Jackson encountered the new President-Elect at the White House. Jackson was gracious, and the city was filled with reports of his grace. "You have, by your dignity and forbearance under all of these outrages, won the people to your love," a friend told Jackson, who would run again in 1828 and win.

Historian Jon Meacham recently wrote in March of this year about President Lincoln in 1864, the country mired in a Civil War, running against George McClellan on the Democratic side. Lincoln had written privately he was ready to accept defeat, the election did not look like it was going to go his way, and even in a Civil War, there would be a peaceful transfer of power.

This resolution states clearly to every American, not on our watch. Not on our watch are we going to let American greatness vanish and an authoritative state rise.

The reason we are the beacon to the world is that here, with our elections, the people decide, not our leaders. We let the people decide.

We shouldn't only be horrified by the President's remarks about possibly not having a peaceful transfer of power; we should also be concerned by who he looks up to. Unfortunately, America is ruled by someone who admires dictators. He said as much recently to Bob Woodward in a recording stating: "The tougher and meaner they are, the better I get along with them," referring to dictators like Putin, Erdogan, and Kim.

And what do dictators do?

They don't let the people decide, and they certainly don't honor any peaceful transition of power.

Why is it a problem for Americans to have a leader who admires Putin and often sides with Putin over America? Because we know that Vladimir Putin would love nothing better than to destroy our democracy.

In fact, our intelligence community assessed that in 2016, Vladimir Putin had a preference for our President and interfered to help him and that he is doing the same today. Putin wants America to be weak, second to Russia, just another country with no moral standing in the world.

But what makes us strong is our rule of law, our democracy, a country governed by the consent of the people. When that happens, we all do better, and Russia hates that. Why? Because Russians and other oppressed people then will want to look more like America.

Just think about it. The idea now that Russia could bring down America without even firing a shot because we have one person who is threatening to upset the fabric of our democracy. We cannot let that happen. Too many have sacrificed too much to make sure it doesn't happen.

Days after the election, we will each go back to our districts and honor those who have served our country in honor of Veterans Day. We will be reminded of so many heroes who have died and shed blood, just for the principle of a peaceful transition of power. We have lost so many for this concept.

Now, I know there are some in this country who think that these heroes who fought for this country are suckers and losers for giving up their lives, but I don't think that. I don't believe my Republican colleagues think that. I know colleagues on both sides hold these folks up to be heroes. I know each of us wants to go to our hometowns right after election day to those Veterans Day parades, look at our hometown heroes, look them in the eyes and tell them when our democracy was threatened, we stood up and we spoke out.

The way we honor their sacrifice is to fight for this. And when someone suggests that a peaceful transfer of power may not happen, we have to push back in every way we can.

So I want to thank all of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, who over the past few days have reaffirmed the understanding of how in America we handle transitions of power and reject the threats from our current leader that it may not happen.

By voting for this resolution, you can go on record as supporting these principles. By its text, it "reaffirms the House's commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States; and intends that there should be no disruption by the President or any person in power to overturn the will of the people of the United States."

Even in this era of bitterly divided partisanship, these are basic, philosophical tenets, bedrocks and living principles that should receive unanimous support here in the House.

I urge all Members to support my resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to waste time on an unnecessary resolution to commit to a peaceful transfer of power.

To be clear, President Trump and House Republicans are committed to ensuring Americans receive a free and fair election. Republicans are also committed to peaceful transitions of power.

Democrats have been the ones to contest Presidential elections. They contested the 2000 election, they contested the 2004 election, and Democrats still refuse to believe that President Trump won the 2016 election fair and square. So ahead of November 3, 2020, the Democrats are using floor time for par-

tisan smear tactics to undermine the President.

The administration has been clear. On September 24, 2020, Press Secretary Kayleigh McEnany stated: "The President will accept the results of a free and fair election. He will accept the will of the American people."

The real question today is: Will the Democrats accept the results of the election?

They are already questioning the legitimacy of this election. Hillary Clinton, the Democrats' nominee in 2016, has advised: "Joe Biden should not concede under any circumstances."

A senior House Democrat stated that President Trump is not going to win fairly.

□ 1715

Democrat Presidential nominee Joe Biden has said that his "single greatest concern" is that the President is "going to try and steal this election."

This resolution is just another attempt by the Democrats to instill fear within the American people, just one more hoax for them to perpetrate upon the American people.

Not only have Democrats prematurely questioned the results of the election; they have proactively sought to erode basic election security safeguards as States move toward all mail-in voting, universal mail-in ballots. This is the concern that President Trump has been warning about.

In several States, Democrats are trying to eliminate absentee ballot witness and notary requirements, expanding ballot harvesting, and extending deadlines for States to receive mail-in ballots for up to a week after the election. If successful, Democrats will inevitably open the door to election crimes and administration errors.

So while making baseless accusations about President Trump stealing the election, Democrats are also undermining the integrity of the electoral process by pushing for less accountability. On top of that, we are here today to consider a resolution to chastise the President for raising policy concerns about the process. This is ridiculous, and it needs to stop.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution.

There has been quite a bit of discussion regarding partisanship from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. I would offer the following quote, which was uttered 39 years ago: "To a few of us here today, this is a solemn and most momentous occasion, and yet, in the history of our Nation, it is a commonplace occurrence. The orderly transfer of authority, as called for in the Constitution, routinely takes place as it has almost for two centuries, and few of us stop to think how unique we really are. In the eyes of

many in the world, this every-4-year ceremony that we accept as normal is nothing less than a miracle."

Those words were uttered in 1981 by President Ronald Reagan, and his words couldn't have been more prescient.

It is a shame that we are here today, a shame that the current President has refused to affirm perhaps that most basic tenet of American democracy, the peaceful transfer of power after an election.

I don't believe that this should be partisan. We may be on different sides of the aisle; we have different solutions to some of the most pressing challenges that our country faces; but we all should, we all must, believe in this grand American experiment.

The peaceful transition of power is a hallmark of our Republic. For over 200 years, as President Reagan noted, every President has honored the orderly and peaceful transfer of power to his successor.

So, in my view, the House of Representatives must speak loudly here. We must meet the unrelenting insistence on undermining our democracy with the full force of the United States Congress by joining together today, on a bipartisan basis, to reaffirm our commitment to the peaceful transition of power, as our colleagues in the United States Senate did just last week.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SWALWELL for leading on this issue, and I would urge every one of my colleagues in this Chamber, Republican, Democrat, and independent, to support this important resolution.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues across the aisle. This should not be a partisan matter. We shouldn't have to be here today. But unfortunately, the Democrats decided to make this partisan.

I begged to be allowed to make an amendment because this is one slap at a man who has already made clear, yes, he wants to stop fraudulent voting and make sure that hadn't occurred, but he is going to abide by the will of the people. Yet, they refused to allow any amendments.

It says, it is resolved that the House of Representatives "intends that there should be no disruptions by the President or any person in power to overturn. . . ." They would not accept a friendly amendment, so it could be completely bipartisan, to say, "or any candidate or anyone acting on a candidate's behalf," which would have included the President. Oh, no, we have to have a slap at the President.

As my friend Mr. STEUBE pointed out, it is not Republicans who have divided this country in refusing to accept results of the elections. No, you go back to 1860. November 6, 1860, Republican Abraham Lincoln is elected President by a big margin, and then States start seceding. They are not going to accept the results.

Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated. Back then, it was March 4, 1861. States were already seceding. We are not accepting the results. And they were, every one a Democrat, saying that we are not going to accept that Republican's election to President.

Then, what do we hear from Hillary Clinton? She has been quoted as saying that "Joe Biden should not concede under any circumstances, because I think this is going to drag out."

Go back 100 years, after the Democrats refused to accept the results of the election of 1860. In 1960, John F. Kennedy was elected, and I have confirmed again today with someone who worked closely with Nixon that he had information submitted to him that established that there was much wrongdoing in Chicago, Illinois, fraudulent voting schemes.

Despite what any others may think about Richard Nixon, he made the decision that the country could not stand that kind of divisiveness, so he refused to pursue the fraud of which he was told there was plenty of evidence in Chicago, Illinois. That is the way the Republicans have been.

Then, we hear more sanctimonious talk about George W. Bush, and then who contested the election? Well, Al Gore. He calls and concedes, and then he later calls and backs it up. Thank goodness he wasn't President when we needed a decisive leader.

But if you go through the chronology of Gore's defeat by President Bush—and a recount ultimately showed that he did lose. Gore did lose; Bush did win. But he was still contesting. He divided this Nation, refused to accept the results of the election, brought up some of the most ridiculous things from the butterfly ballot that kids in the fifth grade had no problem with. Oh, but it is unfair because they can't really understand it in that part of Florida. What an insult to those people in Florida.

If you look now at what the Democratic Party is saying about this election in response to President Trump saying, I just want to make sure that it is not fraudulent voting; it is fair voting. And as long as everything is legal and fair, you betcha, he will have a smooth transition of power. He would agree to that.

But if you look, as reported on August 2 of this year, buried near the end of Ben Smith's column is a report that "Democrats have participated in a 'war game' in which they considered several possible outcomes of the election. In one scenario, John Podesta, the former chair of Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign and a leading figure in party circles, played former Vice President Joe Biden and refused to concede the election."

Then later it was posted—much more recently, I guess, that is September 6: "Democrats promise more violence if Joe Biden doesn't defeat Trump by a landslide in the 2020 election. Rosa Brooks, a leftist who writes for The

Washington Post, penned a piece that stated her research showed that the only scenario in November that would stop the violence is if Biden wins in a landslide. That kind of attempt to manipulate the voters by intimidation will just make Americans vote for Trump."

It was posted September 6 in the American Thinker. "Democrats openly say that if Trump is reelected, they are going to redouble their 4 years of madness, with special emphasis on the last 3 months of open violence. Indeed, they are already planning to destabilize the election and to contest if Trump wins, in hopes of a violent coup."

And as if there is not a God in Heaven, today of all days, when this that should have been bipartisan is brought to the floor to slam Donald Trump, we have newly released information out today that has been declassified. This report, on September 7, 2016: "U.S. intelligence officials forwarded an investigative referral to FBI Director James Comey and Deputy Assistant Director of Counterintelligence Peter Strzok regarding 'U.S. Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton's approval of a plan concerning U.S. Presidential candidate Donald Trump and Russian hackers hampering U.S. elections as a means of distracting the public from her use of a private mail server.'"

Then further, it came out today: "A former senior intelligence official told saraacarter.com that it would make sense that Clinton's plans would be usurped by the Russia's GRU, its military intelligence, as well as Russia's FSB, its equivalent of the CIA, when former British spy Christopher Steele began peddling the Russians for information."

"The real people colluding and conspiring with Russia were the Democrats, Hillary Clinton, and Fusion GPS," stated the source. "It is the weaponization of the agencies and those like Clinton who built their private Idaho in the U.S. bureaucracy. They gave the keys to the kingdom to Russia to wreak chaos in our Nation for the past 4 years."

Moreover, the information that came out today reveals that former CIA Director John Brennan allegedly knew of Clinton's plans and briefed President Obama on those plans in July 2016. It was the same month the FBI opened up the Crossfire Hurricane investigation against President Trump and his campaign—or candidate Trump and his campaign officials.

So, what a day, the day that more evidence comes out that it was Hillary Clinton's campaign, the DNC, and they were refusing to go along with the legal and fair election. Then, afterward, that whole conspiracy, the dossier was used to try to prevent a President from staying in office after sworn in, and we are supposed to vote now to come after President Trump and demand he be legal and lawful in leaving office.

He just wants fairness in the vote, and he will follow the will of the peo-

ple. It is a real shame that my friends across the aisle wouldn't allow an amendment, so we could say to both sides: Follow the will of the people; have a proper transition of power.

But, no, they wouldn't go there.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, back to Secretary Clinton. It is clear that she has at least two homes, one in New York and one inside the heads of my colleagues. But this is actually about President Trump.

While I appreciate my colleagues speaking for what President Trump may do after the election, citing what his press secretary has said, and my colleague from Texas said that he believes that the President will peacefully accept the transfer of power, the President has never said that.

In fact, he was asked: "Will you commit to making sure there is a peaceful transfer of power after the election?" And he said: "Well, we are going to have to see what happens."

He is not saying we are going to have to go to the courts, that we are going to contest this. He is suggesting that we may have something other than a peaceful transfer of power, which, of course, would be a violent transfer of power, a violent holding of power.

Then, he was asked again: "Will you commit to making sure that there is a peaceful transfer of power?" And he said: "Get rid of the ballots and we will have a very peaceful—there won't be a transfer, frankly. There will be a continuation."

Again, not himself saying there will be a peaceful transfer of power. So, we really can't rely on anyone else, other than what the President has said.

□ 1730

So we really can't rely on anyone else other than what the President has said. And I don't disagree with my colleagues that if there are issues in the election that both parties have a right to contest those issues, to go to the courts through the legal channels, but that is not what this is about.

This resolution talks about a peaceful transfer of power. In fact, they were complaining that it is not a bipartisan resolution. Actually, it is identical to the bipartisan, unanimously passed resolution in the Senate.

To my colleague from Florida who is controlling time on the other side, I understand he doesn't like that this resolution is on the floor, and I would yield to my colleague respecting his service as a veteran, in our country, he is voting for this resolution. I would be shocked if I heard that my colleague is not going to vote for something that passed unanimously in the Senate.

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

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, while I know the comments of the majority's

time manager were directed to my colleague from Florida, it will likely not surprise him that I will regularly vote against things that pass unanimously in the United States Senate. I don't hold that as a standard.

We are here on a resolution regarding the peaceful transition of power. We barely had a peaceful transition of power in 2016. My colleague, the gentleman from California, was on television almost every night telling the American people that President Trump was an agent of the Russian Government. How fake it all turned out to be.

I rise in opposition to this resolution even though I completely support the peaceful transfer of power. This resolution is a way for Democrats to attack the President and disguise the fact that they will refuse to accept the election results unless they win.

Professional loser Hillary Clinton has told Joe Biden that he should not concede "under any circumstances."

The Transition Integrity Project has said that the aftermath of the November election will be a "street fight, not a legal battle." The same report suggests that Biden could even try to convince States to secede from the Union before accepting a Trump victory.

Are these the actions of a party willing to accept defeat? They weren't willing to accept defeat in the 2016 election. They had to go blame the Russians. I guess I am still waiting for the 13 Russians who were indicted to show up.

No, this resolution is projecting and gaslighting.

The media has begun gaslighting the public, too, saying that it may look like Trump won on election night, but that as ballots are counted, States will flip. How will this great switch be accomplished? Through the Democrats' usual methods: lawfare, fraud, and violence.

Look at what we have already seen: Mike Bloomberg is trying to quite literally buy votes from felons in Florida; in Pennsylvania, absentee ballots for President Trump were found in a dumpster; and in Minnesota, Democrat operatives were caught on camera discussing forcible illegal ballot harvesting.

Democrats ignore all this. They are not on the floor to condemn any of it. As a matter of fact, they have ignored it the same way they ignored the riots and arson and violence in America's cities, the same way they ignore the antifa goon squads and the gangs of fascists in brown shirts who threaten to harm anyone who does not want America to become their communist wicketopia.

Democrats ignore criminality when it helps them and because they not-so-secretly believe that anyone who is punched or maimed or assaulted by antifa might deserve it, especially if they are a member of our brave law enforcement.

Democrats ignore these heinous acts of violence when the victims are Re-

publican or when they are pro-life or when they are Trump supporters. Those lives don't matter to Democrats. But they are more than happy to burn America to the ground when they think it will help them.

This resolution is part of the Democrats' plan to lay the groundwork for a color revolution, the ousting of an elected leader and calling it democracy. But that is not democracy. It is nothing less than the destruction of our cherished Nation.

I unequivocally support the peaceful transfer of power but will vote "no" on this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. I will pray that America survives the Democrats' mad and destructive lust for power.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers the minority floor manager has remaining.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: The real threat to our democracy are the attempts to undermine the election process.

Universal mail-in voting is not the same as absentee ballots like we do in Florida. When a voter requests an absentee ballot, she knows to expect it. Universal mail-in voting is when States mass mail ballots to voters, whether or not a voter has moved, has died, or is otherwise no longer eligible to vote or is even a citizen of our country. Universal mail-in voting increases the risk of election crime or administrative error because States are providing prepaid return envelopes for election ballots.

The U.S. Postal Service does not typically postmark premarked mail, and although it has a policy to postmark election-related mail, its policy is not foolproof, as we have seen in some primary elections over the summer.

All of these last-minute changes will harm the integrity of the election process and risk chaos in the general election. We are already seeing the disastrous results of the Democrats' last-minute process changes.

Last week, the Justice Department found that several military ballots were discarded in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. Seven of the nine ballots were cast for President Trump—not surprising.

This month, the Georgia Secretary of State revealed that at least 1,000 Georgians voted twice in the June 2020 primary, once via mail-in balloting and once in person.

In New York, Governor Cuomo's last-minute shift to all-mail voting cost thousands of ballots in Chairwoman MALONEY's primary to be discarded for lacking postmarks. Election officials took 6 weeks to certify the results of the primary.

In a New Jersey municipal election, a last-minute shift to all-mail voting resulted in the Postal Service still delivering ballots to election officials weeks after the election.

If these problems occurred in local primary elections, the risk to a national general election is even greater. The President is right to highlight these problems, and I fail to understand why Democrats won't.

The best and surest guarantee of electoral integrity is for Americans to vote in person where safe and possible, with absentee ballots available for those who legitimately cannot make it to the polls or have voter ID safeguards in places like we have in Florida.

This resolution is nothing but political messaging and creating a narrative without any facts to base it, just like the Russia collusion hoax.

There is no question that every single American, including President Trump, wants a peaceful transfer of power after a free and fair election, but this rhetoric and fear-mongering by our friends across the aisle must end. The liberal mainstream media and Democrats should stop this nonsense and let the American people speak.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

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

This resolution simply calls for a commitment to the peaceful transfer of power. I know my colleagues on the other side have their own suspicions about what the motive is behind this and want to project onto it something that is not in the language, but this was passed by 100 Senators last week. Every Republican and Democratic Senator voted for this because it reaffirms America's commitment to having a peaceful transfer of power.

What my colleague on the other side just brought up are process issues in the election, but that does not relate or compare to the suggestion that there would be violent opposition to the outcome.

Both sides have a right to use the courts and then accept the outcome. One of my colleagues referenced the 2000 election, litigated all the way to the top of the Supreme Court, and the loser accepted the outcome.

This resolution is calling on us, and it is sad that we have to do this, to reaffirm that principle. It asks the question: Are we Gambia, where an outcome was not accepted and people died, or are we a country that, even in the thick of the Civil War, had a President who was willing to accept the outcome?

Are we Congo where the outcome was not accepted and people died, or are we the country that fought the great war,

the Second World War, the Greatest Generation, who would build a new economy and afford new opportunities?

Are we Bolivia, where the outcome was not accepted and there was violence in the streets, or are we the country that sent someone to the Moon, saw contested election after contested election, but losers left office graciously, just as President H.W. Bush did in the letter I read earlier.

Who do we want to look like? We are imperfect, but the ideas that we are founded upon are perfect, that we are governed by consent, not by leaders or violence, consent of the people. That is what this resolution says.

Thirty-five days to go to the election. I know it is going to be tense in this Chamber, it is going to be tense in this country, but unity in our country during our darkest times has always been an antidote against anything that would seek to divide us or take us away from who we want to be, who we can be, and who we should be—a more perfect Union.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1155.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONSTITUENT SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JOHN H. RUTHERFORD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Amanda Torbush, Constituent Services Representative, the Honorable JOHN H. RUTHERFORD, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 25, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the United States Navy has served me, Amanda Torbush, with a subpoena to testify before a Special Court-Martial of the United States.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

AMANDA TORBUSH,  
Constituent Services Representative.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1825

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERS) at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring forth the privileged resolution, H. Res. 1148.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1148

Whereas, on July 22, 2020, H.R. 7573 was brought to the House floor for a vote, with the purpose of eliminating four specific statues or busts from the United States Capitol along with all others that include individuals who "served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United States" yet failed to address the most ever-present historical stigma in the United States Capitol; that is the source that so fervently supported, condoned and fought for slavery was left untouched, without whom, the evil of slavery could never have continued as it did, to such extreme that it is necessary to address here in order for the U.S. House of Representatives to avoid degradation of historical fact and blatant hypocrisy for generations to come;

Whereas, the Democratic Party Platform of 1840, 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856 states "That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists, or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery . . . are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.;"

Whereas, the Democratic Party Platform of 1856 further declares that "new states" to the Union should be admitted "with or without domestic slavery, as [the state] may elect.;"

Whereas, the Democratic Party Platform of 1856 also resolves that "we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories . . . to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery.;"

Whereas, the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 penalized officials who did not arrest an alleged runaway slave and made them liable for a fine of \$1,000 (about \$28,000 in present-day value); law-enforcement officials everywhere were required to arrest people suspected of being a runaway slave on as little as a claimant's sworn testimony of ownership; the Democratic Party Platform of 1860

directly, in seeking to uphold the Fugitive Slave Act, states that "the enactments of the State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.;"

Whereas, the 14th Amendment, giving full citizenship to freed slaves, passed in 1868 with 94 percent Republican support and 0 percent Democrat support in Congress; the 15th Amendment, giving freed slaves the right to vote, passed in 1870 with 100 percent Republican support and 0 percent Democrat support in Congress;

Whereas, Democrats systematically suppressed African-Americans' right to vote, and by specific example in the 1902 Constitution of the State of Virginia, actually disenfranchised about 90 percent of the Black men who still voted at the beginning of the twentieth century and nearly half of the White men, thereby suppressing Republican voters; the number of eligible African-American voters were thereby forcibly reduced from about 147,000 in 1901 to about 10,000 by 1905; that measure was supported almost exclusively by Virginia Democrats;

Whereas, Virginia's 1902 Constitution was engineered by Carter Glass, future Democratic Party U.S. Representative, Senator, and even Secretary of the Treasury under Democrat President Woodrow Wilson, who proclaimed the goal of the constitutional convention as follows: This Democrat exclaimed, "Discrimination! Why, that is precisely what we propose. That, exactly, is what this Convention was elected for—to discriminate to the very extremity of permissible action under the limits of the federal Constitution, with a view to the elimination of every Negro voter who can be gotten rid of legally.;"

Whereas, in 1912, Democratic President Woodrow Wilson's administration began a racial segregation policy for U.S. government employees and, by 1914, the Wilson administration's Civil Service instituted the requirement that a photograph be submitted with each employment application;

Whereas, the 1924 Democratic National Convention convened in New York City at Madison Square Garden; the convention is commonly known as the "Klan-Bake" due to the overwhelming influence of the Ku Klux Klan in the Democratic Party;

Whereas, Democrat President Franklin Delano Roosevelt continued Woodrow Wilson's policy of segregating White House staff and maintained separate dining rooms for White and Black staffers. He also continued the White House Correspondents Association's ban on credentialing Black journalists for White House duties until outside pressure from Black publications finally forced a change in policy in 1944, the last year of his presidency. According to the American Journal of Public Health, prior to his presidency, Roosevelt not only banned Blacks from receiving treatment at his polio facility in Warm Springs, Georgia, Black staff were forced to live in the basement of the facility or in a segregated dormitory while White staff lived in the hotel or in surrounding cottages;

Whereas, Democrat Congressman Howard Smith, former chairman of the House Rules Committee introduced the "Declaration of Constitutional Principles" in a speech on the House floor where he attacked the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (KS) which determined that segregated public schools were unconstitutional. Smith's declaration urged people to utilize all "lawful means" to avoid the "chaos and confusion" which would occur if they desegregated schools. HistoryHouse.gov states that "Under Smith, the Rules Committee became a graveyard for