

Epworth by the Sea undertook an incredible expansion under Mr. Willis' leadership, adding over 135 rooms and 50 employees, fostering the growth of St. Simons Island. Not only have his efforts strengthened the local economy, but Mr. Willis has made it Epworth's mission to continue giving back, as shown through its history of accommodating church-related and nonprofit groups.

Mr. Willis has exemplified the best of hard work and Southern hospitality, and it is an honor to recognize him and his service to the community of St. Simons Island.

#### SUPPORTING GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS

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

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the administration's cuts to critical gun violence prevention programs, and I rise today in deep solidarity with the innovators of CeaseFire, violence interrupters, and community organizations around this country that spend every day, hour after hour, working on the ground and in our communities to stop gun violence.

I thank them for their work. It is so critical and needed at a time when the Trump administration has announced cuts of \$500 million to community violence intervention organizations and funding opportunities directly from the Department of Justice and over \$1 billion in gun violence prevention funding for schools from the Department of Education. Make it make sense.

Now, organizations like Youth Alive in Oakland, California, will not have the funding that they need that is so critical in this moment to do the work of violence interruption on our streets in conjunction with law enforcement and community members who have lost loved ones to violence.

June is Gun Violence Prevention Month, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot stop this work in decreasing gun violence on our streets and in our communities.

#### HONORING COLONEL LEN LITTON

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

Mr. HARRIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Len Litton, a decorated combat pilot, national security expert, and proud son of North Carolina who has spent his entire life in service to our Nation.

Born in Banner Elk and raised in Shelby, Len joined the Air Force out of The Citadel. Over a 25-year career, he flew the A-10 and B-2, trained the next generation of pilots, and led some of the most complex and high-stakes missions in our arsenal. At every level, he

brought discipline, precision, and an unshakable sense of duty.

When his time in uniform ended, his service didn't. In the White House, the Pentagon, and across the Department of Defense, Colonel Litton became the go-to leader for problems that demanded results.

Most recently, he led the effort to eliminate DEI mandates from the Pentagon's personnel system, refocusing it on what matters: merit, unity, and mission readiness.

Colonel Litton never sought credit. He just did the job quietly, effectively, and always in the best interests of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for a lifetime of selfless service, and I wish him fair winds and Godspeed.

#### DEFENDING BLACK HISTORY

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the nine Black worshippers murdered at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina. June 17 marks the 10-year anniversary of that horrific act by a white supremacist.

Representative Wendell Gilliard has introduced a hate crime bill. It still hasn't been passed. We must pass it.

Today isn't just about remembering the Emanuel Nine. It is also about confronting the attacks on Black history. President Trump called the African-American history museum oppressive and gave Vice President VANCE the power to erase Black history.

Mr. Speaker, 44 States now are debating laws to limit the teaching of Black history. One Pennsylvania district even banned children's books about Rosa Parks and Dr. King.

As we honor the Emanuel Nine, we must stand up for teaching honest Black history. I think of my friend, Representative JA Moore, who lost his sister, Myra Thompson, today. His call is not just to remove symbols of hate but to dismantle the systems of hate that Dr. King talked about.

Let the Emanuel Nine inspire us today to teach honestly about Black history and confront the systems of hate.

#### D-DAY AND THE BEACHES OF NORMANDY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 81 years ago today, American troops, along with British and many others, stormed the beaches of Normandy.

They faced intense gunfire, landmines, and the real chance they wouldn't make it home. Actually, over 4,000 didn't, as witnessed by the beautiful cemetery that oversees those beaches in France.

Of course, it took grit, sacrifice, a deep belief, and an incredible assembly of materiel and the ability to keep it secret when all that machinery and materiel was assembled just above the White Cliffs of Dover in England.

If anyone has ever watched the movie "Saving Private Ryan," there are actual soldiers who were there at the time who say that that was one of the most accurate descriptions and depictions one would ever see of how nasty and how bad that was.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine that front door of that landing craft opening and the hail of gunfire that was put upon those guys? Yet, they went anyway because they were required to, because it was a duty, and because they had to turn back one of the greatest threats that the world had ever seen in what Nazi Germany had been foisting upon the world for 5 years up to that point.

We owe them so much.

As Captain Miller said toward the end of that movie to Private Ryan himself: "Earn this."

We all, as citizens, will remember this day on Memorial Day to be good citizens and to uphold what the Founders gave us with this country. We earned this.

#### OPPOSING FUNDING FOR MUSEUM

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to defend President Trump in one of his initial requests for next year's budget.

One of the goals of the Biden administration, of course, could destroy the country by having unfettered immigration, but also to divide America by groups. Part of that was when he passed one of his big bills, and he put in there an American Hispanic museum. This is consistent with the Democratic policy of trying to divide America.

Our motto put in place in 1782 was E Pluribus Unum, Out of Many, One. The Democrats are trying to teach people they should always walk around hanging on to where their ancestors came from.

President Trump is right not to fund a national Hispanic museum. The wonderful accomplishments of the Hispanic Americans can be placed in other museums, including the National Museum of American History, without having every group having their own separate museum.

□ 1100

#### AUTHORITARIANISM

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GREEN of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

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

rise, proud to be an American, proud of what this country stands for. I also rise as a person who is censured. I have been censured, but I have not been silenced.

I rise as an unbought, unbossed, unafraid, liberated Democrat. As such, I rise to speak on a topic today that I believe to be most important to the American people, most important to posterity, most important to the direction of the country, most important to who we are.

The topic is about Congress and why Congress is the court of last resort for an authoritarian President.

Let me start by saying this that I think is exceedingly important. There are many among us who would manage authoritarianism. They would want to find a way to work with it, to become a part of it if it benefits them, to make it something that is acceptable to many of the people in the classes and, perhaps, some of the people in the masses.

I am not one of the persons who would do this. I believe that authoritarianism, Mr. Speaker, must not be managed. It must be eliminated.

This country was founded upon the basic premise that it would be a democratic republic where you elect your Representatives to vote for you. This is a democracy. As such, in this democratic republic, I choose to stand and fight this movement toward authoritarianism. I stand to do so because the greatness of America is not going to be found among a very few who have power concentrated in their hands or in a single person who has power concentrated in his hands. That is not where the greatness of America is achieved.

The greatness of America is achieved by the people having the power and the people making the decisions; by having a Supreme Court that is respected, that is honored; by having a judiciary that is respected; by having a Congress that is respected; by avoiding what could become authoritarianism that metamorphoses into something even greater in harm to this country than the authoritarianism that we face today.

I rise to indicate that Congress is the court of last resort for an authoritarian President, and here is why. It is the court of last resort because when an authoritarian issues executive orders and expects them to be honored, even when the courts disagree; when an authoritarian believes that his orders supersede, supplant, if you will, the rule of law, supersede what has become commonplace in terms of understanding the rule of law in this country; when an authoritarian will defy Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, then we have to conclude that the Supreme Court may not be the court of last resort as it should be for an authoritarian President, someone who is assuming power that he should not assume with executive orders that cannot change the Constitution.

When we have a President who, by executive order, believes that he can remove people from the country without due process, and when this President is told that due process must be accorded people before he can take this extreme action, and when this President is told not only must there be due process, but if you believe that the court has made a ruling that is inappropriate, that the court has made a mistake, you must still honor that court order and appeal; that the appellate courts will then take charge of what you believe to be an incorrect decision by the courts.

When I see a President saying to the country that a court that has issued an order that he does not agree with but contends is inappropriate for various and sundry reasons, when I see that President say that the judge that issued that order should be impeached, you are now moving into authoritarianism.

When that President then sits with others in his Cabinet and they are caught on national TV indicating why they can defy the Federal court's orders, after having been told that they have to appeal, after having been told that they cannot do what they have done, after having been told that they have to facilitate the return of someone that they have improperly, and according to what members of this administration have said, removed from the country by mistake, then you have to bring that person the relief necessary for that person to raise his hand and say, You got the wrong person; for that person to say, I want my rights of due process under the law in this country.

We have a President who believes that his executive orders exceed and supersede the orders of Federal courts.

How do I know? I know because he has not returned a person to this country that he was told to facilitate the return of such that he could receive due process or just facilitate such that this person could get due process. It hasn't happened.

The lower courts have told him at the Federal level, the Supreme Court has told him, and the evidence now exists that he understands what facilitate means because there was a second person who was removed without due process, removed to another country without due process, and that person is being brought back because the judge in a Federal court said you have to facilitate the return.

They know what facilitate means. They are just being defiant. They are just ignoring the orders of the Federal courts.

□ 1110

They are flouting the orders of the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Make no mistake about it: We are now dealing with an authoritarian President who I choose not to manage. I choose to eliminate the

authoritarianism. I don't want us to try to find a way to get along with an authoritarian.

If the Supreme Court cannot manage this authoritarian President to the extent that he would cease and desist and obey the Court's orders and if an authoritarian President now has total control of the Republicans who represent this House and the Senate—total control of them—they are not going to be able to do anything because he manages their affairs.

They have become people who look for a sense of direction. He has become their North Star. He has become the means by which they conclude that they will go this way, or they will move in that direction.

They can't do anything because they have surrendered their sovereignty. They have surrendered their power to make judicious decisions to an authoritarian President. The Supreme Court can't stop him. The Republicans who control the House and Senate won't stop him. We have an authoritarian President.

When you have an authoritarian President, you do have a court of last resort: The Constitution. Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution makes it explicitly clear that we can impeach, and we can impeach for this type of behavior. It is not in these exact words. It uses language that we are all familiar with: "high crimes," "misdemeanors," "treason," or "bribery."

Yet, we have an authoritarian President who is defying the courts, who does not respect the separation of powers. We have an authoritarian President who would demean and minimize the role of the judiciary and our system of governance.

With such an authoritarian President, impeachment and this congressional court of last resort is within the power of all 435 Members of the House because the congressional court of last resort has to have a prosecutor. Any one of the 435 can become the prosecutor once you see that impeachable actions are taking place. Any one of us can become the prosecutor.

The prosecutor will have what we will have called the equivalent of a grand jury. That will be the rest of the Members of the House of Representatives, 435 of us. Some of us can act as prosecutors. It doesn't have to be one. It can be more than one. It can be many. It could be as many as would want to sign a resolution to impeach.

Impeachment and a congressional court of last resort is where we are now. This is the room where the congressional court of last resort would be convened, and it is convened here before a prosecutor, a Member of this august body. It is not known as a prosecutor, but I am saying it to you such that you can understand this process and see that it is akin to something else that you really do understand.

This prosecutor, this person, this Member of Congress will have to stand

and read these Articles of Impeachment. This is done now because, remember, the Supreme Court can't control this authoritarian President, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle won't control this authoritarian President. They have the power to, but they won't.

Mr. Speaker, impeachment and this congressional court of last resort, Congress is where the court of last resort lies.

I am familiar with impeachment. I understand the process. I want you to know that it is imminent. A vote takes place with this grand jury that I called to your attention, which would be the Members of Congress. We need but only a majority of the Members of Congress to vote in favor of impeachment, and a President can be removed from office. An authoritarian President can be removed from office.

If you don't like authoritarianism and you believe that you have an authoritarian President, then you would vote for the Articles of Impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, is there any proof that there are people who don't like authoritarianism and who would vote, in theory, for impeachment? Yes. Before the election that brought Donald John Trump to the Presidency this time, before he was sworn in by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, there were many among us—and I am one of the many—who talked about this very topic and who prognosticated this very behavior that we are seeing. It was not the exact behavior, but behavior that would be indicative of a person becoming an authoritarian.

There were some who said that he would be a fascist. There were some who said that he would be a dictator. The point is that there are many people who are Members of this House who made this prognostication. What is absolutely amazing is that many of them who made these prognostications and who have seen their prognostications become a reality may not vote to impeach.

I am going to give you what I believe is a rationale. I think this is a vote of conscience. People have to vote their conscience. If your conscience tells you no, then I think you should follow your conscience. I cannot, in good conscience, say the things that I have said about this authoritarian President, see it become a reality, and then take no action.

I cannot in good conscience, but there are people who can do this in good conscience. I have no ill feelings toward them. I don't count the votes. I count what is necessary to be done. It is necessary for us to take action to remove an authoritarian President from office.

The only way it can be done is right here in this Chamber. Someone has to act as a prosecutor and bring the Articles of Impeachment to the attention of this august body, at which time there would be a vote on these Articles of Impeachment. As some people will

vote to table, there is always going to be a vote to table.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues on the other side have alleged that this is a great thing. This is a great thing. We are going to have impeachment again. This is a great thing. Let them bring it on.

If you truly believe this, then you vote for the Articles of Impeachment. You vote against tabling because there will be a motion to table. Vote against tabling. All of my Republican colleagues who are saying this, you vote against tabling, and then see what the other side does since you are absolutely convinced that this is going to be a benefit to an authoritarian President.

It is not going to be a benefit. We will take that vote. Those who vote to table will be voting against the Articles of Impeachment. Those who vote against tabling will be voting for the Articles of Impeachment.

I said to you that I have some experience in dealing with this. I am the person who laid the foundation for President Donald John Trump's impeachment when he was impeached the first time around. I am using a personal pronoun only to communicate, but the truth is there were other persons who engaged in this process with me. I will tell you about these other persons.

I have here something that has been removed from the wall of my office. It is something that indicates who the persons were who participated favorably, meaning indicating that there should be an impeachment, when the first Articles of Impeachment were filed. This is on the wall in my office. The press assumed that it would be only AL GREEN. They were wrong. They may be right this time. It may just be only AL GREEN.

I will stand alone because when it is a question of conscience, it is better to stand alone than to not stand at all.

The press thought that there would be probably AL GREEN and maybe one or two others, which may be the case this time. Yet, believe me, it will not deter me.

What is interesting is that I have this on my wall. By the way, many of the people who are listed here as persons who supported H. Res. 646, many of the people who supported H. Res. 646, many of them who are listed here, they have a similar document in their offices, and they will have it on their coffee tables.

When people would come in, because this became such an important issue, they were proud to display this and say, yes, I voted to impeach. Yes, I did. That was important.

□ 1120

It is going to become important again. Make no mistake about it, it will be important again.

I am not going to name all the persons on this first article of a resolution for impeachment, but I will tell you that there were 58. They were known as the first 58.

There is one person who I will mention because I am proud and he was proud to have associated with these Articles of Impeachment. I remember talking to him right in this area about impeachment.

I will not divulge the entirety of the conversation, but I am proud to say this: The Honorable John Lewis has his name on these Articles of Impeachment—the Honorable John Lewis, the first 58.

The first 58 was not sufficient, and I knew that it wouldn't be. By the way, whenever I say "I," assume that I am saying "we" because there were persons who were engaged in helping me.

I knew that it would not be enough, and I knew that we would have to continue to build on this to generate a mass such that impeachment could no longer be ignored. Many of the people who were opposed to impeachment were making it clear that certain things would have to happen before there could be impeachment.

You would have to have bipartisan support for impeachment. You would have to have—well, let's just say certain things. If I say more, I will probably say enough that you will know who I am talking about, and I don't care to mention names at this time. If I am forced to, I will.

We moved forward with a second impeachment. This was H. Res. 705. Many Members of Congress had something similar to this in their offices. It could have been a very large display that would unfold, and it was on coffee tables. It was placed in various places in congressional offices.

I placed this on the wall in my congressional office, along with the other article that I just called to your attention. This was H. Res. 705.

It did not grow by what some would consider a very large number, but it did move to 66 Members of Congress with H. Res. 705.

The reason I know Members are in possession of these documents that I have called to your attention that were displayed is because I sent them to the Members. I sent Members a thank-you, as we customarily do here, and it was something that they could display in the office. I had many Members and many people say that it was a good idea.

Continuing, knowing that 66 was not enough, we brought articles before Congress again. This time, the number hit what I call critical mass. It caused people who were antithetical to the idea to embrace the idea.

By the way, I never thought that it had to be the exact articles that I presented. I never thought it had to be that, but I knew that there had to be impeachment, and these articles that I presented had to do very much with invidious discrimination, something I will say more about later.

This time, we had 95 people who supported the articles, H. Res. 498. What is important about H. Res. 498 is this. When you add the persons who supported H. Res. 498 with the persons who

supported the other articles, you then move beyond 100 people—well beyond 100 people who were supporting impeachment.

Some supported one set of articles and some did not, but then they supported another, so you have H. Res. 498 with 95 persons supporting the Articles of Impeachment.

There is but one solution to an authoritarian President who cannot be controlled by the Supreme Court because he flouts the orders of the Supreme Court, who won't be controlled by Members of his party because he has control over the party. There is but one solution. There is but one place where that solution can manifest itself, and that is the House of Representatives.

Congress has become the court of last resort for an authoritarian President. As such, I pledged to many before today and pledge to the Nation today that in this month, in this month, there will be a vote on the floor of this House, a vote to advance Articles of Impeachment this month. It is necessary, and it will be done.

I truly believe in what the country stands for. I know that it has not always lived up to the expectations written in the great documents that support what the country stands for. I know that it has not always lived up to these expectations, but I also know this. It is a country with due process, with free speech, with freedom of religion. It is a country where I can vote. It is a country where I can fight to make the difference so that it can live up to these great ideals expressed in these great documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution.

I am going to fight to maintain the right to fight. That is what this is all about. Not fighting in the sense that I am going to go out and harm someone, not fighting in the sense that I am going to use some means of using physicality. No, that is not what I am talking about.

I am going to fight with peaceful protests. I believe in peaceful protest. I do not in any way condone persons who go out and harm other people, and I have said as much.

Yes, I get all the backlash that others get when they say as much, but I absolutely will continue to say peaceful protest is the way to make change that can make the difference.

I can do it through peaceful protest, and I am going to do it. That is the kind of fighting I am talking about, peaceful protests.

I can also do it with litigation. We have protestation, litigation. I have signed on to many briefs, and I will continue to do so. Protestation, litigation, but we also have something else. We have legislation. That is what Articles of Impeachment are, legislation.

Protestation, absolutely, I will never give up my right to protest. I am going to fight to maintain that right to protest, protestation. Litigation, I believe in the court system. Then, of course, this whole notion of legislation.

These are the means by which we can make the difference. I assure my friends, my colleagues, persons, this is official notice. There will be a vote on articles to impeach Donald John Trump, who is now President of the United States.

I do it because conscience dictates that this be done, and it has become a moral imperative that we have to proceed with.

□ 1130

Now, I close with this. This is something that came to my attention just recently. There are people who believe, I think, that I will be intimidated. They believe that I will be intimidated.

Now, these are people—other than those who have already made their many threats that have not intimidated me, but there is a new movement afoot now to do what cannot be done, as they see it, fast enough through the electoral process, meaning my removal from office.

They don't think that the electoral process works efficaciously—effectively, if you will, for them. I was saying efficaciously, but let's just say effectively for them. The Governor of my State, while I am in trial currently defending the Ninth Congressional District—I have been in trial for many years, so this is nothing unusual to defend this district, to keep this district.

It has been difficult. Lots of money has been spent just fighting to maintain the Ninth Congressional District. The Governor of my State has now decided that it is appropriate, according to the sources that have called it to my attention, and many have. Many persons in the legislative body in the State of Texas have called this to my attention—has established what is called a redistricting commission or committee.

With this redistricting commission or committee, the Governor is going to try—I am being told—to draw the lines for these congressional districts so that it will be either difficult or impossible for me to get reelected.

Here is my message to those who would stoop to this level of political shenanigans, as I see it. Here is my message to you: The people who elected me are more important than my being reelected. I am going to stand up for the people who elected me. My re-election is not the issue. You can take me out. There will be another AL GREEN. There is always going to be one more.

The world seems to be put together such that there is always someone who will stand up. You can take me out, but you are not going to intimidate me. I am saying this to the Governor of the State of Texas: Do what you may. Redraw the lines such that I could never get reelected, but I guarantee you this, as long as I am here, I may be censured, but I won't be silenced.

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

## TEN RADICAL FAILED POLICIES OF GOVERNOR NEWSOM

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. KILEY of California was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this last week, a local newspaper published a letter to the editor claiming that by fighting against Governor Newsom's policies, I was not serving my constituents.

I very strongly disagree with that statement.

The fact is that we have a Governor whose policies have turned the greatest State in the country into the most popular State to leave.

We have a Governor who believes that because he has a supermajority in the legislature, he can run roughshod over the rights of Californians and continue to cause the quality of life in our State to decline.

Here in Congress, we have tools to fight back. I set out at the beginning of this year to use whatever tools are available to fight back against Governor Newsom's most harmful policies, and I believe that is precisely how I can best serve not only my constituents but all Californians and, indeed, all Americans because the Governor has himself said that his failed policies are "a model for the Nation."

I will go through the 10 areas, the 10 radical failed policies of Governor Newsom, which have prevailed in California that we set out to reverse, to fight to overturn or to, at least where we can, mitigate the harm.

I will give a progress report on where we are with respect to each of those 10 items.

Very quickly, the 10 are: Number one, crazy EV mandates; number two, free Medicaid for illegal immigrants; number three, out-of-control homelessness; number four, reckless crime policies; number five, the high-speed rail disaster; number six, the sanctuary State disgrace; number seven, failing public schools; number eight, manmade water shortages; number nine, catastrophic wildfires; and number 10, chaotic elections.

The good news is we have made significant progress when it comes to each of those 10 items.

When it comes to EV mandates, just about a week and a half ago, the Senate followed in the House's footsteps and passed my resolution to overturn Gavin Newsom's ban on gas-powered vehicles.

Any day now, President Trump will sign my resolution into law and Gavin Newsom's unworkable gas car ban, where he wanted to dictate what millions of Californians drive, will be reversed and Californians will be able to drive the car of their choice.

Not only that, we are reversing Newsom's EV mandate when it comes to trucks, and we have already seen the reversal of his mandates when it comes to trains, when it comes to buses, when