

□ 0915

**AFFIRMING U.S. RECORD ON
ARMENIAN GENOCIDE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 660

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

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

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

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 3. TRANSMISSION OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS.

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

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

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

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

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

(A) by subpoena or otherwise—

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

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

(B) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. No, I do not.

REQUEST TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Think about that, America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

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

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

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

(By Danny Hakim)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge opposition to this resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

What is at stake? Our democracy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

That is not democracy.

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

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

He has barred White House counsel from any participation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

History will judge us all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I support this resolution because we have no choice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A distinguished career ambassador was publicly smeared and pushed aside.

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

death struggle with Russia—was blocked.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

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

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

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

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

My amendment will do three very simple things:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

But do you know what this Congress counts?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So what has happened?

There is nothing like that today.

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

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

Madam Speaker, you have failed in that promise.

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

What has changed since those words have been spoken?

Alexander Hamilton wrote that:

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, why do you not trust the people?

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

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

Has animosity risen that high?

Has Hamilton been proven correct again?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 minute remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is a somber and solemn time.

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

We choose due process, regular order and fairness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is against that backdrop that we debate this resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He stated:

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

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

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

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

He stated in his testimony:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 603]

YEAS—231

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

NAYS—196

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

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

NOT VOTING—4

Hice (GA) Rose, John W.
McEachin Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1119

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 604]

YEAS—232

Adams	Allred	Axne
Aguilar	Amash	Barragán

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CURTIS of Utah.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. TIPTON of Colorado.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CROW of Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CURTIS
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 605]
AYES—180

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

NOT VOTING—4

Hice (GA)
McEachin
Rose, John W.
Timmons

□ 1127

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

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

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY ACT

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

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

□ 1130

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

NAYS—196

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