

SHAM IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. WALKER. Before they identified the crime, Madam Speaker, the Democrats organized the firing squad. Before anyone was talking about Ukraine, over half of the Democratic majority was in favor of impeachment.

In fact, this process didn't begin with Ukraine or a whistleblower, this sham impeachment process started year one of President Trump's administration when a Democrat colleague stated, ". . . if we don't impeach this President he will get reelected."

Hatred for President Trump has become the new religion of the radical left, creating an irrational behavior, not rooted in good judgment, but rather in emotion.

The Democrats are protecting ADAM SCHIFF, as seen by yesterday's censure vote. This was not, and is not, about the facts. Facing your accusers and "innocent until proven guilty" used to be the American way.

It is the basic standard that every American should expect, including the President. Being targeted by an angry mob, a willing media machine, and a twisted version of democracy.

The President calls this a witch hunt. Unfortunately, it looks like that is exactly what it is.

STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAALAND). 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. And since my name has been called several times, I rise to respond. I rise to explain why the impeachment inquiry should be expanded.

Some things bear repeating: I rise to explain why the impeachment inquiry should be enlarged, to include the President's weaponization of hate.

I know what weaponized hate is like. I am a son of the segregated South, Madam Speaker. My rights that were accorded me and recognized under the Constitution of the United States of America were denied me by my neighbors.

I am a son of the segregated South. I know what weaponized hate is like. I was forced to not only live with, but to also honor weaponized hate.

Madam Speaker, I know what it was like to have to stand in the colored line. And while standing in the colored line, others could always come who were of a different hue and stand in front of me. And it could happen until every person of a different hue had been served. I know what weaponized hate is like.

And I recall once—actually, on more than one occasion, but this one stands out in my mind—when the young man

who was bagging the purchased items, he took my purchased items and he put them in the bag—he was of a different hue—and he crushed the bag. And he stared me down as he crushed the goods that I had purchased.

I know what weaponized hate is like. I saw the anger not only in his face, but I could see it exude from his body. He was probably a little bit older than I was. He didn't know me, but he had the hate that had been weaponized, and it was within him.

I can remember having to go to the back door. I had to go to the back door to receive goods that I paid for, paid taxes on, the same as others did. But I couldn't go to the front and receive my goods, only the back door was available to me. And then when I would go to the back door, people would still say ugly things to me, notwithstanding the fact that I was a paying customer.

Weaponized hate causes people to behave this way, to stand against their own interest. I was a customer, a paying customer, but weaponized hate would cause them to stand against their own interest. It was in their interest to have me come back, but they knew that I had no place else to go for the most part, so they could be ugly to me and treat me any way that they chose.

I know what weaponized hate is like. I can remember being required to sit only in the balcony of the movie. When we came in, we had to make a turn and go up to the balcony. This is what weaponized hate is like. It segregates people. It didn't allow me to enjoy the movie in the presence of persons of a different hue who might be seated next to me. This is what the neighbors that I had denied me under the Constitution. It was accorded me, but they forced me to go into a segregated area.

And, of course, I remember the colored water fountains. And the incident that really stands out in my mind the most was when my mother saw me drinking out of a White water fountain—that is what it was called. And when she saw me drinking out of the White water fountain, my mother pulled me away quickly. She pulled me away because she knew that her young son was at risk of being harmed because he was drinking from a White water fountain. And I remembered what the colored water fountain was like. The colored water fountain was filthy. You could see the crud, but it was all that was available to me. I know what hate is like when it is weaponized, how it can hurt.

I remember traveling across country with my father and my mother, and we stopped at a service station. We purchased gasoline, and we wanted water. And the person who was there representing the management of that station said that we could have water, but we would have to drink it out of an oil can.

I know what it is like. I know what it is like to live under hate and to have to honor hate. I remember my mother

speaking to me in rather stern terms about how I was to behave around White women. How I had to always make sure that I never said anything that a White woman might conclude was offensive, because White women had a license to accuse. And once you were accused, only God knows what would happen to you. We know what happened to Emmett Till. Weaponized hate killed Emmett Till.

I know what it is like. I am a son of the segregated South. I know how persons of a different hue had but only to accuse you, and for all practical purposes, you were guilty. You had to prove that you were innocent.

I mention these things because the President of the United States of America, who has been referenced by my colleagues tonight, same one, the same President, compared impeachment to lynching. He compared impeachment to mob violence, because that is what lynchings were all about. Mob violence, no due process, no trial.

If it was said that you had spoken in an unkind way to a White woman, you could be collected, taken off somewhere in the back woods, castrated, lynched, beaten, brutalized. Mob violence, unlawful hate to terrorize and intimidate.

I know what it is like. I lived in the segregated South. I am a son of the segregated South. And for the President to compare this level of violence and hate to Article II Section 4 of the Constitution, which deals with impeachment, is unacceptable. Totally unacceptable. This is nothing more than a continuation of his weaponizing of hate.

I am a son of the segregated South. I know what hate looks like. I know what it smells like. I know what it sounds like, and I know what it feels like. I have experienced all of the above.

So when the President did this, when he said it, it sparked this flame in me to come and stand here in the well of the House, alone, to explain why the impeachment inquiry should be expanded to include the weaponization of hate by this President.

Yes, I stand alone, but I believe in my heart that it is better for me to stand alone than not stand at all, because I see what's happening to my country, and I love my country.

This is not a game for me. This will follow me the rest of my life. I didn't come to Congress to impeach a President. It is not something that was on my agenda, I had not a scintilla of a notion. I do it because I love my country. I do it because I know what weaponized hate is like.

Yes, I called for the impeachment of the President some 2 years ago for his obstruction, but I also have called for his impeachment for his infusion of hate into policy.

Earlier this evening, someone mentioned Federalist No. 65. I have read it many times. Yes, the words of Hamilton. The words of Hamilton addressed

what it is like to impeach a President. The Framers of the Constitution knew that it would not be pleasant. It is not easy, but it is something you do when you want to preserve democracy and protect the Republic.

They understood, and they gave us Federalist No. 65 to remind us how prophetic they were, that there would be a time such as this and a President such as Trump.

How prophetic they were. If you read Federalist No. 65, you will find that the Framers of the Constitution defined impeachment as the acts of public men, that would be people who hold public trust, and they went on to explain that it was about the harm that they would cause society.

They didn't use terms like "abuse of power" in the sense that there had to be a statutory crime committed. When they mentioned high crimes and misdemeanors at that time in Article II Section 4 of the Constitution, crime also meant a wrong that was being perpetrated, a great wrong. You don't have to have a statutory offense committed, something that is defined with a penalty associated with it.

And when they mention misdemeanors—then and to this day—a misdemeanor is a misdeed, as well as a minor offense.

□ 2045

Don't be misled. Don't be deceived by those who would have you believe that the President has to commit a statutory offense, something that is defined and codified with a penalty associated with it, before a President can be impeached.

If this were true, Andrew Johnson would not have been impeached in 1868 for his comments that were rooted in bigotry and hate. He weaponized hate. Because he weaponized hate, because he didn't want the freed persons to have the same rights that other persons had, because he didn't want the Freedmen's Bureau to function as it should have, he weaponized hate.

In Article X, he was impeached for the high misdemeanor of saying ugly things about the Congress as he was weaponizing his hate. It was a high misdemeanor, and that law has not changed.

This notion of some modern law, modern constitutional requirement, those persons who were closer to the Framers of the Constitution probably knew better what the Framers intended than we do today. They impeached Andrew Johnson for a high misdemeanor.

I beg that people would at least read Article X.

By the way, since we started this engagement to explain to the public, a good many people have had to walk back their comments. A good many people who wanted to know, "What crime did he commit? What rule did he break?" a good many people have had to walk back those comments because they are now of the belief that im-

peachment should prevail. A lot of comments have been walked back.

By the way, I welcome the walk-back. I want people to do the right thing, as it were, so walking back does not offend me.

Comments that were made about me don't offend me. Many of my colleagues have made comments about me, but they don't offend me. I welcome them coming on board now.

This is not about me. It has never been about me. It has been about my country. It has been about democracy, not about Democrats. It has always been about the Republic, not about Republicans.

Say what you may, I do what I must. And I must explain why we should expand the impeachment inquiry so as to cause it to include the President's weaponization of bigotry.

The President needs to be impeached for the high crime and misdemeanor that he has perpetrated, and I will paraphrase Peter Irons, a historian who deals with the Supreme Court. Paraphrasing, he reminds us that the President—he didn't say "weaponization"; these are my words. The President's weaponization of hate presents a clear and present danger—these are his words—to the constitutional equal protection of the laws guaranteed to all of us.

My dear friends, he is eminently correct, and I have paraphrased because I changed the language slightly.

So, Mr. Irons, if I have in any way abused what you have said—I read your comments posted on NBC.com, I believe it was—I was moved by what you said.

Yes, the President should be impeached for his weaponizing hate. Yes, it does present a clear and present danger to equal protection under the laws for all of us because, when the President does this, there are people who will hear what he has said, and they don't always respond in a positive way.

I will never forget that a man in Texas drove hundreds of miles so that he could get to a place where he could murder, assassinate, people of color who happened to be of Mexican ancestry. He went out of his way to do this and said that they were invaders, the kind of comment that we heard from the President as he weaponized hate.

I won't forget that the President decided he would ban a certain religion, did it in a tweet, went on to develop a policy pursuant to the tweet, infused the bigotry into policy, weaponized it.

If you are not Muslim and you are not around Muslims, you probably don't know the level of consternation that has been created within them, the level of concern that they have for their families, the level of concern that they have when they go to their prayer hours. I am around people who happen to be Muslim. I know how they are concerned for their families.

Then the President went on to talk about the s-hole countries. Note that the s-hole countries were countries

where there were people of color. He didn't say it about a European country. He didn't say it about countries where people of a hue different from me happen to predominate. He didn't say it because he knows that he has to be careful, that it is all right in some quarters to say it about people who look like me.

But you have to be careful, Mr. President. Don't say it about some European country. Don't say it about some of these other countries in what we call the Middle East. You will have more trouble on your hands than you can contend with and likely would be impeached already.

There seems to be a willingness to tolerate the bigotry and hate when it is directed toward people of African ancestry, when it is directed toward people who happen to be Muslims, when it is directed toward people who happen to be of the LGBTQ-plus community.

I will say this. I have plenty of friends who are of European ancestry, who are Catholics and Christians and Jews, who are absolutely opposed to what you have said about people of different hues who happen to be of religions different from those that I have mentioned, who happen to be of the LGBTQ-plus community. Yes, there are people across this country who don't believe that this President should remain in office.

As a matter of fact, there is a poll out now that says that about 50 percent of the people in this country—I think 50 percent is the number that is used—are saying that the President ought to be impeached and removed from office.

A Quinipiac poll back in July of this year indicated that more than 50 percent of the American people believe that the President is a racist.

Yes, he must be held accountable. Yes, no one is above the law.

What is the law? The law is Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution. What does it say? It says that the President can be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and it does not say that a misdemeanor or a high crime has to be a statutory offense.

I would also add this. Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution was drafted with the notion in mind that not only should a President not be above the law, that which is codified, but also with judicious and prudent thoughts of the President not being beyond justice.

The Framers of the Constitution talked about how the President should not be beyond justice. Above the law is here; beyond justice is far above this level of above the law. Beyond justice means that the President should not be able to destroy a country, destroy the norms, and not be removed from office.

We have a general who has said that the President is harming the country, that this person who represents the majesty of the United States of America—he didn't use that term, but the person who holds the highest office, the Chief Executive of the country, the

chief magistrate of the country, is harming the country.

Constitutional scholars are saying it. Over a thousand lawyers have said that, pursuant to the Mueller report, the President should be impeached. Anyone else would be locked up, would be charged. They said he would be charged if he were anyone else. That is what they said.

I want you to know that, wherever I go, I encounter people who are saying: Please, don't give up. Please, don't stop. Please, do something about what is happening to our country.

I get expressions of gratitude from people across the length and breadth of the country. And I don't do it to get expressions of gratitude. I do it because I love my country.

The weaponization of hate ought to be a part of this impeachment inquiry.

I have already prognosticated that the President will be impeached. And when the President is impeached, I hope that we will have expanded the articles such that the weaponization of hate will be included.

If Andrew Johnson could be impeached for his bigoted and hateful commentary, surely, we can do this again. Those were radical Republicans, by the way, who impeached Andrew Johnson—radical Republicans. If radical Republicans could impeach him on evidence rooted in his bigotry and hate, we can impeach this President for similar reasons.

I do believe that, if you read the Articles of Impeachment with reference to Andrew Johnson, you will gain a greater appreciation for what I say.

There have been only two Presidents impeached, Andrew Johnson in 1868 and William Clinton in 1998. Only two. Nixon was not impeached.

We need not try to debate this issue of whether the President has to commit a statutory offense. Constitutional scholars know better.

Unfortunately, you have had to cope with a person who is not said to be a constitutional scholar, didn't finish number one in his class, didn't finish from an Ivy League school. But he did bring you truth, and that truth is being recognized.

I stand here in the well of the House of Representatives tonight. I believe that comments comparable to what the President has said with reference to lynching, comparing lynching to impeachment, is but a continuation of his weaponization of hate, bigotry, racism, xenophobia, homophobia, Islamophobia, all the invidious phobias. That is all it is.

It will not cease. He is only going to continue.

If the House of Representatives does not impeach, we will have a President who will have no guardrails because we are the bar of justice. We are where it is initiated, right here. It is not initiated anywhere else.

The Justice Department is not going to do it. There is no place else. This is where it is initiated, right here, the House of Representatives.

If we do not impeach, no guardrails. If we do not impeach, we will have a de facto monarch, a person who does pretty much what he chooses, who believes that he is beyond the reach of any person or persons on this planet.

If we do impeach and the Senate does not convict, that will send another message. The President will perceive himself to be a de facto monarch. We will have a de facto monarchy.

We have a duty to do this. Our country—our country—is what this is all about.

□ 2100

The Constitution is the last word. We are the first line of defense against a reckless, ruthless President who would weaponize hate. We are the first line of defense, the Members of this august body. We have a duty to take up the cause of justice for the country that we love.

I respect anyone who differs with me. Do what you may. But I do believe that, in time, I will be vindicated. I believe that, in time, the 58 who voted initially to impeach will be, again, vindicated. We have already been vindicated to a certain extent, but they will be further vindicated.

The 66 who voted the second time, they are going to be vindicated, too. The 95 who voted the third time, they will get additional vindication. They are already vindicated because we are moving toward impeachment. They were just a part of the avant-garde, already vindicated.

And the question remains, where do we go from here? Do we limit the impeachment to Ukraine and issues related to Ukraine only?

It is my opinion that we should expand it, and I have explained why—because of hatred and bigotry.

Finally, this: We are talking about the original sin of this country; and there are those who would make the argument that, well, the Ukraine circumstance deals with national security; it is a threat to national security.

Well, it is a threat to national security when you have white nationalists who are murdering people in the streets of this country, in the schools, to a certain extent, in various places where you would assume that you are safe. That is a threat to national security as well.

It is time for us to deal with the original sin. We have the opportunity. It is impeachable.

I don't want him impeached because of some election. I want him impeached because he has committed impeachable offenses. I want him impeached because we need to deal with our original sin.

I believe that those who look through the vista of time upon this time are going to realize how right we were, those of us who have moved to impeach for the bigotry, the racism, all of the invidious phobias that we have had to endure from our President.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak. I love

this facility. I love my country. This country means something to me. I stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. I salute the flag.

But I also respect those who choose not to and will respect their rights and defend their right if they choose not to.

But I do. This is my country. I love it. I love it. I stand alone, but it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 724, the PACT Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 835, the Rodchenkov Anti-Doping Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2704. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Bank Advisory, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Stress Testing Rule for National Banks and Federal Savings Associations [Docket ID: OCC-2018-0035] (RIN: 1557-AE55) received October 18,