

□ 1120

## CENSURED BUT NOT SILENCED

(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 now to proudly yield to a person with great honor and integrity. She is a Member of this Congress who has been on the right side of righteousness. She is a Member of this Congress who stands for those who are among the least, the last, and the lost. She hails from the 14th Congressional District in the great State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

## THE KIRK RESOLUTION AND POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for yielding to me.

Today the Republican House majority brought to the floor a resolution honoring the life and legacy of Charlie Kirk.

Charlie Kirk's assassination was a horrific and vile attack. It was an incident of political violence, and condemning the depravity of Kirk's brutal murder is a straightforward matter. It is one that is especially important to help stabilize an increasingly unsafe and volatile political environment where everyday people feel more at risk.

We can deeply disagree and come together as a country to denounce the horror of this killing, and it is not a license for the abuse of power and whitewashing of American history.

Today's resolution only underscores the majority's recklessness by choosing to offer this condemnation and honoring on a purely partisan basis, instead of uniting Congress in this tragedy with one of the many bipartisan options to condemn political violence in Kirk's murder as we did with the late Melissa Hortman. Instead, the majority proceeded with a resolution that brings great pain to the millions of Americans who endured segregation, Jim Crow, and the legacy of bigotry today.

We should be clear about who Charlie Kirk was. He was a man who believed that the Civil Rights Act that granted Black Americans the right to vote was a mistake, who after the violent attack on Paul Pelosi claimed that "some amazing patriot" should bail out his brutal assailant, and accused Jews of controlling "not just the colleges, it is the nonprofits, it is the movies, it is Hollywood, it is all of it."

His rhetoric and beliefs were ignorant, uneducated, and sought to disenfranchise millions of Americans, far from the "working tirelessly to promote unity" asserted by the majority in this resolution.

It is equally important that Congress does unite to reject the government's attempt to weaponize this moment

into an all-out assault on free speech across the country all in the name of Charlie Kirk.

President Trump and the FCC are now cynically threatening to shut down ABC and any outlets that gives airtime to the administration's political critics.

This is a disgusting attack on the American people and the very First Amendment rights that define us as a country. It is also the ABC corporation's responsibility to refuse to embolden and participate in this corruption and escalation of censorship.

We continue to pray for Mr. Kirk's family and loved ones in the wake of this terrible act. I am thinking especially of his children and his wife whose grief cannot be measured.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I bid the gentlewoman a good day, and we will proceed now, Mr. Speaker, again.

And still I rise.

And I rise today, Mr. Speaker, with the notion in mind that what I have stood for I still stand for. What I have stood for I still stand for. It wasn't that long ago, Mr. Speaker, that I stood right over to my right, the seat next to the aisle. Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States of America was here for a joint session of Congress, the President of the United States of America indicated that he had a mandate.

I, with a degree of spontaneity, Mr. Speaker, from right over there, the second seat from the aisle, collected my portable items and was about to make my departure. I traversed up to the doors and made my exit as a means of protesting what the President was saying.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I did this, I became overwhelmed with just the notion that something was going to happen very ugly and it would be something that would hurt people who are on Medicaid and Medicare. I also brought up Social Security when I spoke, but these are the things that I was overwhelmed with. As a result of understanding what was about to happen and knowing that the committee with jurisdiction over Medicaid had a mandate to cut more than \$800 billion, I was overwhelmed, Mr. Speaker. I did rise to my feet, and I did say to the President: You have no mandate to cut Medicaid.

My colleagues across the aisle became very rambunctious and decided that what I was saying did not merit being heard, so they performed very loudly. I am not angry with them. They performed loudly. I wanted to make sure that the President heard my statement, and I repeated myself and added Medicare and Social Security.

My colleagues continued, and I continued.

I was evicted, and I was later on censured, censured but not silenced. Yes, I stand today where I stood then. Censured but not silent I stand today where I stood then. It is best captured in this photo that depicts what occurred: censured not silenced.

So I stand today where I stood then, and I stand today where I stood then because there is a CR that has been brought before this House, and if I had voted for that CR, then I would legitimize what I stood against.

I refuse to legitimize what I stood against when I said: You don't have a mandate to cut Medicaid, Medicare, and I introduced Social Security into the equation.

That is what this was about for me, today. The question was whether I would stand where I stood then or whether I would now agree that what was done then is something that I condone now. I condemned what happened then. My mind has not changed. The people who will suffer will still suffer.

Mr. Speaker, why would I now decide that I am going to bless, if you will, condone, a CR that continues what happened, when my Republican colleagues did what they thought was right, I assumed, and passed the legislation without the help of Democrats?

If you can pass the initial legislation without the help of Democrats, Mr. Speaker, then why do you want me to join in your CR?

Pass this without my help.

Censured but not silenced. I stand now where I stood then. I went out, and I addressed the press. I didn't go out to address the press, the press asked and appealed to me to come over. I was making my way to my home where I could watch the rest of the joint session of Congress, but I went over to the press, and I said to them what I said to the President. I am on record.

Why would I now decide that I somehow conclude that what was done to Medicaid and Medicare is somehow something that I would now condone?

I have said, and I continue to say that this piece of legislation that was passed—not the CR, but the original legislation, that one big, ugly steal of a bill—this piece of legislation as it continues to develop is going to hurt people on Medicaid. If you live long enough, Mr. Speaker, you are going to need Medicaid because if you live long enough, then you are going to need some sort of long-term healthcare if you are fortunate enough, and you are going to get that from Medicaid.

I refuse to change my position. I stand now where I stood then, and I believe that what we are doing is the greatest cut in healthcare history. It is the greatest cut in healthcare ever.

□ 1130

All we are trying to do as Democrats, or at least this one Democrat—I don't speak for the Democratic Party. I speak for myself and everybody who agrees with me.

What we are trying to do is to protect Medicare. That is all that CR is about for me. It is about a lot of other things as well, but I am trying to protect Medicare as I tried at the joint session of Congress. I am going to stand where I stood then.

I am proud to tell you that Democrats have produced some documents

that encapsulate—that are terse but very much substantive in terms of what this appeal is all about. The style of it is: What are the elements of the Republican healthcare crisis?

There is a healthcare crisis. The Democratic Party has passed this on to me. I want to give them full credit for it. I am going to adopt it as my own, but I did not produce it.

It says here—this is a part of the crisis—slashing Medicaid with the largest cut in history. I said that. I am repeating myself. Some things bear repeating. Slashing Medicaid with the largest cut in history. I can't condone that. If I had voted for this CR, that is what I would be doing. You passed it without my help before. Why would you expect me to support it now? I want to change that. I am not a status quo politician.

Next point: dramatically raises premiums, copays, and deductibles for tens of millions of Americans. There are people who are living on the margins, barely capable of affording healthcare, and this legislation is going to make it impossible for some of them to afford healthcare. These premiums and copays and deductibles are going to go up for a good many people who can't afford them. We are trying to change that, or I am. I support this.

It goes on to say: forcing hospitals and community health centers across the Nation to close. That is no joke. People are starting to see it. They are starting to express their consternation. They are starting to let the people know that somehow this must not happen. They want to change it. If they want to change it, why would I vote to continue it? I refuse to change my position. I stand now where I stood then.

It goes on to indicate: setting in motion \$536 billion in cuts to Medicaid. Mr. Speaker, that sums it up.

I stand now where I stood then. I am a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbosomed, unafraid, censured, not silenced. I stand for the people I have been faithful to in my congressional district. I am going to be faithful to them until the very end, wherever and whenever that occurs. I stand for what is best to help them through these turbulent times and the crisis that the GOP healthcare initiatives have introduced to people who are in need of healthcare.

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. This is the richest country in the world. We cannot allow healthcare to become wealth care. We also cannot allow healthcare to line the pockets of the wealthy. That is another form of wealth care, healthcare to become wealth care for the wealthy.

The cuts are going to line the pockets of the very wealthy in this country. That has been published. It has been accepted, it seems, by all or a good many except me. I don't accept that. I refuse to allow healthcare to become wealth care and do it in the sense that it becomes the wealthy who benefit the most from the cuts that are taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I stand now where I stood then, censured but not silenced.

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 19, 2025.

I hereby designate the period from Friday, September 19, 2025, through Sunday, September 28, 2025, as a "district work period" under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION COMPROMISE

(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, the House has just voted to pass a continuing resolution that is now going over to the Senate with the Democratic leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, pledging that his caucus will be united against it, barrelling us toward a potential government shutdown that would very much not be in the interests of anyone and would be terrible for the country as a whole.

The minority leader in the Senate has not been abundantly clear as to what exactly he is looking for in order to avoid this outcome. After all, we are dealing with a so-called clean CR, which simply extends funding levels as they have been for quite some time now. This is really not the way things should be done, by the way, but that is where we are, and it is the only proposal on the table for avoiding such a shutdown.

I have a thought on how this whole terrible outcome can potentially be avoided in a way that would satisfy Members on both sides of the aisle and keep the government open, which is to include in the continuing resolution language that will preserve the congressional maps in every State in the country as they existed at the time of the 2024 election.

I have proposed legislation myself along those lines to stop this horrible redistricting war that we see playing out across the country that is bad for representative government and is widely opposed by Members of the Democratic Caucus and Republican Conference in the House.

That is my proposal to avoid a shutdown, to give the minority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, in the Senate, something that he can claim he delivered that would help members of at least the Democratic Caucus here in the House. We simply reach a deal where we are going to say we are going to

stop this redistricting war; we are not going to be upending maps in the middle of a decade.

This could be done easily. It could be put into the continuing resolution that the House just sent over to the Senate. Here are the two main virtues of this proposal.

□ 1140

Number one, the proposal is widely supported by the American people, 66 percent to 23 percent. The American people say that we should not be engaging in redistricting mid-decade. That is according to a recent Noble Insights poll.

Mr. Speaker, by a 3-to-1 margin, Americans support the legislation that I have proposed and support the idea that we should not be throwing out congressional maps, upending districts, and dis severing the connection between voters and their Representatives in the middle of the decade.

Not only do the American people support this proposal, but Members of the House on both sides of the aisle do. How do we know that? On the Democratic side, you just had a number of Members of the House who announced their own bill to get rid of mid-decade redistricting.

On the Republican side, I have had Members come up to me every day saying that what I am proposing is the right thing for them, the right thing for their districts, the right thing for their States, and the right thing for the country.

The only thing that is stopping us from moving forward on this common-sense proposal is the refusal on the part of the Speaker of the House to put on the floor a piece of legislation that is widely supported by Members of the House and by the American people.

The ball is now in the Senate's court when it comes to government funding, and I am absolutely opposed to a government shutdown. That is why I supported the stopgap funding measure today, even though I don't think it should have come to this.

Now, the Senate has an opportunity to negotiate a compromise that will keep the House open. That has to, by its very nature, be bipartisan, given the rules of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that a way to do that that would be in the interests of everyone here in this institution would be to reach an agreement that keeps the government open; that provides us some runway to actually pass a budget, which we should have done a long time ago; and that will stop this chaos of upending one district after another in State after State from cascading across the country.

UPDATE ON PROPOSITION 50

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide an update on Proposition 50 that is set for a vote in California, otherwise known as Gavin Newsom's redistricting sham.

This is a proposal by the Governor to tear up the map drawn by California's