

I recently visited Shirley and reiterated my commitment to helping military families like hers, because supporting our servicemembers means supporting them long after they come home. It means providing them with safe, affordable housing; expanding educational opportunities to help veterans pursue their career goals; improving home care services for elderly veterans; and so much more.

Today, and always, I will keep fighting to do just that.

#### WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on World AIDS Day, as we remember tens of millions of beautiful souls we have lost around the world to HIV and AIDS and pray for their families.

Over the last two decades, our fight against HIV/AIDS in the world has been transformed by PEPFAR, made possible by the leadership of President Bush and bipartisan support in Congress.

It was my privilege to be a leader in this fight on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee where we secured more than \$100 billion for PEPFAR to support its life-giving work.

I salute President Bush and Mrs. Bush for their ongoing attention and commitment to this issue. I have traveled to visit the clinics in Africa and have been told by people there that PEPFAR gave them hope. They would never have been tested if they didn't think there was an opportunity for something to improve their lives. They lost the stigma of being tested positively by having hope given to them.

I thank President Bush and Mrs. Bush for helping address the issue with their Pink Ribbon Campaign.

As we go forward, let us hope that this body will soon reauthorize PEPFAR for what it means.

During the COVID crisis, I spoke to the head of the World Health Organization and asked him if PEPFAR helped. He said, yes, the science, the distribution of drugs, the network that was created was all very helpful to us in the fight against COVID, especially in Africa.

Again, thanks to President Bush for his leadership at the time. I told him at that time that I am with you as long as it is big. He made it big, and he has made it constant; and we salute him and are grateful to him for that.

This year's World AIDS Day is fraught with meaning because our nation faces the imperative of reauthorizing PEPFAR HIV is very resourceful: it keeps adapting to survive, and so must we. I join so many of my colleagues and voices across the world in calling on Congressional leaders to make reauthorizing PEPFAR a top priority as we negotiate government funding legislation. Today, and every day, America must demonstrate to the world that

we remain fully committed to building an AIDS-free generation, with health equity and justice for all.

#### SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base is getting it done for the American people.

As a proud U.S. Air Force veteran and member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I toured the base recently to better understand its challenges, including the possibility of losing F-15E Strike Eagles without any replacement. That is why I led a bipartisan letter encouraging House Members not to strike the Strike Eagle provision from the NDAA.

During my visit, I saw a deteriorating child development center, and this is unacceptable. While at the facility, a 4-year-old came up to the window and waved, smiling, which touched my heart.

Mr. Speaker, we must advance military construction projects like this and join in the work of the bipartisan Quality of Life panel, because this 4-year-old, her friends, and her family deserve nothing less. This is the best way that we can wave back to the children of our military families.

#### ST. JUDE MARATHON

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, will be the beginning of the weekend of the St. Jude Marathon in Memphis, Tennessee.

Memphis is a city that has much to be proud of, but one of our most prideful things is we are home to St. Jude Children's Research Hospital. It cures cancers, tries to cure the ones that they haven't yet, and gives children with cancer opportunities to be treated free of charge.

This week, there will be a St. Jude marathon through Memphis; a big race with thousands and thousands of runners who are there to raise money for St. Jude and to bring attention to what St. Jude does for the children of the world.

I praise St. Jude, and I am appreciative that they are in Memphis. I encourage everybody to support them and to contribute.

I am not supposed to say that but I did.

□ 1145

#### THE RIGHT OF THE STATE OF PALESTINE TO EXIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 9, 2023, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, proud to be an American. Why shouldn't I? My foreparents suffered 240-plus years of slavery to make it great. I am proud to stand in the House of Representatives today as a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbosomed, and unafraid.

Today, as a liberated Democrat, I will address two issues. Both relate to votes that I have taken. The first issue that I will address deals with affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. The second issue that I will address will deal with my having voted "present" in the case of the expulsion of Mr. SANTOS.

With reference to the state of Palestine's right to exist, I am proud to tell you that on Tuesday of this week, we took a vote. Mr. Speaker, that vote on Tuesday of this week related to the State of Israel's right to exist. I believe that Israel has a right to exist. I believe in and support Israel's right to exist. I support Israel. I have done so since I have been in this Congress. Since I have been here, we have voted on more than \$50 billion in support to Israel. You will find that I have voted for all the help to Israel.

I have spoken on the floor in support of Israel, and I think that my record is very clear on where I stand when it comes to the State of Israel and its right to exist. I voted for the resolution. It was reaffirming Israel's right to exist. I voted for it. I, in voting for it, realized that it did not have something that I thought we ought to have, and that is a statement indicating that Palestine has a right to exist.

Palestine has been there, the inhabitants. In 1948, when the U.N. decided that it would, by way of resolution, recognize two states in the area, the area referred to was Palestine. I believe that Palestine, with Palestinians, has a right to exist, as well.

Today, I will file the resolution that I shall read. This resolution is one that affirms the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Now, I understand that Palestine is not a state currently, and I address that in the resolution. This is not calling for an immediate styling or having Palestine become a state. That is not what the resolution is about. It is recognizing the right to become a state.

In this Congress, we have said that there should be a solution to the concerns related to Israel and Palestine, and it is a two-state solution that we have talked about.

The President of the United States has said that there should be a two-state solution. I believe that there should be a two-state solution. If there is going to be a two-state solution, and if we are going to fund Palestine and Israel as we have—we have sent many dollars in humanitarian aid to Palestine—and if we are going to continue

to do this, and if I am going to continue to vote for these funds, I want Congress to be on record saying that there ought to be a State of Israel and that we can have a state for Palestinians, as well.

I shall file the resolution, and I shall file it immediately after I finish this statement about Palestine as well as about my vote of "present" on Mr. SANTOS for his expulsion.

First, let's talk about Palestine. Here is a resolution. It reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. In the House of Representatives, Mr. GREEN of Texas submitted the following resolution, which was referred to a proper committee.

The resolution itself reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Whereas, this resolution may be cited as the original resolution affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist;

Whereas, the people, the Palestinian people, are inhabitants of the land of Palestine;

Whereas, in 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 181, which called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states.

I may have said 1948 earlier. This corrects my earlier statement.

Whereas, on May 14, 1948, President Harry Truman issued a statement recognizing Israel as an independent state; and

Whereas, on November 28, 2023, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 888 reaffirming the State of Israel's right to exist by a vote of 412 "yeas," 1 "nay," and 1 "present."

I voted for the resolution. I believe Israel has a right to exist. I believe that the House of Representatives should be on record indicating that Israel has a right to exist.

Continuing: Now, therefore, be it resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time—important words, "and at a future time"—to become a nation-state.

Some things bear repeating: Resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a nation-state.

If we believe in a two-state solution, then we want to have this resolution approved by the House of Representatives. We believe that Israel has a right to exist as a nation-state. We say we want a two-state solution. This but only codifies what we say.

The President of the United States has said there should be a two-state solution. You can't have a two-state solution without at some point recognizing the fact that Palestine has to be one of the two states.

Again: Resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a nation-state.

That was number one.

Number two: Recognizes the two-state solution as the only solution that will secure a lasting peace in the region.

Number three: Rejects calls for Palestine's destruction.

Just as we reject calls to have Israel destroyed, we should reject calls to have Palestine destroyed or the notion of a Palestinian state to become a non-existent notion.

I believe this resolution is going to make a difference. I am going to file this resolution. I believe that the resolution ought to go to the proper committee. I will ask the chairperson of the proper committee to bring the resolution to a vote within the committee or to process it out of the committee. I will leave it to the chair and the ranking member to make the decisions as to how this will work.

I want it to come to the floor for a vote. I would like to see it have the opportunity to come to the floor for a vote with the same level of expediency that the resolution supporting Israel's right to exist had in coming to the floor to a vote. There was expediency exerted. There was expediency that allowed that resolution to get to the floor not within months, not within weeks, but within days. I ask that this resolution receive the same level of respect.

We have to respect Israel's right to exist, and we have to respect Palestine's right to exist. Both have the right to exist. The resolution makes it possible for the Congress to go on record.

I also believe this. Aside from filing the resolution, I believe that there are three things that have to happen for Palestine to become a state. The first thing that has to happen is there has to be a recognition that Palestine is a state, obviously, but by the House of Representatives, that it should become a state by the House of Representatives. Number one, Palestine has to become a state, and the House of Representatives has to recognize this right for Palestine to become a state.

Number two, I think that the Israelis should recognize Palestine's right to become a state, but I don't think that we have to allow them to determine whether Palestine should become a state. I think that Palestinians have the right to have statehood without having the Israelis determine that they should become a state.

Number three, just as in 1948 when President Truman recognized Israel as a state without the consent of the Palestinians, I believe that a President of the United States can recognize Palestine as a state without the consent of Israel. I don't think Israel has to give its consent for Palestine to become a state. Just as we recognized Israel without Palestinians giving their consent, we can do the same thing for Palestine without Israel giving its consent. I believe that Palestine has a right to become a state, and I don't believe that Israel has the right to veto the Palestinian's right to become a state.

I will file this resolution, which will put the House on record. If the House

goes on record, I will continue my efforts to push for a two-state solution as a resolution to the concerns between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

ON THE MATTER OF THE EXPULSION OF GEORGE SANTOS

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, now, to my second point, the issue related to Mr. SANTOS.

I voted "present" today. Let's look at what the vote count was. The vote count was 311 "yeas," 114 "nays," 2 "present," and 8 persons not voting.

I am proud of my vote. I am proud to say that I voted "present."

It is not unusual for me to stand alone. I know that it takes a certain type of courage to stand alone. I pray that I will continue to have that type of courage because I believe that the House has made a mistake today in going on record and expelling Mr. SANTOS from Congress.

I believe it was a mistake because I believe that the process itself will now lend itself to whatever 290 persons believe to be a reason to expel a person, that becomes a reason for a person to be expelled. Whatever 290 persons can agree on, you can now expel a person. I don't think that that process is a fair and just process.

Let me continue by saying this. Yes, the House had every right to do what it did. Yes, constitutionally, the House had the right to do what it did. Constitutionally, it did, yes.

□ 1200

Yes. So it is not about whether I differ with the Constitution or differ with whether the House had a right to do this. I believe that we have the right to do things, but I believe also that there are better ways to do things, and there are some ways that we should not do things.

Prior to today, it has been said many times, that five persons have been expelled—two for having committed crimes and three for having been associated with the Confederacy and its rebellion against the Union, the United States.

I think that what we have done today opens ourselves up to having persons expelled for things that a good many people are not going to agree with. Let me explain.

To expel a person without a bifurcated system, in my opinion, is a mistake. Impeachment has a bifurcated system. The House indicts by way of impeaching, and then after impeaching, the Senate has the trial to convict or not. Impeachment itself is not bifurcated, the process to remove the President from office is bifurcated. Impeachment is one part of that process. That is the function of the House.

The process then provides that if you want to continue and remove, you have to get the consent of the Senate. That is the bifurcated process to remove a President from office.

I think we ought to have a bifurcated process—notwithstanding our right not to. I think we ought to have a bifurcated process to remove a person from Congress.

There is only one way for a person to get to the Congress of the United States of America, unlike the Senate, where you can get appointed. With the Congress, you have to be voted in by the people. That is why this is the people's House. This House belongs to the people of the United States of America, and membership herein belongs to the people of the United States of America.

In the infinite wisdom of those who were the codifiers and the writers of the Constitution, they have given us the authority to remove people. We can do it. I just happen to disagree with the way we are doing it. By doing it this way, without having the actual House of Representatives give some deference to the judicial system, we no longer have another party in the process.

We, in fact, now have become the investigators, the judges, the jury, and the prosecutors. We have every right to do that. I don't quarrel with anyone who would say to me, as a retort, well, we have the right to do it. We have every right to do it.

The question is: should we do this?

I don't think so. I think it was a mistake. I think that at some point in the future we are going to see the error of our ways. This decision is going to haunt us. You cannot appeal a decision of the House of Representatives, which is why we ought to have the judicial system involved.

If a person commits a crime, it is brought to our attention, there is a conviction, it comes from the judiciary, and we then act on that conviction. We have now a second party involved in the process such that that party can deliberate and make a decision without the House of Representatives having influenced that decision. I think that is a fair way to remove people from the House of Representatives.

I don't think that we should do it with the House being the investigators, the judge, the jury, and the prosecutor. I believe that justice itself would be better served if we used the system that we have been using. Utilizing the system that we have put into place today I think is going to create some serious concerns for us in the future.

What can we do?

We can impose sanctions. We can remove persons from their committee assignments. We can publish our findings. We can allow the citizens—which every 2 years they have the opportunity to determine who will serve them—allow them to have the vote and let them determine whether or not they want a person—that I might deem unfit to serve—give them the opportunity to do so.

I think that a bifurcated system works better than the system that we have now installed in the House of Representatives.

I believe, given the history of my country that I love—again, I love it because my foreparents suffered for 240 years as enslaved persons. We built it. We made it great with the economic foundation of mothers and fathers. Yes, I love my country.

I also understand that my country is not always fair to people of color. It hasn't been. To this day there are times when it still is not. I think people of color are going to regret having cast that vote because we are the most vulnerable—we are the most vulnerable in this country.

Let me say this: we are among the most vulnerable because I recognize that there are other persons who are vulnerable, as well. We are among the most vulnerable in this country. Among the most vulnerable. There are others who are vulnerable, as well. I don't want to disrespect the truth.

I know that we suffer because I understand how we got here and why we were brought here. We were brought here to be permanent—240 years of slavery is evidence of the desire to have permanency. We were brought here to be permanent subservient—with no power. Subservient. Having the mindset of a person who wants to serve and wants to please.

A permanent subservient. Powerless. There was a desire that we never have the power that we have today. I am grateful for the way the country has metamorphosed to this point. I am sorry it took so long. I regret that there was ever an institution of slavery. A permanent, subservient, powerless cast of people.

I would also add this: identifiable. Identifiable, permanent, subservient, powerless cast of people. Identifiable. There is your evidence. Identifiable. Subservient—240 years, plus, of slavery. A powerless, subservient cast.

Born into slavery. Died as a slave. That 240 years has not been erased. No, we don't have slavery in the country today, but we still have some minds that have not metamorphosed into the future. We have some people who still disrespect people of African ancestry.

They disrespect people of African ancestry as evidenced by certain things they do or choose not to do. Disrespect. Disrespect because they will respect people who rebelled against the country, who fought to maintain slavery, who were in the Confederacy, they respect them.

In 1956, this Congress gave them a Congressional Gold Medal, the enslavers, the Confederate soldiers. To this day, the Congress doesn't have the respect that it should have for the enslaved. No Congressional Gold Medal for the enslaved. The Congressional Gold Medal is for the enslavers.

THE RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING IS  
DISRESPECTFUL TO PEOPLE OF COLOR

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, persons of color suffer greatly in this country. Disrespect. Disrespect because right across the street there is a building, the Russell Senate Office Building, that disrespects people of color.

Richard Russell was a self-proclaimed white supremacist. He was a Senator who fought the Voting Rights Act and voting rights in general. He was a Senator who was a coauthor of the Southern Manifesto. He was a racist and a bigot.

His name is on the building. We have been asking now for a long time that his name be removed from the building. We find that the Senate, in its wisdom, has not done so. That is disrespecting people of color. Yes, we are among the most disrespected in this country.

There is evidence and the Senate could remove Russell's name from that building tomorrow if they wanted to. It is not a question of whether there is a way, it is a question of whether they have the will. I marvel at how Senators' offices are in a building named after a racist and a bigot. I don't go into the Russell Senate Office Building. I respect myself enough to stay out of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Those Senators, they decide the timeline. Until they decide that it should be removed, it won't be removed. It will be removed. When it is removed, I am going to acknowledge it and be grateful for it. I will tell them that it took too long. It is just taking too long. Why?

They claim they can't remove a racist's name from a building paid for by taxpayer dollars because they can't agree on a new name. We have solved that problem. Simply call it what it was before it became the Russell Senate Office Building, and that was the Old Senate Office Building.

Let it become the Old Senate Office Building. Then take as much time as you like to conclude that it should have some worthy person's name. I have no name to offer. I only want that you do justice by Black people the same way you do justice by other people.

The same way you make an issue of an injustice against others. Make the same about television time available to criticize the Richard Russell Office Building and the name being on it. It is a symbol of national shame.

Why is it that CNN, MSNBC, FOX, all of them, why have they not made a big to-do of it?

One of the reasons may be because they report the news from the Russell Senate Office Building. Yes, they are all located right there near the rotunda where Richard Russell has a statue in his honor.

The Richard Russell Office Building is a symbol of national shame, and the news outlets ought to be ashamed of themselves to tolerate it and then participate in it—to participate in the perpetuation of the maintenance of the name on the building. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Yes, people of color are among the most disrespected. Yes, we are.

□ 1215

That is why I am concerned about this vote that we have taken today. It is because we are among the most disrespected that I am not sure our transgressions are going to be judged the same as the transgression of a person of a different hue. I believe that a

person of a different hue can get a better decision than a person of color in this country.

We see it all the time in the courts of the country. I was a judge of a small claims court for one-quarter of a century. I was a litigator. I saw the injustices as they took place that I could do nothing about. This is an injustice that is in its infancy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I warn you that you are going to see the injustice take place. You will see it. Maybe what I am saying today will help to prevent it. I doubt it. I doubt it.

There are some Members that I am very much concerned about now that this vote has been taken. I am very much concerned about them because there are people here who would want to remove them from office if they could without having committed a crime because of positions that they have taken, policy positions. That would be an injustice.

So, I am proud of my vote. I voted the way I voted for reasons that I have called to your attention, Mr. Speaker, but a review does not hurt.

One, Mr. Speaker, the only way you get here is if the people elect you. You can't be appointed to the House of Representatives. It is the people's House. The people send us, and the people ought to remove us unless we have committed a crime and been adjudicated as such by a proper court.

Two, the decisions are not appealable. There is no appeal from our decision.

Three, the process itself is not bifurcated any longer when it comes to removal from the House of Representatives. Prior to today, it was bifurcated, and the judicial system would have the opportunity to judge a person and determine whether the person was guilty of a crime. Finding such, that could then be used by the House of Representatives to expel the person.

We have taken the judicial system completely out of the process. We have become judge, jury, prosecutors, and investigators.

The truth is, whatever 290 of us can agree on, then that is a reason to expel a person. If 290 of us can agree on a reason, then that is it. Given the way we have entrenched ourselves now into teams, I don't favor the consequences that I can foresee.

We have allowed ourselves now to become, unfortunately, a House of Representatives where this discord is no longer just a difference of opinion about policy. It has become a means by which we can come to the floor to remove a person from office, a person who was sent here by people who voted. I am much afraid for what we are going to have to regret because of what we will do as time progresses.

So, I shall now move to the well of the House and file my resolution affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. I have read it to you, Mr. Speaker. Some Members may be tuning in late, so I will read it again. This is the resolution.

I voted for Israel's right to exist on Tuesday of this week. I think we ought to vote similarly for Palestine to have a right to exist, as well.

It reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Whereas, this resolution may be cited as the Original Resolution Affirming the State of Palestine's Right to Exist; Whereas, Palestinian people are inhabitants of the land of Palestine;

Whereas, in 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 181, which called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states;

Whereas, on May 14, 1948, President Harry Truman issued a statement recognizing Israel as an independent state.

Mr. Speaker, I support Israel as an independent state. That is not here. I support Israel as an independent state. This is a sidebar comment. I have supported it. I will continue to support it.

I supported Israel by voting for more than \$50 billion in funds, but I did it because I thought we were moving toward a two-state solution. I did it because I thought a two-state solution was the will and the desire of the House of Representatives.

I have reached a point now where I have to know. That is what I thought. Passage of the resolution will give me the certainty I need. The absence of the passage of the resolution will cause me to have a great deal of consternation about how I am going to approach votes in the future.

To continue:

Whereas, on November 28, 2023, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 888, reaffirming the State of Israel's right to exist—I voted for it, and I would vote for it again and again and again if given the opportunity—by a vote of 412 “yeas,” 1 “nay,” and 1 “present.”

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives, one, affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a state.

Mr. Speaker, I accentuated at a future time because I am making it clear to those who would make the argument that this is about saying that Palestine should become a state today. That is not what I am saying. “At a future time”—I don't know when in the future, but I do believe that we ought to have that as our goal since we have stated that we want a two-state solution.

Number two, recognizes the two-state solution as the only solution that will secure a lasting peace in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this. There are some people who want a one-state solution. They mouth “two state,” but in their hearts, they want one state. I am not one of them. What I say is what I mean.

Those Members who say they want a two-state solution and really want a one-state solution, well, this is not for them. This is for people who want a two-state solution.

Number three, rejects calls for Palestine's destruction.

Mr. Speaker, there will be people who will say that nobody is calling for Palestine's destruction. They are wrong. I was on C-SPAN just this week, and there was a caller who called in and who literally, by virtue of the way he presented his argument, wanted to see the destruction of Palestine, the destruction of Palestine. I am not for that. I am not for that. I am not for what is happening with the destruction of Palestine currently. For us to conclude that it is okay to destroy Palestine is an absurdity.

How could we possibly approve of the destruction that we see and the lives that are being taken? How could we approve of that? I don't approve of it. If others can approve of it, the killing of babies, I don't approve of it.

Yes, you have a right to defend yourself, but you have to do it in a just fashion. To perform, if you will, an unjust act in the name of justice is still an injustice. You cannot clean it up by saying it is a just act. Your actions themselves speak for you.

Killing babies is not a just act, especially when you have declared war on Hamas and you end up killing Palestinian babies. It was wrong to kill Israeli babies. What Hamas did was dastardly. The way they did it, it is impossible to even imagine a human being doing it, but you can't complain about killing innocent Israeli babies and then decide: Well, it is okay. The Palestinian babies are just collateral damage. They just happened to be in the wrong place.

What is wrong with us? I will not support the killing of these Palestinian babies. I will not support the destruction of Gaza. I pray that this country will come to its senses.

How long can this go on?

Mr. Speaker, I am always honored to have this opportunity. I don't know how much longer I will have it. There are a lot of people who don't like what I say who have the power to change rules.

As you have seen today, Mr. Speaker, they can change the rules. So, I never know when I will be giving my last speech from this podium, but as long as I have the opportunity to give a speech, I am going to speak truth to power, but more than that, I am going to speak truth about power.

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

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF NANCY PALMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Nancy Palmer, a longtime Grass Valley resident and community leader who passed away peacefully in her home in September.