

This is not impossible, Madam Speaker. In 2002, while I was a Member of the New York State Assembly, the lower house of the New York State Legislature, we passed instate tuition allowing undocumented college students the ability to pay instate tuition. We did that with a Republican Governor and with a Republican-led Senate. Just last year, New York State again passed the Jose Peralta Dream Act.

So it could be done, Madam Speaker.

Just recently, I was speaking to a group of Dreamers and advocates in Battery Park, New York, having the Statue of Liberty as a backdrop to our rally. I told them to be cognizant of what they are doing because, very often, those who write history, those who write the chapters and the annals of history, are not aware that they are doing it.

I asked them to pay close attention to what they were doing because they are, in fact, the protagonists. They are the leaders of this movement. When you see their faces, and you see what they want to do for our country, it is almost impossible to say no to them. I told them to be very cognizant of their effort because, in fact, they are an army of goodwill.

They may not have weapons in their hands, and they may not wear military gear, but they are an army of goodwill that I think is fighting every day for the soul of America. And 20 or 30 years from now, they will be able to tell their children and grandchildren that they were successful, that they were critical. They were the protagonists, the leaders of a movement led by an army of goodwill that saved America and what it stands for.

Madam Speaker, we will continue to call on our colleagues in the Senate to take up and pass the American Dream and Promise Act so that the lives of over 800,000 Dreamers no longer hang in the balance.

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

#### IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT TRUMP

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives has been the scene of serious chaos, not only today, but for weeks.

Unfortunately for the American people, we have nothing to show for it. We have issued more subpoenas from this House than we have had bills that have actually been signed by the President.

We haven't been working on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada free trade agreement that President Trump worked so hard to negotiate. We haven't been working on funding the military or bipartisan legislation to lower the cost of pre-

scription drugs. No, 100 percent of the energy of this place has been devoted to the impeachment of President Trump.

There has been a lot of noise, a lot of rumors, and a lot of confusion about exactly what has happened and what is going on, where we are and how we got here. There is a reason for that.

You see, Madam Speaker, by House rules, impeachment is under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has a great big hearing room just across the street. That is where an impeachment inquiry is supposed to take place. But we aren't holding hearings there because Speaker PELOSI doesn't want them there.

Instead, the impeachment charade has been taking place in a small, restricted room, two floors underground, below this Chamber, deep in the bowels of the Capitol. That room is known as the SCIF. The SCIF is a very important room because it is where Members of Congress hear about our country's great secrets. You can't bring a cell phone in there. You can't bring a camera in there. Most importantly, the public can't go in there.

Democrats made a big spectacle about holding their first public hearing today. They act as if they are making some great, virtuous action to bring forth transparency, as if they are operating with the utmost integrity. The truth is that today's hearing is little more than a public showcasing of witnesses they have already interrogated and vetted in that little room to ensure they will only say what the Democrats desire.

You see, Madam Speaker, by conducting impeachment in that little room, Speaker PELOSI and ADAM SCHIFF knew that the American people wouldn't know what was going on, what was being said.

But right outside the SCIF, that tiny room, you will find dozens of cameras and news people. Here they are, you can see, talking to ADAM SCHIFF.

ADAM SCHIFF and his staff have been feeding these reporters bits of information for weeks. For weeks, we have been flooded with reports of so-called explosive things that supposedly have been said in this small, secret room.

Madam Speaker, there is a rule of the House that every Member of Congress has the right to at least watch a committee hearing. A couple of weeks ago, some of my colleagues and I decided that we wanted to know what was really going on in that small, little room. So, we entered the SCIF, that little room, simply to watch. ADAM SCHIFF immediately stopped the proceedings, and he refused to proceed until we left.

There is another rule of the House that says the records of committees are the property of the House, and every Member is entitled to review them. There is a reason for this rule. Those records don't belong to ADAM SCHIFF. They don't belong to Speaker PELOSI. They don't belong to me. They belong to the American people.

So, again, I went back to the SCIF, back to that little room. I showed them that House rule and informed them that I wanted only to read the transcripts from these secret proceedings. But Chairman SCHIFF's staff said no. They would not follow the rules of the House. They would not let me read them. They said: You will get them later, along with everybody else, when we say so.

Finally, they started releasing the transcripts—in a way that fit their agenda. Madam Speaker, I have been reading these transcripts as they come out. I have also been reading what the mainstream media has to say about them. Would you believe it? The mainstream media is saying exactly what ADAM SCHIFF wants them to say. Almost none of them are talking about the other side, about President Trump's defense.

To make sure the American people have the facts, I felt compelled to come down to the floor tonight to talk about the things that, if you are not reading these thousands of pages of materials, you might have missed.

There have now been about 3,000 pages of testimony released. Despite many different opinions of those pages, there is universal agreement that Ukraine is one of the most corrupt countries on Earth. You see, Madam Speaker, Ukraine, like many former Soviet countries, is controlled by oligarchs. These guys have almost all the wealth, most of the industry, and pretty much all the political power.

Corruption is so bad in Ukraine that many American businesspeople refuse to do business there because they don't want to deal with the notorious oligarchs.

It has been the policy of Republican and Democrat Presidents, for nearly 30 years, that Ukraine must end corruption, must adopt the rule of law, and must take away power from the oligarchs. You have had Ukrainian Presidents come and go but, time and time again, things seem to stay the same.

During the 2016 Presidential election, we know that senior members of the Ukrainian Government were very much on Secretary Clinton's side. Don't take my word for it. You can pull this article, which was written in the final days of President Obama's Presidency. You can look at it yourself.

That is not some rightwing website. That is Politico. It might be a little hard to read, but here it says Ukrainian "officials are scrambling to make amends with the President-elect"—President Trump—"after quietly working to boost Clinton." The Ukrainian Government was boosting Secretary Clinton.

Thanks to ADAM SCHIFF's Star Chamber rules, we still have not gotten to hear the President's side of the story. But it should come as a surprise to no one, as some Democrats have pretended, that President Trump did not want to devote his valuable, limited

time by doing things like holding an Oval Office meeting with the President of Ukraine after facing stuff like this.

□ 1830

Of course, a President not offering a rare Oval Office meeting is not the same thing as not providing United States support. As most people know, Ukraine has been at war with Russia for about 5 years. Russia illegally invaded Ukraine and still has forces there today. President Obama rightly began to give nonlethal aid to Ukraine to help in that war. But President Obama would not sell weapons to Ukraine because he was scared that it would upset the Russians.

It actually was, would you believe it, President Trump who began selling real weapons to Ukraine to help them actually bring the fight to the Russians. That decision has had an enormous positive effect on Ukraine. Even those testifying in ADAM SCHIFF's hearings who don't like the President have praised President Trump for that.

But, again, it appears that most of the issues that the Democrats are raising started with a few individuals in the administration trying to convince President Trump that we should forget Ukraine's past, embrace the new President of Ukraine, and put a serious amount of his time into that country. They began, in their own words, working to change President Trump's mind on Ukraine.

For weeks, we have been going back and forth about what these individuals may or may not have been doing. We have a mound of bureaucratic gossip. We have been calling it hearsay, but it is gossip about what was going on, who was doing what.

We have a lot of conflicting testimony, speculation, and, yes, hearsay—gossip—but the Democrats have provided zero, and I mean no, direct evidence showing President Trump ordered some kind of quid pro quo. In fact, they quit talking about quid pro quo because they don't have any evidence of it.

With all of this testimony, with all of these rumors, it is easy to forget that this all goes back to the whistleblower. Of course, we know that the whistleblower also lacked firsthand knowledge of what he reportedly blew the whistle on.

He was, according to the inspector general, a partisan individual. So a partisan individual who has no firsthand knowledge filed a whistleblower complaint and that is what we are dealing with.

The whistleblower made allegations that President Trump made demands on President Zelensky in a phone call that occurred in the White House on July 25, but very few people in the media have reported that President Zelensky has publicly, clearly, and repeatedly denied any demands were made on him.

They also have not reported that the Justice Department, the Criminal Divi-

sion of the Justice Department, reviewed this allegation and declined to pursue a criminal investigation. They found no crime.

Nevertheless, President Trump took the extraordinary step of releasing the transcript of this supposedly extraordinary call. You can read the entire transcript online. I hope the American people will do so because they won't find one demand in there. Not one. Read the transcript.

Madam Speaker, the other issue that has been swirling downstairs in that little room is this hold that was placed on security assistance to Ukraine and apparently some other countries as well.

We know that somewhere around July 10, the Office of Management and Budget placed a hold on certain foreign aid going to Ukraine. That is not a cancellation of funds. That is a process allowing the funds to be reviewed.

Importantly, Madam Speaker, that hold was placed before the phone call that President Trump had with President Zelensky, the call that the whistleblower raised.

But, Madam Speaker, something interesting in the transcript was that neither President Trump nor President Zelensky said one word about the hold on that call. One would think that if President Trump were trying to use the aid for extortion, he would have at least mentioned it. One would have also figured that President Zelensky would have mentioned the issue himself, given how important this aid was to his country.

The truth is, the reason President Zelensky did not mention the funds was because he did not know the funds were on hold and President Trump never told him.

Madam Speaker, this would be a very strange quid pro quo where President Trump did not tell President Zelensky and President Zelensky did not know that the funds were on hold.

In fact, it appears that the Ukrainians first found out about the hold when it was reported in the press on August 29, over a month after the phone call; never mind that the funds were released 11 or 12 days later at the latest, unconditionally.

But let's talk about that hold. Many of the witnesses have speculated about why OMB placed a hold on the aid. But when pressed, in all those thousands of pages, they have all said some version of: I don't know why the aid was placed on hold, or I think it was for this reason, but I don't really know.

Let's just look at the facts. It seems that most everybody has somehow forgotten that President Trump ran a campaign on deep skepticism of foreign aid. He asked some tough questions that the American people appreciated. Are we getting our fair share? Are the Europeans freeloading off of us? Should we be taking a second look at this?

So we have a new President, a new parliament in Ukraine. Is it really that surprising that an administration run

by President Trump would say: Let's take another look at this before we send another \$250 million out the door. I think the American people would find that pretty reasonable.

Again, Madam Speaker, we have a lot of bureaucratic gossip here, a lot of people standing around the water cooler somewhere in the White House; a lot of speculation. But not one person has testified they had any direct knowledge that President Trump ordered the aid be held in exchange for some kind of political favor. Not one person.

In fact, the only witness who had any form of serious contact with President Trump, Ambassador Sondland, testified that he called President Trump and asked him what was going on with this aid.

Almost nobody has reported it, but here is a direct quote from that exchange. In this exchange, Sondland talks about one of the Democrat witnesses raising the rumor of quid pro quo with him.

So Sondland called the President, and here you see the President directly told him: "There is no quid pro quo. No quid pro quo." That is the evidence that is being introduced today and before today.

On top of that, we have Vice President PENCE meeting with President Zelensky on September 1, and about 3 weeks later, you have President Trump, seen right here in this picture, you have President Trump with President Zelensky.

So, Madam Speaker, in closing, let's review. We have got a total sham process, a real Star Chamber. The Star Chamber, by the way, it actually was something that grew up in the 17th century in Great Britain, so that the king, in order to squash his political opponents, could have a closed hearing, have his own rules, and then do whatever he needed to take the people who were dissidents and squash them. That is the Star Chamber that ADAM SCHIFF has been running.

We have no evidence that President Trump ordered any kind of quid pro quo. None. No evidence. And the Democrats have stopped talking about quid pro quo because it isn't working for them. Because they don't have the facts.

The call transcripts show no demand. President Zelensky says there was no demand. And no evidence shows President Trump ordered a demand.

The Ukrainians got the aid money within days of even finding out it was on hold. And, finally, Madam Speaker, they got the high-level meeting, not only with the President of the United States, but also with the Vice President that they wanted.

But here we are, Madam Speaker, so many important issues falling by the wayside with nothing getting done for the American people.

We are going to run out of money to run the government in about a week and we have done nothing about it.

The Constitution makes clear that impeachment is an acceptable redress

only for, let me quote it: “treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.” Nothing less.

I think my friends on the other side, unfortunately, they get up here in Washington, and they forget that although they may not like this President, he was chosen by the American people as the leader of this country.

I am sorry, Madam Speaker, they must do much better than offering the American people some hearsay and bureaucratic gossip if they want to take this President down.

The truth is this about removing the President: They know that the votes in the Senate aren’t there for that. The Senate is not going to remove President Trump from office. It is not happening.

This is about satisfying the Democrat’s desire to play to their resistance base, the people who said the day after the election in 2016 that they wanted to impeach Donald Trump.

The whistleblower’s lawyer wrote that he wanted a coup in January of 2017.

This is also about trying to build up a case for defeating President Trump in the 2020 election. The impeachment process is not supposed to be used for that. We have campaigns for that. We raise money to do that. We don’t use this body for that.

This entire process from its very inception has been a hypocritical, shameful exercise in partisan political opportunism. There is no substance here. None of President Trump’s actions even approach anything remotely near impeachable conduct.

But Democrats have made a critical error in orchestrating their scheme. If you watched what happened today, most of it was boring, and the reason it was boring is because there is no there there.

The Democrats have misunderstood and underestimated the resolve of the American people that elected this President. The facts are on the President’s side, and we will rise to the occasion and fight back against this radical scheme to remove President Trump.

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

#### WE ARE THE HOPE OF THE SLAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise tonight with love of country and heart inspired by “Harriet.” “Harriet,” the movie.

I saw the movie, “Harriet,” and I was inspired to speak tonight because of some of the horrors associated with the movie. There were some high points in the movie, but the movie is about a person born into slavery, a person who had been given the promise of freedom, freedom that was denied.

Inspired by this movie, I rise. I also would rise because I am inspired by the poem Maya Angelou left us, the poem that allows us to express some of the reasons why I am here in this Congress, if you will.

In this poem in the last stanza, she leaves us these words:

Bringing the gifts that my ancestors gave,  
I am the dream and the hope of the slave.

The dreams and hopes of the Harriets, the dreams and hopes of those who were able to survive the journey across the ocean; those who were able to survive and not be lynched; those who were able to survive Jim Crow laws, and Bull Connor’s dogs.

I am the dream and the hope of the slave.  
I rise.  
I rise.  
I rise.

I am proud that Maya Angelou gave us this poem, because it gives us something to believe in. We are the hope of the slave. There are many of us.

I am not the only one, but I rise tonight. I rise because I am the beneficiary of people who lived and died so that I might have this moment.

I am not supposed to be in Congress. People lived and died, people who survived German Shepherds, and high-pressure water hoses.

□ 1845

I am the beneficiary of people who fought in a war, a war for freedom. And in that war for freedom, some 600,000 Americans lost their lives.

Most people believe that World War II claimed the most American lives—not so. Nor did World War I, nor the Vietnam war—not so. It was the Civil War that claimed the most lives of Americans, a war fought so that I might have the privilege of standing here today.

I don’t say to you that that is what was in the minds of the people, but the liberation of a people has metamorphosed into this opportunity.

So I rise understanding that, in that war, there were some African Americans. Then, they were known as colored troops. Some 30,000 colored troops died, and still I rise knowing that others made a sacrifice.

And I am here tonight to talk about the bigotry that still exists in this country. Bigotry is on the rise in this country, and we, the Members of this House, have acknowledged it, and we are responding to it. We have responded to it with hearings:

Tuesday, April 9, 2019, hearing styled, “Hate Crimes and the Rise of White Nationalism”;

Wednesday, May 8, 2019, hearing styled, “Confronting the Rise of Domestic Terrorism in the Homeland”;

Wednesday, May 15, 2019, hearing styled, “Confronting White Supremacy (Part I): The Consequences of Inaction”;

Tuesday, June 4, 2019, hearing styled, “Confronting White Supremacy (Part II): Adequacy of the Federal Response”;

Wednesday, September 18, 2019, hearing styled, “Meeting the Challenge of White Nationalist Terrorism at Home and Abroad”;

September 20, 2019, hearing styled, “Confronting Violent White Supremacy (Part III): Addressing the Transnational Terrorist Threat.”

These are some of the hearings that we have had in our response to the rise of bigotry, to the rise of hate, white supremacy, anti-Semitism, all of the various invidious discrimination that we find ourselves having to deal with—Islamophobia, xenophobia, homophobia, all of the invidious phobias that we have to contend with.

We are responding, and we are responding because this hate has to be dealt with. Those who ignore invidious discrimination, those who ignore hate, those who ignore racism—all of the various phobias that I have called to your attention—perpetuate these various forms of invidious discrimination.

We perpetuate when we ignore. When we tolerate, we ignore. I rise tonight because we cannot ignore the hate. We have to stare it down. We have to take it on. I must do so because I am the hope of the slave, the many who suffered.

I have been given this opportunity, and it would be a waste, a wasted opportunity, if I but only came to this Congress and took on the issues of our day, the issues du jour, and ignore this issue.

Other issues are important. I don’t put them aside. But this issue cannot be ignored. To ignore it would be a betrayal of those who suffered so that I might be here. It would be a slap in the face to those who died so that I might have this opportunity.

So I take advantage of the opportunity that has been afforded me, not necessarily because I want to, but because I have to. I don’t have a choice. And as long as I am in this Congress, I am going to be the reminder. I am going to be the conscience for those who have suffered. I will not back down.

And tonight, I want to ask the question: Why do more than 51 percent of American voters think that the President is a racist?

This is printed. This is information available.

Yes, in this country, the greatest country in the world—the country that stands for liberty and justice for all; the country with government of the people, by the people, for the people; the country wherein no one is above the law—in this country, 51 percent of American voters believe that the President is a racist.

Why would 51 percent believe that the President is a racist?

This makes people uncomfortable to hear me stand in the well of the House of Representatives and talk about the racism emanating from the Presidency. It makes people uncomfortable.

People want to get back to bigotry as usual, when bigotry is something that