

we confront on an as-needed basis, but not anything that we seek to end, bigotry being something that we read about, that we hear about, but we don't have to do anything about.

No, we have to do something about it.

So the question: Why would 51 percent—more than 50 percent—of the American voters believe that the President is a racist?

Could it be because at the time he was promoting an immigration policy he called countries in Africa, countries where people of color are predominant, could it be because he called them s-hole countries?

I don't use scatology. I never use profanity—I should correct myself. I never speak profanity. There are times when I do think it. And I am told that, as a person thinks, so is the person, but I never say it. I respect those around me to the extent that I don't use scatology.

But the question is: Why do people think that the President is a racist?

One answer is: Could it be because he has infused bigotry into policy?

When he was negotiating this policy, immigration policy, he made this comment and thereafter promulgated a policy—or attempted to—that would limit persons coming from countries of color, would limit them access, and open access to persons coming from countries predominated by Anglos.

Could it be because he launched a travel ban against Muslims? Is this why more than 50 percent of the American public believe that the President is a racist, a travel ban based upon religion?

In this country, we appreciate and celebrate freedom of religion. If you can ban one, where is the line? Where must you stop?

The ban was initially shot down. After some tweaking, this policy was implemented.

This President is thought by more than 50 percent of the American public—that is my refrain—to be a racist.

Could it be because he attacked a Muslim Gold Star family, the parents of a Muslim who served in our military, who gave his life for our country? Could it be because he would attack this family, a Muslim family?

Could it be because he claimed that a judge was biased against him and said that he is a Mexican? Could it be because he believes that he cannot get justice from a person of color?

More than 50 percent of the American voters believe that the President is a racist. And if I said "people" before, I correct the RECORD here and now. It is voters.

Could it be because the Justice Department sued his company twice for not renting to Black people? The President of the United States, having been sued for not renting to people of color, maybe this is a reason that more than 50 percent of the American public believe that the President of the United States of America is a racist.

Uncomfortable to hear, not pleasant, but it is the truth. And it is written that, if you know the truth, the truth will set you free. I hope to free some souls tonight.

Could it be because he refused to condemn the white supremacist who advocated for him? He didn't say: "White supremacist, I don't want your support," didn't condemn white supremacy and white supremacists.

Could it be because he questioned whether the only African American to become President of the United States was born in the United States? Could it be because he carried that message near and far?

He was almost proud to take on the challenge of questioning the nationality of the Black President of the United States. And since he has become President, it seems that he has tried to undo the legacy of the African American President.

Could it be because he took out a full-page ad advocating the death penalty for those who were charged in what is known as the Central Park Five, a horrible case? Someone did ungodly things to a young woman in Central Park. Five persons of color were taken into custody. He took out a full-page ad and was an advocate for the death penalty.

Could it have been done because of principle? Let's give him the benefit of the doubt for the moment. But later on, it was proven that the five did not commit the crime—not based on a technicality; based upon DNA evidence.

The President never apologized—stood his ground. As a matter of fact, he hasn't apologized for any of the things that I have called to our attention tonight. He does not apologize. He does not repent. He does not say "I am wrong; I made a mistake"—something that I do more often than I would like to, but I make mistakes. He doesn't apologize.

Five people incarcerated, but five people liberated based upon evidence—no apology, no retraction from the President.

Could it be because he has condoned the beating of a Black Lives Matter protester?

Could it be because he has stereotyped Jews and shared an anti-Semitic image created by white supremacists?

Could it be because he has been sanctioned by the U.S. House of Representatives for his racist comments directed at Members of Congress?

There are many reasons to be discussed, but we have to acknowledge that, with all of this evidence and with our moving forward on impeachment, with all of this evidence, should we not consider the impeachment of this President as the Radical Republicans—as they were called, but they were Republicans—did in 1868 with Andrew Johnson?

□ 1900

Republicans impeached Andrew Johnson in article X—for those who

care to read the articles, article X of the XI Articles of Impeachment against him.

Republicans impeached Andrew Johnson for reasons rooted in his bigotry. He was the President Trump of his time.

Andrew Johnson did not want the freedmen and -women to have the same rights and privileges as other Americans. He fought against this. He fought the Freedmen's Bureau. He did not want them to be accorded freedom—the Harriet Tubmans of the world to have their freedom.

Andrew Johnson was the bigot of his time, but the Republicans took a stand. The Republicans took the moral high ground.

When you are standing on the moral high ground, you have a moral imperative to go forward. And they did. And the Republicans impeached Andrew Johnson. I admire the Republicans of 1868. I believe that what they did was right. And, more importantly, it was the righteous thing to do. I am a person who stands with what they did.

There are those who would say, "Well, that was 1868."

Well, the Constitution hasn't changed. It was based upon the same Constitution that we read, the same Article II, Section 4 that we have used for our impeachment going forward currently—same articles. Nothing has changed.

You can't conclude that what they did in 1868, when they were closer to those who framed the Constitution than we are today, had a greater sense, perhaps, of what—if you measure your sense of what was available by your nexus to those who made it available—they were following the Constitution.

We should follow the Constitution. We have a duty and a responsibility to the Harriets of the world to not allow this level of bigotry to continue to emanate from the Presidency.

Impeachment is moving forward. I had said months ago that the President would be impeached. I repeat only what I have said then when I close with: He will be impeached. The hands of history will record that President Donald John Trump was impeached by this House of Representatives.

And for those who say that I have already made up my mind, you are correct. I have, because the evidence is apparent, and there is no requirement that I must wait until we have had subsequent hearings.

He will be impeached. And I believe that we ought to add articles that include his invidious discrimination harmful to this society.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 14, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1615, the VA-SBA Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1773, the Rosie the Riveter Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3661, the Patriotic Employer Protection Act of 2019, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2910. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Milk Marketing Orders—Amending the Class I Skim Milk Price Formula; Correction [Docket No.: AMS-DA-18-0096] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2911. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Milk Marketing Orders—Amending the Class I Skim Milk Price Formula [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-18-0096] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2912. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Removal of Specific Fee Reference [Doc. No.: AMS-FGIS-18-0063] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2913. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's temporary

rule — Olives Grown in California; Establish Procedures To Meet Via Electronic Communications [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0061; SC18-932-1 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2914. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Change in Committee Structure for Processed Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0078; SC19-927-1 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2915. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Amendment to Marketing Order 929 and Referendum Order [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0017; SC18-929-3 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2916. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Order Amending Marketing Order 959 [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-17-0067; SC17-959-4] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2917. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Legislative and Regulatory Review, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization and Transfer of Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FGIS-18-0073 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2918. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard [Doc. No.: AMS-TM-17-0050] (RIN: 0581-AD54) received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2919. A letter from the Administrator, Livestock and Poultry Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Soybean Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information; Beef Promotion and Research; Amendments To Allow Redirection of State Assessments to the National Program [No.: AMS-LPS-13-0083] (RIN: 0581-AD49) received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2920. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2019-2020 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0084; SC19-985-1 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2921. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty

Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the Handling Regulations for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0067; SC18-948-2 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2922. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-19-0026; SC19-985-2 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2923. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock and Poultry Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Voluntary Grading of Meats, Prepared Meats, Meat Products, Shell Eggs, Poultry Products, and Rabbit Products [Doc. No.: #AMS-LP-18-0095] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2924. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pecans Grown in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas; Revision of Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0019; SC18-986-1 FR] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2925. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Thailand To Export Siluriformes Fish and Fish Products to the United States [Doc. No.: FSIS-2018-0031] (RIN: 0583-AD74) received November 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2926. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam To Export Siluriformes Fish and Fish Products to the United States [Doc. No.: FSIS-2018-0029] (RIN: 0583-AD74) received November 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2927. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of the People's Republic of China To Export Siluriformes Fish and Fish Products to the United States [Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0030] (RIN: 0583-AD73) received November 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2928. A letter from the Department of Agriculture, Specialty Crops Program, Specialty Crops Inspection Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of U.S. Grade Standards [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0081, SC19-329] received November 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2929. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities