

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 Jan-

uary 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

having depositions. Yes, you have a lot of depositions in civil trials.

But in criminal trials, something as important as liberty—and I would submit, a President being thrown out that was duly elected is just as important. In such a case, you get to ask the questions, see the questions; you get to hear the answers; and you get to observe the witnesses. It is important.

Yet, under orders of the Speaker and Chairman SCHIFF, this so-called comparative grand jury kept the huge majority out of those hearings where we could hear and see for ourselves.

Now we find out, through the vote today, that, yes, the Judiciary Committee is ultimately going to get this from the Intelligence Committee. But never in the history of this country have we had such gross unfairness that one party would put armed guards with guns to prevent the duly authorized people from being able to hear the witnesses and see them for themselves.

Then, oh, we hear from this resolution today, we are going to send you the depositions after we get through doctoring and looking at and editing the transcripts. We will send you those so you have the evidence you need.

That is not the kind of evidence that a coup should be based on. If we are going to have what they are trying to legalize as a coup, we ought to have a right to see each of those witnesses. And the only potential use for the depositions should be impeachment of those witnesses, nothing else, not for anything substantive.

The President's attorneys, unlike in 1974 and 1998, were not allowed to be there or even see and hear the witnesses. So the references to this being a Star Chamber are not inappropriate. It is outrageous what has been going on for people who truly care about due process.

Regarding the procedures now, the Judiciary Committee must operate pursuant to the procedures imposed by the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Well, previously, one of the oldest committees in the House of Representatives, the Judiciary Committee, in prior impeachments made the rules for the impeachment hearing. We didn't have it dictated by the Rules Committee, no, because this is the Judiciary Committee. These are people who are supposed to have expertise in constitutional issues.

So when you have the committee that has more expertise in constitutional issues, what did the majority do? We don't want the committee with the most expertise on constitutional issues dealing with these constitutional issues. We want to put armed guards outside a hearing and have it in a Secret Compartmented Information Facility.

And we are not going to let the other side call their own witnesses so we get a fair picture of what actually went on, and we are not even going to let them ask questions we don't want them to ask. We will instruct the witnesses not

to answer because, you see, they want it to be a one-sided, non-due process, sham court.

It is about to push this country to a civil war if they were to get their wishes. And if there is one thing I don't want to see in my lifetime, I don't want to ever have participation in, it is a civil war.

Some historian—I don't remember who—said guns are only involved in the last phase of a civil war. What is going on here has not protected the Constitution. It has not protected the institutions. It has not protected this little experiment in self-government. No.

What it has done is put it all at risk because what some people in this body don't seem to understand is, when you set a precedent as dangerous as what we have been watching for the last 3 years, it won't be me, but there will be Republicans, if this isn't stopped, there will be Republicans who will take the precedent of what the Democrats have done here and use it against a Democratic President, try to set him up and create a coup.

Like I say, it won't be me, but that is the way history works. When somebody sets a precedent, then eventually somebody also not concerned about due process is going to try to mimic that and go one further.

In 1974 and 1998, the committee procedures during the Nixon and Clinton impeachment processes, they included the ability of the President's counsel to attend all hearings, including those in executive session; question any and all witnesses called before the committee; submit written questions for additional testimony; provide summaries of what he would propose to show; and respond to evidence received and testimony presented, either orally or in writing, as determined by the committee. The President's counsel could also review all evidence obtained in the course of the impeachment inquiry.

Not only has the President's counsel not been allowed to do any of those things that have been done in the past to ensure due process and fairness, even the rest of this voting body that will have to vote on an impeachment were not allowed to see the witnesses, to hear the witnesses, to review the transcript until after they are through working with the transcripts.

This resolution today, it bifurcates the impeachment, only allows the President's counsel to participate in Judiciary Committee proceedings. It provides no ability to participate in the ongoing Intelligence Committee investigation.

If we presume that the procedures the Rules Committee has dictated to us on high allow the President's counsel to participate in Judiciary Committee proceedings at all, they will only have access to documents transmitted to the Judiciary Committee and not all the material obtained in the course of the Intelligence Committee's hearings.

I just happen to have H. Res. 803 from 1974 that involved—well, it was from

Chairman—Democratic Chairman Rodino, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

See, that is the way it is supposed to be done. That is the way it has been done in the past, 1974, 1998.

Under the rules that the Democrats passed earlier this year, in January, the rules say, if a rule is not specific about a matter, then precedence is the rule. That is the rule, and it has been ignored repeatedly.

So we voted today basically rubberstamping the secret Star Chamber hearings, the one-sided questioning of the witnesses. Oh, we did hear today Republicans have equal time to the Democrats. It is just that Democrats could ask whatever they wanted and get answers, and Republicans couldn't.

Impeachment in the past, when we have impeached Federal judges before, came through our Judiciary Committee, very bipartisan, because, even as recent as the last 10, 12 years, even ADAM SCHIFF realized, when you are going to remove a Federal officer from a position he is duly placed in, you have got to make sure you provide due process, and you allow buy-in on both sides.

There was no buy-in today because, even though there are some Republicans who are not big fans of the President, to put it mildly, they realize this process is an outrage, and it is a threat to our little experiment in self-government.

□ 1315

So an article comes out yesterday by Paul Sperry, entitled: "The Beltway's 'Whistleblower' Furor Obsesses Over One Name."

To my knowledge, I have not ever talked to this Paul Sperry with RealClearInvestigations, but he brings out a name that has been bandied about on the internet. A lot of people are speculating this guy was the whistleblower.

Regardless of whether this guy is the whistleblower or not, it is important to look at what has been going on with him. Just forget about the claim he is a whistleblower; look at what he has been doing.

The more you find out, the more you realize, wow, President Trump should have revoked clearances for prior potential conspirators long before he did.

But then, in the article, it mentions a 33-year-old—we already knew he was a male, that he worked for Vice President Biden, this guy. He was held over from the Obama White House.

And one of the things that President Obama was able to do so much better than President Trump was make sure that the people who worked in the White House, in the CIA, in the DOJ, the FBI, but especially in the White House, in the Old Executive Office Building for the Vice President, they made much better certainty that everybody there was going to be loyal to President Obama and Vice President Biden. They did a magnificent job of that.

So anybody who is held over—in fact, I understand H. R. McMaster, great Obama Democrat loyalist that was working, continuing to work in the Trump administration, made clear that he didn't want to hear any of his people ever say again that someone was an Obama holdover. I guess he didn't want people outed in front of people loyal to the President as being loyal to President Obama.

But McMaster also was a boss of this guy. He did work for Biden. He worked for CIA Director John Brennan.

Brennan, as the article said, was "a vocal critic of Trump who helped initiate the Russia 'collusion' investigation of the Trump campaign during the 2016 election."

Further, this guy "left his National Security Council posting in the White House's West Wing in mid-2017. . . ."

This guy was working in the White House; Loved Brennan, loved McMaster, and he is in President Trump's White House and part of the National Security Council. They get to see everything that concerns anything on foreign policy and our own national security.

But there were "concerns about negative leaks to the media. He has since returned to CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia."

The article says: "'He was accused of working against Trump and leaking against Trump,' said a former NSC official, speaking on condition of anonymity to discuss intelligence matters."

Alas, this guy "huddled for 'guidance' with the staff of House Intelligence Committee Chairman ADAM SCHIFF, including former colleagues also held over from the Obama era whom SCHIFF's office had recently recruited from the National Security Council."

This guy "worked with a Democratic National Committee operative who dug up the dirt on the Trump campaign during the 2016 election, inviting her into the White House for meetings, former White House colleagues said. The operative, Alexandra Chalupa, a Ukrainian American who supported Hillary Clinton, led an effort to link the Republican campaign to the Russian Government. 'He knows her. He had her in the White House,' said one former coworker. . . ."

"Documents confirm the DNC opposition researcher attended at least one White House meeting with" this guy "in November 2015. She visited the White House with a number of Ukrainian officials lobbying the Obama administration for aid to Ukraine."

And that is the aid we know we have seen, heard former Vice President Biden bragging: Hey, I am leaving in 6 hours, and if they want this \$1 billion, then they are going to have to fire the prosecutor, who just happened to be investigating the gas company that was giving millions of dollars to his son.

The article says: "'Everyone knows who he'" —the whistleblower—"is. CNN knows. The Washington Post

knows. The New York Times knows. Congress knows. The White House knows. Even the President knows who he is," said Fred Fleitz, a former CIA analyst and National Security Advisor to Trump, who has fielded dozens of calls from the media.

"Yet a rare hush swept across the Potomac."

You know, normally, The New York Times and The Washington Post, they can't wait to out a whistleblower, can't wait, don't mind seeing them destroyed. But you look at a real whistleblower, not a fake one like we have here, a real whistleblower with direct information like Adam Lovinger, who, working in the Defense Department—I didn't know that this scheme went that far.

But Lovinger is supposed to investigate improper payments by the Defense Department, and he saw hundreds of thousands of dollars being paid at different times to a guy named Stefan Halper, who is a professor, and he couldn't see anything in return for all the money.

Then we have this investigation about President Trump and find out that, actually, Halper was getting paid by the Defense Department to help set up Trump campaign people so they could use that information to go before a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court and get a warrant to spy on the Trump campaign.

Phenomenal. The Defense Department is paying a guy to help set up the Trump campaign before President Trump was ever elected so they could get warrants to spy on the campaign.

It is incredible. The article says, "Trump supporters blame the conspiracy of silence on a 'corrupt' and 'biased' media trying to protect the whistleblower from due scrutiny about his political motives. They also complain Democrats have falsely claimed that exposing his identity would violate whistleblower protections, even though the relevant statute provides limited, not blanket, anonymity, and doesn't cover press disclosures."

"His Democrat attorneys meanwhile have warned that outing him would put him and his family 'at risk of harm,' although the government security personnel have been assigned to protect him."

And I come back to the facts. There are lots of people that have testified adversely to President Donald J. Trump. As far as I know, they are all still living, breathing, and saying nasty things about him. Their health is not put in jeopardy in any way. Their personal safety is not a problem.

Now, that is not true of some other people that have been in high positions in this town where people end up dead in the morgue. I am not saying they caused it. I am just saying, if you are worried about outing some incident, somebody, President Trump is not the one you need to worry about.

Fleitz said, "They're hiding him. They're hiding him because of his po-

litical bias. A CIA officer specializing in Russia and Ukraine," this person, "was detailed over to the National Security Council from the agency," meaning CIA, "in the summer of 2015, working under Susan Rice, President Obama's national security adviser. He also worked closely with the former vice president."

That is the same Susan Rice—according to a book a few years after—according to that book it reported that Secretary Clinton called her husband and said, they are wanting me to go out there and say this attack in Benghazi was all about a video. And the advice was, you know, you can't be the one that goes on the Sunday shows because nobody is going to buy that.

So Susan Rice was picked to go out and tell people the attack in Benghazi was based on a video, when most everybody, maybe not Susan Rice, but most people who had looked into it at all knew it was not about a video at all. And the Obama administration had been warned repeatedly of the threat that was coming and didn't give them the security they needed, nor did they allow anyone to go lift a finger to help the people at Benghazi.

And I love hearing people on the other side say, oh, you investigated Benghazi for so long and you had nothing. Yes, that is because the Obama administration wouldn't produce anything that we asked for, the important things we asked for. They covered things up. Same on Fast and Furious, and we didn't have a Speaker on the Republican side that would allow us to go to court and get those things released.

So the more important things that got released were a result of Judicial Watch, Tom Fitton's folks going to court and getting the court order to get things produced, but still there was so much that was not produced we don't know all the facts about what happened.

By the way, I do know that Intelligence people lied to the Republican chairman of Intelligence back then and he never would wake up and realize it. Because he reported to our Republican conference after Benghazi about 6 months after, well, guys, some of you have asked me, isn't there somebody at Walter Reed that was injured? We keep hearing rumors. And Mike said, no, I can tell you, there is no one who was injured at Benghazi that is at Walter Reed.

I couldn't sit still anymore. It was in one of my trips to Walter Reed I met such a person. He was on the roof with Tyrone Woods and the other heroes. He had much of his leg blown off. And I had met him, and I honored his request for anonymity being out there.

But I couldn't sit there and listen to the Republican chairman of Intelligence perpetrating what he thought was true but was not, and I knew it wasn't. I said, That is not true. He got red faced and said, That is true. I said, No, I had lunch with the one yesterday. He said, That is not true.

And he told me later after the meeting, I have talked to our intelligence people, and they tell me that the guy you must have seen, he is not at Walter Reed, he comes there for physical therapy. And I said, No, I can tell you the building number and where his apartment is, and it adjoins the physical therapy. It is right there on Walter Reed.

□ 1330

Anyway, he didn't believe it.

I had emailed this great hero and didn't hear from him for a couple of weeks. He later emailed back that: Gee, the strangest thing happened. I had the most painful surgery on my leg.

He had numerous surgeries, but this was the most painful since half of it got blown off on that rooftop in Benghazi. He said: They medicated me because of all the pain. That night, in the middle of the night, these guys show up at our apartment there, and they moved my wife, my kids, all of us immediately off the hospital property. It doesn't make sense.

Well, it made sense to me because we had intelligence people that were covering up the lie that they had told the chairman of the Intelligence Committee because he was a Republican chair. I bet they don't lie like that to ADAM SCHIFF.

Anyway, Federal records, according to the article, show that Biden's office invited this guy "to an October 2016 state luncheon the Vice President hosted for Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi. Other invited guests included Brennan, as well as then-FBI Director James Comey and then-National Intelligence Director James Clapper."

Several U.S. officials told RealClearInvestigations that the invitation that was extended to this guy, who was a relatively low-level GS-13 Federal employee, "was unusual and signaled he was politically connected inside the Obama White House."

Former White House officials said this guy "worked on Ukrainian policy issues for Biden in 2015 and 2016, when the Vice President was President Obama's 'point man' for Ukraine." He is a Yale graduate, speaks Russian, Ukrainian, as well as Arabic.

"He had been assigned to the NSC by Brennan. He was held over into the Trump administration and headed the Ukraine desk at the NSC," under President Trump, "eventually transitioning into the West Wing, until June 2017. 'He was moved over to the front office,' to temporarily fill a vacancy, said a former White House official, where he 'saw everything, read everything.'"

The official added that it soon became clear among NSC staff that this guy "opposed the new Republican President's foreign policies. 'My recollection . . . is that he was very smart and very passionate, particularly about Ukraine and Russia. That was his thing, Ukraine,' he said. 'He didn't ex-

actly hide his passion with respect to what he thought was the right thing to do with Ukraine and Russia, and his views were at odds with the President's policies.'"

In May 2017, this guy went "'outside his chain of command,' according to a former NSC coworker, to send an email alerting another agency that Trump happened to hold a meeting with Russian diplomats in the Oval Office the day after firing Comey, who led the Trump-Russia investigation. The email also noted that Russian President Vladimir Putin had phoned the President a week earlier. Contents of the email appeared to have ended up in the media, which reported Trump boasted to the Russian officials about firing Comey, whom he allegedly called 'crazy, a real nut job.'"

In effect, this guy "helped generate the 'Putin fired Comey' narrative, according to the research dossier making the rounds in Congress."

Anyway, it is a mess.

Now, one of the things about whistleblower protections, though, is if you were to be prosecuted for committing a crime, then the whistleblower status could be used to help hold off potential prosecution. It is my understanding that it would not likely win the day, but it could delay a prosecution.

Say, hypothetically, you worked for somebody like Brennan, or say, hypothetically, you worked for somebody like McMaster and Brennan, and you helped come up with a conspiracy to oust a duly-elected sitting President by alleging some conspiracy with Russia, and you found out that the Attorney General and the U.S. attorney assigned to investigate the origins of the Russia hoax were closing in on participants of your conspiracy.

Well, if you had a really smart lawyer, he might just tell you, if you could get whistleblower status, if they start closing in on you, then we can start filing motions to keep you out of that prosecution because if you are a whistleblower, you are in a protected status. It shouldn't prevent the ultimate prosecution, but it could delay things for a while.

So it could make sense, if you are a coconspirator and trying to bring down a duly-elected President, that you might want that whistleblower status.

The problem with that is—and this is a problem for a tainted inspector general who would protect such a whistleblower—if you are complaining, it has to be, to get that status, somebody in your chain of command. The President, we were told, is not in the whistleblower's chain of command because that is outside, the CIA.

It has to be within that leadership ladder, and the President is outside of that. So he wasn't a real whistleblower. Plus, a whistleblower has to have direct evidence.

What we have seen with this march of the gossipmongers, as it is best described, that have been paraded into the secret Star Chamber with the

armed guards outside of it so that other members of this grand jury can't get to see and hear the witnesses, it really appears to be a march of those who don't like President Trump and are willing to sully in some cases valiant military service, a great career. They are willing to have that tarnished and sullied by becoming gossipmongers.

For example, one person who apparently had a great career in the Army, William Taylor, I understand he was in the infantry for 6 years. I was at Fort Benning for 4 years, and I can tell you, anybody who was a commander in the infantry didn't last any time at all if he allowed gossipmongers, like he has become, to come before him and say: Captain, Captain, I heard that somebody else heard something that was said.

He would throw him out of the office: I am not going to be running a gossip column here. If somebody knows something directly, send them to me, but don't you come in here being a gossipmonger.

Well, now he has become the gossipmonger. "Well, I heard that somebody else heard that they heard the President say. . . ."

I just come back to this, as someone who had to sit and listen and evaluate evidence and make life and death decisions in a courtroom, you analyze what kind of person this is before me as a witness. If you have a witness before you that is willing to try to destroy and remove a President from office who was duly elected under our Constitution, and they are now willing to use secondhand, thirdhand, fourth-hand gossip, it tells you they are not the great person that they once were. They are not the patriot they once were. They are nothing but gossipmongers.

If you are going to be a fair arbiter of truth and justice, it should dramatically diminish your evaluation and analysis of what they have to say. This is not a classy person. This is a gossipmonger.

That is what William Taylor became for the Intelligence Committee, and that is what Vindman became.

Some have said: Oh, gee, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, he is the ultimate American. He even came in uniform.

Well, I was trained that if you are going to say bad things about someone in your chain of command, including the Commander in Chief—because a lot of us were not happy with President Carter when I was at Fort Benning, but we all knew you can't say anything negative about President Carter, especially not in uniform. It doesn't matter if it is true. You can't do it.

He comes parading in, in his uniform, to try to take down a sitting President, and he uses gossip to do that.

We also have to wonder, okay, so whistleblower number one, this great patriot, we are told—who he is not. He is a gossipmonger. Where did he get that information since he didn't get it

firsthand? He was not allowed to receive information about those telephone calls the President made to the leader of another country, so somebody violated the law by telling him. We don't know who that was. Whoever it was, Vindman or anybody else, there is a good chance they committed a crime.

That crime and all the surrounding information about their crime should be admissible in helping impeach and analyze that witness's testimony. You ought to be able to pursue it, but we are told, when Republicans were asking Colonel Vindman who he told about this, who did he transfer information to, they were shut down by the chairman.

That tells you the chairman must know what the answers were, and he didn't want the Republicans to have them. It sounds to me like there is a chance he committed a crime, and that was being covered up. Otherwise, if you want due process, if you want a fair process, if you want justice, then we have to hear the good, the bad, the ugly, so we can make a fair determination.

Every person elected as a Member of Congress is going to have a right to vote on that impeachment, if it ever comes up, and we have a right to hear the witnesses. Anything else is a sham.

By the way, this Colonel Vindman, it turns out, it has been published, he went to the stenographers. We had heard previously from the President there were four stenographers who take down everything.

Well, I have used court reporters my whole adult life, and they miss a word from time to time. I have had to fix transcripts where they have missed something. We have that problem here. They are amazing. These stenographers are absolutely incredible, but they miss a word from time to time.

But they have four. Apparently, we are told, the reason is that they don't want to tape it so that no foreign leader has to worry about ever hearing his own voice say things that he said in a private conversation with the President of the United States. So they have four stenographers so that they make sure they get exactly what was said.

And this guy Vindman goes to the stenographers and tells them: I want to get these words inserted in the transcript, Burisma—the name of the gas company they are trying to go after President Trump and say he demanded information on them.

Apparently, none of the stenographers heard that. It sounds like not only is he a potential criminal for leaking information to people who weren't supposed to get it, but there is also potential there that this is part—when you go to prove a conspiracy in Federal court, you have to prove not only that you plotted but that there was an overt act. His overt act of going to stenographers and trying to get words embedded into the transcript that the President didn't say could potentially be such an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

□ 1345

There is a lot we don't know here, but this process has the possibility to bring this Nation's constitutional Republic to the brink of the end on our watch.

This ought to be a bipartisan thing. You can hate a President; you can disagree with him; but let's make sure that we have due process so we don't get drug into a third world status.

We know no country lasts forever, no country ever will. If we are going to perpetuate this any further, we have got to have some bipartisan concern for justice, for due process, for making sure that all of the protections to protect against a Star Chamber-type thing are not what we use here. Unfortunately, that is what we have been seeing for nearly 3 years.

One of the things I was taught in law school is what separates us is that we don't just take somebody and try to find a crime. That is unconstitutional. You have a crime that you find was committed, and then you try to find out who probably committed it. When you get probable cause, you can get them indicted, then you can have a trial.

What we have seen clearly is that, over 3 years ago, some people in Justice, FBI, Intelligence, maybe Defense, maybe somebody in the White House, decided: Here is Donald J. Trump. Let's find a crime, whether he committed it or not, that we can wrap around his throat.

That is what we have been watching happen. They found somebody. Now let's find a crime that we can allege.

The problem with this one about the quid pro quo, demanding something, they are going to have to prosecute Vice President Joe Biden. They are going to have to prosecute some U.S. Senators who have sent letters that have said: Gee, if you don't do this or that, we are going to cut off funding to you.

Whoa, Joe Biden bragged about it: I told him that, if you want this billion dollars, you better fire that prosecutor.

They are going to have to prosecute all of those people before they go after President Trump, and he didn't do anything nearly like he was accused of.

There is nothing wrong with a President saying to a foreign leader: Your country apparently was involved in a conspiracy to affect our election. Could you help us out by giving us information about what happened? We just need to know.

There is nothing wrong with it.

And you look at the transcript not amended by somebody who was trying to set up the President, but by four stenographers who were intent on having everything in there that was said, and you see there was nothing wrong with this phone call. What was wrong was the process of trying to commit a coup d'etat and take out a duly elected President.

It is time we wake up and we do what is right for this country.

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

#### RISE AND MAKE TOMORROW BETTER THAN TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, this is the last speech that I will give from this floor as a Member of Congress. I wasn't ready for my time here to come to an end so soon. It is a reality I am still grappling with, and I will be for a long time to come.

I expected, or I at least hoped, to be here for as long as the voters of California's 25th District deemed me worthy of the honor of representing them. I thought I could make a difference here in making our community, our great country, and the world a better place for generations to come.

I, like so many of my colleagues, ran for office because I believed that our political system was broken, controlled by the powerful and the wealthy, ignoring and failing the regular people that it is supposed to serve. I came here to give a voice to the unheard in the halls of power.

I wanted to show young people, queer people, working people, and imperfect people that they belong here because this is the people's House. I fell short of that, and I am sorry.

To every young person who saw themselves and their dreams reflected in me, I am sorry.

To those who felt like I gave them hope in one of the darkest times in our Nation's history, I am sorry.

To my family, my friends, my staff, my colleagues, my mentors, and to everyone who has supported and believed in me, I am sorry.

To the thousands of people who spent hours knocking on doors in the hot summer Sun, who made countless phone calls, and who sacrificed more than I could ever know to give everything they could in every possible way so that I could be here, I am so, so sorry.

And to every little girl who looked up to me, I hope that one day you can forgive me.

The mistakes I made and the people I have hurt that led to this moment will haunt me for the rest of my life, and I have to come to terms with that.

Ever since those images first came out, I barely left my bed. I have ignored all the calls and the texts. I went