□ 1245

PASS LEGISLATION FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, Congress exists to serve the American people by passing legislation that will protect their rights and promote their welfare.

Since January of this year, House Democrats have been vigorously legislating for the people and have passed more than 200 bills—200 bills—bills to secure a living wage for American workers, bills to protect pensions and fight discrimination in the workplace, bills to expand access to healthcare and lower the cost of prescription drugs. We have passed bills to safeguard our elections, the bedrock of our democracy, from both foreign and domestic interference.

In contrast, the Republican-controlled Senate has offered little but obstruction and inaction. Their leader proudly calls himself the ''grim reaper'' for laying waste to our 200 bills.

So, I rise today to implore Senate lawmakers: Do your job. Take up these House-passed measures and start serving the American people.

HONORING FIL BAKE SHOP DURING FILIPINO AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on the last day of Filipino American Heritage Month, to honor the Fil Bake Shop in Delano, California, and to congratulate them on becoming the Delano Business of the Year.

Owner Tessie Patricio, or Aunty Tess, and workers of the Fil Bake Shop have been dedicated to hard work and unconditional love for their business for nearly 30 years. As a result, Fil Bake Shop has become a staple of the Delano community and a personal favorite of mine.

One-third of the 52,000 residents of Delano are Filipino, and Fil Bake Shop has been a steadfast supporter of our community in Delano and across the Pacific.

When the Philippines are struck by natural disasters, Fil Bake Shop sends care to the islands. They collect donations in times of disaster to support families back in the Philippines, while still providing the hardworking farmworkers and families of Delano with their delicious sweetbreads.

As this local gem is honored as Business of the Year by the Delano Filipino community, I am proud to represent such a tremendous place in the 21st District of California.

CELEBRATING A DOUBLE WIN FOR D.C.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, with the impeachment inquiry vote, the House made history today, but the Washington Nationals made unprecedented history just last night.

Our D.C. Nats won the World Series for the very first time in American history. Our Nats were the underdogs throughout the series, just like their hometown, the District of Columbia, has been for 218 years.

But hold on, America. We are about to make it a double: Nats' victory last night; House passage of H.R. 51, the D.C. statehood bill, during the 116th Congress.

Watch for how I make my friend, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, pay up on our bet against the Houston Astros.

Go Nats! Long live D.C. statehood!

HONORING OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, on Veterans Day, we remember the devotion of the brave men and women of the military who have honorably served our Nation. Our veterans have fought to preserve this Nation, its ideals, democracy, freedom, and prosperity.

American veterans not only have helped maintain the rights that were established by our Founding Fathers, but they have also set an example of enduring patriotism, returning home to become leaders in their communities, States, and Nation. Back home, they have helped advance our country by embodying the American spirit of hard work and preservation.

Today, we acknowledge these men and women who have served our Nation as members of our military. We thank them for their many contributions to our country. We remember in prayer those men and women who never returned home from foreign soil.

SPEAK OUT AGAINST GENOCIDE

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, the history of the United States has been intertwined with that of the Armenian people and the Armenian genocide.

It was American missionaries and diplomats who let the world know that the Ottoman Empire was attempting to cleanse itself of the Armenian and Christian populations. The U.S. became home to many survivors.

Their experience inspired Raphael Lemkin to create the term ''genocide,'' only to see his Jewish family suffer the same fate at the hands of Nazi Germany.

The denial of the Armenian genocide has had contemporary consequences. I have visited both Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I saw that a Turkey which denies genocide has no fear of committing it again. In fact, Turkey has begun an ethnic cleansing of the Syrian Kurds in northern Syria.

I have long called for our government to officially recognize the Armenian genocide. I am an original cosponsor of H. Res. 296.

The House has spoken with a clear voice, breaking the silence, recognizing the Armenian genocide. We call on the Senate and President Trump to do the same.

We cannot allow history to repeat itself.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in observance of Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Over 25 years ago, I was in an abusive relationship with my ex-husband. I became a single mother to a young daughter, working just to survive day to day. I never dreamed in a million years that I would be standing here before you today as a Member of Congress, speaking on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. But I not only survived, I thrived.

I share my story in hopes of helping others. I hope they find strength in our efforts to acknowledge their suffering and recognize the many organizations that exist to help them today.

TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON AS A BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY UNDER AGOA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116–77)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 506A(a)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)(B)), I am providing notice of my intent to terminate the designation of the Republic of Cameroon (Cameroon) as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA).

I am taking this step because I have determined that the Government of Cameroon currently engages in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, contravening the eligibility requirements of section 104 of the AGOA.

Despite intensive engagement between the United States and the Government of Cameroon, Cameroon has

failed to address concerns regarding persistent human rights violations being committed by Cameroonian security forces. These violations include extrajudicial killings, arbitrary and unlawful detention, and torture.

Accordingly, I intend to terminate the designation of Cameroon as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under the AGOA as of January 1, 2020. I will continue to assess whether the Government of Cameroon engages in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, in accordance with the AGOA eligibility requirements.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 31, 2019.*

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116–78)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Sudan declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2019.

Despite recent positive developments, the crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 13067; the expansion of that emergency in Executive Order 13400 of April 26, 2006; and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, and Executive Order 13804 of July 11, 2017, has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13067, as expanded by Executive Order 13400, with respect to Sudan.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 31, 2019.*

IMPEACHMENT: THEN AND NOW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we had a vote today. Some would say it was very important, but actually, it didn't do so much. In fact, it revoked some of our history, some of our precedent, some of our rules to take an unusual step toward supposed impeachment.

I still continue to be of the opinion that we will not end up having a vote in this Chamber on whether or not to actually impeach President Trump because if that happens, it goes to the Senate. It gets slam-dunked down in the Senate, both on the basis of a massive failure of due process as well as no direct evidence of any wrongdoing, unless we are talking about someone who is a Democrat and has held the second-highest office before. But this is not due process.

By the way, of course, once it gets to the Senate, they vote it down, and then it ensures a repeat of 1996, where the current President is reelected. I am sure my friends across the aisle don't want to do that.

I am still of the opinion that I don't think we will end up with a vote to actually impeach or not impeach President Trump. We will see how that plays out. But it is worth looking at precedent, as an old history major who has never quit studying history.

If we look at the impeachment committee authorizations in 1974 and 1998, back then, when there was bipartisan concern about due process, not just one-sided concern, the authorization by the House directed the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate if there were sufficient grounds for impeachment.

Currently, though, the Speaker directed six different committees, with the House Intelligence Committee at the forefront, to continue their ongoing investigations as part of what was called an impeachment inquiry.

Regarding the subpoena power in 1974 and 1998, what was authorized in the resolution back in the days when there was concern about due process and fairness and ensuring justice would be done, the resolution authorized both the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary to issue subpoenas acting jointly or unilaterally.

□ 1300

If either the chairman or the ranking member declined to act, then the other had the right to refer the decision to the full committee.

Currently, under what we voted on today, it authorized the chair of the Intelligence Committee, Chairman SCHIFF, and Judiciary Committee to issue subpoenas, but the authorization to the ranking member only is with the consent or approval of the chairman. It is incredible.

I mean, basically, our friends have said, well, it is like a grand jury. Well, I have been a prosecutor in front of grand juries. I have been a judge who impaneled grand juries, answered their questions, and dealt with issues that arose over grand juries. I am quite familiar with them.

With a grand jury, every single person on the grand jury who is going to get a vote gets to hear every witness, gets to ask any question they wish, and they could even send the prosecutor out of the grand jury if they wish. He is only there as an adviser.

But what we have had not only was a sham impeachment inquiry, but they actually had armed guards outside of the Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility, the SCIF. They had armed guards with guns to try to keep us out, people like me, on the Judiciary Committee, who is fully authorized, under the current rules, to sit in on any impeachment inquiry, participate, because the rules, through precedent, have made clear it is the Judiciary Committee that does that.

The Speaker can't just stand up and say: ''I am changing all the rules unilaterally''—except for the fact that, in this case, that is exactly what happened. ''Forget the rules. I am decreeing these are the committees that will do an investigation.''

And I didn't realize until we went into the SCIF, which I am authorized to do and which, under the rules, Judiciary having jurisdiction, I should have a right to hear each one of those witnesses.

I didn't know until we got in there, it turns out, Chairman SCHIFF, each time a witness was about to begin to speak to the Intelligence Committee, the committees, he would instruct, now, this is unclassified, so if a question is asked that you think might end up revealing something classified, then you can just say you can't answer, it might reveal classified information.

It sounds to me like that was instruction, when the Republicans ask you a question you don't want to answer, just say, well, it may reveal classified information, and you don't have to answer their questions.

Except that then we find out that, in the more recent depositions, the witnesses were actually instructed not to answer questions.

Well, this metaphor of a grand jury totally breaks down. It doesn't apply. There has never been a grand jury where one grand juror could tell the witness you don't have to answer these other grand jurors' questions, and we are going to put armed guards where people that are on the grand jury can't get in to hear the testimony if we don't want to hear the testimony.

Sure, they will have to vote at some point, but we are going to put armed guards to keep the biggest part of the grand jury out of being able to see the witnesses, to see their countenance as they answered questions.

It is why in military courts martial that I participated in, in Federal trials, in State trials we have an aversion to