

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker. I was not present for the following votes due to the passing of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 603, "nay" on rollcall No. 604, "yea" on rollcall No. 605, "yea" on rollcall No. 606, "yea" on rollcall No. 607, "yea" on rollcall No. 608, and "nay" on rollcall No. 609.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE AMENDMENT TEXT IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO VOTE ON PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 660

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from the Rules Committee, Ranking Member COLE from Oklahoma, be permitted to insert the text of the amendment he would have offered had the House rejected the previous question on H. Res. 660, along with extraneous material, into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 660.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LEE of Nevada). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 31, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 30, 2019, at 1:32 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1678.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LLOYD HORWICH,
Legal Counsel.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2505

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representatives WELCH, KIRKPATRICK, TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and WESTERMAN from H.R. 2505.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, on of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING WASHINGTON NATIONALS ON WINNING WORLD SERIES

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, today is a serious day. Last night was an extraordinary night.

I rise for the millions of people who live in the Washington metropolitan area to congratulate and to exalt with all of our region on the extraordinary achievement of the Washington Nationals.

This morning in Washington, the heavens are crying tears of joy. In other words, it is raining. But there is no rain in any of our hearts or minds today. It may be raining, but the faces of Nationals fans are shining with pride and happiness.

For the first time in 95 years—we have waited a long time, Madam Speaker—the Major League Baseball team from our Nation's Capital is bringing home a World Series Championship. My colleague Ms. NORTON is here, being urged to put on a sweater, over her pride.

With the might of their bats and the lightness of their feet, the Nats pushed through to a hard-won victory in game seven last night against the Houston Astros—arguably, the best team in either league this year—who won the most games.

While I congratulate the Houston Astros on an extraordinary season, they just didn't count on the Washington Nationals.

But, today, the Houston Astros and the Washington Nationals are in absolute agreement. It is my understanding that they are sending a joint letter to Major League Baseball, saying: "We want all of our games to be road games from now on."

In case you didn't get that, neither team won at home. They all won games on the road. The good news was, the Washington Nationals had four games in Houston, and the Astros had only three games in Washington.

So there is joy in Washington this day. It is sustained by a spirit of camaraderie and sportsmanship. Our Nats grew strength from their dedicated fans across this region, including, of course, my district.

We have been waiting a very long time for this day, so I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the 2019 Nationals, led by their extraordinary manager Dave Martinez, who played earlier in his career for the

team that moved from Montreal to become the Nats. How appropriate. How wonderful.

I hope my colleagues will also join me in congratulating this year's most valuable player. Very frankly, there were a lot to choose from on the Washington Nats, who started out with a 19-wins-and-31-losses season.

What an extraordinary achievement to come that far that quickly, to meet, arguably, as I said at the beginning, the best team in baseball, the Houston Astros.

I also want to mention, as I said, the most valuable player. There were a lot to choose from. Stephen Strasburg was recruited and signed by the Washington Nationals some years ago as a very young man. He pitched extraordinarily, then got his elbow and had to be operated on, a Tommy John operation, they call it, and he has come back to be one of the best pitchers in the major leagues. He won three games. What an extraordinary achievement. So let's congratulate, as well as Stephen Strasburg, all the members of the team on this victory.

To paraphrase the old poem: "Oh, somewhere in this favored land the sun is shining bright;

The band is playing somewhere, and somewhere hearts are light;

And somewhere men are laughing, and somewhere children shout."

Today, Madam Speaker, that somewhere is the Nation's Capital.

Congratulations, Nationals. We love you.

□ 1230

SOVIET-STYLE IMPEACHMENT

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, last week I joined several dozen of my colleagues at the SCIF in protest of the secret impeachment inquiry.

Seventy-five percent of the elected Members of Congress have been shut out of this impeachment inquest. This whole inquiry is a sham led by the Speaker of this House and her impeachment czar, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Their attempt today to try and open these proceedings is nothing short of Soviet glasnost—a fake transparency that only leads to less participation, more secrecy, and less due process.

Madam Speaker, this is too little too late. You can't unring the bell on this sham process that is your high watermark in seeking to undo the 2016 election at all costs.

Case in point: while saying there will be a resolution to try and bring transparency to these proceedings, this inquiry has continued to take depositions in secret. Democrats in this Chamber have been acting like bank robbers after they have tripped an alarm and they are trying to shove as much money in the bag as they can before the police get there.

We demand due process.

LAW AND ORDER IMPEACHMENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a somber and solemn time.

I rise in support of H. Res. 660, a resolution establishing procedures for the impeachment of the President. I do it with a heavy heart.

But today we choose our beloved Nation over individual self-interest and political party. We choose due process, regular order, and fairness. We choose this little document called the Constitution, lasting for over 200 years.

We are reminded of the words of James Madison who argued in favor of impeachment, stating that some provision was indispensable to defend the community against the incapacity or negligence of the chief magistrate.

We do not do this in a rush, and we do not do it eagerly.

We are reminded of Lieutenant Colonel Vindman who came here at 3 years old. He said he had dedicated his entire professional life to the United States of America. And he said about the call that he was on: I realized that this was troubling, that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens, it would be heavy and wrong. I do not think it is proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen.

Again, we stand on the Constitution. We must do it right and do it fairly.

This is a somber and solemn time.

Today we choose our beloved nation over individual self-interest and a political party.

We choose due process, regular order and fairness.

And as the founding fathers crafted a document, which 230 years later, from 1789 to 2019, we can abide by, we choose the Constitution.

When the Framers of our Constitution designed our government, they bifurcated power between the federal and state governments, and divided power among the branches.

Indeed as the Framers debated ratification of the Constitution, they knew of the need to remove an individual who breached the public trust.

James Madison of Virginia argued in favor of impeachment stating that some provision was "indispensable" to defend the community against "the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the chief Magistrate."

With a single executive, Madison argued, unlike a legislature whose collective nature provided security, "loss of capacity or corruption was more within the compass of probable events, and either of them might be fatal to the Republic."

They wrote Article I and vested in the Congress the capacity to make the laws.

They wrote Article II, and in the Executive vested the power to faithfully execute those laws.

Because the House enjoyed a natural superiority, as most representative of the passions of the populace, the Framers vested in the House of Representatives the sole power of

impeachment, and made the Senate the judges.

In Article II, they specified the standard by which a president or any constitutional officer is to be removed from office: for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

It is against that backdrop that we debate this resolution.

I support this resolution because it protects our interests, holds us responsible, protects the American people and gives the president ample opportunity to try to justify his conduct.

In September, members of the House of Representatives learned of a complaint filed by a whistleblower within the Intelligence Community.

The whistleblower alleged that on July 25, 2019, in a telephone conversation with the President of Ukraine, the American President sought to withhold foreign military aid from the besieged and beleaguered nation of Ukraine unless and until the Government of Ukraine produced or manufactured produced political dirt against a person he deemed his most formidable political rival.

The allegation suggests an effort and intent to extort the assistance of a foreign power to help the current president retain his office.

This is similar to the allegations surrounding his 2016 election victory, which were at the heart of the Special Counsel's Report regarding Russian election interference.

After the whistleblower's details were made public, the White House engaged in a series of untenable defenses, all designed to discredit the courageous whistleblower's account, which the Intelligence Community Inspector General found credible.

First, the White House indicated that the whistleblower should not be trusted because it referenced secondhand information, forgetting that much of the information in the Whistleblower's complaint was corroborated by the White House itself.

Next, the White House claimed, without proof, that the whistleblower was a liar.

Then, the White House spread a lie that it was a "perfect" call between the two leaders. Outrageously, the White House then claimed that Chairman Adam Schiff is lying and had helped the Whistleblower draft his complaint.

That was before the President said that the whistleblower's complaint is a lie made up by the "Deep State."

And that was before the President said that he made the call at Rick Perry's urging and that the phone conversations with the Vice President are more problematic than his.

The President and his last defenders are now trying to denigrate the life and accomplishments of Ambassador Bill Taylor, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, and decorated soldier, and dismissing him as a Never Trumper, as if that is a demerit.

This past Tuesday, Lt. Colonel Alexander Vindman, a member of the National Security Council who immigrated from Ukraine when he was three-years old and was dismissed by the President as insufficiently loyal to him, before one of the President's acolytes suggested Lt. Col. Vindman held a greater loyalty for Ukraine over the United States.

Lt. Col. Vindman has loyally served our country and our Constitution. He was injured in the war in Iraq, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

It is thus fitting that when Lt. Col. Vindman appeared to testify in this impeachment inquiry, he did so wearing his Army class A uniform, and had inside his leg shrapnel from the attack that wounded him, and won him the commendation of his superior officers in the Army.

And when he began his testimony, he indicated just what service to this nation meant.

He stated:

I have dedicated my entire professional life to the United States of America. For more than two decades, it has been my honor to serve as an officer in the United States Army. As an infantry officer, I served multiple overseas tours, including South Korea and Germany, and a deployment to Iraq for combat operations. In Iraq, I was wounded in an IED attack and awarded a Purple Heart.

And immigrant to this country, Lt. Col. Vindman stated:

The privilege of serving my country is not only rooted in my military service, but also in my personal history. I sit here, as a Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army, an immigrant. My family fled the Soviet Union when I was three and a half years old. Upon arriving in New York City in 1979, my father worked multiple jobs to support us, all the while learning English at night. He stressed to us the importance of fully integrating into our adopted country. For many years, life was quite difficult. In spite of our challenging beginnings, my family worked to build its own American dream. I have a deep appreciation for American values and ideals and the power of freedom. I am a patriot, and it is my sacred duty and honor to advance and defend OUR country, irrespective of party or politics.

When Lt. Col. Vindman testified, he spoke of the horror he felt when he realized that our country's national security apparatus was being manipulated for the president's personal and political gain.

He stated in his testimony:

On July 21, 2019, President Zelenskyy's party won Parliamentary elections in a landslide victory. The NSC proposed that President Trump call President Zelenskyy to congratulate him. On July 25, 2019, the call occurred. I listened in on the call in the Situation Room with colleagues from the NSC and the office of the Vice President. As the transcript is in the public record, we are all aware of what was said. I was concerned by the call. I did not think it was proper to demand that a foreign government investigate a U.S. citizen, and I was worried about the implications for the U.S. government's support of Ukraine. I realized that if Ukraine pursued an investigation into the Bidens and Burisma, it would likely be interpreted as a partisan play which would undoubtedly result in Ukraine losing the bipartisan support it has thus far maintained. This would all undermine U.S. national security. Following the call, I again reported my concerns to NSC's lead counsel.

Throughout the last five weeks, Congressional Republicans have presented a series of strawman arguments designed to deflect but not delve into the very serious charges against the President.

Congressional Republicans' claims that the whistleblower complaint was hearsay are specious because its contents have been independently and repeatedly confirmed.

Similarly, there is no merit to the claim that there was no quid pro quo when the evidence adduced to date confirms there was.

In their perverse logic, Congressional Republicans decried the lack of due process for