

today to recognize the life and memory of a law enforcement professional who served the people of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for over two decades. Steven F. Hillias, chief of police to the Perkasio Borough Police Department, passed away on Sunday at the age of 49.

Born in Allentown, Chief Hillias was a graduate of Allentown Central Catholic High School and went on to receive a degree in management from Penn State. Chief Hillias later attended the FBI National Academy and received a master's degree in criminal justice from DeSales University.

Chief Hillias joined the Perkasio Borough Police Department in 1997 and was elevated to chief of police in 2014. Well-respected in the law enforcement community, Chief Hillias was a member of the Police Chiefs Association of Bucks County and the Fraternal Order of Police.

Chief Hillias was known as an approachable, community-oriented chief who cared deeply about the Perkasio community. He worked tirelessly and with empathy to combat the opioid epidemic and advocated for young offenders in diversionary programs. He was a man admired for his fairness and his compassion.

Madam Speaker, I send my deepest condolences to Chief Hillias' wife, Tracy, and his children, Michael and Lauren. We thank them for sharing him with our community.

May Chief Hillias enjoy his eternal reward for a life he spent serving others.

CONGRATULATING PROSPER HIGH SCHOOL MEN'S LACROSSE TEAM

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team for bringing home their first State championship title by defeating the Smithson Valley Rangers 11-5.

The team proved their ability to stay composed while overcoming obstacles under pressure. Winning is not just about talent, skill, or the type of cleats you wear. Winning is about character, on and off the field, alongside hard work and dedication to one's team. The Prosper Eagles showed their commitment to these values from the very beginning.

I know I speak on behalf of the entire community when I say the city of Prosper is beaming with pride.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Prosper High School men's lacrosse team on their successful season.

□ 1930

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my friends and colleagues in celebrating Juneteenth.

Madam Speaker, 154 years ago, on June 19, 1865, Texas became the final State in the U.S. to officially abolish slavery. This was a pivotal day in American history, one that represents both the checkered past of our Nation as well as the rising above it.

September 1862, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, and it took effect on January 1, 1863, throughout all the formerly Confederate States.

Madam Speaker, 2 years later, Texas was the last stop on the road to the abolition of slavery in America on June 19, known as Juneteenth.

On a day like Juneteenth, we encourage everyone to come together and celebrate this occasion and recognize not what makes us different from one other, but what we all have in common, all that we share: the love of freedom and individual rights that we are one people.

There is still more to be done, but a lot of progress has been made the last 150 years, and we will continue to make that together as a society.

SEVEN FACTORS IMPEDING IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. It is a preeminent privilege to stand here and address this august body—to address those who are within the sound of my voice would probably be more appropriate—and those who are onlookers by way of various means of telecommunications. It is an honor and a privilege to do so, and I am grateful to the leadership of this House for extending and allowing the privilege. I believe that it is one of the great honors of being a Congressman, to be able to stand and address the Nation, if you will.

So tonight, as a Member of this body, it is my honor to speak on a topic very near and dear to my heart and the hearts of a good many Americans. I would like to talk about some of the current factors that are impeding impeachment.

I have mnemonic notes that I will refer to from time to time so as to address seven different topics that are factors currently impeding impeachment.

The first that I shall address is the belief by many that not enough bipartisanship exists as it relates to impeachment, not enough persons from both sides of the aisle, and, more specifically, not enough persons who are representative of the Republican Party.

There is this belief that impeachment must be an effort that is bipar-

tisan, and it must be to some significant amount of bipartisanship. That amount has not been announced, so it is hard to say what the significant amount of bipartisanship is that is being sought.

But I think that at this point, so as to address the question of bipartisanship, which I believe in, would hope for—I think that bipartisanship is a wonderful thing. But to address it, I believe we will have to go to Federalist 65.

For those who are interested, the Federalist Papers consists of some 85 articles that were published between 1787 and 1788, published by the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay. He was also assisted by the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. And, of course, the third part of this group of persons was Madison, the fourth President of the United States.

These persons, the three of them, the trio, were to, if you will, present reasons to the country why the Constitution should be ratified; and in presenting reasons for ratification, they published Federalist 65.

Federalist 65 explains what impeachment is all about. It does a little bit more than just explains what it is about. It explains what one might expect, what we might expect if impeachment is sought.

And I must say, at this point, that these three Framers of the Constitution were prophetic, absolutely persons who could see into the future, one might think, because they prognosticated what we are having to concern ourselves with currently in terms of what will happen among the people and in society should we move toward impeachment.

Prophetic—they had their flaws; they were not perfect; but on this issue, they seemed to have been prophetic, because they prognosticated that at a time such as this, there would be division, that you would have parties separating in their own corners, if you will, that the people among us in society, that they would have very hard opinions; that people would sometimes base their opinions upon the circumstances, and others, just based upon the knowledge that they might have of the person who is being impeached.

They prognosticated that this would not be a time of great unity, that it is more likely to be a time of division. And they knew, however, that the Constitution could survive this.

The Constitution survived the impeachment of Andrew Johnson in 1868. It was rancorous; there was a lot of divisiveness; but the Constitution survived. The Constitution is capable of surviving it, and the people, more importantly, are capable of surviving. And society is capable of surviving, which means the country can survive impeachment.

But it is there for a reason. It is there because there is a belief that, from time to time, you may have one

holding public trust in the highest office of the land, the Chief Executive Officer, known as the President. The Chief Executive Officer may engage in conduct that would cause the trust in the Chief Executive Officer to be assumed less than what it should be.

The Chief Executive Officer might breach his trust that the public has in him. The Chief Executive Officer would do harm to society, and in doing harm to society, the Framers of the Constitution concluded that there should be a means by which the Chief Executive Officer could be removed, and this, of course, would be impeachment.

Impeachment is not something that anyone relishes. We don't seek impeachment. It is sometimes forced upon us, something that you have to do if you truly believe that no one is above the law.

Let's look at some of the historic impeachment cases. There are but two: Johnson in 1868, and Clinton in 1998. And in both of these, the parties were separated. There was not a moment when the Republicans and Democrats decided: Yes, this is what we must do, and we will unite and get it done.

Andrew Johnson was not impeached, and the impeachment failed by one vote.

President Clinton was not impeached, but there was not this rush of Democrats to support Republicans to impeach President Clinton. It just didn't happen.

So an expectation of national unity is probably setting the standard so high that we may not ever impeach.

The Framers understood that there might not be this unity, probably wouldn't be, and prognosticated that unity would not exist in Federalist 65. So we are setting the bar pretty high when we decide this must be done.

By the way, no one can impose that standard upon us. That is a standard that we can accept, but it doesn't have to be a standard for the Members who would vote for impeachment. That is absolutely not the case. There is no one person who can impose such a standard on this body.

Each person has the opportunity to make up his or her mind based upon the evidence presented using the standard that he or she believes to be appropriate. So imposing a standard of national unity is probably setting the bar a bit too high.

Next, there is this notion that we should defeat, not impeach. Defeat, not impeach.

Well, we say that no one is above the law, and I have heard a good many Members of this body say so. It has been published: No one is above the law.

And usually there would be the following words thereafter: No one is above the law, and this includes the President of the United States.

Well, if no one is above the law and you believe that the President has committed impeachable acts, then you probably wouldn't want to say that we

should defeat at the next election as opposed to impeach now—if no one is above the law. Because, in essence, you are saying: No one is above the law; however, I won't enforce the law. I won't honor Article II of the Constitution. No one is above the law, but I am not going to impose the law upon one who has committed impeachable acts.

I don't see the consistency in doing this, but it is the prerogative of people to do what they may. I am merely explaining some of the impediments to impeachment. This is one: Defeat, not impeach.

And if no one is above the law, as I have indicated, and I believe this—and this includes the President—then I believe we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to move forward with impeachment. I don't think you wait until the next election to avoid your duty, responsibility, and obligation.

One salient point that can be made is some ugly things can happen when you have no guardrails, when you send a signal to the Chief Executive Officer that there is no one to hold you accountable, that the Congress is not going to fulfill its responsibilities under the Constitution—no guardrails.

Well, the Chief Executive Officer, who has already committed impeachable actions, will proceed probably to do what he may and will simply because he knows that he does not have the deterrent that the Congress is supposed to impose by virtue of having this awesome amount of authority to remove from him office—assuming that the President is impeached and the Senate convicts.

But, if you don't have guardrails, you don't have a Chief Executive Officer who is being deterred from doing things that we might find totally inappropriate, for example, going to war. The Chief Executive Officer could decide: I need not go to Congress to go to war. The Congress has the duty and responsibility to declare the war, but since Congress isn't going to do anything, why bother?

Congress is but another entity, not a coequal partner in the government with the executive.

So I think you can't hold the position that you will defeat, not impeach, especially when you have said, if you have, that the President has committed these impeachable actions.

Now, there are a good many people who are walking back comments. And everybody has a right to walk back comments—happens quite regularly here—but you might take note of this: You can't walk back history. You can walk back comments, but you can't walk back history.

So if you have already said that the President has committed these impeachable actions and you have already said the President should be impeached, you won't be able to walk that back from history.

Time tells and history judges. The truth is known. The truth will be published at some point about what we have said and how we have behaved.

Impeachment cannot be but a talking point to be used for political expediency. You can't on one day say, "Oh, yes, he ought to be impeached," and then the next day say something that contradicts this in an effort to walk it back.

Well, you can do it, but history will record both of your comments, and history will judge you. At some point, that judgment will be codified such that the world will know what was said on all occasions, not just on the latest rendition of the commentary that is made.

Time tells; history judges. The truth will be known. Defeat, not impeach is not an option if you believe that the President has committed impeachable actions.

□ 1945

Then, there is, of course, the notion that the Senate won't convict. There is no requirement that the Senate convict. This is something that a person or some persons can require of themselves, a belief that since the Senate won't convict, there is no need to impeach. But that is not what impeachment is all about. It is about the House of Representatives doing its job.

The House does its job quite routinely here sending bills of great importance to the Senate that the Senate doesn't act on. It did so last week and will do so again and again. H.R. 1 was not acted on, and a good many others. I need not go through all of them. But the point is, you cannot conclude because it is impeachment that you have a different standard, in my opinion.

You have to have one standard. Either we are going to decide we will not send things to the Senate, and cease and desist, I suppose being the House of Representatives, which I would not abide with, but that, I suppose, would be a decision that you might make, one might make, but not one for me to make.

I think that we have a responsibility to do our jobs, and then we give the Senate the opportunity to do its job. If we do our job, we do more than simply impeach, which is important. We act as a deterrent that impeachment is to deter the next President; to let the next President know that the House of Representatives will not shy away from its responsibility; that it will do what it is supposed to do when a President commits impeachable actions.

So this notion that the Senate won't act is a reason for us not to act, would mean then that the Senate controls impeachment, which is the responsibility of the House of Representatives.

Do we want to give the Senate the authority to do its will and not have the House do its will? Do we want the Senate's will to become the will of the House? What we are saying is, until we can get a Senate that will follow our lead, we will not take the lead and do as we should, do what we, according to Article II section 4, and in my opinion, must.

We cannot allow the Senate to control the House of Representatives no more than we can allow another party, if I am on one side of the aisle and we have a party on the other side, we can't allow another party to dictate what we would do on this side of the aisle.

If you have overwhelming majority, you cannot blame the other side for your failure to act. That is my opinion. If we have an overwhelming majority, then at some point, it will be noted in history that we didn't act. And it won't be said in history that we didn't act because the minority prohibited us from acting here in the House.

It won't be said that we failed to act because the Senate had the authority to prevent us from acting. The Senate does not trump the House of Representatives. We cannot decide that only the Senate can determine whether the House should move forward. This is not what the Framers intended. But this is, in effect, what we will be doing if we predicate our actions upon the actions of the Senate.

I don't think that is appropriate and I take issue with the notion that we must wait until the Senate is ready to act before we can act.

By the way, no one knows what the Senate would do until the Senate has an opportunity to do it. Once the Senate is confronted with having to vote, we may find that the Senate will take a different course of conduct than that we have presupposed the Senate will do or take.

The Senate could very well have an epiphanous moment. Probably not, but it could, meaning some two-thirds of it, and act. But whether it does or doesn't, we have a duty to do our job and then let the Senate take a vote, go on record, and we will let the chips fall where they may in history.

I think all of us, we should all be on record. We know what the circumstances are. We know the harm that is being caused in society. We know that the trust has been breached, and we only have to now do what the Framers have given us the way to do, assuming that we have the will to do it.

They gave us the way, but they could not give us the will. We have to have the will to act ourselves. Impeachment in the Senate, where the trial is to take place, is not to be predicated upon the House following the will of the Senate.

Now, there is another reason that I would like to call to your attention, another impediment, and it is the notion that impeachment will divide our Nation. I have covered this to a limited extent, but I will go back because some things bear repeating.

In Federalist No. 65, the Framers of the Constitution made it very clear that you will not have, as they saw it at that time, this national unity. It doesn't work that way. People are going to take sides. And when they do, you are likely to have things develop along party lines. But we have to still

do our job. We cannot set standards that may be impossible.

We can't have the standard be the Senate must decide it will go along with us before we will act. That is not a reasonable standard for us to have as Members of the House. We are independent. We can't have the standard that we can only do this if we have the consent of the opposing party.

What you are doing is putting the fate of the country in the hands of the minority. You are putting the fate of the country in the hands of the Senate when the House has a duty to act.

So I conclude with this on this point, the notion that it will divide the Nation is something that was prognosticated. Now, I would love to have the country in unity. I believe in unity, and I think you can have unity without uniformity. We don't all have to do the same thing all the time to have unity on certain issues.

But there is no constitutional requirement that we have the minority support what the majority can do, and the Senate be aligned with the House before the House can act. There is no constitutional requirement for such a thing.

Next, we have the notion that impeachment can benefit the Chief Executive Officer. Impeachment will benefit the Chief Executive Officer. It is hard to imagine a Chief Executive Officer wanting to be impeached.

I have seen and heard statements from the Chief Executive Officer that would give me reason to believe that the Chief Executive Officer really does not want to be impeached.

There is something called reverse psychology that we are all familiar with. Say that you want the thing that you don't want, to the extent that you convince the people who can have the impact to do the thing that you do want them to do, which is the thing that they think you don't want them to do.

My point is simply this: We cannot assume that we are walking into some sort of petard, by virtue of our taking up our constitutional responsibility. This is not a trap. This is our responsibility, and we should not allow a Chief Executive Officer to convince us that we should do this because the Chief Executive Officer thinks that it would benefit him, when, in fact, the history of impeachment seems to provide evidence to the contrary.

The history of events is that Andrew Johnson did not get reelected after he was impeached.

And for those who have been in this debate about what happened with President Clinton, I assure you, his Vice President did not get elected. One would assume that the mantle would be passed on to the Vice President. Such was not the case. He was not elected.

There are those who would say: Well, but the House of Representatives—no, the House didn't change hands. The Republicans maintained control of the

House of Representatives. Well, they lost some seats. Well, they did, but they still had 218 and they controlled the House.

The point is, you cannot assume that impeachment is going to be a benefit. As a matter of fact, it is an indelible stain on the record of the Chief Executive Officer. It would be forever known, whether he is removed from office or not, that this Chief Executive Officer was impeached. It will have an impact on the Chief Executive Officer's brand. This person will forever have the brand of an impeached Chief Executive Officer.

I am not saying you do it just to brand a person. I am talking about impeachment, because we would fulfill the responsibilities under Article II section 4, which indicate that the President can be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, bribery, treason. We would fulfill those responsibilities pursuant to Article II section 4.

In so doing, we would indelibly place the brand of impeachment on the Chief Executive Officer. Whether he is convicted and removed or not, he still suffers eternally throughout all of time the fact that impeachment was imposed upon him, which I think is an appropriate remedy. Even if we don't get a conviction I think we should let the world know that the House took up its responsibility. The House of Representatives did its job.

Of course, there is this notion now, another standard, that you have to have what I am calling a rock-solid case. I hear commentary that would lead me to believe that this has to be done only when you have evidence beyond all doubt; not a reasonable doubt, which is what we might have in court; not by clear and convincing evidence; clearly, not by the preponderance of the evidence, which is a very low standard, but beyond all doubt.

I am hearing persons speak such that one could conclude that if you didn't see it yourself, whatever the impeachable act is, that we need more evidence.

We have the Mueller report. We were told, let's wait for the Mueller report. We waited for the Mueller report. And then, well, we need to hear from Mr. Mueller. Mr. Mueller has spoken and has pretty much said: What you see is what you will get. He may ratify what is there, but it doesn't appear, based upon what I heard him say, that he will be giving nuanced testimony above and beyond what is contained in the report.

For those who want to hear from Mr. Mueller, I wouldn't get in the way of that. Let's have Mr. Mueller come and testify. But the truth is, the report, in and of itself, is evidence, because all of the statements contained in the Mueller report were taken from persons who were giving their testimony at the expense of committing perjury if they didn't give truthful statements.

So perjury was a consequence of giving an untruthful statement to the FBI

agents who were asking these questions. And the Mueller report is pretty good evidence. We could use that to impeach if we chose to do so.

I believe that the Mueller report contains some 10 opportunities for this Congress to engage in impeachment, bringing impeachment to the floor of this House for a vote. And for edification purposes, the President doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. We won that battle. That was one of the first things that was said when impeachment was called to the attention of this body some more than 2 years ago. What crime has he committed?

Well, we know now that you don't have to commit a crime. We knew then that you don't have to commit a crime. But it seems that there was an effort, almost, among some to distort what the law is for purposes that I cannot announce. But there seems to have been a desire to convince the public that the President must commit a crime to be impeached. That is not true.

What is the evidence of it not being true? The fact that Andrew Johnson was impeached in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him in 1868 for speaking ill of Congress, which wasn't a crime then, and isn't a crime now.

Speaking ill of Congress is not a crime. He was impeached for speaking ill of Congress in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against Andrew Johnson. That is the best evidence, what has happened.

□ 2000

What has happened?

What we know to be the case. So those who would like to change the standard, you have got history to deal with, Madam Speaker. If you want to change the standard. To change the standard, you would have to literally erase what happened with Andrew Johnson.

There is no requirement that the President commit a crime to be impeached. He has to do harm to society. He has to breach the public trust—breach the public trust, cause harm to society—and you can be impeached if you are the Chief Executive Officer. There is no requirement that you commit a crime, no requirement that the Senate has to agree with the House before the House can act, and no requirement that there must be a national unity government before you can have impeachment.

These are standards that are being set that are, quite frankly, beyond the rationale that the Framers of the Constitution provided for us.

Read the Federalist Papers, Madam Speaker, and you will get a better understanding. Federalist 65 would be a good read. It is a short read, and you will get a better understanding.

So these standards—these unreasonable standards, in my opinion—are such that we will probably end up en-

gaging in expediency and saying that we want to impeach for the purpose of expediency, but not making impeachment an action item. It is one thing to have political expediency, but another thing to turn that into an action item. The action item would have to be impeachment. You cannot just talk about this with certainty and not act, Madam Speaker.

The final thing that must be done pursuant to the moral imperative to act is to impeach. And I find that we are talking about this to the extent that we will do it eventually—if we are not very careful of what Dr. King called, engage in the paralysis of analysis—just analyze this and set standards. All standards keep changing from time to time.

But remember this, no one can set the standard for any one of us in the House of Representatives. All 435 of us have been given the standard of being a Member of the House and making a decision. I say this based upon what your conscience dictates and based upon a belief that Article II section 4 of the Constitution has been violated.

Speaking of Article II section 4 and the President not having to commit a crime, it is important to note this: high crimes and misdemeanors.

By the way, Madam Speaker, you can be impeached for a high misdemeanor. It doesn't have to be a high crime and misdemeanor. This is what a good many persons are still saying. Not true.

How do you know that you can be impeached for a high misdemeanor?

Because Andrew Johnson was impeached for a high misdemeanor. It doesn't have to be a high crime and misdemeanor. It can simply be a misdemeanor. A misdemeanor, Madam Speaker, can be a minor criminal offense or it can be a misdeed. The word "misdemeanor" was defined at the time the Framers wrote the Constitution, and to this day, as a misdeed. Andrew Johnson was impeached for a high misdeed in article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him.

Make notes. Write that down. Read it. Check. You will find the truth is there for a misdeed, a high misdeed, a high misdemeanor, and a misdemeanor is a misdeed.

Let's debunk the notion that impeachment will benefit the President. It has been debunked. The notion that you have to have a rock-solid case, there is no such thing as a rock-solid case or maybe some other term similar. There is no requirement.

The notion that impeachment is not political, well, that is not what the Framers of the Constitution said. That is not what is said in Federalist 65. Read Federalist 65. There is no requirement that you avoid politics. The Framers used that very word, "political", in Federalist 65. So the notion that impeachment can't be political is contrary to what the people who wrote the Constitution thought should be contained therein.

What is interesting to me is that we have a good many people here who believe in the intent of the law.

What was the intent?

I am starting to think that it is for convenience some of the time. Either you are for intent or you are not, Madam Speaker. Well, the intent of the Framers was that this would be political, and it is going to be political. You are not going to escape the politics of it with clever phrases. It is not going to happen. This is political the notion that you have to have a rock-solid case. That is beyond what is expected from the Framers. And I am not sure you are going to ever finish your investigation if you are going to continue to investigate until you have exhausted every possible thing before you move forward, and nobody can set that standard for the 435 Members of this House.

Next, we have the question of bigotry in policy. There are some who believe that it is okay to have bigotry intentionally placed in policy. Bigotry in policy, to decide that you are going to do something that will be bigoted as the Chief Executive Officer and you will put that into policy, to decide you are going to ban certain people from the country, to decide that you are going to change the rules because people may be from what might be called a s-hole country, change the rules for those from that s-hole country. And then to give some indication that you have bigotry within you by announcing that people who would say phrases like, "blood and soil", "Jews will not replace us", protesting out in the street, calling themselves members of groups that have been known infamously for behaving in invidious discrimination, give us all of the evidence that we need. I guarantee you that bigotry in policy is impeachable.

I assure you of this: I believe in the deepest corners of my soul that if a previous President said and did the things that the Chief Executive Officer has said and done, he would be impeached. He would be removed from office. And I would be one of the persons to support it. We cannot have double standards.

Madam Speaker, you can't have a standard that exists because you have a beneficial bigot, a bigot that serves a useful purpose, a bigot that benefits your agenda. All of your adult life you have been preaching against certain things, and then you get a beneficial bigot, someone that might do something such as, appoint persons to the court that you would like to have, and then your standards change. You accept bigotry in policy against people that I would call the least, the last, and the lost.

You would accept it against these babies, Madam Speaker. You would accept, accept, accept having a 4-month-old baby separated from his parents. At 4 months old, taken out of the arms of his father. And some time thereafter, when the father is trying to gain custody of his child, say to the father that

we will have to deport you, when you take your seat on the plane, we will bring your child to you. We will give you the child back.

This is the United States of America I am talking about. I love my country. I don't love that kind of behavior. I have great disdain for that level of behavior. Tell this man he is going to get his child, and then have him deported without his baby. This was reported some 2, 3 days ago in a reputable news source—separated. We know babies are being separated or have been separated. This is supposed to be the youngest, 4 months old. Later on you take the 4-month-old to court, you have a hearing. The baby is now with some people who are taking care of the baby. And then you finally decide the baby is now 6 months of age or there about and you will return this baby to his parents.

They have suffered greatly.

Can you imagine, someone taking your 4-month-old baby?

Can you imagine the pain, the sleepless nights, and the crying?

Can you imagine how your life would just be torn apart?

Your baby has been removed. Well, you finally get your baby back. One would assume that this would be a joyous occasion, but the baby doesn't recognize the parents.

Imagine the pain of reaching out to your baby, Madam Speaker, and your baby withdraws and turns to someone else, because a government had a policy of deterring people from coming by separating babies as young as 4 months old from parents.

I just don't abide with this. I cannot accept this. Those who can are a better person than I am. They are. It really does not matter what happens to me. The story of the Good Samaritan is not the story of the person who said: If I cross over and help this person, what is going to happen to me?

The story of the Good Samaritan is the story of the person who said: If I don't help this person, what is going to happen to him?

We use that parable quite a bit in this country.

The story of the person who is the brother's keeper is the story of a person who said: Am I my brother's keeper?

Well, we know this: you can't be your brother's keeper without keeping your brother. Brothers and sisters are our relatives. Distant though they may be, they are a part of humanity. They are ours. We belong to them, and they belong to us.

This kind of behavior is unacceptable. I have said before, and I will say again and again, if these babies were coming across the northern border we would have a different mindset. We would not have the mindset that we have now such that we put them in cages.

I went to the border. I wanted to see for myself, and I saw babies lying on a cement floor with some sort of tinfoil blanket over them in conditions that

the SPCA would not allow animals to exist in.

If it doesn't touch your heart, Madam Speaker, you are a better person than I am, because it touched my heart. When I saw it, it hurt. This is about humanity. This is about persons fleeing harm's way. This is about a law that allows them to approach one of our agents, make a proper announcement, and get a fair hearing.

It is not about circumventing the law, trying to find clever ways to keep people out who are following the law. It is not about that. It is about people. It is about humanity. It is about the greatest country in the world and what people around the world think of us now.

I assure you, Madam Speaker, the image that we had is being tarnished, I won't say irreparably, but I will say it is being tarnished.

The lady with the golden lamp, or light, if you will, torch, give me your poor, you know the rest of the story, your tired, you know the rest of it. We have honored that. We took about 11 million people, I believe, from Europe. We didn't separate babies from mothers. We welcomed them.

Something has changed. Something has changed. We are witnessing before our very eyes a change in the culture and a change in our country, because we are witnessing before our very eyes that we seem to think that it is okay or that it is not something that we ought to address.

The President doesn't have to commit a crime, the Chief Executive Officer doesn't have to commit a crime to be impeached. We but have to have the will to do what we must, in my opinion.

By the way, my opinion is that we are more likely to impeach than not. This is my opinion. I really do believe that in this House there will be people who are going to conclude that they will not tolerate the level of injustice being perpetrated.

□ 2015

I believe it. I believe that there will be a majority to do it, more likely than not. I believe that it can and will happen. I really do.

I think that we should be deliberative, but I don't think that we should allow the paralysis of analysis to prevent us from doing our job.

I believe there will be enough people who are going to come forward to say we will hold the Chief Executive accountable for this behavior and other behavior: the whole notion that the Chief Executive can tell members of the constabulary, the police, that when they arrest people and they have them within their care, custody, and control, that they don't have to be nice to them; and the whole notion that the Chief Executive can ban people, that he can send out a tweet and kick people out of the military who have been serving honorably or prevent people from coming in because of who they are.

I believe that there are enough people who will find this offensive and that they will take the action that the Framers of the Constitution fully intended we take.

I close with this, a belief that we have been given an awesome responsibility. We were elected to the people's House. We were elected to do the work of the people, but we were also elected to do the morally righteous thing.

There are some times when we have to step beyond where the people may be at a given time because we know what is right and we are going to do the righteous thing. Sometimes, we have to do this. We just have to step out.

We don't take a poll, by the way. This whole notion that, until the country is with us, we can't do that which the law requires us to do, in my opinion, that whole notion that we can't do it until the country is with us, well, that is taking a poll.

A poll is a snapshot in time. That is all it is, just a snapshot in time. Are we going to allow something as necessary as impeachment to be governed by a poll?

I thank God that Dr. King and those who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge did not do so based upon a poll, that they had huddled and said, "Well, Dr. King, what do the polls say?"

If it is a righteous cause, the polls don't matter. We have to do that which is right, be led by the spirit sometimes, as a friend said to me, to do the right thing.

Polls. What if Rosa Parks had taken a poll? "Let's take a poll before you take that seat on the bus, risking everything." She had no idea what her fate would be.

"Take a poll, Rosa." Would she have taken the seat if she had relied on polls?

What if Lincoln had said, "Let's take a poll before we attempt to pass the 13th Amendment."

Polls can prevent us from doing that which is bold. Bold actions are not predicated upon a poll. They are predicated upon the righteousness of the cause. If the cause is righteous, we ought to do the right thing.

Dr. King said the time is always right to do what is right.

I believe that we need not take polls, that we have enough evidence, that we shouldn't have unreasonable standards, and that this House can and will do its job.

I say "more likely than not" simply because anything is possible, I suppose. But I just believe that there are enough people here of goodwill who are going to decide that what we have seen is enough before we end up seeing something that we cannot reverse, something that could be beyond what we would want to see happen, not only to this country but to all countries, by way of what happens to one directly happens to all indirectly, according to Dr. King, because life is an inescapable network of mutuality.

I don't want to see something happen, but I do want to say this: Given that we know we can impeach right now, if we fail to impeach and some dastardly thing occurs, there will be Members of this House who will regret not having taken the appropriate action.

It is bigger than any one of us. This is about humanity. We ought to respect the means by which we can preserve integrity, the means by which we can preserve the lives that we have been charged with the responsibility of caring for as Members of this body.

Let us move forward.

I greatly appreciate the leadership for giving me this opportunity to be heard.

My dear friends, unless leadership changes the rules, I will be heard again because I plan to come back again and again. I assure my colleagues that if no one else does, there will be another vote on impeachment on the floor of the House of Representatives, not because I want to do it but because I believe I am forced to do it. I have little choice if I want to protect the integrity of the Constitution and preserve the notion of no person being above the law.

I believe I have a responsibility to do it. I don't like using the personal pronoun "I" as it relates to this, but I have no choice. It will be done. We will all go on RECORD.

I assure my colleagues, I will not approach any individual person to try to convince a person that he or she should do a given thing. I will talk from this podium, as I have, and I will answer those who may ask me questions. But I do believe we have to take this duty seriously, and we have to have a vote in the House of Representatives.

I am thankful for the time, Madam Speaker, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be a Member of this august body. While I am here, I plan to do all that I can to make sure, for the people I have been elected to serve, that I do what is in their best interests, even if they may not think it is in their best interests.

There are some things that are bigger than individuals. It is about a country. It is about humanity.

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

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

HONORING HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP ELPIDOPHOROS

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of His Eminence Archbishop Elpidophoros, who was recently elected the new Greek Orthodox Archbishop of America.

Archbishop Elpidophoros was born in Constantinople, Istanbul, Turkey, in

1967. Since August 2011, he has served as the abbot of the Patriarchal Monastery of Holy Trinity in Halki, where I had an opportunity to meet him this past April. What a wonderful, wonderful person.

Madam Speaker, our beloved seminary is located there as well.

He is an expert theologian. I was so blessed to have a conversation with him. He is kind and honorable. We could hope for no better qualities in our new archbishop.

He replaces Archbishop Demetrios, who has retired after 20 years at his post.

Archbishop Elpidophoros leads a church of more than 1½ million Greek Orthodox Christians in the United States, promoting the values of orthodoxy at every opportunity.

I wish Archbishop Elpidophoros the best in all of his endeavors and congratulate him on this great achievement. May God's grace be upon him in his new role.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family medical emergency.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 19, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 299. To amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 21, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1348. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's Major final rule — Payday, Vehicle Title, and Certain High-Cost Installment Loans; Delay of Compliance Date; Correcting Amendments [Docket No.: CFPB-2019-0007] (RIN: 3170-AA95) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1349. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Rural Development, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's

final rule — Single Family Housing Direct and Guaranteed Loan Programs (RIN: 0575-AD13) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1350. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Health Reimbursement Arrangements and Other Account-Based Group Health Plans (RIN: 1210-AB87) received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1351. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental consolidated report to keep the Congress informed about deployments of United States Armed Forces equipped for combat, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(c); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(c); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 116-43); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1352. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Major final rule — Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Extension of Eligibility to Certain TRICARE-Eligible Individuals; Effective Date of Enrollment (RIN: 3206-AN58) received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1353. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0696; Product Identifier 2017-SW-101-AD; Amendment 39-19650; AD 2019-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1354. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0801; Product Identifier 2017-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-19632; AD 2019-08-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1355. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1058; Product Identifier 2018-CE-051-AD; Amendment 39-19646; AD 2019-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1356. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Rotax GmbH & Co KG Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0916; Product Identifier 2018-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-19643; AD 2019-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1357. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0708; Product Identifier