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AFIRMING 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 hearing recognizes this resolution.

(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 such questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of questioning, and such questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and 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 that the ranking minority member deems necessary 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 request, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(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.

(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 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 served by any person designated by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(D) 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.

(E) 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 deems appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution. The chair shall transmit such report and appendix, 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 authorized to conduct proceedings 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 deemed 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 described 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 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 may deem 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 do not live in an 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.

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

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 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 the 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 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 is 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 been 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.

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.

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 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.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate 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.

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 fair to anyone. 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: they 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 included. 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 majority the right to subpoena witnesses and materials only with the concurrence of the minority, 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 the committee has 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 President 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 prepared 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 gives rights to 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 consider. Let me just say, briefly, that this resolution provides fewer 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. If there is a ‘true’ President’s counsel to ask questions at the presentation of evidence.

Under our procedures, the ranking minority members of the Judiciary Committee are the same minority 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 witness subpoenas, 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. 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 chair 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 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 chair, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chair, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them. The chair, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, may administer oaths to any witness. For the purposes of this section, ‘things’ includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memoranda, papers, documents, data compilations from which information is obtained or may be derived, 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 chair 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 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, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, tape recordings, 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. MCOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN), the Assistant Speaker.

Mr. LUJAN. 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. MCGOVERN. 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-
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 more power to run this secret proceeding in a bunker in the basement of the Capitol.

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 a bunker in the basement of the Capitol.

We have less than 13 months before the next election. Americans understand 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 I would not participate in any effort to pressure the president to secure a political benefit for personally injurious policies.”

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 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 time was on July 18, when the colonel met with senior officials at the White House, in a stormy meeting in which Mr. Bolton is said to have had a handshake exchange with Mr. Zelensky 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.

“[The] president instructed Mr. Sandland to push for an investigation of the Bidens. ‘There is no such thing as the N.S.C. 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 Europe, Russia, and Eurasian 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.

Mr. 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 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 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, dedicated public servant 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 yield the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Collins).

Mr. Coles. Madam Speaker. The reason we are here 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 gone to the Judiciary Committee, he is saying that they 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 this out of the way. The White House appears to have frozen out Colonel Vindman and a cloud has fallen on this House.

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 to 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 warned us 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 Parliamentary said we couldn't. That is just false. It needs to be corrected.

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.

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. Coles. 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
Mr. 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. The resolution of this bill, 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 permits 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, but 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 gentleman 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 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, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The gentleman wants to talk about a sham process; let’s talk about a sham process.

Instead of honoring its obligation 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 would be a forum to look for 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.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman 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, 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 the people 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 we're 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 in a way that is, in fact, 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 con-
sume you in a political, partisan proc-
tess 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. They have abso-
lutely 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 Chair-
man SCHIFF and Speaker PELOSI.

Madam Speaker, I urge my col-
leagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I
yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman
from Florida (Ms. SHALALA), a distin-
guished member of the Rules Com-
mmittee.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, hav-
ing been through this before, I know
how much impeachment investiga-
tions 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 in-
vestigating our own President for com-
promising our national security and
obstructing justice. Regardless of poli-
tical ideology, we all understand our
constitutional duty.

It is with profound sadness and dis-
appointment 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 the Federal Government account-
able 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.

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

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, the im-
peachment and removal of the Presi-
dent is a serious matter. At its heart,
its small, partisan group in Wash-
ington overturn the will of the entire
American people.

Almost all Americans believe in fair-
ness 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 ne-
cessary.

I will not legitimize this unprece-
dented and unfair charade with this
today.

Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF
long ago abandoned the due process
and fairness that was guaranteed dur-
ing the Ombudsman. I know
because I was here in Congress for it.

There is simply no cause for this im-
peachment inquiry—none. It is shame-
ful 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 distin-
guished chairman of the Permanent Se-
lect Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise
in strong support of H. Res. 660. I rise
in strong support of the resolution, 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 now, 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 coun-
try and Constitution that we all love and
have pledged to defend.

For the past several weeks, the Intel-
ligence 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 ques-
tion 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 pre-
ceded and followed that call.

That work has necessarily occurred
behind closed doors because we have
had the task of finding the facts ours-
elves, without the benefit of the inves-
tigation of liberty to ourselves and our pos-
terity, do ordain and establish this
Constitution of the United States of
America.”

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

We are going to the other side of the
world, that it would be paired with a
commitment to crack down on corrup-
tion at all levels, no matter who some-
one’s daddy is or what their political
ambitions are.

I think we all know that this was in-
evitable. From the moment Donald J.
Trump was elected, the ends of harass-
ment 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
dignity to the solemnity of this pro-
cess. We can stand and be count-
ed. 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 bless-
ings of liberty to ourselves and our pos-
terity, do ordain and establish this
Constitution of the United States of
America.”

As I mentioned earlier, this is a solemn
case. No one deserves to be in priso-

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, the im-
peachment and removal of the Presi-
dent is a serious matter. At its heart,
it lets a small, partisan group in Wash-
ington overturn the will of the entire
American people.

Almost all Americans believe in fair-
ness and, when accused, the right to
due process. This sham impeachment
offers neither.
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 in declaring 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 Founders 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 support the Constitution of the United States. That is what this vote is about.

Today, I 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, how we work, and, again, doing so in a way that honors what the Constitution of our nation established.

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.

In a way that brings people together that is healing rather than dividing.

In this process, we must respect the Americans who have been impacted by this investigation.

And that is how we will honor our oath.

Today, I urge an “aye” vote. We must support the rule of law.

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

ernment to interfere in our elections and 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 ag-
gression.

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

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of H. Res. 680 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 partici-
pate. 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 Representa-
tives. The White House has ignored duly authorized subpoenas and has tried to prevent witnesses from testi-
fying.

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 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 in stead 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 distinguished member from New York (Mr. Morelle), another distin-
guished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Morelle. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 680.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply troubled that this process has become nec-

essary 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 Amer-

icans 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 pre-

sented during these proceedings. In-

deed, the President will have strong protections as we weigh the evidence during our deliberations.

Our only goal is uncovering the truth: Did the President purposefully lie to the Constitution and preserve 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 purposefully lie to

the Constitution? 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 a solemn obliga-
tion, but it is our obligation, nonethe-
less.

Madam Speaker, I urge my col-
leagues to join me in supporting this resolution so we may uphold our oath, our constitutional standard, but just because you have got the votes, but that is not how impeachment was supposed to go. In fact, Alexander Hamilton himse-

lfs, during the debate on the Con-

stitution, in the Federalist Papers, warned of days like this, that the greatest danger is that the decision on impeach-

ment "will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstrations of in-

nocence 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 legisla-

tion, to lower drug prices that won't come to this floor for the reason of impeach-

ment.

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 in-

fatuation with impeachment.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, when you look through this resolution, you see how one-sided, how Soviet-style this is run-

ning. This is the United States of America. Don't run a sham process, a tainted process like this resolution en-

sures.

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 disting-
guished 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 inves-

tigate 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 in our 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. McGovern. 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 our 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, the Nation has worked 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. McGovern. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. Waters), the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. Waters. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. 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 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 gentleman 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 gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGovern. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Cole).

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 California (Ms. Swalwell).

Ms. 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 forward 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 of Colorado. 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.

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 most pressing national security issues regarding China or Iran?

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

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 sycophants 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 it says. 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 there, 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 of this 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 one day 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 serve our country. But when you go back to the American public with the achievement of more subpanes 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, 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. MCOVERN. 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.

The chair of the 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 drug costs. 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 re-political gala, 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 the United States.

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

There are 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 President Clinton, I urge 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 its power to impeach President 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 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 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.

This is consistent with the President’s declaration 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 defense.

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 so wore 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, 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 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 25, 2019, the President called President Volodymyr Zelensky to congratulate him. On July 25, 2019, the call occurred. I listened in on the call in the Situation Room with the President, the Vice President, and senior officials 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 proceeded to investigate the Bidens and Burisma, it would likely be interpreted as a partisan play which would undoubtedly result in Ukrainian support for Russia, which it has thus far maintained. This would all undermine U.S. national security. Following the call, I again reported my concerns to the NSC’s lead council.

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.

The President’s allegations are utterly indefensible. 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 directed 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 provides 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 was 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 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 outlines 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 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 damaging 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 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
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

YEAS—231

Adams
Aguliar
Alied
Akin
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Bank
Bar
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Adams
Aguliar
Alied
Akin
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Bank
Bar
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—231

Adams
Aguliar
Alied
Akin
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Bank
Bar
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—231

Adams
Aguliar
Alied
Akin
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Bank
Bar
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—231

Adams
Aguliar
Alied
Akin
Arrington
Babin
Balderson
Bank
Bar
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis

[Roll No. 603]
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
October 31, 2019
H8698

A 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 de- clares 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) 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. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, 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. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, 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. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, 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. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, 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. Pursuant to rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-204 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.