

promptly enacted \$1.6 billion to address it. A total of one person died from the Zika virus. Of course, there were many other health problems that were attributed to it.

Again, the \$1.6 billion that was appropriated was rightfully so. Nowhere near that much is appropriated for mental health and suicide research on a yearly basis. The National Institutes of Health needs the money.

Congress has a responsibility to assist individuals experiencing mental health challenges through effective legislation and research subsidies. Congress should advance policies that increase America's access to mental healthcare treatment as a mechanism for preventing self-harm incidents and suicide attempts.

Just one-third of Americans with mental illness receive treatment—just one-third. Our country is in desperate need of additional trained therapists, psychologists, and counselors. This lack of access can be partly attributed to a shortage of mental healthcare professionals in certain communities.

In order to establish a more reliable supply of mental healthcare professionals, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO and I recently introduced the Mental Health Professionals Workforce Shortage Loan Repayment Act of 2019.

Our bill delivers professionals to areas that require mental healthcare experts the most by forgiving their secondary education student loans. It invests in bolstering our mental health workforce, while expanding treatment for Americans with mental illness.

I am proud to stand by my colleague across the aisle, GRACE NAPOLITANO, in pushing this most important bill.

Americans across the country, regardless of age, social status, or background, are affected by mental illness. Mental Health Awareness Month serves as an opportunity for any of my congressional colleagues, Republican or Democrat, to join the conversation.

I can't think of a more bipartisan action than what we are talking about today. Together—together—we can improve mental health outcomes for Americans across the country by engaging in thoughtful discussion and crafting efficient policies.

Finally, it is an honor, once again, to co-chair the Congressional Mental Health Caucus with Congresswoman NAPOLITANO. I am grateful for her continued leadership, her commitment to this issue, her stewardship, and her mentorship to me on it, as well.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to hear all the work that Mr. KATKO has done on mental health. He has been exceptional in this field, and I thank him for all his support. Working together is a pleasure.

What is mental health? If somebody says you belong in a crazy house, not so. It could be a child in school, a middle school, suffering the effects of bullying, or somebody who has had trauma, a shooting or something that affects them, and it won't go away and it festers when they grow older.

Forty percent of the incarcerated need mental health services. Foster children, who are unaware of what their next step will be after they are emancipated, need mental health support.

That can just go on and on. It is something that is needed. Somehow, we are not doing our job.

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

NO PERSON IS ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I love my country. I love what it stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I am a person who sings the national anthem. I salute the flag. But I also respect those who, as a matter of principle, choose not to do as I. I love my country.

I believe that one of the hallmarks of our justice system is the concept that no person is above the law—no person. It doesn't matter where you were born; it doesn't matter where you happen to be in life; it doesn't matter what office you happen to hold. No person is above the law.

This is something that people revere us for the world over, the belief that in this country you will not be above the law. But they also understand that, in doing this, no person will be beneath the law. The law applies equally to all in the United States of America.

I believe in this concept to the extent that I will stand alone and say that the President of the United States is not to be above the law. And I will stand alone because, on some things, it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

So I will stand alone and say to the world that, in this country, wherein we indicate in the Pledge of Allegiance liberty and justice for all, in this country, wherein we recognize that all persons are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, in this country, no person is above the law.

When it comes to the law as it relates to the President of the United States of America, the place where the President is brought before the bar of justice is this House of Representatives. This is the place where the law and the President will come together.

And in this place, because of the Constitution of the United States of America, Article II, Section 4, if a President commits impeachable acts, the President is brought before this bar of justice—not brought here in person, but those acts are called to the attention of the House of Representatives.

Each Member of the House can do so, and in so doing, each Member can have what is called a privileged resolution presented. When this resolution is pre-

sented, a President who is believed to have committed an impeachable act can be brought before this House, this bar of justice. Those acts can be voted upon.

□ 1445

This is the only place on the planet Earth where a President of the United States can be brought to justice while in office, in this House of Representatives.

This is why I have stood my ground. I have said that this President, who has committed impeachable acts, must be brought before the House of Representatives for his impeachable acts, his impeachable behavior.

I marvel at those who would say that the President has done things that merit his impeachment but would then go on to say, "But I don't think we should impeach him."

They will say they don't think so because if we do so, the President won't be convicted in the Senate.

The Constitution of the United States of America does not require a conviction in the Senate before there is impeachment in the House. The House acts first, and then the Senate is given the opportunity to give its response.

In this House of Representatives, it is imperative that we let the world know because the world is watching. The world is watching the United States of America, which means it is really watching this House of Representatives.

They want to see if we are going to allow a President who has committed impeachable acts—they want to see if we are going to allow him to escape the long arm of the law. They want to see whether or not we truly believe that no one is above the law, and that includes the President of the United States of America.

We must act.

Mr. Mueller has taken up the cause. We outsourced the investigation to the executive branch of the government, which was not the appropriate thing to do. The Framers of the Constitution never intended that the agents of the executive branch investigate the chief executive officer, which would be the President, for impeachment purposes. That was never contemplated.

They gave us Article II, Section 4, so that we, the Members of this august body, would take up our duty, our responsibility, and our obligation.

They gave us the way. The question is, do we have the will?

Mr. Mueller has done his job. He has submitted to us his report. That report alone is enough for us to bring Articles of Impeachment.

That report is based upon persons giving statements that were subject to the penalty of perjury if they should give untruthful statements.

It is clearly a roadmap to impeachment. Mr. Mueller has so much as said—not in these exact words, but when you understand the import of his language, he has so much as said that

if he could bring the President to justice, he would.

But they have a rule. They have a mandate in the Justice Department that they will not indict a sitting President. Whether you agree with that or not, that is the rule that Mr. Mueller believes in, and they followed it.

He went on to say that he is not exonerating the President by not bringing the President before the bar of justice. He is simply saying to us: I have done what I am allowed to do. Now, Congress, it is up to you. I have given you what I believe is the evidence. You take this evidence and do with it what you believe to be appropriate.

If Congress takes this evidence and simply sits on it, if we engage in the paralysis of analysis—a phrase that I borrow from Dr. Martin Luther King—if we investigate until someone will eventually say, “Well, it is too late to go on with impeachment. It is too late now. It will look political. Let’s just wait until the next election,” that is not what the Framers of the Constitution intended. They intended for us to have the will to follow the way that they accorded us in the Constitution.

We made it clear that we wanted to wait on the Mueller report. Well, we waited. Now there are persons who are saying let’s wait until the next election.

I refuse to wait until the next election. I refuse to send the world a message that, as a Member of this body, I allowed the President to go unchecked, that I did not bring Articles of Impeachment.

Mr. President, I want you to know that the hand of justice awaits you. I want you to know that this body is going to take up impeachment.

And here is why: If we fail to do so, we will allow the President, who has committed impeachable acts, to go out and market himself as a person who has been vindicated by our inaction. He will say to the world: If I committed an impeachable act, they surely would have brought impeachment before the House of Representatives.

After all, one party has more than enough Members to bring impeachment before the House without the help of another party. He will tell the world that there was no collusion, and he did nothing that would merit impeachment.

This is what he would say. He would have that liberty. Even if he doesn’t say it, he would have the liberty. My guess is that he would. That is what I believe.

We must bring impeachment before this body so as not to allow a President who has done things worthy of impeachment to go out and contend that he is not subject to impeachment and that he should be considered a person who has been vindicated by our inaction.

What are some of the things that the President has done that would merit his impeachment? Let’s just start with

Mr. Mueller’s report. I won’t go through everything in its entirety.

He lists some 10 possibilities. I am just going to mention trying as best as he could to get people to have the investigation terminated by having the person who is performing the investigation fired, having that person resign, having that person cease and desist.

The President started this with Mr. Comey when Mr. Comey was investigating the President’s association, by and through his campaign, with Russia, interference in our elections.

This kind of thing is something that we would want to have investigated. That was the genesis of it.

Then we can move forward to the latest rendition that Mr. Mueller has given us as it relates to the counsel to the President and his desire to have the counsel have word given to certain parties that the President desires—probably not say that, but that was his desire—to have the lawyer who was investigating, Mr. Mueller, removed.

This is not acceptable. This is obstruction. Obstruction takes place when you attempt to do such a thing.

There are other things in between. As important as these are, I believe separating babies from their mothers as a policy is impeachable when you add it to the many other things that he has done with reference to people of color.

To say that the countries in Africa are s-hole countries and then develop policies, immigration policies, if you will, that address immigration from these countries, you are putting your bigotry into policy.

To say that there were some nice people among the racists, the bigots, the xenophobes, the Islamophobes, the homophobes, the Klansmen, the neo-Nazis who marched in Charlottesville where a person lost her life, where others were injured, to say that there were some very fine people among them, very, very nice people, if you will, among them, if I said that, I assure you there would be a penalty for my doing so. If any Member of Congress said such a thing, there would be a penalty for doing so.

I am not above the law. Members of Congress are not above the law. And the President cannot be above the law.

To say this gives these persons who were screaming “blood and soil,” and, “Jews will not replace us,” to say that we will not take up this cause in this House is to say that the President is above the law when we know if one of our Members did it, we would take up this cause in the House of Representatives.

The President cannot be above the law. No Member of this House can be above the law. No judge can be above the law. No police officer can be above the law. The law applies equally to all.

The President has engaged in these invidious acts, harmful acts, harmful to society, telling members of the constabulary, the police, that when you have persons in your custody, you don’t have to be nice to them.

We know about how many persons have been mishandled in the hands of the police. Not all police do this, but some have. In fact, many have gone to jail. That doesn’t mean all law enforcement officers are bad. It just means that those who did it are, and we don’t want to encourage others to do such a thing.

The President has committed impeachable acts. These impeachable acts can be brought to this House, and they must be brought before the House of Representatives.

Right now, the President is committing obstruction by causing persons who should appear before Congress’ various committees—by doing all that he can to cause them not to appear. He is continuing to obstruct.

He does not want congressional committees to perform their lawful duties, the duties that have been accorded them. He is standing in the way, thwarting as much as he can. He wants to thwart subpoenas. He wants to make impotent the subpoena power of the Congress of the United States of America.

This is a continuation of his obstruction. His obstruction has to be checked. This is where it is checked.

There is currently, as I stand and speak to you, a constitutional crisis taking place. There is a standoff between the executive branch, wherein the President is at the helm, and the House of Representatives. A standoff exists, as I speak to you.

This is a constitutional crisis. The President is creating this constitutional crisis.

The President ought to be brought before the bar of justice for obstructing, for what he is doing right now to create this constitutional crisis.

Don’t let anybody kid you. I have heard persons on these news programs say that somebody has said that there is a constitutional crisis. Well, I am that somebody. I have said it.

Then they go on to say something that would minimize the fact that there is a crisis.

They will be saying that there is a crisis soon. The very persons who are saying now, “Well, don’t worry about that,” they will be saying it soon because the crisis is only going to intensify under this President.

They will be saying there is a constitutional crisis. It is just a matter of time. When they say it, somehow, it is going to have greater legitimacy than it does now when I am saying it.

I believe that we must speak truth to power. I didn’t come to Congress to do this. It is not my desire to be the canary in the coal mine. It is not my desire to take on the President of the United States, the most powerful person in the world.

I do it because I love my country. I do it because we cannot allow a reckless, ruthless, lawless President to remain in office. He has to be impeached.

I do it because I believe that we cannot allow political expediency to

trump the moral imperative to do that which is right.

I do it because we have to make these talking points that we have an action item. That action item is to bring the President before the bar of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I love my country. I promise those who believe as I do that you will see the President have his day in court right here in the Congress of the United States of America, where the Framers of the Constitution intended that we hear the calls and take a vote.

We will all have to vote. I don't lobby people. I simply say, "Vote your conscience."

But I do know this: I believe that history is not going to be kind to us if we take no action. We must act. I will act.

I love my country. For this reason, I would do so.

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

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-30)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2019.

The regime's brutal war on the Syrian people, who have been calling for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including pursuing and using chemical

weapons, supporting terrorist organizations, and obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively continue to foster the rise of extremism and sectarianism and pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Assad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses and calls on the Assad regime to stop its violent war, uphold existing ceasefires, enable the delivery of humanitarian assistance, and negotiate a political transition in Syria that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice. The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2019.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

□ 1500

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-31)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2019.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic, which has been marked by a breakdown of law and order, intersectarian tension, widespread violence and atrocities, and

the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers, threatens the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and the neighboring states, and continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 with respect to the Central African Republic.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2019.

INTENT TO DESIGNATE BRAZIL AS A MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-32)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2321k), I am providing notice of my intent to designate Brazil as a Major Non-NATO Ally.

I am making this designation in recognition of the Government of Brazil's recent commitments to increase defense cooperation with the United States, and in recognition of our own national interest in deepening our defense coordination with Brazil.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2019.

IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE IRON, STEEL, ALUMINUM, AND COPPER SECTORS OF IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-33)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") with respect to Iran that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and to supplement the authorities provided in the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (subtitle D of title XII of Public Law 112-239).

The order takes steps to deny Iran revenue, including revenue derived from the export of products from Iran's