

And in the past year, we have done just that.

We've passed legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs, combat climate change, secure our elections, make sure our veterans have the care that they need, and that our children attend safe schools.

Impeachment was not our only goal.

This president left us no other choice.

After reading the facts, listening to the testimony of witnesses, and seeing how this President put his own personal political interests above the American people, I will vote to impeach Donald Trump.

This is not something I take pleasure in.

This is a solemn moment for our country.

This vote is about the safety of the American people and the future of our democracy. I cannot, in good conscience, ignore his outright disregard for the rule of law, his continued obstruction of Congress, and the use of his office for personal gain. President Trump's most recent abuse of power was the breaking point.

For a sitting president of the United States to actively seek the interference of a foreign government in our election by withholding critical military aid is a violation of his oath of office.

President Trump has purposefully damaged the integrity of our elections and put American lives at risk.

The founders of this great country and the authors of the Constitution created a system of checks and balances so that no single branch of government would become too powerful and abuse that power.

They devised a mechanism for removing a president from office should a person like Donald Trump, use the office for their own personal, unscrupulous reasons.

I came to my decision after reviewing the mountain of evidence and the testimony of several high-ranking White House officials who have testified and confirmed his malfeasance.

I do not take my responsibility as Representative for California's 29th District lightly. Serving the people of my district is one of the greatest honors of my life.

It is my constitutional obligation to do what is right for my district and for all of the American people.

Madam Speaker, President Trump remains a threat to our democracy and by voting to impeach, I am fulfilling my constitutional duty and living up to the oath I swore before the American people.

HONORING SYLVIA ROSEN ON HER
100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Sylvia Rosen, a New York City original who turned 100 years old this week.

Born December 14, 1919 in Manhattan, New York, Sylvia lived with her mother, sister and three brothers. In 1928, at age nine, Sylvia moved to Brooklyn where her family settled at south 9th and Roehling.

Sylvia attended elementary school at P.S. 16 in Williamsburg. Later, she attended Seward Park high school. Having grown up with

three brothers, Sylvia was a tomboy and enjoyed playing softball with friends and checkers and marbles with brothers and sisters.

After graduating high school, Sylvia attended a trade school for sewing. In 1939, Sylvia married her husband, Hyman, in a local synagogue. They moved to Independence Towers when they first opened in 1965. Although her husband passed away in 1978, Sylvia still resides in Independence Towers to this day.

Sylvia's best friends are Dina and Elsie. They live nearby and the three celebrate their birthdays together. She also has a cousin named Sylvia. They were both named after their grandma and her mother's best friend.

Madam Speaker, as Ms. Sylvia turns 100, I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing her all the best for a joyous and momentous celebration.

RECOGNIZING MS. LISA
WILLENBERG

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lisa Willenberg for being selected as the new Chancellor of the University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton (UACCM).

The college was established in 1963 and Ms. Willenberg serves as the college's fourth Chancellor and the first woman in this position.

She earned her Bachelor of Business Administration from the University of Central Arkansas and Master of Education at the University of Arkansas.

Ms. Willenberg has served at Morrilton for 27 years, first as a general accountant and, in 2011, becoming Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations—handling the college's finances, human resources, information technology and physical plant.

Under her leadership, the college has increased its fiscal reserves, improved the college's financial scoring and constructed new campus facilities to benefit the students.

Congratulations to Chancellor Lisa Willenberg on being selected for this prestigious position, and I look forward to the school's success for years to come.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about why I am voting "Yes" on both articles of impeachment against President Trump:

Impeachment is a solemn and historic task. With the outrageous, ongoing conduct of President Trump, impeachment is necessary for upholding our oath of office and the Constitution. Benjamin Franklin said after the Con-

stitutional Convention in Philadelphia that we have 'a republic, if you can keep it.' House Democrats intend to keep it.

This impeachment process, holding the President accountable, is only possible because the House majority changed, but the root cause of it all is the President's own unconstitutional, reckless behavior. He withheld \$391 million in congressionally approved, tax-funded military aid from a free country, Ukraine, that is trying to defend itself from a dictatorship, Russia, and he did this for political gain. His action appears to have cost Ukrainian lives. He obstructed investigation and oversight by Congress, which is a co-equal, independent branch of government under the Constitution. He appears to have no shame or regret about any of this behavior, which means he is likely to repeat it unless he is held accountable.

No one is above the law in America—that is the principle the House is voting to uphold. Now the nation will be watching the Senate to see if Senators will uphold their oath to do impartial justice.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, the United States is based on a principle that our second President, John Adams of Massachusetts, so eloquently summed up long ago: we are a 'government of laws, not of men.'

No one, absolutely no one, stands above the law.

Over a century after President Adams uttered those words, another Massachusetts statesman, John F. Kennedy, delivered his famous "City on a Hill" speech before the General Court of Massachusetts prior to the start of his administration in 1961. President Kennedy powerfully proclaimed that 'we must always consider that we shall be a city upon a hill [and that] the eyes of all people are upon us.'

He continued, explaining that:

For of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions:

First, were we truly men of courage—with the courage to stand up to one's enemies—and the courage to stand up, when necessary, to one's associates—the courage to resist public pressure, as well as private greed?

Secondly, were we truly men of judgment—with perceptive judgment of the future as well as the past—of our own mistakes as well as the mistakes of others—with enough wisdom to know that we did not know, and enough candor to admit it?

Third, were we truly men of integrity—men who never ran out on either the principles in which they believed or the people who believed in them—men who believed in us—men whom neither financial gain nor political ambition could ever divert from the fulfillment of our sacred trust?

Finally, were we truly men of dedication—with an honor mortgaged to no single individual or group, and compromised by no private obligation or aim, but devoted solely to serving the public good and the national interest.

Courage—judgment—integrity—dedication—these are the historic qualities of the Bay Colony and the Bay State—the qualities which this state has consistently sent to this chamber on Beacon Hill here in Boston and to Capitol Hill back in Washington.

Madam Speaker, we are called to serve in this great country with courage, judgement, integrity, and dedication. And when those among us—those in the highest positions of public trust—willingly corrupt those values for personal benefit, it is incumbent upon us to act, however reluctantly.

I believe that it has become undeniably clear that the President of the United States, Donald J. Trump, has engaged in a pattern of behavior designed to extract personal and political benefit from the Office of the President. In doing so, President Trump irreparably violated his oath to preserve—to protect—and to defend—the Constitution of the United States of America. It is with a heavy heart, and a deep reverence to that same oath that I refuse to abandon mine.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRAMENTO STATE'S EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the Education Opportunity Program

(EOP) at Sacramento State. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service that Sacramento State's Education Opportunity Program provides to our community.

Sacramento State's EOP has graduated thousands of students, supporting the success of first-generation and low-income scholars from educationally-disadvantaged and historically-underrepresented communities. Sacramento State was one of the original California State University (CSU) campuses to embrace an Education Opportunity Program. Under the leadership of Dr. Edwin Klingelhofer, the program began with a successful pilot for 36 students and has expanded to now serve over 1,500 students each year. Soon after the program began at Sacramento State, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1072, which established similar programs at all CSU campuses. Since then, Sacramento State's EOP has thrived under the leadership of Dr. Marcellene Watson-Derbigny and the exceptional staff of the Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Programs office. Their dedicated service has paved the way for equity at Sacramento State and does not go unrecognized.

EOP was Sacramento State's first equity program. It provides admissions assistance, a special orientation to university life, the Summer Bridge Academy, academic advising, personal counseling, tutoring, financial assistance, and various other programs. EOP is vital in ensuring the access, retention, and

graduation achievements of underserved student populations. EOP is a major pathway for first-generation and low-income college students to succeed through its provision of a quality educational experience at Sacramento State. I wish the university's faculty, staff, students, and alumni success as they work to help individuals earn a college degree and fulfill their college dreams.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the Education Opportunity Program at Sacramento State. As Sacramento State and the wider community celebrate, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the accomplishments of Sacramento State's Education Opportunity Program's staff and students, as they have paved the way for the success and representation of historically-underserved students.

INTRODUCTION OF JONES ACT
MODERNIZATION BILLS

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, today I introduce three bills to end a century of monopolistic closed market domestic cargo shipping to and from my isolated home state of Hawaii as well as the other island and separated jurisdictions of our country not part of the continental United States. In doing so, we will break the stranglehold on the peoples and economies of these exposed communities and their resulting sky-high costs of living which results from just a few domestic shipping companies controlling the lifeline of commerce upon which we absolutely depend.

These bills all amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, also known as the Jones Act. That federal law mandates that all cargo shipping between U.S. ports occur exclusively on U.S., not foreign, flagged vessels. Additionally, the law requires that these vessels are built in the U.S. and owned and crewed by U.S. citizens.

The Jones Act was enacted in a protectionist era under the guise of preserving a strong national merchant marine. But today it is just an anachronism: most of the world's shipping is by way of an international merchant marine functioning in an open, competitive market. And those few U.S. flag cargo lines that remain have maneuvered the Jones Act to develop virtual monopolies over domestic cargo shipping to, from and within our most isolated and exposed locales—our island and offshore states and territories—that have no alternative modes of transportation such as trucking or rail.

My Hawaii is a classic example. Located almost 2,500 miles off the West Coast, we import well over 90 percent of our life necessities by ocean cargo. There are plenty of international cargo lines who could and would compete for a share of that market. Yet only two U.S. flag domestic cargo lines—Matson Navigation and Pasha Hawaii—operate a virtual duopoly over our lifeline.

While they are nominally subject to federal regulation, the fact of the matter is that cargo prices have gone in only one direction—up, fast and repeatedly, despite a surplus of international shipping—and it is indisputable that

there is no downward market pressure which would otherwise result from meaningful competition. These accelerating cargo prices are not absorbed by the shipping lines, but passed through all the way down the chain, to the transporters, wholesalers, retailers, small businesses, mom-n-pops and ultimately consumers, of all of the elementals of life, from food to medical supplies, clothes, housing and virtually all other goods. The result is a crippling drag on an already-challenged economy and the very quality of life in Hawaii.

The broadest, deepest effects of the Jones Act on Hawaii result from its impact on west-bound imports from the continental United States to Hawaii. But Hawaii is an export location as well, in key products such as agriculture and livestock. Here the Jones Act also effectively stifles meaningful competition in getting those products to their primary markets on the U.S. Mainland. Because the producers of these products and all that rely for their own livelihood on their successful export have to eat inflated shipping costs, these export industries, which any economist knows are the ultimate key to any economy's prosperity, are also crippled.

Let's take a concrete example: Hawaii's once-prosperous ranching/cattle industry, which is so key to the economic health and the very lifestyle of so much of areas like the rural Big Island, where I was born and raised. That industry depends on getting its product, young cattle, to West Coast pens and transportation hubs in a cost-efficient manner.

There are foreign cargo carriers that specialize, through custom cattle ships and overall sensitivity and adjustment to rancher timetables and needs, in such transport, but the Jones Act outright excludes them from the Hawaii-Mainland market. As a result, Hawaii's ranchers are reduced to two crippling, cost magnifying options.

The first is to ship their cargo by foreign carriers to Canada, where they have to go through a myriad of bureaucratic, cost-magnifying gyrations to get their product eventually to their U.S. markets. The second is to beg for the goodwill of the domestic carriers, to whom this is simply a hindrance rather than a major commitment, to ship directly to the West Coast.

And it shows: most of the cattle are first shipped from Hawaii's Neighbor Islands, where the bulk of the cattle industry is located, to O'ahu, in small "cow-tainers," where they sit for days in Honolulu Harbor awaiting the return to the Mainland of one of the massive cargo ships designed and utilized for quite another purpose. The result (besides associated higher costs) is in-harbor cattle waste disposal challenges, higher in-transit cattle mortality and lower-weight cattle delivery to market. That's what happens when you try to squeeze a square peg into a round hole.

More broadly, there is much evidence about the direct impact of the Jones Act on shipping prices to noncontiguous areas. At a basic level, the everyday goods that we rely on in Hawaii cost much more than on the Mainland, a difference which largely cannot be attributed to anything other than shipping costs. Yesterday, there was a 30 percent difference in the price of a gallon of milk at Safeway grocery stores in Honolulu and Long Beach, California. My constituents pay \$6.39 for a gallon of whole milk and those in Long Beach, one of the major ports where Hawaii's good come