

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

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 supremacists 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.