

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I commend their tireless efforts to supporting those affected by Alzheimer's and other dementias and to fighting this devastating illness.

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

□ 1230

BLOODY SUNDAY AND VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(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, and I rise, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of this august body some important information.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress ever to be evicted during a joint session of Congress. I have been censured, Mr. Speaker, but I have not been silenced.

Still I rise today to call to our attention some history associated with the Voting Rights Act and to bring to our attention how this Voting Rights Act has had a positive impact on our Nation, on this Congress, and, I would say, indirectly on the entire planet Earth.

A very important aspect of this Voting Rights Act is section 2. Section 2 had its genesis, as is the case with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, with Bloody Sunday. Bloody Sunday occurred in March 1965 at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

One of our Members, John Lewis, was there. In fact, he was a leader of this march on Bloody Sunday. As such, he informed us—I talked to him on more than one occasion about it—how they started the march at a church, how they approached the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and how, on approach to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they could see the bridge itself.

As they got more along the way, they could see that there were persons waiting for them. Some of these persons were on horseback. Others were not, but they were armed. These persons had intentions that were less than honorable.

They knew that the intentionality was less than honorable, yet they marched on, forward, knowing that this could become an unpleasant scene, that persons could be harmed.

They had been trained, and they had been lectured by Dr. King, who taught them how to engage in nonviolent, peaceful protest and how it is necessary to, when engaging in this protest, not engage in acts of violence because, in so doing, you can harm the actual protest movement itself.

They were there, unarmed, marching peacefully from Selma to Montgomery. After having been told by the officers that they must turn back and peacefully marched on, they were then beaten—clubs, men on horseback. They

were beaten all the way back to the church where they started.

The Honorable John Lewis reminded me that he thought he was going to die on that bridge, beaten all the way back to the church where they started.

This is what is important about Bloody Sunday, aside from many other things. There are many things important, but this is important. Bloody Sunday was a date that had some other circumstances that we don't often talk about.

I am just going to read something that will help us better understand why Bloody Sunday and this time in our history is so horrific, and it gave a President an opportunity to do something that, but for Bloody Sunday, he could not have done.

This is what I would like to read. Four deaths are directly attributed to the events of Selma to Montgomery marches: Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was shot by a State Trooper in February 1965 before the main march; James Reeb, a White minister, beaten in March 1965 after Bloody Sunday; Viola Liuzzo, a White civil rights activist, shot and killed in March 1965; and Jonathan Daniels, another White activist, shot and killed in August 1965 during a later demonstration related to the marches.

All of these things happened around Bloody Sunday, but Bloody Sunday afforded President Lyndon Johnson the opportunity to sign into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

My speculation is but for these horrific events and for the world having the opportunity to see the horrors of invidious discrimination, the horrors of segregation, the horrors associated with people who had hate in their hearts and were determined to prevent people of color from having the same rights that they enjoyed, meaning the people who were Anglos enjoyed—this Bloody Sunday is marked by violence, but it is also a mark in history that gave us the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was signed on August 6, 1965, by Lyndon Johnson. Here is what is important. When it was signed on August 6 in the 89th Congress, there were 6 Black Members of Congress—6, 5 Latinos, 4 Asians, a total of 15 persons of color that we could identify as such.

As of January 3, 2025, in this Congress, the 119th Congress, we have 68 Black persons, from 6 to 68; Latinos, from 5 in 1965 to 58; Asians, from 4 in 1965 to 24—a total of 150.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a good many of these 150 are currently at risk. If things continue as they are in Texas, then we are likely to lose a third or more of these 150 Members of Congress.

Let's talk about Texas for just a moment. In Texas, we have evidence and, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the Department of Jus-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION,
Washington, DC, July 7, 2025.

Hon. GREGORY ABBOTT,
Office of the Governor, Texas Capitol,
Austin, Texas.
Hon. KEN PAXTON,
Office of the Attorney General of Texas, Attention: Austin Kinghorn/Ryan Walters,
Austin, Texas.

DEAR GOVERNOR ABBOTT AND ATTORNEY GENERAL PAXTON: This letter will serve as formal notice by the Department of Justice to the State of Texas of serious concerns regarding the legality of four of Texas's congressional districts. As stated below, Congressional Districts TX-09, TX-18, TX-29 and TX-33 currently constitute unconstitutional "coalition districts" and we urge the State of Texas to rectify these race-based considerations from these specific districts.

In *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. 1, 45 (2023), Justice Kavanaugh noted that "even if Congress in 1982 could constitutionally authorize race-based redistricting under §2 for some period of time, the authority to conduct race-based redistricting cannot extend indefinitely into the future." 599 U.S. 1, (Kavanaugh, J., concurring). In *SFFA v. Harvard*, the Supreme Court reiterated that "deviation from the norm of equal treatment" on account of race "must be a temporary matter." 600 U.S. 181, 228 (2023). When race is the predominant factor above other traditional redistricting considerations including compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivision lines, the State of Texas must demonstrate a compelling state interest to survive strict scrutiny.

It is well established that so-called "coalition districts" run afoul of the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment. In *Petteway v. Galveston County*, No. 23-40582 (5th Cir. 2024), the en banc Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made it abundantly clear that "coalition districts" are not protected by the Voting Rights Act. This was a reversal of its previous decision in *Campos v. City of Baytown*, 840 F.2d 1240 (5th Cir. 1988). In *Petteway*, the Fifth Circuit aligned itself with the Supreme Court's decision in

Bartlett v. Strickland, 556 U.S. 1 (2009), and determined that a minority group must be geographically compact enough to constitute more than 50 percent of the voting population in a single-member district to be protected under the Voting Rights Act. See also *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986). Opportunity and coalition districts are premised on either the combining of two minority groups or a minority group with white crossover voting to meet the 50 percent threshold. Neither meets the first Gingles precondition. Thus, the racial gerrymandering of congressional districts is unconstitutional and must be rectified immediately by state legislatures.

It is the position of this Department that several Texas Congressional Districts constitute unconstitutional racial gerrymanders, under the logic and reasoning of *Petteway*. Specifically, the record indicates that TX-09 and TX-18 sort Houston voters along strict racial lines to create two coalition seats, while creating TX-29, a majority Hispanic district. Additionally, TX-33 is another racially-based coalition district that resulted from a federal court order years ago, yet the Texas Legislature drew TX-33 on the same lines in the 2021 redistricting. Therefore, TX-33 remains as a coalition district.

Although the State's interest when configuring these districts was to comply with Fifth Circuit precedent prior to the 2024 *Petteway* decision, that interest no longer exists. Post-*Petteway*, the Congressional Districts at issue are nothing more than

vestiges of an unconstitutional racially based gerrymandering past, which must be abandoned, and must now be corrected by Texas.

Please respond to this letter by July 7, 2025, and advise me of the State's intention to bring its current redistricting plans into compliance with the U.S. Constitution. If the State of Texas fails to rectify the racial gerrymandering of TX-09, TX-18, TX-29 and TX-33, the Attorney General reserves the right to seek legal action against the State, including without limitation under the 14th Amendment.

Respectfully,

HARMEET K. DHILLON,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

MICHAEL E. GATES,
Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the first is a letter from the Department of Justice. This letter from the Department of Justice is addressed to the Governor of the State of Texas, Governor Gregory Abbott. It is also addressed to Attorney General Ken Paxton. The letter is dated July 7, 2025.

The reference line is: "Unconstitutional Race-Based Congressional Districts Texas-09, Texas-18, Texas-29, and Texas-33."

It references unconstitutional race-based districts. This letter, dated July 7, has language indicating that if the State of Texas fails to rectify the racial gerrymandering of Texas-09, Texas-18, Texas-29, and Texas-33, the attorney general reserves the right to seek legal action against the State including, without limitation, under the 14th Amendment.

There is an accusation made against the State of Texas that the State of Texas engaged in unconstitutional race-based congressional district gerrymandering, I suppose, as this letter would indicate.

However, this letter, which has a July 7 date on it, requires the State of Texas attorney general or the Governor, or both, to respond by July 7. The letter is dated July 7, and the response is required. It says here: "Please respond to this letter by July 7, 2025, and advise me of the State's intention to bring its current redistricting plan into compliance with the U.S. Constitution."

Let's focus on these dates for just a second. The date of July 7, the date of the letter, and the request for the response is the same date. It can be said maybe this was a mistake and they meant to insert another date. It could also be a means by which we tell a person: Call me. Contact me right away. Contact me today. Contact me ASAP, as soon as possible.

I believe that there was a conversation that took place. I believe that that conversation is, in part, why we have the maps that we have today.

The attorney general for the State of Texas responded to the Justice Department. I include in the RECORD the letter from the attorney general.

KEN PAXTON,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,
Austin, TX, July 11, 2025.

Hon. HARMEET K. DHILLON,
Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Washington, DC.

DEAR ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL DHILLON: I am in receipt of your July 7, 2025, letter concerning Texas congressional districts and welcome a discussion both of the constitutionality of those districts, and how they can best serve Texans. I fully support Governor Abbott calling a special session for the Texas Legislature to conduct congressional redistricting to take advantage of recent changes to the legal and political landscape.

As you know, I have stood shoulder to shoulder with President Trump in fighting for the constitutional rights of Texans, and of all Americans. My office filed 107 lawsuits against the unconstitutional policies of the Biden-Harris Administration, setting the constitutional framework for opposing the liberal agenda including DEI, open borders, anti-gun hysteria, and transgender procedures forced on children. I also filed the landmark *Texas v. Pennsylvania* lawsuit and have vigorously defended one of the most comprehensive election integrity bills anywhere in the country. Nothing is more important to me or the office I am proud to lead than upholding the Constitution and combatting the left-wing assault on American values.

We agree that the time for race-based decisions in government is over. As Chief Justice Roberts wrote in *SFFA v. Harvard*, "Eliminating racial discrimination means eliminating all of it." 600 U.S. 181, 206 (2023). We also agree that Justice Kavanaugh has acknowledged temporal constraints on race-based decisions required under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. 1, 45 (2023) (Kavanaugh, J., concurring).

I am also keenly aware of the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Petteway v. Galveston County*, 111 F.4th 596 (5th Cir. 2024) (en banc). My office successfully briefed that case's implications for Texas congressional districts earlier this year. See First Amended Motion for Partial Judgment, *LULAC v. Abbott*, No. 3:21-cv-00259 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 15, 2025), ECF 848; see also Defendants' Brief Addressing the Effect of *Petteway*, id., ECF 815. Indeed, a coalition claim under the Voting Rights Act brought against Texas Congressional District 18 has been dismissed under *Petteway*. See Order Granting Motion to Dismiss, id., ECF 972; see also Response to Order Requiring Additional Briefing, id., ECF 917. Around the same time—which is to say, after the *Petteway* decision—your office dismissed all of its claims against Texas election districts. I agreed with your decision in that regard, and still do. I applaud your leadership and legal acumen in recognizing the futility of the claims brought against Texas under the Biden-Harris administration.

We also agree that, had the Texas legislature felt compelled under pre-*Petteway* strictures to create coalition districts, the basis for such decisions—as you say—"no longer exists." However, my office has just completed a four-week trial against various plaintiff groups concerning the constitutionality of Texas's congressional districts, as well as its State House and State Senate maps. The evidence at that trial was clear and unequivocal: the Texas legislature did not pass race-based electoral districts for any of those three political maps. Texas State Senator Joan Huffman, who chaired the Senate Redistricting Committee, testified under oath that she drew Texas districts blind to race, and sought to maximize Republican political advantage balanced

against traditional redistricting criteria. See, e.g., Tr. Jun. 7, 2025, PM Session at 33; Tr. Jun. 9, 1025, AM Session at 54. Dr. Sean Trende, renowned redistricting expert, testified on behalf of Texas that its electoral maps correlate more closely with partisan advantage than any racial consideration. See Tr. Jun. 9, 2025, AM Session at 67–177, id.

Finally, we agree that there have been substantial changes in the law since Texas drew its congressional districts in 2021. In the four short years since then, the Supreme Court has issued *Milligan*, *SFFA*, and *Alexander v. South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP*, 602 U.S. 1 (2024). At the same time, voting patterns in the state have undergone tremendous change, including—as you are certainly aware—Texas's historic support for President Trump in the 2024 Presidential Election.

The Texas Legislature has led the Nation in rejecting race-based decision-making in its redistricting process—it has drawn its current maps in conformance with traditional, non-racial redistricting criteria to ensure Texas continues to adopt policies that will truly Make America Great Again. As permitted by federal law, the congressional maps in 2021 were drawn on a partisan basis. See *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 588 U.S. 684 (2019).

For these reasons, I welcome continued dialogue about how Texas's electoral districts can best serve Texas voters without regard to outdated and unconstitutional racial considerations. My office stands ready to support President Trump, Governor Abbott, and the Texas Legislature in their redistricting goals and will defend any new maps passed from challenges by the radical Left.

Respectfully,

KEN PAXTON.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. It is addressed to the Justice Department, Civil Rights Division.

There is a part of this letter that addresses the allegation that Texas engaged in race-based gerrymandering.

There are two pages. The attorney general has in bold print, the only bold print on the pages, these words: "The Texas Legislature did not pass race-based electoral districts for any of" some three maps that are discussed in the letter, which includes the maps that are addressed by the Department of Justice. By the way, the President made the request that this be done.

The attorney general for the State of Texas said, no, they don't do business like that. They don't draw lines to benefit people of color. They draw their lines to gain some partisan advantage.

Let me read just a little bit more of what it says in this one paragraph. It says: The evidence at the trial—there was a trial concerning the maps that the Justice Department is referencing.

"The evidence at that trial was clear and unequivocal. The Texas Legislature did not pass race-based electoral districts for any of those three political maps."

Texas State Senator Joan Huffman, who chaired the Senate Committee on Redistricting, testified under oath that she drew Texas districts blind to race.

Remember the Justice Department said Texas needs to redraw these lines. The exact words are unconstitutional race-based congressional districts.

The attorney general goes on to say: "Huffman, who chaired the Senate

Committee on Redistricting, testified under oath that she drew Texas districts blind to race."

I am a part of this trial that is referenced here. I have been litigating against the State of Texas most of the time that I have been in Congress. I am protecting the Ninth Congressional District and 18th Congressional District.

Some things bear repeating. "Huffman, who chaired the Senate Committee on Redistricting, testified under oath that she drew Texas districts blind to race, and sought to maximize Republican political advantage balanced against traditional redistricting criteria."

As evidenced in this letter from the attorney general for the State of Texas to the Justice Department, she is saying she didn't do that. The reason that they are asking us to draw these lines is just not there. It doesn't exist. We don't do business like that in Texas.

In fact, this is true because it is the State of Texas that had White-only primaries. Yes, in the State of Texas, if someone was a person of color, at one point in the history of the State of Texas, they could not vote in the primary election simply because of the color of their skin.

That is a kind of hate for those who may not have analyzed this to the extent that I have. That is a kind of hate. We call that racism. Racism is a form of hate where we just don't like people because they show up with the wrong complexion. That is Texas. By the way, that is my State.

In Texas, persons could not vote because they were of color. They could not vote in the primary. The primary would decide the winner of the election. If someone couldn't vote in the primary, they didn't have a choice as to who would ultimately be the victor and become the representative.

This case went all the way to the Supreme Court as it relates to Texas. Mr. Lonnie Smith, a dentist in Houston, Texas, took this case involving all-White primaries all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

The Supreme Court ruled that Texas could not have all-White primaries. Texas immediately responded. They agreed with the Supreme Court. There should not be any more all-White primaries.

□ 1250

Texas concluded that the just thing to do—and I say just, I don't know that these words were ever used, but I assume that they were acting with some sense in a belief of justice or injustice. The Texas governing body decided that since we can't have all-White primaries, then we will have all-White pre-primaries.

The State of Texas decided to have all-White pre-primaries, and, again, people of color could not vote in those primaries. He went back to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said:

Texas, we just told you that you can't have all-White primaries. So now we tell you that you can't have all-White pre-primaries.

I call this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because it is important to understand that Texas has a shameful, sinful history of thwarting the efforts of people of color to vote. They have a shameful, sinful history.

This is why section 2 of the Voting Rights Act was so important, because it addressed that shameful, sinful history such as to prevent Texas from doing what the Justice Department alleges Texas did and what the Texas Attorney General said: No, we didn't do that. We don't draw lines like that.

Texas proceeded to honor the request of the United States Justice Department and proceeded to honor the request that it said was unlawful. In a sense it was an unlawful request because Texas hadn't gerrymandered to benefit people of color, Texas was gerrymandering to gain partisan advantage.

Moving on to the drafting of the lines. The Governor of the State of Texas called a special session to draft lines. It is said to draft lines, to have this redistricting, this actual gerrymandering, to take place. Some brave, bold, and courageous members of the Texas Statehouse understood the rules and knew that if Texas could not get two-thirds of the body present, then they could not move forward and conduct this type of business. That would necessitate having 100 persons present. They left with enough such that Texas could not acquire the 100 persons.

They were bold, brave, and courageous because they have families that have to be taken care of. They have obligations, and they have bills that have to be paid. They have to look out for themselves and others.

In so doing, they put a lot at risk. They were fined \$500 per day for each day they were away. There were threats made to remove them from committees, all sorts of threats, but they weathered all of those storms, those storms that included threats and fines.

The special session ended without the maps being adopted. However, in the second special session, the Governor prevailed and the maps were presented. They were voted on, and they are now the law of the State of Texas.

These maps are maps that were drawn pursuant to this letter from the Attorney General by—well, the Attorney General's name is not on the letter, so let me not confuse anyone. There is another name on the letter. There is Attorney Dhillon and Attorney Gates.

These two letters, which are in contradiction with each other, the Attorney General's Office for the Justice Department having indicated that lines were drawn to benefit people of color and the State of Texas saying: No, we didn't do that.

Now we have these maps, and we are litigating. We want to prove that the

State of Texas has again violated the Voting Rights Act as it has done in each decade that the Voting Rights Act has been in effect. It violated it. We want to prove that this is another violation.

Here is the difficulty: The only way to prove it is enough evidence—I think this is the evidence we need.

I was there when a person testified at great length that this was being done for political reasons.

Now, the disadvantage that we would have but for these letters—and some other evidence that I shall not go into—the disadvantage that we would have if not but for this would be that we would have to somehow get that person to confess: No, I didn't really draw it for political advantage. I did it for racial reasons.

That is not likely to happen. That is the position that we are being put in by having section 5 of the Voting Rights Act eviscerated and by having section 2 now being eviscerated. We are losing that which helped us acquire these 150 persons whom I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, who are a part of Congress now, as opposed to the 15 who were there when the Voting Rights Act was signed into law in 1965.

So we are going to be put in a position where unless we can find some way to get into a person's head, we are not going to be able to prevail with this kind of litigation.

This Supreme Court has done this country a disservice with these latest rulings. This Supreme Court is well aware, these persons are all aware of the history. They know that this Voting Rights Act of 1965, while it was signed with the ink—the ink of a pen in the hand of President Johnson, it was written with the blood of people at the Edmund Pettus Bridge, the blood of people who died in the days before and after. It was written in blood. Yet they would overlook that part of the history, fast-forward to today, and it seems that they are now about to eliminate section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

This means that if Texas prevails with these maps and can remove five people simply because a President says that those five belong to me—I think he may have used the personal pronoun of me, as opposed to indicating that these maps belong to the people of these districts, but he claims them as his own and that they should belong to him, which means he can then use them to maintain power and dominance over the Congress and dominance over the Senate and Supreme Court that has a conservative majority that seems to favor much of what he does.

He believes, and he is moving forward. We are moving forward in court. One would say that this can be resolved, and as a result of it being resolved, if you are right, Congressman GREEN, and you can have this proof that you have presented, perhaps you

would prevail with some sort of injunctive relief that would keep these maps from going into effect.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I am the guy who has been litigating against the State of Texas most of the time that I have been in Congress. That is an estimate. It could be a little bit less, but I have been there fighting for the Ninth and 18th Congressional Districts.

The courts don't generally do this. They don't provide that injunctive relief. They give deference to the State legislators because they are charged with the responsibility of drawing the maps, so they give them sort of the benefit of the doubt as it were, and they go on to allow us to litigate. We have been litigating against the last maps for more than 2 years. El Paso, Texas, I have been there to testify. As such, litigating against it, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if things go as they have gone, and I pray that they won't, it will be another 2 years before we get an answer. These lines that have been put in place will remain, and as a result, other States will try to respond as best as they can to maintain some sort of equilibrium.

□ 1300

California is responding to what Texas is doing. California did not initiate; California is responding. This would not be occurring in California—this effort to redistrict in an equitable way to offset what is happening in Texas wouldn't be taking place but for what is happening in Texas.

Those who would contend that California is initiating this, they are entirely wrong. Texas initiated; California is responding.

Texas is going after five seats. If California can produce five additional seats on the Democratic side, as opposed to the five that are produced on the Republican side, then we are still at equilibrium, where we are now.

That is not good enough for the President. The President has his eye on Missouri. There is an African-American seat in Missouri that the President is eyeing, as it were, a President who believes that all of this is just fair for him to maintain power.

They will go after Missouri. They are likely to try to get something done in another State, perhaps Indiana, and it goes on.

Rather than compete and redistrict at the end of a decade, this mid-decade redistricting is a way of cheating rather than competing. You can compete with the lines we have and wait until we get the empirical evidence necessary to redistrict, or you can cheat now and steal congressional seats so that you can maintain power, but you are doing it in a race-based way, which is unconstitutional. Proving it can be difficult. If you look at the seats that are vulnerable, the seat in Missouri is a person of color. The seats in Texas identified were held by people of color. The seat in Indiana, one of them could conceivably be a person of color.

This is racism. Racism is still alive and well. There is a tragedy associated with racism as it relates to trying to prove it. One I have already called to your attention, getting people to confess. If you commit a racist act, you are not likely to confess that you have done it. Every now and then miracles happen, but not likely.

Here is the other side of racism. Currently, in this country, when racism rears its ugly head, if you do as I am doing and you say that is racism, if you stand up and say it and stand up against racism, you become persona non grata.

Racism cannot be used against racism. What do I mean by that? Let me restate that. You cannot use language that identifies racism to identify it and attack it. You can't because when you do, people know that you become persona non grata. You can't say: This is racism.

You are left without the defense of identifying racism when you want to assault racism. We should be able to assault it. We should be able to attack it. You can't do it because when you do, the status quo across the media and many persons who can make a difference will reject what you are doing simply because you are saying this is racist. That is the case.

It is not like anti-Semitism. There is a big movement to eliminate anti-Semitism in the country, but when it comes to racism, we want to manage racism and eliminate anti-Semitism. We need to eliminate both.

Where is the movement, Mr. President, to eliminate the racism in lending in this country? It does exist. Racism in lending exists in the United States of America, and it can be proven. It could be proven with a methodology known as testing. We can test. We can send people out of different hues to get loans, and we can find, as we have found, that persons of color who are more qualified are less likely to acquire the same interest rate, a good interest rate, as I shall say for our purposes—less likely to get a good interest rate, less likely to get as much money as a person who is Anglo and less qualified.

In this country, there is this White privilege that nobody can talk about. A few of us will, but you become persona non grata when you talk about White privilege.

It exists in lending. It also exists when you are ready to buy a home or rent a place, rent a home. White privilege exists in this country. Unfortunately, we are not allowed to address it. People don't want to hear it. It is okay to talk about anti-Semitism but not about racism.

Let me explain why. When you address anti-Semitism, you are looking into the window of life. You are looking into someone else's backyard in another country. When you address racism, you are looking into the mirror of life and see the reflection of your own deeds. These are the deeds that we

don't want to confront. These are the deeds that cause people of color to be able to sometimes get loans that are equal to their contemporaries who are White, but a good deal of the time, they do not. Those are car loans. They are loans for homes. They are just loans in general. These are statements that can be proven with empirical evidence.

I was the chairperson of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations for the Financial Services Committee, and we have looked into these things. I can give an assurance that if we do it again today—let's erase the past. Let's do it again today. Oh, but we can't do it because this House won't allow that. This House will not allow us to acquire the empirical evidence. We can't do that testing with this House.

We go back to where we were in 1965 at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. So much changed as a result of the lives that were lost and Bloody Sunday. So much is changing now to revert back to that time when persons of color had difficulty voting and difficulty winning office because there is still hate in the hearts of many Americans.

They are not going to confess, but the evidence is there when you do the testing, when you look into the loans and lending, when you look into houses being sold, where they are being sold, and to whom they are being sold. The evidence is there.

We have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation in this Congress to talk about these things. More importantly, we have a responsibility to do something about them. We are not doing very much in this Congress to fight racism. We have done a lot to fight anti-Semitism.

By the way, I am against anti-Semitism. I am going to fight it. I am going to stand up against it. I would just like for a good many of those people who insist on fighting anti-Semitism to be as vocal about fighting racism. I don't see it. I don't see it.

□ 1310

When we have a judiciary that can't seem to control the President because of some theory associated with a unitary Presidency, meaning that the President has the authority to just fire and hire anybody who he wants—we will find out whether he can do that with the Fed soon—but when you have that and then you have a Congress who will do nothing except differ with him until it is time to vote, you then have a judiciary that can't do anything and a Congress that won't do anything, then what is left?

Two things are left. The first is something that this President doesn't like. He doesn't like it. They pretend, oh, wow, there goes impeachment again, but they are preparing to prevent it by stealing votes and by stealing congressional seats. That is what is happening in Texas.

They really don't want this impeachment again. He is already a twice-impeached President and 34 times a felon.

They don't want this. Yet, we are still in the countdown to impeachment. This is one of the remedies that we have. It is probably the only one that we have currently that we can impose upon the Congress for a vote; it is impeachment.

The other remedy is one that belongs to this country and has been here since, probably, before the arrival of the pilgrims at Plymouth Rock; the farmers coming to Washington, D.C., with their tractors to protest what was happening to their land; and Dr. King's famous speech on The Mall where he gave his "I Have a Dream" message, and that is we the people. That is why I wear this necktie. It is my favorite tie. It is one of my favorites, I should say.

We the people. We the people protest. Protestation is a part of the fiber and fabric of this Nation. When we can't prevail with all else and we have an authoritarian President, then we the people will have the last word.

I was honored to participate in a march just this week. We the people, hundreds of people, marched from over at Union Station through the Capitol. We the people.

Nobody was arrested. The building was not assaulted. We the people just engaged in peaceful protest. People were very vocal with their language. Yes, there was profanity that was used by some of the persons, we the people. That is not unusual at marches, by the way, but it was peaceful. It was non-violent.

A couple of names. Jessica was there. She gave an awesome message. We had others there who gave messages, as well. My point is this as it relates to the march: That is a part of the reaction that we the people can have to let the status quo know that we are not happy and that we are not satisfied with what is happening.

Here is the thing that concerns me about this march and future marches: When they are peaceful and people protest in a nonviolent way, you don't get as much coverage as you do if you do something that breaks the law. Then the entire march is painted as one of being violent because a few people might do something that is contrary to the law. A few people, and then the entire march: They were violently protesting.

Yet, when you do it and you have hundreds of people marching, protesting peacefully, very little coverage. Very little coverage.

I greatly regret that the status-quo media chooses not to allow the marches that are peaceful to receive the same coverage as the marches wherein violence takes place or some breach of the law takes place.

I assure you that the countdown to impeachment is on. We have laid the foundation previously for impeachment, and we will lay it again. We will lay it again. The countdown to impeachment continues.

The Edmund Pettus Bridge and Bloody Sunday—I am in Congress

today because of Bloody Sunday. I owe it to the lives who were lost to bring impeachment against this President. I owe it to them. Those who cannot say "impeachment" and who cannot say "racism," all I ask of you is: Let me do it for you. I will do it for you. Just let me do it for you, and you continue to do the good things that you are doing.

We shall overcome, and we shall impeach this President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FACTS AND MATH

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I missed all of you now that we are back. I get teased back home of doing these things that seem more like an economics lecture. That is actually not the goal here. It is actually just to sort of walk through the reality of the math because so much of this body is about theater and not about facts.

As my wife a decade ago said: David, you get to go and hang out in a math-free zone.

Let's have some fun with facts and math.

Mr. Speaker, next year, the 2026 fiscal year, 3 weeks away, take a guess: For every dollar of tax collections—for every dollar of tax collections we get next year, what are we going to spend?

For every dollar of tax collections we take in next year, we are going to spend \$1.43. This one number right here should scare the hell out of people. Instead, the hallways around here are full of people demanding more spending. Just a little while ago in my office there were more people saying: Can you get us a grant? Can you get us more money? Can you regulate our competition?

For every dollar of tax collections this year—we still have 3 more weeks before the fiscal year is over—my estimate is that we are going to spend \$1.39. Next year, it is \$1.43.

How long do you intend for this to go on?

Here is your problem: Most of that increase in spending is not some sort of crazy this or crazy that. It is interest. Remember, interest rates are up. We still have to finance about \$10 trillion of refinance this year, and we are going to bring about \$2.4 trillion or \$2.3 trillion in total new debt this year.

Next year, the baseline was we are going to borrow \$2.5 trillion. It is probably going to be less \$300 billion because of customs duties, tariffs. Yet, here is something I beg of everyone. Whether you are on the left or the right, burn this into your psyche: We borrow about \$70,000 to \$72,000 every

second, and almost all of the growth in that borrowing is interest and healthcare costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Forgive me. I enjoy tormenting you. I don't mean to.

Think of this: In 7 years, the Social Security trust fund is empty. Under the law—under the law, grandma takes a 24 percent cut in her check. In 7 years, we double senior poverty in America.

□ 1320

Yet, if you are an idiot like I am, and you get up and say: We really should work on this. The Democrat consultants are going to beat the crap out of a Republican and vice versa for even mentioning the fact about the math. It is not Republican math. It is not Democrat math. It is in the Social Security actuary report.

In 7 years, the Medicare trust fund is empty. If you are running a hospital or one of these where the part A trust fund is your revenue source, you get an 11 percent cut. In 7 years.

This year, we are going to spend \$1 trillion on Medicare. In 7 years, we spend \$2 trillion. It doubles in 7 years. It is demographics. It is not personal. It is not Republican-Democrat. It is what we are as a society.

We have the same number of 18-year-olds today as we had 20 years ago, but we have double the number of our brothers and sisters who are 65. It is math.

Behind these microphones this week, how many people have come up and actually talked about math, about the demographics, about the economic future? I would argue that understanding the math is moral. Is it moral to look the other way and in 7 years double senior poverty?

Yet, you will get the living crap kicked out of you around here if you actually tell the truth about the math because we have spent so many decades lying to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have this board I have used for a while. It was saying that right now we are borrowing \$6 billion a day. I apologize. This number is wrong. We are borrowing \$6.5 billion dollars a day, and there is the theatric problem.

You get people saying: I am going to save a couple hundred million dollars. That is wonderful. Let's see. If I am doing \$6.5 billion a day, that is almost \$270 million an hour. There is the fraud around here. It is the inability to understand the scale of what is going on.

Let's understand that borrowing is a tax. It is a tax paid for in the future with your retirement, my kids, but it is a tax paid with interest.

We have a society who so desperately wants free stuff. They want money. The 100 times I have come behind this microphone and show the charts saying, I want every dime of my Social Security. Of course. Of course. Most people don't realize the Social Security formula actually is progressive. If you are a high-income earner, you get less