

we call the United States of America, it means that we have the responsibility to work with, to support, to empower, and to protect our law enforcement officers as they go out into the community and they put their lives and their families' future on the line to protect us.

As someone who has made those sacred promises too many times at funerals, it is my honor to stand here today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives on May 15, police day in police week, to reaffirm and to challenge all of us to continue with those two sacred promises: never forget and then go out, be a good citizen, be a member of a community, support the law enforcement officers, and the men and women who themselves are physically every day putting on the badge and the uniform and who are keeping that watch from here.

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

PROUD TO BE AN UNBOUGHT,  
UNBOSSSED, LIBERATED DEMOCRAT

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GREEN of Texas was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, Madam Speaker, proud to be an unbought, unbossed, liberated Democrat. I am proud also to have friends, and tonight I will thank a couple of my friends who have helped me with an endeavor that I believe is necessary and that is going to generate a movement that will make a difference in the lives of the people of this country.

Tonight, I will start by thanking my friend, attorney John Bonifaz, a lawyer par excellence, a person who has been involved with the movement to impeach and who has, through his organization, Free Speech For People, they have collected more than 500,000 signatures for impeachment.

These are the people who are at the genesis of this movement, and I thank all of them for what they are doing.

I also thank another friend, a lawyer as well, but a great consumer advocate, a protector of rights for people who we consider consumers, and that, of course, is the attorney Ralph Nader. The great Ralph Nader. While I missed his last birthday, I heard it was quite a celebration. He is 91 years young, and I am grateful to him for all that he has done. He has done things that have benefited people when it comes to safety with automobiles, safety with consumer products, generally speaking.

I thank them both for what they have done in this effort to impeach and to inspire me to do the things that I will do and call to your attention.

Madam Speaker, I also make note that on this evening, I have filed Articles of Impeachment. The articles are H. Res. 415. I say articles. There is really but one article within this resolution.

I will not read the resolution. There will be an appropriate time to read it. This is not that time, but I do want to call to your attention the fact that I have been censured not silenced, and I say this because I will be presenting this resolution, but I have many more things to say about the effort that we are embarking upon and because this effort is so important to us, I will be talking about it a good deal of the time in the future. I am censured but I am not silenced.

I am, at this moment, bringing to the attention of everyone the countdown to impeachment. The countdown begins tonight with a message that I have for my colleagues, for the press, for the public, and for all who are interested in this topic. This message will be sent to persons. It will be published. It will be on my website. It will be available to those who desire to know the essence of it.

The message reads with a reference, and the reference is: "My reason for impeaching the President: The threat that we said Donald John Trump posed to democracy prior to his being sworn in on January 20, 2025, has become our reality."

"To whom it may concern:

"I pen this communique with a heavy heart, driven by a conscience that will not allow me to ignore my well-founded, strong preelection condemnation of Donald John Trump as a threat to American democracy that has now become our reality."

□ 1900

Currently, I am among the many who denounced President Trump as an authoritarian, defined by Merriam Webster as "of, relating to, or favoring a concentration of power in a leader or an elite not constitutionally responsible to the people."

I am among those who have pointed out President Trump's failure to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution by flouting constitutional law, as well as the orders of Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

I am among those who strongly denounce the President's dangerous flouting of separation of powers and undermining the independence of the Federal judiciary by calling for the impeachment of Federal judges who rule against him rather than appealing the decisions, as was explained to all by Chief Justice John Roberts on March 18, 2025.

I am among the throngs who know that the President violates the Fifth Amendment constitutional right to due process when he condones the deportation by our Justice Department of anyone residing in the United States of America to another country without providing them with constitutionally mandated legal process owed to present evidence of why they shouldn't be deported.

Regrettably, the President is doing the above things that I just mentioned

in tandem with expressions of American citizens being deported while condoning the potential suspension of the great writ of habeas corpus, another fundamental constitutional right.

I cannot in good conscience, as a Member of Congress, having said what I have said, knowing what I know, wait until the next election to deal with authoritarian President Donald John Trump's pre-election threat to American democracy that has become a post-election assault on our government.

The President has devolved American democracy into authoritarianism with himself as the authoritarian. Authoritarian President Donald John Trump is the problem. The threat of impeachment can act as a deterrent. Should that fail, actual impeachment becomes the solution.

Having presented Articles of Impeachment that laid the foundation for President Trump's prior impeachments, which contributed to his Presidential defeat, I am compelled by my moral imperative, driven by my conscience to act again.

In Federalist No. 65 of the 85 articles of essays contained within the Federalist Papers, written to promote the ratification of the Constitution, the great Alexander Hamilton explains that the subject of the Senate's jurisdiction for trials of impeachment are those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men or, in other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to society itself.

Contrary to what many status quo personalities may have you believe and would have you believe, there is no requirement for the existence of a constitutional crisis before impeaching for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Because of the importance of this statement, I shall repeat it. Contrary to what many status quo personalities would have us believe, there is no requirement for the existence of a constitutional crisis before impeaching for high crimes and misdemeanors.

In fact, in 1868, President Andrew Johnson was impeached for speaking ill of Congress in Article 10 of the Articles of Impeachment against him. Federal Judge John Pickering became the first person convicted by the Senate. He was impeached by the U.S. House of Representatives in 1803 for misconduct as a judge and for intoxication. He was impeached and convicted under the same constitutional law that all Presidents have been impeached under.

Typically, there has been no constitutional crisis associated with Articles of Impeachment. I have to repeat this because there seems to be the notion that you must wait for the constitutional crisis before you can initiate impeachment.

Typically, there has been no constitutional crisis associated with Articles of Impeachment, although a constitutional crisis can exist without any crime having been committed.

An authoritarian does not have to commit a codified statutory offense to be impeached. I raise this point because there are many people who are of the opinion that there must be some statutory, criminal law that has been violated before one can be impeached. That is not the case, not the case at all.

The constitutional law that authoritarian President Trump would have Congress use to impeach a Federal judge for ruling against him, that would be Article II, Section 4 of the United States Constitution, is the same law that has been used and can be used to impeach him again for making his threats to democracy a reality. I will use that law again.

Former President Gerald Ford was right—he was right then and now—when he proclaimed that an impeachable offense is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history. Whatever a majority of the House of Representatives consider it to be at a given moment in history.

For edification purposes, the Members of the House who vote on impeachment are not given any instructions, as you might expect a jury to be given. No one can tell them what the definition is such that they must honor what they are told. People can suggest but, ultimately, they are the judges of what impeachment is, and the standard that they use they need not reveal to anyone.

Waiting for a constitutional crisis to impeach can be the forerunner to tanks on American streets. Acting now, with my single vote to impeach, can function as a wake-up call to impeach as well as deter an authoritarian President and avert a constitutional crisis.

I believe in the power of one. I believe that one person can make a difference. I believe that one person who has the ability to take a stand to make a difference, I believe that that one person should.

Acting now, as was done before, can also become a part of the genesis of a public movement similar to that which led to authoritarian Donald Trump's prior impeachments and defeat at the polls in 2020, the Presidential election year when he was defeated.

I said acting now could become the genesis of a public movement. That is the movement that my good friends with Free Speech for People have initiated, the movement that people across the country are engaged in and talking about.

I don't claim that what we are doing tonight is the genesis. I think it is a part, but I don't think it is the genesis. As such, I would say to persons who would tell me: Well, he won't run again, why would you impeach? To them, I would say: Because he doesn't

have to have another term within this term of office. I believe that he can be impeached for what he has done immediately. Whether he will be or not will be a decision for this Congress, but I believe that he can be and should be. Although he won't run again, Members of Congress who aid and abet America's devolution into authoritarianism will. This bears repeating as well.

Although he won't run again, Members of Congress who aid and abet America's devolution into authoritarianism will. I have not asked nor will I ask any Members of Congress to stand with me. I encourage all Members to vote their conscience.

As for me, I stand where I have always stood on the question of impeachment which, of course, is a question of conscience for me. Because it is a question of conscience, even when the odds are against me, my position is, it is better for me to stand alone than not stand at all. If I have to, it won't be the first time.

I believe that it is a question of conscience because it impacts the entire country. It impacts the lives of people within the country. The act that would bring us to the point of impeaching is something that impacts society in a negative way, impacts the lives of people in an adverse way. I believe this is a question of conscience. Because I believe it is a question of conscience, I don't tell others how they should conduct themselves, and I have not had any Members tell me how I should conduct myself. I believe that how I conduct myself in terms of trying to do what I perceive to be the right thing is something that is between me and my conscience.

As a Member of Congress, I consider these actions by authoritarian President Trump harmful to society and impeachable: condoning the flouting of Federal court orders, flouting the separation of powers, undermining the independence of the Federal judiciary, and flouting the constitutional mandate of due process, all of which have devolved our democracy into authoritarianism.

I opposed authoritarian President Donald Trump's behavior that made him a threat to our democracy prior to his election and have witnessed that threat become a reality. Therefore, I cannot in good conscience fail to take action that the Constitution provides to protect the American people.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., addressed such questions of conscience when he proclaimed cowardice will ask the question when you are confronting these questions of conscience. This is what he said, "Cowardice asks the question, 'Is it safe?'" Is this the safe thing for me to do? Can I get hurt physically by doing this? Is it safe for me to traverse my neighborhood, to move across the country? Is it safe for me to do it? Cowardice asks this question.

He goes on to say, "Expediency asks the question, 'Is it politic?'" Is this

good for politics? Will this help me to ascend to some lofty position or will this bring me down? Will this be something that can hurt my career? This is what Dr. King is saying: "Is it politic?"

Madam Speaker, then he said: "Vanity asks the question: 'Is it popular?'"

□ 1915

Will I lose the smiles that I am greeted with? Will the people who normally carry on conversations avoid me? Will they seek to make me a pariah simply because I have done what I believe to be right? I am not telling anybody else what they must do.

This is what Dr. King was saying. Is it popular?

Then, he goes on to say that conscience asks the question, and I say this is the ultimate question: "But conscience asks the question: 'Is it right?'"

Then, he closes with the crescendo: "There comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular."

One must take it because conscience dictates, and conscience tells one that it is right. I understand that my stance may be neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but I honor the wisdom of Dr. King and take my stance because my conscience says it is right.

It is not unusual for the U.S. House of Representatives to vote multiple times before passing important legislation. Although the first vote is not always the victorious vote, it is not always the final vote. It can be a foundational vote. It can be the vote that can lay the predicate for things to come.

I have filed and will make H. Res. 415, the Articles of Impeachment, available to the press, the public, and all who would desire to know what is contained herein.

I will call for a vote to impeach authoritarian Donald John Trump at a time to be determined, knowing that the American people don't expect me to always win. I am going to elaborate on this before I finish this sentence.

The American people don't expect me—I don't speak for anybody else. This is my belief. I don't believe that the American people expect me to always win. They do want to know that on the great issues of my time, when there was great challenge and controversy, they want to know where I stood and where I stand.

They want to know: Am I willing to fight for the people whom I represent? Am I willing to take a stand for people I will never meet and greet but do it because it is not only the right thing but the righteous thing?

Madam Speaker, the American people don't expect me to always win. I sometimes measure my friendships by the people who are willing to fight, fight even when the odds are against you, fight even when you know that you are not likely to be victorious.

I think there is something about people who are willing to take up a cause

because they know it is a cause worthy and worthwhile and a cause that can make a difference in the lives of people.

I may not win, but I will know that I took a stand for righteousness and that I made a difference. Maybe not at that moment, but in the long run, the difference will be made.

The American people don't expect me to always win. However, I do believe they expect me to always fight, and I don't mean in a pugilistic fashion with fisticuffs. I mean to stand up and be counted on the great issues of my time and their time, our time, on the issues that confront the Nation and, indeed, the world.

I am honored that the American people have allowed me to have this position. I am not going to allow posterity to look back upon my tenure in Congress and say that when we had the opportunity—or I had the opportunity—to take a stand for justice even when it might cost me a career, cause me a lack of popularity, cause me a lack of safety. I want people to know that I took the stand that could make a difference.

Madam Speaker, I want my friends to know that I appreciate all of them who have stood with me over this journey. I want my staff to know that I appreciate them greatly for standing with me. In fact, we stand together.

I have a great staff. I have people who are committed not to work. They are committed to a cause. They are committed to the cause that we extoll when we say the Pledge of Allegiance: liberty and justice for all.

They are committed to a cause of making sure that we maintain government of the people, by the people, for the people.

They are committed to a cause that says William Cullen Bryant is right, that truth crushed to Earth shall rise again. They understand that when we do these things, people will say bad things and ugly things. They understand that truth crushed to Earth shall rise again. This is a great staff.

They appreciate Carlyle. They appreciate his wisdom when he said that no lie can live forever. Let them say what they may. Let others do what they may. We will do what we must and take a stand for liberty and justice for all.

I have a great team, and I want them to know how much I appreciate and thank them for what they do. This morning, I had two members of my team come in at 8 o'clock a.m. Some would say that is not really early, but it is when they are still with me at this hour, after 7 o'clock, nearly 7:30. They are still over in the office, working. I have a great team. I thank my team.

I also thank the people who serve right here on the floor. I thank all of them for their kindness, courtesy, and willingness to help persons who are trying to find their way. I thank the court reporters and the clerks.

I thank the Parliamentarian for being a person who is true to his mis-

sion. He sides neither with Democrats nor Republicans, nor anybody, but always gives us the information as the rules permit him to provide it. I thank him and all the people in that office.

Madam Speaker, I thank you. This, for me, is a historic moment. I thank you for the time that I have.

To the persons who work in the cloak room, let me not forget them. They are always gracious and kind. I thank all of you and the Sergeant at Arms.

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.

#### THE BIG, BEAUTIFUL BILL

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I think it is important that the Chair and the public know that there are always debates going on in this building that will determine how the big, beautiful bill is sent to President Trump.

One of those debates involves the State and local tax deduction.

Another of the debates, which hasn't been as highlighted, involves President Trump's proposal to reduce the marginal rate on manufacturing to 15 percent. President Trump is, rightly, obsessed with America being the world leader in manufacturing.

Another one of the debates is what we should do to encourage Americans to have more children, and President Trump has proposed a \$5,000 credit for people having children. I think that might not be quite right. I personally prefer a new \$5,000 exemption. Nevertheless, there is no time in life when people are more financially strapped than when they have young children.

I am strongly opposed to the so-called SALT Caucus of people who desperately want to have a greater deduction for State and local taxes. These people are, as a practical matter, looking to encourage their Governors, their school boards, and their county boards to raise local taxes.

Last weekend, when I was home, a conservative county executive in my district begged me not to increase the deduction for property taxes. He is a conservative and does not want to have the liberals on his county board make the case that it would be great if all of our property taxes and income taxes were tax deductible so we could raise taxes.

I am sure right now, particularly in the more liberal States—places like California with Governor Newsom, places like New York—the Governors and State legislators are waiting to see if they can increase the deduction for State income taxes and for local property taxes, so they can spend more money.

We have to realize that if the SALT Caucus succeeds, there will be less

money available here to lower the income tax on manufacturing, as President Trump tries to bring back American manufacturing jobs from China, Korea, and Mexico.

We will not have the money available to do eventually what I would like to do, and that is have a \$5,000 personal exemption to help out young couples who are just starting out, so they have more income at a time in their lives when they need it more than anybody else.

I strongly encourage our negotiators to turn back the people who want a big State and local tax deduction, even though Wisconsin is a mildly high tax State.

Madam Speaker, I think encouraging any more taxes anywhere in the country hurts us all as it slowly takes away the freedoms of people in America and makes America more of a country that you would not want to move to start new manufacturing. That is one of the things that is going on in this building.

The next topic to take up—and I am kind of disappointed we didn't deal with it like we should have in our proposed big, beautiful bill, but I know President Trump's team is concerned about this. It is the degree to which so many of our welfare programs are designed to discourage people from getting married.

We know that people who get married and have children—well, all types of families have successful children. I personally know many people who, on their own, both men and women, have done a very good job of raising children we would be proud of. In the long run, it is not fair to the next generation to discourage people from getting married and having children.

Right now, there are many Federal programs. They used to be called food stamps, low-income housing, Medicaid, which is healthcare for the poor, and Pell grants. All of these programs are designed to penalize young couples who get married.

□ 1930

Madam Speaker, if you are a single parent, then you may be eligible for all of these programs. If you are married, then you may be eligible for none of the programs.

I think the most generous of the group is low-income housing, or Section 8 vouchers, whatever. In any event, it is not unusual to look up a hypothetical in which if a woman marries say the father of her children, she will lose \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year.

This is why since the Great Society in the 1960s we have gone from a situation in which in the fifties, 4 percent of the children in this country were born out of wedlock. Now we are in a position in which we have over 40 percent of the children in the country who are born out of wedlock. It did not happen by accident. It happened because the Great Society programs in the 1960s were designed to encourage this sort of behavior.