

crush people if they are still saving when they are older. We need to deal with the reality of how much longer baby boomers are going to be living. And we have got to get our labor force participation numbers up. It turns out all these things tie together. You can't do one without doing the others to get the economic benefits of it.

And that is what terrifies me about our place here: Are we capable of doing complex policy, when over here I am doing immigration issues, and over here I am doing tax reform issues, and over here I am doing trade issues, and over here I am doing healthcare technology issues; and understanding they are all sympathetic to each other, they all tie together to create the economic philosophy and the changes in our cost structure together? When what we have here is a place where we fight over the naming of a post office.

I understand we are living in a time of political rage, and that is how so many people raise money, how they hold office.

□ 1445

I have a 4-year-old daughter. I am 57 with a 4-year-old daughter. My wife, the same.

You know I am pathologically optimistic, but I am optimistic because I get to get behind this microphone and advocate for what I believe is an actual path that saves us from a debt-ridden future.

I have been doing this now for a year, saying here is the problem, but also offering the steps of a solution.

I will go back to my office now, and the phones won't ring. There won't be any text messages or emails from even fellow Members, let alone the world, saying: Hey, DAVID, can you tell me about this technology? Can you tell me about this? How do we help?

If we don't have that revolution, I am terrified.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for highlighting a number of different issues, starting, of course, with spending and talking about the future that we are going to deal with from a fiscal standpoint in our country, particularly the extent to which Medicare and our entitlement situation is going to drive that, but, importantly, getting to the point of disruption, technology, and the ways that we can totally transform healthcare in a way that will both fix our fiscal situation as well as provide the best healthcare in the world.

As the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) knows, I am a cancer survivor. I am a father, as well, of a 10-year-old and an 8-year-old.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I wish he would tell that story more.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I do, and I try to talk about it. There are others of us in this body who have gone through that sort of thing.

This is what is so critically important, what we are talking about: We have the ability at our fingertips to transform our healthcare system and to save our country from the depths of \$23 trillion, \$24 trillion, \$30 trillion, \$40 trillion of debt. This is where we are headed if we don't go down this road.

I know there is a bipartisan thirst for this, but we have to stop having our leadership in two corners, with shirts and skins squabbling instead of focusing on these kinds of roll-your-sleeves-up solutions.

The question I would ask my friend from Arizona is, what does he see as the obstacles to what we are talking about here, in terms of the current situation with insurance oligopolies and the government bureaucracies that get in the way of innovation, technology, and direct primary care and going to the doctors of your choice, and being able to get that kind of innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, look, in some ways, telling the truth is like soaking yourself in kerosene and running around with a lighter.

Congress has functionally become a protection racket. The armies in our hallways, both with Democrats and Republicans, say, "We like this technology, but," and the "but" always happens to be, "you are going to blow up my business model."

How do we as policymakers stop having the arrogance of thinking we know what the future is and, instead, design the rules, reimbursements, licensing, and mechanisms that all go with that so the best technology is constantly winning and today's winner, it turns out, gets crushed tomorrow because a better one comes along?

Today the way we do it is we build walls of protection that say, "This is good. Yeah, there is something incredibly good over here, but."

That is why I use that Blockbuster video example. We all sort of accepted that, hey, we used to go get the little silver disk and shove it in the machine. The creepy guy would give us movie recommendations. He was creepy, but his movie recommendations were really good.

Today, we go home and hit a button. We just lived through that, and the world didn't come to an end.

When it comes to healthcare technology particularly—and I do a similar presentation on environmental technology. There is stunning stuff that could revolutionize those issues. If you are concerned with global warming or greenhouse gases, the technology is here, yet we don't talk about it because we know what we know. The problem is, much of what I and others know is a decade out of date.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he agree with me that when we are talking about this kind of disruption, that this is not a partisan problem, that this is a problem of this body not sitting down and rolling up its sleeves to try to address using innovation and finding how to

break through and not getting into the trap of this town where the power brokers make all the decisions and the lobbyists are driving a lot of what we are doing so powerful insurance companies or powerful government entities are making decisions for you instead of you and your doctor, and technology and innovation?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we have to be a little careful because I find there are certain insurance companies that are ready to offer a technology, sensor-based healthcare, but it is illegal.

There are hospitals I have worked with that desperately want to do an outreach in the community, where they are using data and algorithms to keep people healthy and to know when there is an issue coming.

It is not only us as Members of Congress and what we know and don't know, and the arrogance of how we often do pieces of legislation where we don't future-proof it to use it, and also the incentives that are built in to surviving election, raising money, everything there, I will also argue our bureaucracies have become calcified.

The bureaucracies now have become incredible barriers when they say: "Well, we don't see that in the rules; therefore, you can't do it. Yes, it would help society. Yes, it would make us healthier. Yes, it would."

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, by that, government and private sector bureaucracies, and State and Federal.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Exactly, Madam Speaker. States are going to be a real issue, and then different lobbying organizations and different constituencies.

Guess what? We don't have a choice. The single biggest threat to our Nation is the massive wave of debt that is here.

One of our charts, in just a decade or two, we are running \$2½ trillion, almost approaching \$3 trillion, deficits. It is almost all solely driven by our demographics. We have gotten older.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman. I appreciate his time and his dedication to this. Let's do this again.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I enjoyed it.

Madam Speaker, there is a path. Will we step up and understand that the path turns out to be complicated? We are going to make some of our constituencies just elated with the opportunity to change. We are also going to terrify some of our constituencies.

There is a way to get there, and believe it or not, it is technology. It is not Republican technology. It is not Democratic technology. It turns out it is math, and the math will always win.

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

STILL I RISE: SENATE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise because I love my country, and I rise today to talk about impeachment and the trial thereof, the trial associated with impeachment.

Madam Speaker, there is much to be said. However, I assure all that I will not say it all.

I do want to call to the attention of those who are paying attention that we are now about to embark upon a trial in the Senate.

Impeachment was a function of the House of Representatives pursuant to Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution, and the trial is a function of the Senate pursuant to Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution. The trial is to take place in the Senate. The House has done its job.

The House acts similar, not the same, but it behaves in a fashion similar to that of a grand jury—similar but not the same. The House determines whether there is enough evidence for a trial to take place, simply put—similar but not the same as a grand jury.

Then it becomes a function of the Senate to have a trial. The Senate is the only place on planet Earth where a President can be tried.

The President will not be punished at this trial, assuming that the President is found guilty. There is no punishment. The President can be removed from office, but there won't be any punishment similar to what we call punishment, as it were, with a court, for example, wherein you might be fined or accorded some sort of incarceration. None of that has to do with removal from office.

There was a big debate about this trial of the President. In Federalist Paper No. 65, Alexander Hamilton speaks at great length about the trial of the President.

It was contemplated in making a final decision that perhaps the Supreme Court would be the place to try the President. With much debate, without going into the nuances, the details, this was not concluded to be the appropriate place for a trial of the President.

It was finally concluded that the trial would take place in the Senate but that, in doing this, there would be a presiding officer, and this person would be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Senate tries the case with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

In Federalist Paper No. 65, there was much talk about this trial and how it might move forward. Clearly, the Framers of the Constitution contemplated that the trial would receive evidence, that there would be evidence received. Clearly, a fair reading of Federalist Paper No. 65 would cause one to conclude that.

Of course, the Federalist Papers, as it were, there was a conclusion drawn that in this trial, there would be evi-

dence presented. The evidence would be presented, of course, by the House. We call the persons presenting the evidence managers. They will act as lawyers. The Senate will receive this evidence.

It was anticipated, in my opinion, after perusing Federalist Paper No. 65, that the trial could consist of evidence beyond what the House might present because at a trial, it is expected that one might call witnesses and present documents, present additional evidence.

It is my opinion that this is especially true, and I believe a good many constitutional scholars agree with me, this is especially true if it is known that there are witnesses who have evidence that would be of great value, witnesses who have evidence, material evidence that is relevant, would be of great value in coming to a just conclusion, a trial that would have a just conclusion, a trial that would afford not only the accused to have witnesses to testify but also the managers to have witnesses to testify.

You see, the country, the United States of America, is entitled to a fair trial. The President should have a fair trial, but the people should have a fair trial.

If the trial is to be fair in the Senate and there are witnesses available, then those witnesses ought to be called. If the witnesses are not called, and it is known that there are witnesses, then the question becomes: What are we doing? What is the Senate doing? I say "we"; I mean as a country. I am not a Senator, obviously.

What is the Senate doing? If there are witnesses who are available and are willing to testify, and the Senate decides to simply dismiss the case, what is the Senate doing?

Before I answer that question, let me just share this with you. The truth be told, not only will the President be on trial but also the Senate would be on trial. I will answer what the Senate is doing, but I must say first that the Senate is on trial.

People are watching not only here in the United States of America but across the globe. The world wants to see the kind of justice that the United States of America accords. The world wants to know whether the United States of America will pursue justice such that witnesses who are material and relevant will have the opportunity to testify.

□ 1500

What is the Senate doing if the Senate declines to hear from these relevant witnesses? The Senate is having something less than a trial. No question, because a trial contemplates witnesses and evidence.

If the Senate is going to have what may amount to a briefing, then there is no need to have Chief Justice Roberts. The Framers constituted a trial. They contemplated a trial with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

If we are going to have only a briefing, why have the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court present? This would be tantamount to a briefing, to simply call the Senate to order, receive some comments, some statements, and perhaps whatever the House has sent over. But knowing that a witness is available—multiple witnesses, I might add—and not call any of the multiple witnesses would be tantamount to a briefing.

If the Senate but engages in a briefing, what would we call the results of a briefing? In my opinion, justice delayed, if not denied—justice delayed, if not denied.

The Framers of the Constitution contemplated a trial. Federalist Paper No. 65 contemplates a trial.

The Senate acts as the triers of fact. They conclude with their findings with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

One can easily conclude that the simple dismissal of a case, wherein others are available to give testimony, would cause something less than a trial and, quite frankly, will be an embarrassment to the Senate, to the country, and to our sense of justice. It would be an embarrassment to do such a thing.

As I have read in various publications, this is being contemplated, to simply dismiss the case knowing that there are additional witnesses to be heard.

Could it be that in so doing, whether by accident or with intent, whether by accident or design, if this occurs, could it be that we are now seeing a coverup, a coverup if you know that there are witnesses who are available and who would testify but you denied them the opportunity to testify by simply dismissing the case? Are you participating in a coverup?

I pray that there are enough Senators who will say: "I will not participate in what appears to be a coverup," and will ask for witnesses to testify. If a majority of the Senators should so ask, there will be testimony presented.

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right. It would not and will not look right if the Senate knows that there are witnesses available and declines to call them. It won't look right.

Some would say it is right because the Constitution doesn't have strict guidelines, in terms of how the Senate is to perform. But I assure you, the Framers contemplated a trial.

If there is no trial, a simple dismissal, there are many people who will say that the Senate has engaged in a coverup because evidence that should be revealed has been concealed, has been covered, has been pushed aside.

The Senate, in my opinion, will do our country a disservice if it simply dismisses this cause.

It is my belief that the Senate will not dismiss the cause summarily. It is my belief that the Senate consists of honorable people who are going to take

an oath, and they are going to abide by the oath that they will take.

I was a judge of a small claims justice court. I will tell you that I marveled at how people, after taking the oath as jurors, would rise above the many things that would ordinarily influence them and see to it that justice was done. It is a wonderful thing to see how people take an oath and take that oath seriously.

I believe that a majority of the Senators will take the oath seriously, and I believe that there will be witnesses, or at least one, called to testify.

I believe that this will happen because I think that the Senators who will do this will understand that justice is in their hands and that this justice has much to do with what the witness will say, but it also has much to do with the balance of power that they are there to protect.

The Senators are there to protect the balance of power as it relates to the cause that has been presented to them. The Senators will have to decide whether or not the House of Representatives is going to become less than a coequal branch of government because one of the articles deals with the fact that the President has blocked the appearance of witnesses in the House and has blocked the presentation of certain evidence, documents, if you will, in the House.

Now it is left up to the Senate to determine whether or not they are going to allow a President to block the presentation of evidence and walk away without some consequence.

Blocking evidence without consequence, that is going to be one of the considerations before the Senate. Will you protect the balance of power? Will you assure this country that no one is above the law?

Madam Speaker, I assure you that if the Senators do not take this cause seriously and simply dismiss it out of hand, they are simply saying that the President is above the law.

The President deserves a trial. The country deserves a trial. We ought to have witnesses presented.

There ought to be some degree of deliberation. The Senate acts as the trial jury, the petit jury, if you will, similar to a petit jury, a trial jury, but not the same. It is not the same because they can make decisions about whether evidence will be presented.

I had a constituent ask me whether or not the Chief Justice could decide to receive the evidence, and I had to tell the truth. The response is that the ultimate judge of whether evidence will be received will be 51 Senators. The Chief Justice can make rulings, but the Senators can overrule the Chief Justice with a vote.

The world is watching, and the House of Representatives hangs in the balance, as it relates to the balance of power.

If this Senate simply dismisses out of hand, we will have a President with no guardrails. There will be no guardrails.

It doesn't matter how you feel about the President. The question is: How do you feel about the country that we love? How do you feel about the notion that no one is above the law, a very bedrock principle in this country? How do you feel about this?

What happens once can happen twice, and what happens twice can happen multiple times.

We should not allow this to take place. My clarion call to my brethren, my friends, the ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, is: Do more than have a briefing. Do more than simply dismiss the cause out of hand.

There will have to be 51 who will conclude that there will be more than a briefing, that there will be a trial.

I assure you that there are many of us who are waiting to see what will happen. Some of us will traverse great distances across the country to be in Washington, D.C., to make it clear that they want to be a part of this history for various and sundry reasons.

The world is watching. We have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to the country to have a fair trial, a trial where witnesses are called and witnesses are examined.

This is not unusual. This is what every person in this country anticipates if he or she is charged with an offense. Why would we have the President be above this basic premise of calling witnesses to have a fair trial? Why would we have one person in the country who is above this, above the law? Every person is subjected to the law in this country.

Madam Speaker, I will close with these words: It is not enough for things to be right. They must also look right.

If the Senate does this simply because it has the power, meaning if the Senate simply dismisses because it has the power and doesn't call witnesses, that won't look right, and in my opinion, it won't be right.

The Senate has a responsibility to have a trial, and witnesses must be called. I do believe that witnesses will be called.

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

IMPEACHMENT TIMELINE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, my eloquent friend so ably made his case, and I would suggest that it is undercut in some respects when one introduces and discusses impeachment the day after the election in 2016, before President Trump even came to office.

That isn't protecting the country, is it? What that is suggesting is that one knows more than the voters of this country.

I am also always intrigued when the complaint comes up about the majority

in the Senate, when the majority in the Senate is going to determine the rules for the trial in the Senate because the Constitution says that the Senate holds the trial.

We just heard that there have to be 51 votes over in the Senate. Oddly enough, I didn't hear complaints when the majority in the House controlled the inquiry. In fact, the term "cover-up" was used preemptively regarding the Senate, but what I saw in the House was a coverup.

We didn't get to introduce all of our witnesses. I sit on the Judiciary Committee. Who did we get as witnesses? We got three or four law professors who came in. That is who got to come in to testify before the Judiciary Committee.

We didn't have the witnesses who had factual evidence come in. We requested. We gave lists. We were told we couldn't have them. That is part of the problem.

Adding to this hypocrisy, we heard over and over again that we must impeach the President of the United States because it is an imminent danger for him to continue in his office. But once that vote was taken, the Speaker held the Articles of Impeachment and would not transmit them. Here we sit, 27 days following that vote, with no transmittal.

We hear that there is going to be a transmittal tomorrow. I am interested to see if that really takes place.

Madam Speaker, I am joined today by a number of my colleagues, and I am grateful to have them here.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today one last time to ask the House to drop these charges against our duly elected President, if, for no other reason, because the process that they have used has been the exact partisan process that was just condemned on the floor by people who were the first to call for impeaching the President, the Speaker of this body.

This is a 2.5-year endeavor, in spite of it being only a few months after the call to Ukraine that is supposedly the abuse of power that the President engaged in.

As for the other charge, they say that it was obstruction of justice, but the House didn't even bother to enforce its own subpoenas.

The impeachment process boldly broke with that of Presidents Nixon and Clinton. The urgency was so great that the House declined to enforce its subpoenas and relied on shaky evidence, trying to move swiftly so they didn't lose the momentum.

□ 1515

Now, when they realize they haven't made the case—not just that it will be needed in the Senate, but for the American people, first and foremost—they