

## NOT VOTING—15

Axne	Gottheimer	King (IA)
Bost	Green (TN)	Kuster (NH)
Buck	Griffith	Long
Clay	Hastings	Ryan
Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Wright

□ 1412

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.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

## AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 430) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules, printed in the resolution, is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 430

*That the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives is author-*

*ized, on behalf of such Committee, to initiate or intervene in any judicial proceeding before a Federal court—*

*(1) to seek declaratory judgments and any and all ancillary relief, including injunctive relief, affirming the duty of—*

*(A) William P. Barr, Attorney General, to comply with the subpoena that is the subject of the resolution accompanying House Report 116-105; and*

*(B) Donald F. McGahn, II, former White House Counsel, to comply with the subpoena issued to him on April 22, 2019; and*

*(2) to petition for disclosure of information regarding any matters identified in or relating to the subpoenas referred to in paragraph (1) or any accompanying report, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e), including Rule 6(e)(3)(E) (providing that the court may authorize disclosure of a grand-jury matter “preliminarily to... a judicial proceeding”).*

*Resolved, That the chair of each standing and permanent select committee, when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, retains the ability to initiate or intervene in any judicial proceeding before a Federal court on behalf of such committee, to seek declaratory judgments and any and all ancillary relief, including injunctive relief, affirming the duty of the recipient of any subpoena duly issued by that committee to comply with that subpoena. Consistent with the Congressional Record statement on January 3, 2019, by the chair of the Committee on Rules regarding the civil enforcement of subpoenas pursuant to clause 8(b) of rule II, a vote of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group to authorize litigation and to articulate the institutional position of the House in that litigation is the equivalent of a vote of the full House of Representatives.*

*Resolved, That in connection with any judicial proceeding brought under the first or second resolving clauses, the chair of any standing or permanent select committee exercising authority thereunder has any and all necessary authority under Article I of the Constitution.*

*Resolved, That the chair of any standing or permanent select committee exercising authority described in the first or second resolving clause shall notify the House of Representatives, with respect to the commencement of any judicial proceeding thereunder.*

*Resolved, That the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives shall, with the authorization of the Speaker, represent any standing or permanent select committee in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in the first or second resolving clause.*

*Resolved, That the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives is authorized to retain private counsel, either for pay or pro bono, to assist in the representation of any standing or permanent select committee in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in the first or second resolving clause.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 430.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a dark time. This Congress is being tested—in this case, not by a foreign adversary but by our own President, a President who is undertaking a relentless campaign of obstruction and stonewalling.

We have never seen anything like this. Never before, Mr. Speaker, has a President from either party so flagrantly ignored Congress' constitutional oversight authority and our Nation's separation of powers.

You don't have to take my word for it. President Trump has declared, “We are fighting all the subpoenas,” and, “I don't want people testifying.” These words make Richard Nixon look like an Eagle Scout.

His Attorney General, William Barr, is apparently more than willing to follow the President's command. He has refused to release the full, unredacted Mueller report and any underlying evidence until a compromise was finally reached yesterday. That is after the Judiciary Committee had already voted to hold him in contempt of Congress. Apparently, the Attorney General went from being America's lawyer to being the defense counsel for the President of the United States.

I hope the Justice Department acts in good faith on this new agreement. These are documents that Congress needs to see in response to Special Counsel Mueller's findings. But if they do not, and if the Attorney General holds back key information, then all options need to be on the table, including enforcing these subpoenas. That is in addition to the fact that some documents and testimony we deserve to obtain could very well fall outside the bounds of this agreement.

The Mueller report is just the tip of the iceberg. The President is using every trick in the book, including false claims of executive privilege, absolute immunity, and lack of legitimate legislative purpose, all to obstruct legitimate inquiries into matters that impact Americans' daily lives. This includes the President's attack on affordable healthcare coverage for millions of Americans, including those with pre-existing conditions; his family separation policy that has torn apart vulnerable immigrant families; his misappropriation of military funds for his offensive border wall; and his decision to roll back landmark civil rights protections.

This is exactly the sort of concentrated power in the hands of the few that the Founders intentionally prevented through the creation of the three separate but coequal branches of government, each branch with unique powers and responsibilities and each branch expected to act as a check on the power of the others.

But the President is trying to take this balance of power and centralize it

in one place, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. He is acting as though the law applies to every American but himself.

The President's strategy here is clear. Tweet by tweet, quote by quote, he has laid it bare for all of us to see.

The question is whether this Congress will have the courage to take a stand against it and whether we will confront it for what it is, an attack on the very notion of Congress as a co-equal branch of government. I can't speak for my friends on the other side of the aisle, but this Democratic majority will not allow this President to turn a blind eye to the rule of law.

That is why I introduced this measure, H. Res. 430. It is a civil enforcement resolution that will strengthen our hand in court as Congress tries to get the documents this administration is currently trying to hide, so we can uncover the truth and follow the facts, wherever they may lead.

The first part of this resolution follows past precedent used by Democratic and Republican majorities, this time to allow the Judiciary Committee to go to court to enforce subpoenas issued to the Attorney General and former White House General Counsel Don McGahn.

The second part reaffirms key language in House rules, making clear that every committee chair retains the ability to go to Federal court to seek civil enforcement of their subpoenas when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. That includes those already issued, as well as any future subpoenas.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side will be quick to claim this resolution is unprecedented. To them, I would ask this: What is the precedent for an administration refusing to comply with any congressional oversight—no documents, no information, nothing? There isn't one.

We have never seen anything like this before, so we need an appropriate response like this because of this administration's constant obstruction.

I am proud that my fellow committee chairs quickly joined in cosponsoring this resolution, including Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman CUMMINGS, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ENGEL, Judiciary Committee Chairman NADLER, Ways and Means Committee Chairman NEAL, Intelligence Committee Chairman SCHIFF, and Financial Services Committee Chairwoman WATERS.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us. This deserves support from both sides of the aisle.

I know the silence from some of my Republican friends to what this President is doing has been deafening, but this moment demands you finally speak up and say enough is enough. This resolution is not about politics or partisanship. It is about defending the rule of law and the very notion of separation of powers.

The challenge here is so great that if we don't stand up to President Trump

today, then we risk losing the power to stand up to any President in the future.

I strongly urge my colleagues: Let's make clear that the law still matters, even in Donald Trump's America. We can do that by voting "yes" on this resolution and making clear that no one is above the law, not even the President of the United States.

Let's do right by the American people. Let's restore the dignity of this institution. Let's pass this resolution.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H. Res. 430.

It is disappointing that we are here again debating a measure that will have absolutely no impact on the lives of our constituents. Instead of fixing pressing issues like the security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border, the Democrats continue their focus on influencing the 2020 election at taxpayer expense. Americans are tired of this witch hunt.

For nearly 2 years, Democrats claimed that the President colluded with the Russians to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election. After 22 months, 2,800 subpoenas, 500 warrants, 40 FBI agents, and spending \$35 million, Special Counsel Mueller concluded there was no collusion between President Trump and Russia and did not charge him with obstruction.

Yet, my Democratic colleagues continue to attempt to undermine the President of the United States because, all I can think of is, they haven't accepted the fact that he won the election. It is clear to me that the Democrats are trying to influence the 2020 Presidential election at taxpayer expense.

Americans have real problems that we can and should be tackling instead. In May, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended a jaw-dropping 133,000 people at our southern border. That is only the people they caught. Yet, we are here debating subpoenas targeting the President, probably because it will provide Democrats free airtime.

This unprecedented resolution should not even be on the House floor today. It has never been done before in the entire history of the United States.

The House has only sued for documents twice before. In both cases, the individuals in question were first found in contempt of Congress at both the committee level and by the full House. This has not happened here.

On top of that, the relevant subpoenas seek material that includes grand jury materials that, by law, cannot be made public. The Democrats are asking Attorney General Barr to violate the law.

When my colleagues and I tried to improve this resolution, the Democrats blocked us at every turn.

I offered an amendment that would let the American people know how much money this resolution would cost taxpayers. Democrats blocked it. Republicans offered amendments to prevent taxpayer money from going to lobbyists, to disclose contracts with lawyers, and to disclose where this taxpayer money was coming from to fund this witch hunt. Democrats blocked each and every one.

One amendment in particular highlights the partisan political, media-grabbing motives of this resolution. Republicans offered an amendment requiring the Judiciary Committee chairman to certify that he made a good faith effort to negotiate with the Attorney General, but the Democrats blocked that amendment, too.

The Attorney General has been transparent, and the Department of Justice has attempted numerous accommodations, including just yesterday when the Department of Justice agreed to let members of the committee view an unredacted report excluding grand jury material, which, by law, cannot be released.

□ 1430

But even as the Attorney General has attempted to work with the Committee on the Judiciary, Chairman NADLER has moved at unprecedented speed, moving from a demand for an unredacted report to subpoena to this resolution in a matter of mere weeks. From the Democrats' actions and prior statements, it is difficult not to view the purpose of this resolution and this debate as anything but political.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 430, which authorizes litigation to compel Attorney General Barr to provide key evidence underlying the Mueller report and the unredacted report itself, authorizes a civil suit to compel Don McGahn to provide the Committee on the Judiciary with documents and testimony, and, prospectively, allows committee chairs to bring civil actions on behalf of their committees to enforce their subpoenas without a subsequent full House vote when authorized by the bipartisan legal advisory group.

H. Res. 430 is key to ensuring that Congress is able to efficiently exercise its constitutional responsibilities in light of the unprecedented stonewalling by the Trump administration and a President who has openly said such things as: "We're fighting all the subpoenas," and, "I don't want people testifying."

Who does he think he is? A dictator? The committees have requested information that we are constitutionally

entitled to, as a coequal branch of government, and that we need to fulfill our legislative and oversight responsibilities. In the Financial Services Committee, for example, we have subpoenaed documents from financial institutions, including Deutsche Bank and Capital One, as part of our investigation into the integrity of the United States financial system, bank safety and loan practices, and anti-money laundering policies, including as they apply to and involve the accounts of President Trump and family members. So, ladies and gentlemen, in another display of stonewalling, President Trump sued to prevent the banks from complying with the committee's valid subpoenas.

I will continue to support efforts to ensure that our critical oversight is not impeded.

Who does he think he is?

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 430, a resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, and for other purposes.

This resolution is an assault on this body's constitutional oversight authorities. By proceeding in this unprecedented manner, the House is putting the judicial branch in an unfortunate position.

Never before has the House authorized the general counsel to sue without first exhausting all our constitutional remedies to gain compliance with our oversight demands. Proceeding in this manner risks weakening our ability to carry out our oversight responsibilities.

On May 8, the Committee on the Judiciary voted 24–16 to hold Attorney General Barr in criminal contempt of Congress. The committee did not pursue contempt against Donald McGahn. Mr. McGahn's case is unique, and I will address it in more detail later.

Contrary to press reports, Mr. Speaker, we are not acting today on the contempt citation reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. We are authorizing the House to sue the Attorney General, Mr. McGahn, and any other official or private citizen any committee chair deems contemptuous in the future.

This is a novel, untested, and risky proposition. I will give it to you this way, Mr. Speaker: The majority is definitely audacious in their request.

The media and the Democrats routinely rail against the President being quick to sue. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the majority is doing. Having rushed to contempt, we are now bypassing that remedy altogether and going straight to court.

Constitutional scholar Jonathan Turley recently wrote, Democrats' litigation strategy "is clearly driven more by political than legal calculations."

This is the problem I have, Mr. Speaker: These tactics weaken the House, aggrandize the executive branch, and cede decisionmaking to the judicial branch.

This is a problem. The majority can mess up oversight however they want to. The majority can rush to judgment whenever they want to.

My chairman has subpoenaed most everything that moves, and it seems other committees are wanting to as well. But here is the problem: When you are rushing to this and you are taking it on grounds that are not legally sound—and which, by the way, at this same hearing where Mr. Turley was, all three of the Democrat witnesses also agreed that the subpoena of the Attorney General was not legal in the sense that it was asking him to do something illegal.

The other issue here is, when you practice proper oversight, we are getting documents on election results, we are also getting documents on immigration and others from this administration. Where the rub has come is in overbroad illegal subpoenas from these committees.

Now, they may want to screw it up now for their purposes, but I don't want it in the future, going forward, where this House's oversight ability has been tampered by a rush to judgment. Let's think about this institution more than our next headline.

This is a problem because it is uncertain here, Mr. Speaker, the House will even be granted standing in court since we have declined to exercise all of our constitutional remedies, namely, contempt, in its many forms.

This is not the only impediment facing Democrats. At every turn, as we have discussed in our minority views to the committee's contempt report, the majority refused to engage with DOJ in the requisite negotiations and accommodation processes.

During our markup of the contempt resolution, the chairman made several damaging admissions—this is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary:

First, he conceded the Attorney General cannot lawfully comply with his subpoena demanding grand jury material.

Second, he stated the subpoena was the beginning of a dialogue. I am not sure what first-year law student will believe that a subpoena is the beginning of a dialogue.

Third, he admitted the subpoena was intentionally broad to give the committee clout in court.

Again, I am not sure which Black's Law Dictionary we are looking up under "subpoena," but that is not part of it.

All along, the goal has been to get to court, not to get information and conduct legitimate oversight of Russian

interference or secure our elections. If Democrats were interested in these good government issues, they would have accepted DOJ's offer to review the nearly unredacted Mueller report.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the chairman, even, has not done so. The goal is to clearly haul the administration into court in an attempt to pacify a base rabid for impeachment.

When Congress exercises its oversight powers, it must take advantage of every offer of information from the other branch. It is disingenuous to decline the free information Democrats so strongly claim to want. It shows the majority does not want the information; they want a fight.

In addition to the subpoena being overly broad and requiring the Attorney General to violate the law to comply, the chairman failed to establish a valid legislative purpose for his demands. There are other avenues the chairman could seek to get the information he wants. Congress could pass a law granting itself an exemption to grand jury secrecy rules, but the majority has not brought that up.

The most alarming aspect of this action, however, is the unprecedented speed—a mere 44 days passed between the chairman's first request to the Attorney General and the date the committee held him in contempt. In stark contrast, 464 days passed from the date that Chairman Issa requested information from Attorney General Holder on Fast and Furious and the date the Committee on Oversight and Reform held him in contempt, 138 days for Harriet Miers and the date the committee held her in contempt.

The action the majority is authorizing today against Don McGahn, however, Mr. Speaker, is far more egregious for many reasons. Mr. McGahn is not the custodian of the documents the committee and the chairman demand. The White House is. Yet we are smearing a private citizen's reputation and dragging him into court—at taxpayer expense—in an effort to redo the Mueller investigation because the majority and the media didn't like the outcome.

Democrats again have failed to lay a foundation for any action against Mr. McGahn. Chairman NADLER has never formally objected to the President's protective assertion of executive privilege or other common law privileges asserted by Mr. McGahn.

Under Supreme Court precedent, the chairman must take this important procedural step to pursue further actions against a witness. The witness should be given a clear-cut choice between compliance and noncompliance, between answering the question and risking prosecution for contempt. Here, the witness is being hauled into court without proper notice.

Evidence of this glaring error is in the RECORD. On May 31, Chairman NADLER wrote Mr. McGahn's counsel and stated he did not agree with the White House or Mr. McGahn and offered to

continue negotiating, but the chairman also gave Mr. McGahn a deadline of June 7—this past Friday—to respond. Meanwhile, the Rules Committee noticed a markup of this resolution on June 6, one day before the deadline.

I think we are seeing the pattern here. This is a revealing error. But errors occur when you are pushing action through at light speed and ceding your power to the judicial branch. A court will decide whether the House has standing, whether the case is right, and whether the Congress is entitled to the information outside of an impeachment inquiry.

As also has been said, the propositions are a gamble. Here, Mr. Speaker, we are gambling with the power of a coequal branch. This approach is untested and can do significant harm to Congress' Article I authority.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I must make mention, the authorization of the general counsel to seek pro bono legal services circumvents the House ethics rules.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, those rules provide an exception for Members to bring civil action challenging the lawfulness of an action of a Federal agency or an action of a Federal official taken in an official capacity provided that the action concerns a matter of public interest rather than a matter that is personal in nature.

This resolution contravenes ethics rules by giving the general counsel the authority, in Mr. McGahn's case, to solicit a gift: pro bono level services. I am not sure that was the majority's intent, but the inconsistencies result when Democrats aim to rush resolutions through the House outside of regular order.

Mr. Speaker, the majority may wish to change the rules. This majority may wish to get to the finish line quicker. The majority may wish to circumvent everything that is present in this House—and we have seen a lot of it over the past 5½ months—but I wish they would take into account that they may not be the majority forever, hopefully, and if they mess up oversight of a coequal branch, it is on their hands.

That is what the vote for “yes” is on this resolution. That is why a Member of this body should vote “no” for the integrity of this House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just assure the gentleman from Georgia that there is nothing novel about this legislation. It is not novel because everything in this bill goes to the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, and that has been the case in the past.

What is novel, however, is a President of the United States who says “ignore subpoenas” and “we will not cooperate” and tells people not to testify. That is not only novel, it is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friends on the other side: You are going

to have a choice today to either vote for this resolution and stand up for this institution and support the rule of law, or you are going to vote in a way that is going to be complicit with this President's obstruction and disrespect for this institution and disrespect for the rule of law. I urge you to vote with us.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration is engaged in one of the most unprecedented coverups since Watergate, and it is not just about Russia. It is so much broader than that. This coverup spans across numerous investigations, and it extends from the White House to multiple Federal agencies of government to completely separate outside parties.

The administration officials now question the fundamental basis of Congress to conduct oversight. They object to committee rules and precedence that have been in place for decades under both Republican and Democratic leaders, and they make baseless legal arguments to avoid producing documents and testimony. The Trump administration is challenging the very constitutionality of congressional oversight, and it is happening in broad daylight.

Several weeks ago, President Trump vowed, “We're fighting all the subpoenas.” Since then, he has refused to work on legislative priorities such as infrastructure until Congress halts oversight and investigations of his administration. He wants us to forgo our responsibility under the Constitution as a condition of passing laws to help our constituents and his constituents.

The President's arguments are baseless. He suggests that all subpoenas that Congress puts out are partisan and somehow related to the Russia probe, but that is simply not correct. In the Oversight and Reform Committee, we have issued eight subpoenas: six of them are bipartisan and none of them are about Russia. They involve issues like the census, immigrant children being locked in cages and separated from their families, and the President's finances.

□ 1445

This entire year, the White House has not produced one document to the Oversight and Reform Committee. Let me say that again: In all of our investigations, the White House has not produced one single shred of paper in response to our requests.

The hurricanes in Puerto Rico, the White House has produced nothing. Security clearance abuses, the White

House has produced nothing. Efforts to transfer nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia, the White House has produced nothing. Hush-money payments, the White House has produced not a thing. Even on issues like spending taxpayer dollars to pay for private jets, the White House has produced absolutely nothing.

Over and over again, it does not matter what the topic is, the tactics are the same. This begs the question: What are we covering up?

Tomorrow, our committee will vote on whether to hold the Attorney General and the Secretary of Commerce in contempt of Congress for refusing to produce documents relating to the Census. Again, these subpoenas are bipartisan, and this issue has nothing to do with Russia. Yet, the Trump administration has delayed, stonewalled, obstructed, and challenged the authority of the Congress on even those questions.

I support today's resolution because it makes clear that in addition to seeking criminal contempt on the House floor, committees may seek authority to enforce their subpoenas directly in civil court actions. Nobody is above the law.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, nobody is above the law, not even the President of the United States.

Today's resolution reaffirms that Congress has the independent authority under the Constitution to investigate waste, fraud, abuse, and wrongdoing so that we can pass laws that are effective and efficient on behalf of all of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I oppose this resolution.

The subpoena for Attorney General Barr is unenforceable on its face. It demands the full and unredacted Mueller report, including grand jury material that the Attorney General cannot lawfully disclose, and the Democrats know this.

In a hearing last month, Chairman NADLER admitted that Attorney General Barr could not lawfully release grand jury material. He therefore admitted that the Attorney General could not lawfully comply with the subpoena.

Instead, the chairman suggested that the subpoena is a starting point in negotiations. Rarely have I heard that term used with regard to a subpoena. In fact, I never heard it before that time.

In the Judiciary Committee's hearing on executive privilege last month, one of the majority's own witnesses testified that "one of the categories of information presently sought by the committee appears so broad as to put the executive branch officials to a nearly impossible task. . . . The committee cannot in good faith expect compliance; accordingly, the burden is on the committee to substantially narrow this aspect of its request."

My friends talk about the rule of law, but the Democrats have admitted in a hearing in the Judiciary Committee that the subpoena was overly broad and that objects of the subpoena that are prohibited from disclosure, such as 6(e) material, were not subject to the subpoena. But they didn't fix their subpoena. They didn't issue a new subpoena. They didn't amend the subpoena. They just attempted to amend their contempt citation.

The defendant's confusion over what is subject to a subpoena is adequate evidence that the subpoena itself is legally deficient as being confusing and overly broad. A court will not be able to read the collective minds of our Democratic colleagues and will not expect such clairvoyance from the Attorney General nor from the former White House Counsel.

The administration is currently negotiating in good faith. We see that an agreement was reached just yesterday. The same Democrat, when discussing the assertion of executive privilege by the administration, stated, "These developments do not, however, relieve the committee of its obligation to continue to negotiate."

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, just as the subpoena is overly broad and, quite frankly, unprecedented, as well as legally deficient, this resolution is also overly broad and unique in the annals of American history.

When the chairwoman from California referred to the President of the United States as a dictator, her language was rancorous and unparliamentary, but it seems to have been filled with projection, as this resolution provides unique authorities.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for giving us this opportunity to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which is our oath of office.

Let me salute the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction who have led us down this path of great respect for law, precedent, and the oath we take: Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, Congressman CUMMINGS, Congressman NADLER,

Congressman RICHARD NEAL, and Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, all of whom have been fighting the fight and gathering the facts to protect and defend our Constitution.

The oath of office that we take is why we are on the floor today, to hold Attorney General of the United States Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn in civil contempt for their refusal to comply with Congress' subpoenas. We must follow the facts and uncover the truth for the American people.

At the birth of our democracy, amid war and revolution, Thomas Paine said the times have found us. We are here today because the times have found us. While we do not place ourselves in the same category of greatness as our Founders, we do recognize the urgency of the threat to our Nation that we face today.

This body has a solemn duty, Mr. Speaker, to protect and defend our democracy, honoring the oath we take and the Constitution that is the foundation of our freedom. That Constitution begins with our beautiful preamble, "We the People."

Immediately following those words of the preamble is Article I, establishing a Congress in which "all legislative Powers herein granted are vested."

The Founders conferred upon the first branch responsibilities that are sweeping in scope. We set an agenda. We hold the power of the purse. We write the laws that all of us are bound by, including the President of the United States and those who surround him.

Fundamental to those responsibilities is oversight of the executive branch and all the areas essential to the well-being of the American people.

Oversight is our institutional duty, to ensure against the abuse of power, protect the rule of law, and expose the truth for the people who are "the only legitimate fountain of power," in the words of James Madison.

To conduct that oversight, the Congress is both constitutionally obligated and legally entitled to access and review materials from the executive branch, which it can subpoena.

Yet, the President and the administration have shown an unprecedented and unjustifiable refusal to furnish Congress with that information. President Trump himself has said, "We're fighting all the subpoenas," and, "I don't want people testifying," and, "No do-overs."

His administration has employed every tool it can find to obstruct legitimate committee oversight, everything from witness intimidation to blanket stonewalling to spurious claims of executive privilege, absolute immunity, and lack of legislative purpose.

This obstruction violates decades of established legal precedent. Throughout our history, the courts have made absolutely clear that the House has the authority to follow the facts to uncover the truth for the American people

and that "the power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process."

Our oversight responsibility continues to be resoundingly affirmed in the courts again and again. Last month, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled in the Mazars court decision that "there can be little doubt that Congress' interest in the accuracy of the President's financial disclosures falls within the legislative sphere."

That same week, the judge ruled in the Deutsche Bank case that Congress' "subpoenas are all in service of facially legitimate investigative purposes."

The administration's obstruction not only violates long-established precedent, but it also endangers our very democracy. We need answers on the many questions left unanswered by the Mueller report, which made clear that the Russians waged an all-out attack on our democracy, and the Mueller report documented 11 instances of obstruction from the White House itself.

This is a grave threat to our democracy, but the President calls it a "hoax" and refuses to protect our democracy. Why is that? We take an oath to protect our Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic. What the White House and the administration are doing is a danger and a threat to our democracy.

At the same time, the administration's campaign of stonewalling extends far beyond the Mueller report. The administration is obscuring the truth behind its disastrous policy decisions, from attacking Affordable Care Act coverage for millions of Americans, including those with preexisting conditions, taking it to court to overturn it while saying to the American people that it supports preexisting conditions coverage; to tearing apart vulnerable immigrant families at the border; to stealing military funds for an ineffective, wasteful border wall; to rolling back key civil rights protections for women, LGBTQ Americans, and people of color. The list goes on and on.

In court, they also tried to defend their abuse of power when it comes to the Census, which the Constitution is very clear about, that every 10 years the people of the country will be enumerated. They want to put a citizenship phrase in there to put a chilling effect on our getting an accurate count.

The well-being of the American people and the integrity of our democracy are imperiled by this brazen behavior. Senator McCONNELL declares "case closed," enabling this campaign of blanket, unprecedented obstruction.

We see the obstruction in this House to trying to uphold our proceedings, but we have the votes to proceed. The United States Senate has a responsibility to protect and defend the Constitution, but they are ignoring that. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to honor our oath of office

and strengthen the institution in which we serve for the people.

We have a responsibility under the vision of our Founders and the text of the Constitution to ensure that the truth is known. No one is above the law. Everyone will be held accountable, including the President of the United States.

The people's House will continue to fight to make the truth known for the American people and will defend Congress' role under Article I.

I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn in civil contempt for their refusal to comply with Congress' subpoenas and to honor the oath of office that they take.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is a reason for the abusive rhetoric from the left. For 2½ years, they peddled a monstrous lie that Donald Trump is colluding with a hostile foreign government. They concocted it with a phony dossier commissioned by the Clinton campaign and promoted by the highest officials in the FBI, our intelligence agencies, and the Justice Department, first in a failed attempt to interfere with the 2016 Presidential election and then to undermine the constitutionally elected President of the United States.

Now, despite spending \$25 million on an outrageously biased team of partisan zealots assembled by Mr. Mueller, which initially included the now-infamous Peter Strzok and Lisa Page, and using some of the most abusive prosecutorial tactics ever employed in this country, they could find no evidence to support the lie.

□ 1500

So what to do?

They had to think up another lie and think it up quick. So now we hear cries of obstruction and coverup. Good luck with that.

Coverup of a crime that never happened?

Obstruction, by turning over every document Mueller requested and even waiving executive privilege to allow the White House counsel to testify?

Now, Mr. Speaker, you compare that to Hillary Clinton's willful destruction of 30,000 emails under subpoena and you get a sense of the double standard involved here.

This is a desperate scavenger hunt to salvage their false narrative, and their time and the Nation's patience is running out. The other shoe is about to drop. Broad investigations are now well underway and will soon reveal how this lie was perpetrated and promoted. Two governments interfered in our elections, the Russians through ham-handed propaganda, and the Obama administration by turning the most terrifying powers entrusted to our government against our political process.

The reckoning is coming. As Longfellow said:

The wheels of the gods grind slow, but they grind exceedingly fine.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for Congress to reassert itself as an equal branch of government. The fact that it is supposed to be three equal branches of government is not totally accurate.

When we came up with the Constitution, we decided that we didn't want to have an autocratic king rule us. That is why we had a revolution. When the men met to write our Constitution, they made Congress Article I. There was a reason they made Congress Article I, because the Congress represents the people. It is not a king, it is not an autocrat, and it is not a despot. It is the Representatives of the people who make the laws. We are supposed to really be the embodiment—and we are the embodiment—of the American people.

This President has thumbed his nose at the Representatives of the people by not complying with lawful requests for documentation and lawful requests for testimony for Congress to do its constitutionally delegated purpose of oversight of the executive branch and laws that are necessary for the betterment of this Nation.

This is about time Congress did act. I am proud of Congress for bringing these bills, and I am shocked at the opposition for not wanting the people's House—their House, their legislative body—to stand up for future Congresses as well as this Congress for the rightful power that it deserves to do oversight and perform its functions with the best possible witnesses and testimony and materials that could aid it in its efforts.

I support the contempt citations. I condemn the parties that have thumbed their noses at us, subpoena under law, they are supposed to arrive with documentation and appear to testify. If they object, they can object there and then, not just disregard Congresses' subpoenas that are lawful.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Rules Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate intently. I don't disagree with much of what my friend from Tennessee had to say. It is a bad habit that both parties have gotten into over the decades of my lifetime putting party above Article in terms of judicial oversight, executive branch oversight, and even our responsibilities here, such as declaring war.

But what you have not heard here today, Mr. Speaker, and what you will not hear is why the passage of this resolution advantages us in any way. There is not one piece of information

that the Speaker of our House—our Speaker—just came and asked for that we are not empowered to request today.

The difference, Mr. Speaker, is if we pass this resolution, rather than the House requesting this information—as has historically been true—we would begin to request information one committee chairman at a time.

Does that advantage us in Article I, going to court one committee chairman at a time, or are we advantaged when the Speaker speaks on behalf of us all?

I don't know the answer, Mr. Speaker. I am not a legal scholar, and in the Rules Committee where we had original jurisdiction on this, we did not call any legal scholars to help us answer that question. In the Judiciary Committee they did not call any legal scholars to help to answer this question.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you there is not a Member of this institution on either side of the aisle who cares more about Article I and our exerting the responsibilities the Constitution gives to us and our constituents expect us to do than I do. Perhaps there is someone in here who cares as much, but there is no one who cares more.

Are we disadvantaging the institution for life by taking what has traditionally been the responsibility of our Speaker to do on behalf of all of us and putting it in the hands of committee chairmen?

We don't know, and anyone who tells you that they do isn't telling you the truth. We are going to continue to argue about the White House and what they have turned over and what they didn't turn over and what they ought to turn over, Mr. Speaker. That is not what this bill does today. There is not one piece of information that is requested that we do not have the authority to request today. Let's not move in ways that disadvantage us for generations to come.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow the gentleman from Georgia.

I have a card in my hand. This is a Member's identification. There is no designation of party on this card. This card designates 435 of us when we are at full complement as Members of the Congress, the people's Representatives. I urge all my colleagues to use this card in a few minutes on behalf of the people and on behalf of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats won the majority in this House, we did so on a promise to the American people to hold the executive department accountable. That is our responsibility. The Constitution gives us that responsibility, and we swear an oath to uphold the Constitution. That is what the committees have been doing, and it is what the whole House is doing today.

Now, the previous speaker said we have the right to ask for any information. That is accurate. What he did not then say is we have asked, and we have been refused. Not only have we been refused in the particular, we have been refused in the general because the President of the United States has directed his people not to give us any information and not to respond to any subpoenas, whatever the rationale may be.

Why?

Because he believes the House of Representatives is not acting properly.

Mr. Speaker, you imagine anybody who doesn't want to give us information would say, I am not going to give it to you because you are not asking properly?

Of course, that is what they do; and the House, on behalf of the American people, would be unable to perform its constitutional duty. This is not political. It is constitutional. It is about separation of powers. It is about responsibility. It is about accountability.

The House is exercising its responsibility to uncover all the facts and discover the truth on behalf of the American people. We represent, each us, about 750,000 people. We are not asking on our own behalf. We are asking for the people, so that the people have the information they need in a democracy to make the decisions that they are called upon to make in a very solemn exercise we call voting.

Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn have both refused to respond to subpoenas to testify before the House, and the Attorney General refuses to allow Congress to see the full and unredacted report by the special counsel, Mr. Mueller. You can see entire pages blacked out, Mr. Speaker.

The Attorney General's efforts to pre-judge the conclusions of that report before it is released, as he did, and his public mischaracterization of its conclusions are, in my opinion, evidence of the contempt with which he refuses to answer questions and respond to subpoenas. It seems contemptuous as well of the basic principles of the rule of law and checks and balances.

The American people deserve to know the full extent of Russia's efforts to interfere in our elections and subvert our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, you didn't have to listen too closely to Bob Mueller to understand that he believed that there was much more to be found or to miss the fact that he said to Congress: Do your duty and make sure the American people know the facts.

The American people deserve to know whether the President or anyone in his administration or inner circle of confidants were involved and tried to cover it up.

Now we have been accused of doing awful things, but I remember watching conventions where they said, "lock her up, lock her up." Flynn—General Flynn—who was the National Security Advisor said: "Lock her up."

Well, the fact is they locked him up, and many others who were associated who lied about their involvement with the Russian Government and, yes, with other foreign countries. So there is reason for the Congress to want to get to the bottom of this serious invasion of our election process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for our Constitution and vote for this resolution. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. McGOVERN. I thank Chairman NADLER, Chairman SCHIFF, Chairman CUMMINGS, Chairman NEAL, Chairman ENGEL, and Chairwoman WATERS, all who have jurisdiction over various facets of the information that is needed, and I thank the members of their committees for their hard work to conduct necessary oversight on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this vote is about. I presented that card. It has no party designation on it. It just has a designation of us—each of us—as Representatives of the people. Let us make sure that today we vote for the people and stand up for our Constitution, for this House, and for the rule of law.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is my fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, and I rise in opposition to this resolution.

It seems to allow Democrats on the Judiciary Committee to go to essentially whatever court they want to get a court order to get whatever documents they want—even grand jury documents and those that relate to our national security—all because they don't want, or are afraid to, really, hold Attorney General Barr or former White House Counsel Don McGahn in contempt of Congress, just as they are afraid to institute impeachment proceedings against President Trump or accept the fact that the Mueller investigation found that there was no collusion and Attorney General Barr found no obstruction.

They just can't get it through their heads that that is the case, and they don't want to focus on the real issue threatening our democracy which is that Russia actually attempted to interfere in our national elections back in 2016 while Barack Obama—not Donald Trump—was President, and the Obama administration did absolutely nothing about that.

They really don't seem too concerned that the Russians or another foreign entity might attempt to do so again in 2020. That is what they ought to be using their oversight powers—very powerful things the power that the majority has—they ought to be using it about that, not this charade.

□ 1515

How many documents have the Democrats requested that relate to Russian interference in our elections? None. How many hearings? Zip. How

many Obama-administration officials and others connected to Russia's efforts have they subpoenaed to testify before the Judiciary Committee? Zero.

By continuing with this fake impeachment, the Democrats are doing the American public a disservice. My Democratic colleagues ought to be embarrassed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me correct the RECORD in response to the gentleman of Ohio. The Russians didn't attempt to interfere in our election; they did interfere in our election.

And, if my friends read the Mueller report, they would realize they interfered in the election to help Donald Trump get elected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when a congressional committee issues a subpoena, compliance is not optional. We expect witnesses to testify when summoned. We expect the administration to comply with subpoenas and to provide us with the materials we require to do our jobs.

Of course, there may be differences between the Congress and the executive branch as to what information can be produced on a timely basis. When those differences arise, we are required to seek a reasonable accommodation.

We first requested access to the full Mueller report and the underlying evidence on February 22. After refusing for almost 4 months, the Department of Justice, in the last few days, has finally agreed to permit us to view the special counsel's most important files.

We are hopeful this will provide us with key evidence regarding allegations of obstruction of justice and other misconduct.

Given this potential breakthrough, we will hold the criminal contempt process for Attorney General Barr in abeyance for now.

But President Trump has blocked other key witnesses from testifying before the Judiciary Committee, including his former White House counsel Don McGahn, whose account of the President's actions was featured in the Mueller report.

The President has claimed absolute immunity for critical witnesses to prevent them from even showing up. He has invoked executive privilege to prevent us from seeing documents that stopped being privileged long ago, if they were ever privileged to begin with.

He has done the same in response to Congress' important work unrelated to the Mueller report, and he has ordered the agencies not to cooperate with even our most basic oversight requests.

This unprecedented stonewalling by the administration is completely unacceptable. The committees have a constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight, to make recommendations to the House as necessary, and to craft

legislation that will curb the abuse of power on full display in the Trump administration.

This is why it is important that the Judiciary Committee be able to act in such matters using all of our Article I powers, as contemplated in this resolution and described in both the Rules Committee report and the House Judiciary Committee's contempt report.

Now, I heard what the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) said a few minutes ago, and he is exactly right. This resolution gives committee chairs the power, with the approval of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to go to court on behalf of the House to enforce our subpoenas.

This has not been done before, but neither have we ever seen blanket stonewalling by the administration of all information requests by the House. We have never faced such blanket stonewalling.

The President himself said—and they have been as good as their word—they will oppose all of our subpoenas.

We must go to court to enforce the subpoenas without a separate floor vote each time if we are going to enforce our subpoenas and reject the arrogant assumption of power by the administration and denigration of the power of the House and of the Congress.

We cannot afford to waste all the floor time every single time the administration rejects one of our subpoenas, which is every time we issue a subpoena.

That is why we must pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution so that we can get into court and break the stonewall without delay.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), our Republican leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Special Counsel Mueller officially ended his investigation several weeks ago. His office is closed. Because of Attorney General Barr, his report is public.

And his findings are very clear: No collusion and no obstruction. This is the bottom line of the Mueller report.

But, Mr. Speaker, Democrats refuse to accept it. Mr. Speaker, even the chairman of the committee refuses to go read the portion that he is allowed to read, only six lines. He refuses to read it, but he wants to come here today.

They continue to believe their worst conspiracy theories about the President, despite all the evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, it is even reported in newspapers that, in the campaign to become chairman of the Judiciary Committee, one said he campaigned for the position because he would be the best with impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, even on the floor of this House, there were more than 60 Mem-

bers on the other side of the aisle who voted for impeachment before the Mueller report was ever presented to the public.

At its core, H. Res. 430 is just a desperate attempt to relitigate the Mueller investigation. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

It does not strengthen Congress' oversight powers, contrary to what you may hear from the other side, Mr. Speaker. Fundamentally, it is an impeachment effort in everything but name.

Mr. Speaker, just look at the unnecessary contempt citation against Attorney General Barr. Less than a month after Barr received the Mueller report, Mr. Speaker, Chairman NADLER issued a subpoena that would have required the Attorney General of the United States of America to break the law.

That is not my opinion. Let's be very clear whose words those are: Jonathan Turley's. Mr. Speaker, probably everybody in this body not only knows who Jonathan Turley is; he has, probably, the utmost respect. He is one of the most respected legal scholars in this country.

Now, he told the committee, Mr. Speaker:

You have to tie your request carefully to your authority to demand information . . . if Bill Barr had actually complied with the subpoena as written, he would have violated Federal law.

If he would have complied, he would have violated Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here. Not only, Mr. Speaker, does the chairman of that committee ask the attorney general to break the law or he will try to hold him in contempt; he won't even go read the report.

On May 8, only a few weeks after the first subpoena was issued, House Judiciary Democrats voted to hold A. G. Barr, the Attorney General of the United States, in contempt.

Why would they vote to hold him in contempt? Because they were so angry that the Attorney General wouldn't break the law. They wanted him to break the law; then he won't be held in contempt.

In a May 24 letter to the Attorney General, Chairman NADLER offered, for the first time, to negotiate and narrow the scope of his subpoena request. Then, you know what? He changed his mind.

Yesterday, the Department of Justice reached an agreement with the Judiciary Committee to turn over documents related to the Mueller report.

Now, if the public is watching, this just looks so disorganized. You wonder, from that committee, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't they know better than to ask the Attorney General to break the law?

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't you know that, when you get to this point in a career, you wouldn't be so upset that someone just doesn't do exactly what you want—and you ask them to break

the law—that you would vote to hold them in contempt and force your side of the aisle just to vote that way.

That is not how it has happened in this body before. If the public wants to see a good example of congressional oversight, then let's look at something that is comparable: the House's contempt vote against Attorney General Holder in 2012.

The House Committee on Oversight and Reform took two important actions before suing in Federal court. First, it negotiated with Attorney General Holder in good faith for 15 months—not a few days. It never asked him to break the law either.

After narrowing the scope of its original subpoena, and only after extensive back-and-forth negotiations failed, did it vote to hold him in contempt.

Second, it got the full House to vote on it and approve—you know what—a bipartisan contempt.

Now, I am not sure why the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Speaker, would not know this, but I did a little research because I was here during that time. You know why they didn't realize it was the best way to do it and it was bipartisan? Because, Mr. Speaker, a lot of them stormed outside of the Chamber.

Yep. You heard me right. Even though 17 Democrats voted in favor of the criminal contempt resolution against Holder and 21 voted to enforce civil citation, a number of them stormed outside and protested, took their ball and ran home. Mr. Speaker, I guess, to the public, it looked like they had just thrown another fit.

Now, that is pretty significant. As many of you remember, it was contentious. I remember, Mr. Speaker, watching then-Minority Leader PELOSI, Minority Whip HOYER, and Congressman NADLER lead 100 Democrats off the House floor to protest the vote.

Mr. Speaker, you won't see that on our side. We believe in the rule of law. Mr. Speaker, we would have done the exact same thing the Attorney General did, that Jonathan Turley said, that you would have had to break the law to try to appease somebody's own personal vendetta.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, that someone would run for a position to say that they would be best to impeach somebody and even vote to impeach without even having a report and then, when you get a report and you could go down and read just those six lines that you want to complain about, but you won't—the same person, Mr. Speaker, that would run outside and say: I got elected to Congress, but I am going to pout and I am going to go outside.

Mr. Speaker, that may be the same person that would want to bring this to the floor today.

But what is so different about today than all the others? Well, we are doing something we have never done before. We are doing something that is going to take the power away of every Member in this body and give it to a select few.

Mr. Speaker, if this vote passes today, Members of this body are going to say: Don't bring it here and let me represent my own people and vote about going to court. Let's just give it, really, to three people. Let's give it to Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and to the majority whip. Because that is what BLAG is.

I know the courts are going to sit there and say that is not what Congress is supposed to do. Congress has never done that before. But, you know what? If this new majority thinks all they want to do is make an attorney general break the law, I guess they could break every rule, every history, every point of representation there is inside this body.

Did we wonder if this would happen? Do we wonder why you wouldn't take the months, as they have shown in the time before, and actually come to a bipartisan conclusion?

I think the plan was already written. I don't know if people can talk about the word "patient" because, Mr. Speaker, I remember Congressman HANK JOHNSON of the Rules Committee—this is the Speaker's committee, so everybody understands correctly, that is just appointed by the Speaker on the majority side—said, Mr. Speaker: "Donald Trump will stand for reelection again in a very short period of time, and we don't have 400 days to wait. . . ."

So, don't care about the rule of law. Don't care about asking him to break the law. Just break every historical trend and try to take the power away from millions of Americans and from the Members of Congress who represent them here.

I didn't know today would come. Mr. Speaker, I didn't know if someone would go this far.

I didn't know, just because someone, Mr. Speaker, despises somebody else, that an election didn't turn out the way of the desire—Mr. Speaker, I have been on losing sides before, but I would never think I would break the law just because of losing an election.

I would never think of asking somebody in as high an office as the Attorney General of the United States of America to not give due process, to come to the floor and strip the power of 430 Members and put it in a select few.

Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest. I don't put anything past what this new desire is about.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, Democrats say we are in a constitutional crisis, and they are right, but not because of Attorney General Barr. The constitutional crisis is this: When Democrats can't win, they change the rules.

I just heard it on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, from the other side of the aisle, said this has never been done before, and, yes, this is nothing this House has ever desired to do. But it is also no way to govern.

The American people deserve a majority that is serious about coming up with solutions, not subpoenas. There are plenty of important challenges that we can be working on to solve.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I opened The New York Times. It is not a paper that I think I always agree with, but it had an editorial not for the first time, but for the second time, and it was talking about the crisis on the border.

As I read this editorial, I found myself agreeing with it greatly. When I read it, it talked about the border, talked about Washington needing to stop dithering and do something about it.

I looked and wondered what committee would be most responsible for this challenge? Lo and behold, it was the Judiciary. So I turned it on in hopes that I would see a hearing, maybe I would even see a markup.

No, Mr. Speaker, who did I see? I saw John Dean. John Dean, who pleaded guilty in Watergate. The same individual who has put more than 900 tweets out against the President, many before any Mueller report came forth. He was the expert witness—the same individual who is paid by CNN, the same individual who said the Presidency of George Bush was worse than Watergate.

I guess this new majority will go to no end. It doesn't matter if the facts don't go where they want; just change the rules.

I wonder, all these new freshman Democrats, Mr. Speaker, when they swore in to uphold the Constitution, does that mean trying to make the Attorney General break the law? Does that mean giving their power away to a select few?

There is a crisis on the border. The New York Times knows it. The country of Mexico knows it. I think almost everybody in America knows it except, Mr. Speaker, I guess, this majority.

The committee of responsibility is more concerned about bringing somebody in who pleaded guilty in Watergate, who makes their money off, Mr. Speaker, writing books claiming every Republican President there is is worse than Watergate and then asking the Attorney General to break the law.

That is not a legacy I would be proud of. It is not a legacy I would want to be a part of.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will say on this floor: I will vote against taking the power away, even the power away from people on the other side of the aisle. I won't lead a protest, and I won't go outside, and I won't take my ball, and I won't run home. I believe in the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I had the responsibility and the opportunity to go read the redacted portions of the Mueller report, just as some on the other side of the aisle could. It is just six lines. Not that I think it was just my responsibility, but as an elected official I thought it was a responsibility, so I went. But,

Mr. Speaker, the people leading this today, they have not. They think they know better.

I don't know if they know better, but one thing I do know: They are changing the rules of the House simply because they cannot win. That is not the American way.

Those are the reasons why we stand up. Those are the things that America unites behind, the rule of law. This will not be a day that is proud. This will not be a day that, when they look back in history, the individuals who vote for this will talk about.

It is one when they get asked the question later in life, Mr. Speaker, is there something they regret, they will regret that emotion overtook them. They will regret their own personal dislike drove them.

I am not sure if they are proud of the day when they storm out of the building, even though there is a bipartisan vote here. But I guess that same emotion, the same, Mr. Speaker, lack of ability to actually look at the rule of law and work toward something instead of just changing the rules because you can't have your way, that is what today is about.

The worst part of it all is removing the power of individual Members and putting in a select three. But then again, Mr. Speaker, when you study history and forms of government, that is what socialism is all about.

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

The distinguished minority leader began by saying that the Mueller report makes it clear that there was no collusion and no obstruction. Maybe that is what you would conclude if you just read Barr's summary which tried to cover up what the Mueller report said, but I would urge the distinguished minority leader to read the report. I am happy to lend him my bifocals if he has trouble reading it.

But the report doesn't say that. It doesn't say no collusion. And on the issue of obstruction of justice, it says: If we were convinced that he, the President, did not commit a crime, we would have said so.

That is what the report says. And I would remind my colleagues that obstruction of justice is a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, the issue today is very simple. It is simply about the right of the American people and Congress to get information. That is it.

All this resolution does is allow us to enforce congressional subpoenas. These are documents and witnesses we want, and it allows us to go to Federal court to enforce it. That is all this resolution does.

Why are Republicans so scared of this resolution? Because they know we are going to win in court. We have won three times against the Trump administration.

But why do we even have to go to court to do this? Because the Trump administration is engaging in unprecedented obstruction. And it is not just about the Mueller report; it is about all areas.

So, for example, right now, the Trump administration is suing to eliminate healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions. We want to know more about that. We can't get it. We want to know about a lot of areas that we cannot get, so we want to go to Federal court to get this enforced.

What are Republicans doing? They are making stuff up. They are saying somehow we are asking the Attorney General to do things that will make him violate the law. That is wrong, wrong, wrong.

I am just going to end with this simple example.

The Attorney General of the United States gave the Republican ranking member of the Judiciary Committee the right to see their unredacted Mueller report. Was that illegal? No. But I can't see it.

That is wrong. There is no basis for that. We are simply going to go to Federal court. We are going to litigate it, and we are going to win.

All this resolution does is it allows us to enforce congressional subpoenas in Federal court. It is about not allowing the Trump administration to cover things up.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is about harassing the President, and it is about delaying the inevitable.

I would have hoped that my friends across the aisle, especially in the Judiciary Committee that had concerns in 2005 and 2006 about the overreach that was possible through the FISA procedures, would have seen that there was no collusion, that the Russians did try, but nobody with the Trump campaign bought.

So we are left with the fact that the real collusion here was between the Clinton campaign, with Fusion GPS hiring a foreign agent, Christopher Steele, who talked to people he now admits could well have been agents of Vladimir Putin, who gave false information about Trump, the candidate, that was used in a dossier that was used to manipulate the FISA court into giving a warrant to start spying on the Trump campaign. That is what this was about.

And what people are calling obstruction of justice is exactly what you have when you have somebody falsely accused of colluding, conspiring with the Russians, and he knows he didn't do that, and he sees his family being harassed, and everybody that worked with the campaign that can be pushed and shoved and blackmailed, as happened, and bankrupted, you want to bring it to an end. You want to see justice done.

But instead of my friends in Judiciary coming together with us who have been concerned about the abuses of the FISA system so that it doesn't happen to other Americans, instead, they come with this resolution to push the matter down the road a little further to the 2020 election.

It has got to stop. Let's stop now.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to correct a number of statements that have been made on the floor.

First of all, this is not the end. Director Mueller made this the beginning. When he concluded the report, he left a very large direction to the United States Congress. He recognized that he could not follow up because of policies at the DOJ regarding indictment in the process of the administration.

So the Congress, in its due diligence, took the responsibility not to target anyone, but to simply uphold the rule of law. In upholding the rule of law, we had an empty seat by Attorney General Barr, an empty seat by Mr. McGahn, an empty seat by Ms. Hicks, Ms. Donaldson, and we hope not an empty seat of the author of the report.

So all this resolution does is authorize the committee to seek civil enforcement of its subpoenas against Attorney General Barr, requiring him to provide Congress with the key evidence underlying the Mueller report as well as the unredacted report itself, and former White House Counsel Donald F. McGahn, requiring him to provide documents and appear for testimony.

He is not covered by executive privilege. In fact, executive privilege does not cover—his duty is to the White House Office of the General Counsel, or the White House counsel's office, not to the individual officeholder, the President. He has personal lawyers.

And we didn't break the law. 6(e), which is grand jury materials, our committee diligently said let's work with the Department of Justice, go to court, and decide what we can see.

We are simply following this little book that many have died for, and that is the Constitution of the United States, and those words in the Declaration of Independence that said we all are created equal, with certain unalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The American people would not want a Congress that turned its back on, frankly, the rule of law.

For those of us who had the special privilege of going to Normandy this past week, we got a great sense of pride, of the courage of Americans, the bravery of those young men, and all I could think of is how important it is to

all of us to adhere to those wonderful principles.

So, again, there is no targeting here. This is not a way to do policy or legislation. We can fight that battle on the floor of the House.

But if you read those volumes and end it in the last pages of Volume 2, you know that Director Mueller asked us to finish the task of looking into elements that he did not or could not and the underlying issues.

Let me also say, as we do that, we do it forthrightly because, in 2020, we want to make sure that every American has the right to vote and every American is not undermined by a foreign operative interfering and taking the election away from you.

I support the resolution. We must stand for the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 430, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and for other purposes.

It is an honor to serve in this body.

We are the successors and heirs to an august freedom earned centuries ago, expanded for successive groups and defended through the blood, sweat and tears of the nation's fighting forces.

It is this debt that took me to the beaches of Normandy to pay my respects on the 75th Anniversary of the D-Day invasion.

We are heirs to this legacy, and we are heirs to this ingenious system of separation of powers.

The system they laid down presumes equality of power among the branches.

As custodians of Article I, we have a duty to ensure the rigors of the Constitution are upheld.

This includes that when the Second Branch, Article II, flouts the investigative prerogatives of the Congress, there must be recourse and accountability.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have to say that it is regrettable that we are here.

This is because a hallmark of our constitutional republic is that no person is above the law.

Congressional oversight has been the tradition going back to the first years of our republic.

And the congressional prerogative of oversight has been a tool in the Article I arsenal as a way of asserting our power and protecting against the worst excesses of an executive.

This comports with the founding of our government, which sought to prevent the concentration of power in an autocratic executive, which was anathema to the Founders.

Which is why the events of the last many months have been so confounding.

The decision by this executive to flout all lawfully authorized subpoenas has been unprecedented.

This dispute between the political branches should work itself out, but because of this presidential obstinacy, we are in this predicament, which is why we must pass this H. Res 430, Authorizing Subpoena Enforcement Litigation.

This Resolution, H. Res. 430, builds on the House Judiciary Committee's contempt finding against Attorney General Barr.

The resolution authorizes the Committee to seek civil enforcement of its subpoenas against: (i) Attorney General Barr requiring him to provide Congress with the key evidence underlying the Mueller Report as well as the unredacted report itself; and (ii) former White House Counsel Donald F. McGahn, II requiring him to provide documents and appear for testimony.

The resolution further affirms that all committee chairs, when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, retain the ability to seek civil enforcement of their own subpoenas.

The resolution adds that when committees proceed to court, they have any and all necessary authority under Article I of the Constitution, ensuring that they have the maximum range of legal authority available to them.

For example, on other key issues—such as the Department of Justice defying a subpoena to produce counter-intelligence documents relating to Russia's interference with the 2016 election, or the Commerce Department defying a subpoena to produce documents relating to the addition of a citizenship question to the 2020 Census—the committees can enforce these subpoenas without a floor vote.

This resolution ensures the House can conduct meaningful oversight on issues critical to Americans' lives while continuing to deliver on pocketbook issues.

The President's disregard for congressional oversight allows the Administration to cover-up his many disastrous policy decisions such as: attacking affordable healthcare coverage for millions of Americans including those with pre-existing conditions, tearing apart vulnerable immigrant families, misappropriating military funds for his ill-conceived border wall, and rolling back landmark civil rights protections for minorities.

The information subpoenaed by various congressional committees, including documents and testimony, is information to which Congress is constitutionally entitled and that past Administrations have routinely provided.

President Trump has prevented fact witnesses referenced in the Mueller Report from testifying or providing documents to Congress.

This is despite the fact that the Report detailed the Russian government's sustained attacks on our elections; over 170 contacts between President Trump's campaign and associates and agents of the Russian government; as well as numerous efforts by President Trump to impede or thwart House investigations scrutinizing his own conduct and that of his Administration.

In keeping with the President's sweeping public refusal to comply with congressional subpoenas, the White House and the Administration are fighting to keep the truth from the American people.

This resolution ensures we can conduct oversight on issues that are critical to Americans' lives while continuing to deliver on pocketbook issues.

The information subpoenaed by various congressional committees, including documents and testimony, is information Congress is constitutionally entitled to and which past Administrations have routinely provided.

Congress not only is constitutionally entitled to the underlying evidence in the Special Counsel's Report and key fact witness testimony, it requires this information so that it can fulfill its legislative, oversight, and other constitutional responsibilities.

This resolution follows past precedent used by Democratic and Republican Majorities while reinforcing an important principle in the House Rules.

This Administration's disregard for the legislative and judicial branches has reached a tipping point.

Despite representing a coequal branch of government, this Administration is flagrantly disregarding the role Congress and the Judiciary must play in our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing has been the basis for this Resolution.

It was my hope that this was not needed.

But the President has proven me wrong, which is why this Resolution is needed.

I urge passage of the Resolution.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), a fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time, and I want to recognize the gentlewoman from Texas for her remarks because, as a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, we all stand for the rule of law. I, too, carry a Constitution with me.

The Constitution explicitly creates a system that is representative of the people, where the people are elected by their constituents to come up here and represent their views in Congress and vote for them. It is not to come up here and to hand off control, to hand their vote to the majority leader, to the Speaker, and to the majority whip and let them vote for them and for the people of their district whether or not to go to court.

The votes to enforce subpoenas, the votes to hold in contempt should be votes of the Representatives of the people. That is why this resolution today is such a travesty.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I have only been a Member of this body for a few months, and I was proud to be named a member of the Judiciary Committee, but unfortunately, the circus that I have witnessed over the last few months is shocking, as the Democratic majority tries to find some reason, any reason, to impeach this President now that the Mueller investigation has wrapped up with no crimes found.

If they want to go back and repeat the last 2 years of the investigation, the millions of dollars, the hundreds of subpoenas, they are certainly entitled to do that, but I would argue it would be a waste of time for the American taxpayer and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing earlier today on the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, and the chairman did a masterful job of arguing in favor of that legislation, of which I am a cosponsor. It is bipartisan legislation. It is going to be marked up tomorrow. That is the way that this Judiciary Committee should operate.

Instead, we have hearings with empty chairs for the Attorney General, we have a hearing with an empty chair for the White House counsel.

Finally, yesterday we had a hearing with people in the seats, but they were all MSNBC and CNN commentators.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty of justice. I would urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is one of the most venerable in the House of Representatives, and I am honored to have been selected to join its ranks.

It has jurisdiction over intellectual property, during a time of exponential scientific breakthroughs. It has jurisdiction over election interference, during a time when we are concerned about Russians interfering with our election. It has jurisdiction over immigration issues, during a time of an unprecedented security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border.

I am disappointed to see how the Democratic majority has chosen to waste this authority. I am disappointed to see that it has chosen to ignore its responsibilities to the American people in favor of sound bites and photo ops.

Instead of legislating, the Democratic majority prefers posing with buckets of fried chicken for the national media in crude attempts to undermine our President and his administration.

Really?

It is time to move on and tackle the real issues that Americans care about.

The American people elected us, they elected me, to Congress to get things done. Let us secure the border. Let us improve healthcare. Let us improve education.

Let us stop this political theater that happens meeting after meeting and hearing after hearing in multiple committees in what I believe is a blatant attempt to influence the 2020 presidential election using taxpayer resources.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left and how much time the other side has left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to use my 1 minute to actually refute these blatant allegations and fantasies, I believe, by my fellow Democrats, and that is how somehow the President and the Department of Justice has been stonewalling them.

Let me go over the timelines really quick.

On March 22, the Attorney General immediately notified the chairmen and the ranking members of the House and Senate Committees on Judiciary that they had received the confidential report from the special counsel.

The next day, the Attorney General informed Congress of the special counsel's principal conclusions.

March 29, he updated the Congress on what could be done and what redactions had to be made.

Then on April 18, less than a month after receiving it, the Attorney General made the redacted confidential report available to Congress and the entire public.

The same day, the Attorney General released the confidential report and made the minimally-redacted version of the confidential report available for review.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side have responded to this legislation with the same old same old.

They are circling the wagons around this President and his team. They are deliberately turning a blind eye to the corruption, to the deception, to the illegality that has surrounded this White House.

But let me remind them all of why we are here today. We are here because the American people elected each of us to write laws and to ensure those who execute them are accountable.

We all took an oath when we were sworn in to uphold and defend the Constitution. That is our job.

None of us were sent here to play defense for the President of the United States.

There are some things that are more important than politics, and I hope that even in this day and age, there are still some things that are more sacred than partisanship, like the rule of law and the separation of powers.

I mean, each of us took the same oath. We now have a choice whether or not to uphold it.

The choice should be a simple one: to stand up to President Trump and to defend the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when many of my Republican friends ran for office claiming to be constitutional conservatives. Well, this is their chance to back up their campaign slogan with their vote.

We have a President that publicly states: "We're fighting all the subpoenas."

And I don't want people to testify.

Those are his words. Those are the words of the President, not some mob boss.

As we heard from the chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee, Chairman CUMMINGS, the White House hasn't turned over a single document, a single piece of paper that his committee has requested to do their oversight work, not one piece of paper.

At the core of this resolution is Congress getting the appropriate documents, so we can do the appropriate oversight. That is part of the job.

How can anybody be against that? To be against that is to be part of the

coverup, is to be complicit with the obstruction that this White House demonstrates each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that history will judge how we react to this moment. So I urge all of my colleagues, do not let this moment pass us by. Vote "yes" on this resolution, and let's hold the President accountable.

Nobody is above the law in the United States of America, not even the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2609.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—191

Abraham	Gohmert	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Norman
Allen	Gooden	Nunes
Amash	Gosar	Olson
Amodei	Granger	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Grothman	Posey
Baird	Guest	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Guthrie	Reed
Banks	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Barr	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hartzler	Riggleman
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Roby
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Roe, David P.
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Holingsworth	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rouzer
Budd	Hunter	Roy
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Rutherford
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Cheney	Katko	Simpson
Cline	Keller	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Smucker
Comer	Kinzinger	Spano
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Stauber
Cook	LaHood	Stefani
Crawford	LaMalfa	Steibe
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Stewart
Curtis	Latta	Stivers
Lesko	Lesko	Taylor
Conaway	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Lucas	Timmons
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	
Duffy	Marchant	Tipton
Duncan	Marshall	Turner
Dunn	Massie	
Emmer	Mast	Wagner
Estes	McCarthy	Walberg
Ferguson	McCaul	Walden
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Walker
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walorski
Flores	McKinley	Waltz
Fortenberry	Meadows	Watkins
Fox (NC)	Meuser	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	Miller	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Westerman
Gianforde	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gibbs	Mullin	Wilson (SC)

Wittman	Woodall	Young	Fulcher	Lofgren	Rutherford	NOT VOTING—13	
Womack	Yoho	Zeldin	Gaetz	Long	Ryan	Gabbard	
NOT VOTING—13						Bost	King (IA)
Axne	Gabbard	King (IA)	Gallagher	Loudermilk	Sánchez	Green (TN)	
Bost	Green (TN)	Kuster (NH)	Gallego	Lowenthal	Sarbanes	Buck	
Buck	Griffith	Wright	Garamendi	Lucas	Scalise	Griffith	
Clay	Hastings		Garcia (IL)	Luetkemeyer	Scanlon	Hastings	
Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler		Garcia (TX)	Gianforte	Schakowsky	Davis (CA)	

□ 1623

Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ADERHOLT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

---

DHS ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD  
ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2609) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—419

Abraham	Butterfield	Cummings	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Torres (CA)
Adams	Byrne	Cunningham	Johnson (SD)	Pallone	Torres Small
Aderholt	Calvert	Curtis	Johnson (TX)	Palmer	(NM)
Aguilar	Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Jordan	Panetta	Trahan
Allen	Cárdenas	Davidson (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Pappas	Trone
Allred	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Pascarella	Turner
Amash	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Kaptur	Payne	Underwood
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Dean	Katko	Pence	Upton
Armstrong	Cartwright	Defazio	Keating	Perlmutter	Van Drew
Arrington	Case	DeGette	Keller	Perry	Vargas
Babin	Casten (IL)	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Peters	Veasey
Bacon	Castor (FL)	DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Peterson	Vela
Baird	Castro (TX)	Delgado	Kelly (PA)	Phillips	Velázquez
Balderson	Chabot	Demings	Kennedy	Pingree	Visclosky
Banks	Cheney	DeSaulnier	Khanna	Pocan	Wagner
Barr	Chu, Judy	DesJarlais	Kildee	Porter	Walberg
Barragán	Cicilline	Deutch	Kilmer	Posey	Walden
Bass	Cisneros	Diaz-Balart	Kim	Pressley	Walker
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell	Kind	Price (NC)	Walorski
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Doggett	King (NY)	Quigley	Waltz
Bergman	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Raskin	Wasserman
Beyer	Cline	F.	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe	Schultz
Biggs	Cloud	Duffy	Krishnamoorthi	Reed	Waters
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Duncan	Kustofsky (TN)	Reschenthaler	Watkins
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Dunn	LaHood	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Emmer	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Blumenauer	Collins (GA)	Engel	Lamb	Richmond	Webster (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Collins (NY)	Escobar	Lamborn	Riggleman	
Bonamici	Comer	Eshoo	Langevin	Roby	Welch
Boyle, Brendan F.	Conaway	Espallat	Larsen (WA)	Rodgers (WA)	Wenstrup
Brady	Connolly	Estes	Larson (CT)	Roe, David P.	Westerman
Brindisi	Cook	Evans	Latta	Rogers (AL)	Wexton
Brooks (AL)	Cooper	Ferguson	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)	Wild
Brooks (IN)	Correa	Finkenauer	Lawson (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Williams
Brown (MD)	Costa	Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)	Rose (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fleischmann	Lee (NV)	Rose, John W.	Wilson (SC)
Buchanan	Craig	Flores	Levin (CA)	Rouzer	Wittman
Bucshon	Crawford	Fortenberry	Levin (MI)	Roy	Woodall
Budd	Crenshaw	Foster	Lewis	Royal-Ballard	Yarmuth
Burchett	Crist	Foxx (NC)	Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Yoho
Burgess	Crow	Frankel	Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Young
Bustos	Cuellar	Fudge	Loebssack	Rush	Zeldin

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 11, 2019 as I had another commitment that did not allow me to make it back to D.C. in time for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 245; “no” on rollcall No. 246; “no” on rollcall No. 247; and “yes” on rollcall No. 248.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 11, 2019 because I was returning to Washington, D.C. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted YEA on H. Res. 430—Authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, and YEA on H.R. 2609—DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2019.

---

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962,  
BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill because survivors of abortion deserve protection, and the American people deserve a vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearances.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker?