

provided by rule XXIII of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials, and also to the House of Representatives, the judgment of the Senate in the Case of Donald John Trump, and transmit a certified copy of the judgment to each.

JUDGMENT

The Senate having tried Donald John Trump, President of the United States, upon two Articles of Impeachment exhibited against him by the House of Representatives, and two-thirds of the Senators present not having found him guilty of the charges contained therein: It is, therefore,

Ordered and adjudged, That the said Donald John Trump be, and he is hereby, acquitted of the charges in said articles.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 25

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as cosponsor of H.J. Res. 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE
SURVIVORS WEEK

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Gun Violence Survivors Week and the countless Americans whose lives have been impacted by gun violence across the country.

This issue is personal to me, as it is for so many others. When I was 16 years old, as a young police cadet, an accidental gunshot left me paralyzed.

Last week, I had the honor of spending time with former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, our colleague, in my home State of Rhode Island. Gabby's life was forever changed by a gunman in 2011, but she never stopped fighting. She spoke of the courage it takes to stop gun violence, courage that she embodies every single day.

So, to the parents, children, students, teachers, and countless others who have lost loved ones to gun violence or faced gun violence themselves, I encourage you to keep fighting.

Together, we can reform our gun laws and keep guns out of the wrong hands and save others from tragedy.

OFFICIAL COPY OF PRESIDENT'S
STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, we heard a great speech by the President last night, who spoke to the strength of

our country and the courage and character of our fellow citizens:

People like 100-year-old Tuskegee airman Retired Brigadier General Charles McGee and his great-grandson, the 13-year-old who dreams of going to space;

People like single mother Stephanie Davis and her lovely fourth grade daughter who received an Opportunity Scholarship. Who in this room does not remember the look on Stephanie's face as she realized that her daughter was going to get an opportunity that she sacrificed so greatly for;

And people like Sergeant First Class Townsend Williams, who surprised his wife, Amy, and two beautiful children in the gallery last night.

As I looked around, I saw tears in many people's eyes from the emotion that they felt at that time.

Unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI was unmoved and chose to tear up the House copy of that speech. She had no right to destroy this document, especially one filled with such impactful stories of American patriots.

The record was presented before the people's House and it belongs to the American people. That is why I am here today.

In my hand, I have an official copy of the President's State of the Union address signed by the President, given to me at the White House today. It will be delivered to the House Clerk to be archived and preserved for posterity, whether she likes it or not.

These great American stories will be remembered by history, not erased by the Speaker. We are better because of them, and we should learn from them and we should be proud that they will shape our future.

□ 1800

REACTION TO PRESIDENT'S STATE
OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, obviously, each of us had our own reaction to the speech that was given by the President last night. He had every right under the First Amendment to say what he believed, what he was going to do, and what he wanted us to do.

I suggest to you that if I took this card and tore it up because I didn't like what was on the card, I am protected by the First Amendment in doing that. That is a form of speech. If the effort is to shut one another up, perhaps we will go down that road.

But, clearly, most of you in this House, or at least some of you in this House, have said an act of destroying things that the leader alleges are property of the House—I will ask for a ruling on that, Mr. Speaker, in just a minute—but is an act of disagreement.

It is not an assertion, per se, that what was said was wrong, disagreed with, or anything else. It was not an

outcry to the President of the United States that "You lie" that clearly undermined the decorum of this House.

Frankly, I did not see the Speaker tear that up. I have seen it on television. It has been played, but I would suggest to you very seriously—well, whether anyone saw it or not, that is not my argument. My argument is, if each of us watches closely on the floor each of our actions and we deem those actions to be disrespectful, either to the Speaker, that is, the Speaker at the rostrum or from the microphones behind the desk, do we bring a resolution that that was disrespectful?

Each of you who say "yes," well, I will watch very closely, and we will go back and forth, and that will not be a good precedent because it will undermine the premise of the First Amendment that action is speech.

Now, an action that is criminal, an action that defames, an action that brings the House into disrepute, that is another issue. But an action which says: "I feel this way" should be protected. Now, not necessarily agreed with, maybe even subject to criticism, but certainly, not subject to a resolution.

This resolution will not go forward, of course, because I will move to table it if it is offered because I believe it undermines the First Amendment and the House.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER
RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION
OF THE PRIVILEGES OF
THE HOUSE

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 832.

Whereas on December 20th, 2019, Speaker PELOSI extended an invitation for President Trump to address a joint session of Congress on February 4th, 2020;

Whereas on February 4th, 2020, President Trump delivered his State of the Union address, in which he honored the sacrifice of the following American heroes and their families:

General Charles McGee, one of the last surviving Tuskegee airmen, who served in World War II, the Korean war and the Vietnam war;

Kayla Mueller, a humanitarian aid worker who was caring for suffering civilians in Syria when she was kidnapped, tortured and enslaved by ISIS for over 500 days before being murdered by ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi;

Army Staff Sergeant Christopher Hake, who was killed while serving his second tour of duty in Iraq by a roadside bomb supplied by Iranian terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani;

Sergeant First Class Townsend Williams, who is currently serving his fourth deployment in the Middle East

and his wife, Amy, who works full-time for the Army and devotes hundreds of hours helping military families;

Whereas immediately following the address, while still presiding over the joint session, Speaker PELOSI ripped up an official copy of the President's remarks, which contained the names and stories of these patriots who sacrificed so much for our country; and

Whereas the conduct of Speaker PELOSI was a breach of decorum and degraded the proceedings of the joint session, to the discredit of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the behavior of Speaker PELOSI during the joint session of Congress held on February 4, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader asserted in his comments that the document in question was the property of the House.

Was, in fact, the document that the Speaker had to read the property of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message is part of the proceedings of the House and can be used by the House for archival and printing purposes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, an additional question.

Mr. Speaker, after the President had spoken the State of the Union and delivered that to the Congress of the United States, at the end of that session, I moved that that document be enrolled in the House proceedings of last evening.

Am I to understand from the ruling that that document was specifically the document that would have been enrolled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion was adopted.

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the document was printed.

Mr. HOYER. That document did not exist according to the assertion of the Republican leader. It was destroyed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message is part of the proceedings of the House and can be used by the House for archival and printing purposes. The gentleman has addressed the printing of the document.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that answered my question.

My question was: Was the document that was destroyed or torn apart, the document that was to be enrolled by the House pursuant to my motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is able to use that document and other materials to fulfill the order of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, to clarify, was that document provided from the President to the Speaker of the House a document of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is part of the proceedings of the House and can be used by the House for archival and printing purposes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. So to be clear, your answer is: That is a document of the House, and the President provides one to the Speaker for the House, and the President provides one to the President of the Senate, the Vice President, for the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The document was printed as a document of the House upon order of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, is it allowed to destroy a document of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not provide an advisory opinion. The Chair is not going to give advisory opinions.

Mr. MCCARTHY. But to be clear, it is a document of the House, much like any historical document that has been provided to the floor of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is engaged in debate, and the gentleman is free to engage in debate on the resolution at the appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is not on the floor, I don't think.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, no, the gentleman is correct. It was her intention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for clarification. Obviously, the Parliamentarian—I think we ought to clarify this issue.

If the document has been torn apart as is alleged, and as we know it was,

that document, presumably, is not the document that was enrolled by the House pursuant to my motion last night.

I know it is not in the possession of the House. I know that for a fact. But there is, pursuant to my motion, a document that has been enrolled, the President's address in the State of the Union.

So I simply want to make the point to the Parliamentarian and to the Speaker, that the document that—I have been here for a long period of time. Numerous times, numerous times, I have had in this drawer a copy of the President's speech that is delivered by the communication staff of the White House.

Mr. Speaker, is that to be presumed—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Respectfully, the gentleman is engaged in debate. This issue is more properly addressed in the format of 1-minute speeches.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, you clarified that is a document of the House. Can you clarify that is not a document for the Speaker, but a document for the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The document is used as part of House proceedings and can be used for archival and printing purposes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Did the Speaker have any history in past State of the Unions where that document provided to the Speaker has not been enshrined into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Respectfully, the Chair will not act as a historian.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, in 2009, the majority leader, now Mr. HOYER, led a formal rebuke of South Carolina Representative JOE WILSON defending "the rules of the House and enforcing the traditional decorum of the Chamber."

At the time, Mr. HOYER said: "This House cannot stay silent. What is at issue here is important to the House and of importance to the country."

My parliamentary inquiry is—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Respectfully, the gentleman is engaged in debate. The House may address this during 1-minute speeches.

Mr. BRADY. Is the Speaker of the House—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is engaged in debate.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I asked for a parliamentary inquiry, and the question is this: Is the Speaker ripping up