

our families can put food on the table, and that the next generation can continue the traditions that define who we are as a State.

That is why I am standing here on the House floor today, to stand with our ranchers and farmers.

DEADLY IMMIGRATION POLICIES

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the people's House today to bear witness to the dehumanizing, destabilizing, and deadly immigration policies of the Trump administration.

Pierre Damas Bel should be alive today. Instead, his family, friends, and community are mourning the tragic death of a young man who had his whole life ahead of him.

Pierre was an honor student, captain of his high school soccer team, and a lieutenant in the ROTC program. He wanted to serve the United States, but after losing his temporary protected status and being held in an ICE ankle monitor, his family says he experienced deep humiliation, fear, and despair. Children started picking on him at school for wearing an ICE monitor because they had lost their temporary protected status.

Pierre's death did not begin with that monitor. It began with a campaign to demonize Haitians, from the racist lies that our neighbors were eating people's pets in Ohio to unjustly—and against the congressional intent of TPS—ending protection for roughly 350,000 Haitians who have lived and worked lawfully in this country.

I have opposed these policies, Mr. Speaker, from the start because this is not an immigration that puts America first. It is cruelty. Mr. Speaker, we mourn the loss of young Pierre.

□ 1110

PEACEFUL PROTEST REGARDING GAZA IS UNDER ATTACK

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, and for this one moment, I have a very terse and laconic message. For this one moment I would simply say: If you cannot peacefully protest the genocide that took place in Gaza, if you cannot peacefully protest this, what can you peacefully protest under the Constitution of the United States of America?

I voted against this effort to prevent people from peacefully protesting what they see as an injustice.

What took place in Gaza was collective punishment. It was ethnic cleansing, and it was genocide. In this country, the Constitution allows one to peacefully protest such injustices.

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 3, 2026

I hereby designate the period from Thursday, September 3, 2026, through Sunday, September 13, 2026, as a "district work period" under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF ICE AND CBP

(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 as I always do, as an unbought, unbossed, liberated, and now emancipated, unelected Democrat.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in the name of justice for the victims of persons who have died at the hands of the Federal constabulary. That would be ICE and CBP.

I rise in the name of justice for these many persons, and I do so, Mr. Speaker, because Dr. King was correct: "Injustice anywhere is indeed a threat to justice everywhere." So I rise in the name of preventing justice from becoming an injustice in your town, Mr. Speaker, or my town or someplace in the United States where it has not had its opportunity to visit thus far.

I rise in the name of justice for the many persons who have been victims of ICE and CBP.

I also rise as a person who is engaged in a countdown to impeachment. I will say more about this as I proceed. The countdown continues.

For now, Mr. Speaker, I am AL GREEN, a person who has been censured by this House but not silenced, censured but not silenced. I use my voice to speak against injustices. I will use my voice today to speak against the injustice associated with the killings of many persons at the hands of the constabulary known as CBP and ICE.

I do so to express the fact that voting for impeachment has become a matter of life and death. Voting for impeachment has become a matter of life and death. That is because the President of the United States, Donald John Trump, is covering up unjustified killings of civilians, including Renee Good, Alex Pretti, Lorenzo Salgado Araujo, and Johan Sebastian Duran Guerrero.

In doing this, the President of the United States is covering up unjustified killings of civilians, including the persons whom I have just named, with impunity wherein these persons are acting as judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner. They are terrorizing communities, and the President is wantonly and brazenly devolving the United States' democratic Republic into an authoritarian regime.

Mr. Speaker, I have accused the President of the United States of engaging in a coverup. For edification purposes, I believe we should discuss what a coverup actually is.

I wanted these letters to be exceedingly large so the people viewing can read along with me.

A coverup: a usually concerted effort to keep an illegal or unethical act or situation from being made public.

We should emphasize the fact that a coverup is an effort, it is an effort to keep an illegal or unethical act or situation from being made public. I emphasize the word "effort" because the effort itself, the act of getting involved and engaged and trying to prevent something from being made known, avoiding transparency, that is the coverup.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people who believe that you have to succeed and prevent something from happening forever for it to be a coverup. It can be exposed. The coverup is the effort to do it. In this case we have a President who is engaged in an effort to cover up the killings of the persons whom I have mentioned.

The President of the United States has control of ICE and CBP, Customs and Border Patrol. He has control of them. Immigration, customs, he has control of ICE. He is the person who has gone so far as to defend these killings.

Let's just talk about this for a moment in terms of the killings. These were innocent people, persons who are not charged with crimes or were not charged at the time, and these persons have lost their lives. They were killed, and the killings have not been justified. The killings were done by people who became judge, jury, prosecutor and executioner; judge, jury, prosecutor and executioner.

In many cases, in fact, in most of them, initially it was very difficult to get any information about who the actual shooters were. In some cases we have received some information, but in others there still is not information made public by an official authority, an agent of the United States Government, as to who it is who killed the people in question, some of the people in question.

□ 1120

This concealing and preventing transparency is a part of the coverup. The coverup continues when the persons have been killed, and the President justifies the killing by saying he supports the killing that took place before an investigation has actually even begun. No investigation, just an indication from the President immediately that these persons were, in some cases, terrorists, that they were persons who were trying to harm officers, when literally we have had video to show what actually occurred in some of the cases. Literally, we have our very own eyes to depend on because it has been displayed across the globe in many cases.

Let's take the case of Alex Pretti. Alex Pretti was unarmed at the time he was shot more than nine times while he was prostrate, flattened on the ground, and had officers all around him. He was shot more than nine times, and there has been no indictment. There has been no indication that there will be an indictment from the Federal prosecutors.

I remember when George Floyd lost his life at the hands of a member of the constabulary. This was local police. I remember it very well, and probably most people within the sound of my voice—or if you are watching this on C-SPAN—you remember it, too. The reaction from the country and from the world was one of great, I am going to be kind and say, displeasure. People were angry and upset. People engaged in peaceful protests. People were distraught. People literally were seen to be crying and wailing and not understanding how this could possibly happen.

We have not had the same global response as it relates to Alex Pretti and some others. Somehow, we are losing that special thing that is called humanity within us. We are losing our humanity as a result of these things happening with a great degree of regularity.

In losing our humanity, we are sacrificing the thing that makes us different from all of the other species. It is the humanity that we have. It is the humanity that we are losing because we are allowing this coverup to continue, to continue without our taking the effort to do that which we know can make the difference.

We have to expose the coverup. One would say that would be the Department of Justice. They should expose this coverup. Well, the Department of Justice is owned and operated by the person who is the mastermind, if you will, of the coverup—the chief architect, the person who gives his blessing, the President of the United States of America. He controls the Justice Department.

In fact, the person who now heads the Justice Department has gone so far as to say that he is the President's lawyer, and he is acting like he believes he is the President's lawyer.

One would think that the Justice Department would be out front, transparency presented, and want the American people to understand exactly what has happened and want the American people to appreciate the fact that the wheels of justice are turning in the right direction. Not so. Not this Justice Department.

The courts: One would say, well, the courts can resolve this. The courts can resolve it because the courts have the power to issue judgment—only, however, when there is a case before the court.

The cases for these four persons that I have called to your attention are not before the court. As a result, the court cannot act. The Justice Department can't act. The courts can't act.

What about the local investigators, the local prosecutors, the local State's attorneys? Why can't they act? Because of the coverup. Because the President and his minions, the king's men, are engaged in a coverup to the extent that the local people cannot—the local investigators, the local prosecutors—they cannot acquire the evidence necessary to bring these cases before a grand jury at the county level. They can't do it because they can't get the evidence. They are trying, but they don't have it.

The Justice Department belongs to the President. He owns and operates the Justice Department.

The judiciary doesn't have a case before it; therefore, it cannot act. The local investigators can't act because they don't have enough evidence.

Who can act when you have this kind of coverup preventing others who have the authority to act, preventing them from having the ability to act because they don't have the evidence necessary to act? Who can act? The people who come into this very hallowed space and cast their votes.

The Congress of the United States of America has been empowered by the Constitution for the United States of America. That Constitution accords only the Congress the authority—the power, if you will—to impeach a President for high crimes and misdemeanors, which need not be statutory offenses. You don't have to commit a crime that has been defined by the law to commit a high crime or misdemeanor. That is not what it is about, and that is part of the confusion. Many of the people in this country think that you have to violate some crime to be impeached. Not so.

In 1868, Andrew Johnson was impeached. In Article X of the Articles of Impeachment against him, Article X, for berating and demeaning—not in those exact words, but that is the import—berating and demeaning the Congress of the United States of America. He was impeached for saying ugly things about Congress.

High crimes and misdemeanors are what the Congress says they are because they are not appealable to any higher authority. There would be a trial in the Senate if there is an impeachment in the House, and the Senate can determine whether a person is convicted or not. You don't appeal the decision to another authority—for example, some court. Not the case. High crimes and misdemeanors are defined right here in this House of Representatives.

We have now the only place where we can receive justice, justice for the victims, justice for persons who have been killed, the only place where the coverup can be exposed and talked about, can be presented to the public so that the transparency necessary to make the case for impeachment can prevail. That place is right here in the House of Representatives. This is the place.

This is also the place where we have the opportunity to bring before the

public some of what appears to be evidence as to what happened. In each of these cases that I have called to your attention, the evidence is very much apparent. The evidence is there because we have seen it on television. The belief that you have to have some prolonged investigation is not correct. There is no necessity for the House of Representatives to conclude that what happened to Alex Pretti has to be investigated over some long period of time. That is absolutely not necessary.

When Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868, Article X did not have a prolonged investigation. Article X moved forward to the Senate.

We have the opportunity to do what we should do, and we should do it in short order because this is a matter of life and death, a matter of life and death.

I am withholding bringing the articles that I have presented to this House because I want to make sure that people have an understanding of what they are voting for.

□ 1130

At the next opportunity, the next reasonable opportunity that I have that is available to me, I plan to come before this House and read the Articles of Impeachment so that we may bring them to a vote.

That is a part of the process, but the point is, this House of Representatives is now the court of last resort. The Justice Department won't prosecute. Local investigators can't prosecute because they don't have enough evidence. The Judiciary can't act because there is not a case before it. That only leaves the House of Representatives as the court of last resort.

A court of last resort should not wait until it can be assured that it has enough votes to win. That is not what courts of last resort do.

I will give you examples of people who concluded that they just couldn't wait; they moved forward and how they have made a difference: Rosa Parks.

Rosa Parks could not wait. She could have waited for lawsuits. She could have waited for people to meet and negotiate and come to some conclusion as to why Black people shouldn't have to sit in the back of the bus at all times, and if there were not enough seats for Whites, then Blacks would have to stand on the bus.

She could have waited for litigation to proceed or negotiation. No. Rosa Parks decided she would engage in a protest, a one-person protest. One person can make a difference. Sometimes it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

Rosa Parks is a supreme, superb example of what one person can do when you are engaged in a righteous cause. Rosa Parks took a seat, and in taking that seat, she took a stand that ignited a spark that started a civil rights and human rights movement right there in her town, her city, her State that became global in terms of how people

view it now and understand the necessity for her to do what she did.

She didn't wait until she could win. She took her seat because she saw injustice and she knew that someone had to take a stand. That is what we can do: take a stand. Don't wait until you can count on a majority of the votes. How many more lives would be lost? How many people will have to die before we would conclude that we don't have to wait until we have a majority to do the righteous thing? Not just the right thing, the righteous thing. How many lives would be lost? This is a matter of life and death.

John Lewis at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. When they went to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they did not expect to be treated kindly. When they were at the Edmund Pettus Bridge marching forward, they did not expect the persons there, the police officers, the constabulary, to greet them warmly. They knew that their fate may involve brutality imposed against them, but still they went to the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

As they moved toward the crest of the bridge—if you have ever been there, you can see that it has a crest. As they approached the crest, at some point they could see what was coming, but they marched on. They marched on.

They didn't have a majority. They could have litigated their way through it. They could have negotiated as best as they could, but no. They chose to peacefully protest and march on.

John Lewis was a friend of mine. He and I conversed many times. We conversed here on the floor on occasion. We conversed in other places, including a jail cell, and we talked about these things. He told me himself that he thought he was going to die on that bridge. They beat him brutally, and they beat the people who were marching peacefully all the way back to Brown Chapel, the church where they started.

They beat them back to a church where peaceful protesters aligned themselves and were marching from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, peacefully. They could have waited, but they knew the necessity to act, notwithstanding having a majority on their side.

Lo and behold, that act of peaceful protest was captured by cameras and exposed globally to the citizens of the world. As a result, a Texas President at the time, a former Governor of Texas, Lyndon Johnson, was able to sign into law the Civil Rights Act that probably has allowed me to serve in Congress for the many years that I have. He signed it into law because they didn't wait until they had a majority. They did the righteous thing, not just the right thing, and they moved forward.

Waiting, in this case that we are presenting today, would only expose others to possible death. This is a matter of life and death. John Lewis, peacefully protesting at the Edmund Pettus Bridge, not waiting for a majority.

The majority is a wonderful thing to have, but it is not necessary to expose corruption. It is not necessary to expose injustice. It is not necessary to expose a lack of transparency. It is not necessary to expose the fact that a coverup is taking place and that it emanates from the highest office in the country, the highest office in the United States of America, from the Presidency.

Yes, Dr. Martin Luther King went to Birmingham, Alabama, to peacefully protest. When he went there, he didn't have a majority. When he went there, he knew that he could face certain obstacles. He knew there would be people who would try to thwart his effort. He was eminently correct because he was incarcerated in the Birmingham jail.

He wasn't there to break the laws that were righteous. He was there to protest, and as a result, an unjust law caused him to be placed in jail. It was a wonderful thing. For some things that appear to be so unjust that you can't imagine them happening, but there is a way sometimes—for time, some would say God—for time, God, for something to happen to allow a greater thing to happen.

While he was in that jail, it afforded him the opportunity to communicate with the persons who wrote the letter. If you want to read the letter that Dr. King wrote in responding to the protests, the persons who were protesting against his being there, they were members of the clergy protesting his coming. These were upstanding persons in the community. They were protesting, and they did it in writing.

He wrote a letter from that jail in response to their protests, and in doing it, it has become one of the great reads of all time, his letter from the Birmingham jail where he explicates what invidious discrimination, known as segregation, was really all about.

I don't know that we would have the equivalent of the letter from the Birmingham jail without Dr. King having gone to the Birmingham jail. That letter is something that I think was inspired within him because of what had happened to him, the letter from the Birmingham jail. If you haven't read it, you should, but before you read it, read the letter that the persons wrote who were protesting against Dr. King's coming.

By the way, they had every right to protest. Dr. King didn't wait. We cannot wait until we have a majority. This is not disrespecting anyone else. This is what we have to do to let a reckless, ruthless, lawless President know that, even if we don't succeed, we are going to expose.

We are going to expose the coverup. We are going to expose what is happening. That exposure can prevent, I say possibly prevent, this President from continuing with the reckless, ruthless behavior that we are calling to his attention in the Articles of Impeachment. That exposure says people are watching you. We are going to stop you.

This President deals in what I call fait accompli politics.

□ 1140

He does things until you stop him. Then you can sometimes wait too long to try and stop him, and the injustice that has been perpetrated cannot be undone. You can't bring back these lives, but you can prevent other lives from being lost. You cannot bring back what only God can give, and that is the gift of life. You can't bring it back once it is gone.

We have the duty, responsibility, and a moral obligation to check this President at every point. We ought to file Articles of Impeachment regularly because the impeachable offenses are there. We have to do this. We have to expose fait accompli politics.

Here is a good example of what fait accompli politics is all about: Decide that you, as President, want a ballroom, so you decide that you are going to raze, destroy, if you will, a portion of what we call the White House so that you can construct your ballroom. In constructing your ballroom, you decide that you are just going to demolish, to raze a portion of the people's House without the consent of Congress, which is what he has already done.

So you decide to do it, and you move forward expeditiously, posthaste, without any reservations. People decide they are going to sue and bring it to the attention of the courts. You use every tactic that you can to prevent it from getting to a court that might give some semblance of justice. But by the time it finally gets to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court now has to grapple with a project that they say—this is the President—is some 60 percent finished.

So, as a result, the President is saying: Hey, too late, too late. You have to let me finish because we have this big hole in the ground. You have to let me finish because we need this basement to secure the President and others if there is some sort of attack on the Capitol or on the White House itself, so you have to let me finish. This is the President speaking now: Let me finish.

This is fait accompli politics, to put yourself in a position where you can say to the Supreme Court of the United States of America: You can't stop me now. We have crossed the Rubicon. We have gone past the point of no return. We can only go forward now.

But the Supreme Court could have stopped him. The Supreme Court should have said to the President: Mr. President, you stop now until you get the consent of Congress. Stop. And if you don't have the consent of Congress, don't move forward. But the Supreme Court is afraid to say that. Why? Because they don't want to confront a President who might defy an order of the Supreme Court, and then we would see truly who this President is—an authoritarian who cares less about the Constitution than he does about the

paper it is written on. He doesn't care. This is just words to him. This is advisory—the Constitution. It is not mandatory to him.

This is *fait accompli* politics at its worst—*fait accompli*. And the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court did side on the side of those who were saying that we have to stop this—I suppose is what they would ultimately say—but the Court decided, no, it wouldn't do this. It wouldn't tell the President to hold up because it didn't want to confront the President who has control of the Department of Justice, the President who has control of the military.

What do you do when the President says: Stop me. He tells the Supreme Court: I dare you, stop me. I am going to complete my ballroom.

Now, what are you going to do? So they avoid that confrontation, but that confrontation would let the American people know who we are dealing with—a reckless, ruthless, lawless authoritarian. That is what he is.

The Supreme Court could have stopped him, and he would have to either have this Congress, or maybe when he is out of office, then the next Congress could proceed with a President who would come to the Congress and ask for its righteous opportunity to give the word to spend the money necessary to do what the President is attempting to do. It could have been done.

How does all of that relate to what I am saying? Because the President is dealing with *fait accompli* politics here. He is, at some point, going to wait long enough before there is some announcement made, and at that point, the locals won't have enough evidence to do anything. Only the Federal authorities can do something if something is to be done. As a result, he can say to them: This is about nothing. This is not about anything. We have examined this—and they always give very few facts to support their commentary, their contentions. This is about nothing. It is all over. We have waited a long time. Don't worry about it. It is all over.

Well, it is not all over for those persons who lost their lives. It is not over for those family members. For informational purposes, I have found no place where the President has called the family members who are the survivors of the victims—at least a phone call, no expression of sympathy to those families, nothing said that I have found. If I am wrong, I am sure that there will be people who will correct me, and I would gladly have the correction made.

I know of at least one family where it hasn't been done. The President was in Houston, Texas. The President could have gone by the family of Lorenzo Salgado Araujo. He could have gone by. He didn't do it. He could have said: Come over where I am.

I have no evidence of it. If there is evidence of it, I am sure it will be exposed when appropriate. I will then

gladly thank the President for doing it, but right now I condemn him for not doing it based upon the evidence that I have.

So he engages in this kind of politics where at some point he can say: No, nothing to see here. Or, if there is something to see here, the Federal authorities can try and convict, and then the President can do what he did on day one of his second time in office.

On day one, he pardons more than a thousand people who assaulted this Capitol—insurrectionists. He pardoned them. He pardoned them and then tried to set up a fund so that he could pay them. That is at least what is being reported. He pardoned them. So he can then, if there is a Federal conviction of these people who killed these persons, if there is a Federal conviction, he can pardon them. And they know that he can do it because he did it on the first day in office for these insurrectionists.

They are very much aware that the President has their backs, and because he has their backs, they can do these dastardly deeds. They can take lives with impunity. They can be judge. They can be jury. They can be prosecutor. They can executioner, knowing that if ever they are convicted in a Federal court, the President can give them a pardon. If they are convicted in a State court, the President cannot. That is why the President withholds evidence from the State courts so that they cannot convict, and if there is to be a conviction, it will be in a Federal court. Then he will take the magic wand, the magic pen, and use it to exonerate them, in a sense, with a pardon.

This is the way the President perceives the world. It is all within his hands, within the hands of a person who has the pen that can pardon, without giving any reasonable explanation as to why. That is where we are.

Now, there is a lot of talk about affordability. I think I need to address affordability as it relates to what is happening to these persons that I have just talked about.

□ 1150

Affordability, this is so important that I think I will hold it in my hand.

Affordability, I support affordability. I have been supporting affordability all of my life because all of my life, most of it, I should say, I couldn't afford a good many of the things that others took for granted, but I have been blessed. I have been blessed.

Not everybody has been as blessed as I am, and I ought not assume that because I have been blessed and I have had opportunities, that everybody else is going to have the same opportunities that I have had. Life isn't that way.

In any event, I am for affordability. Affordability is about the necessities of life. Affordability is about food, water, shelter, clothing, healthcare, among other things.

People ought to be able to afford these things. In the richest country in

the world, people should be able to have healthcare for everybody. If you are sick, you get healthcare because you are sick and not because you can buy it. It is because you are sick. There is a way to have the healthcare, and I won't go through that issue today, but healthcare.

Everybody has to have clothing. Everybody has to have shelter, water, and food. That is what affordability is all about. Affordability is about the necessities of life, and we ought to have it.

There is also something called accountability, and you can have affordability and accountability at the same time.

Do not believe that Congress cannot walk and chew gum at the same time. Do not believe that, on a daily basis, we don't do many different things at the same time, every day. There are some people who would have you believe that you have to sacrifice accountability to have affordability. It is not true.

Let's talk about accountability as it relates to the topic today. Accountability is about saving lives. It is about lives that are lost. It is about Renee Nicole Good, Alex Jeffrey Pretti, Lorenzo Salgado Araujo, Johan Sebastian Duran Guerrero.

By the way, Nicole lost her life on January 7, 2026. There has been no justice, no justice for her; no indication that justice is over the horizon, none; no indication that there is an indictment or that there is some rationale for just moving forward. Just let time pass, and eventually, enough time will pass such that these issues won't be as important and you can announce that, for whatever reasons, the officers acted appropriately.

We saw what happened to Nicole. We saw what happened to Ms. Renee Nicole Good on January 7, 2026. We are now in the month of September. No justice.

Alex Pretti lost his life on January 24, 2026. We saw what happened to Alex Pretti. No justice.

These victims deserve justice. Their families deserve justice.

I rise today in the name of justice for the victims: Lorenzo, July 7, 2026—no justice, no justice. In fact, in Houston, Texas, one of our newspapers managed to get some information about the case. In getting that information, the U.S. attorney protested and did not want the information revealed. They are trying to secret the information, and they are doing it openly and notoriously because the President has their backs.

Johan Sebastian died on July 13, 2026—no justice.

No justice for any of these people, among others, I might add, but no justice.

There has to be justice for these victims. There has to be. We cannot have a society where members of the constabulary have become a paramilitary force, a paramilitary force acting in such a way as to be judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner. It is unbelievable that we would tolerate such a thing, this paramilitary force.

Let me just read a little bit more here for you.

This paramilitary force that the President is operating, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE; and Customs and Border Protection, CBP, as his vicious—and they are vicious. Look at the behavior. Look at the way that they talk about how they will treat people.

They are bullies. I am not saying all people in these departments are bullies, but I am saying the ones that have shown themselves to be bullies ought to be identified, and it should be said that they are, because they taint the image of the ones who are not.

In any event, vicious—they are acting as his vicious, quota-driven—they have a quota. They are trying to reach a quota of 2,000 per day. If you are in Houston, Texas, and you have a white van and you look like you are Latino, you are suspect. You are suspect, and you are going to have to show your papers.

That is what happened to Lorenzo. He was driving a white van. There was no warrant for his arrest. He hadn't been charged with anything. This man was on his way to work. He was on his way to work with others in the van with him. These were persons who work out in the sun, persons who do the labor, the hard labor, but they were working.

He was taking care of a family, raising children. This man, Lorenzo Salgado Araujo, is the kind of person who we want in the United States of America. He is the kind of person who this country ought to be looking for.

We have to pay some taxes so that we can take care of some Social Security issues that are going to manifest themselves around the year 2033. This man is paying into that system. He could be paying into that system. He was trying to get his documentation so that he could move forward and become a citizen.

This man did not deserve the death that was imposed upon him by these officers.

We, last time I looked, did not know the names of the persons involved. We don't know who killed him, but there should be some justice for him.

July 7, 2026—nothing said.

Mr. Johan Sebastian Duran, the allegation that I have read is that he was moving away, so he was no threat to the officer, but the officer had concluded that he might be a threat to the community.

No arrest warrant for him, no arrest warrant. We cannot allow this to happen. This is an injustice. These are all injustices that have been perpetrated, and they have all been perpetrated this year, and the courts can't deal with it; the Justice Department won't deal with it; and the local constabulary can't because they don't have the evidence.

We have to take it up. We are the court of last resort. To say that we can wait until we get a majority, or to say

that, no, we are not going to address these issues at all, how can we say this knowing that we have a Constitution? Are we saying that we will allow impeachable offenses to just go on and nothing happen?

You are shredding the Constitution. It will be meaningless. These lives have been lost, and there must be justice for these persons.

Accountability and affordability can occur at the same time, the same time.

We had accountability right here in this House just yesterday. A vote was taken as it relates to a Member. No details will be given, not necessary, but a vote was taken. This was accountability. We dealt with accountability while we were dealing with affordability.

We can take another vote. We are talking about a vote in the Congress of the United States of America for righteous Articles of Impeachment, for lawful Articles of Impeachment, but there won't be this vote if the people have their way. There won't be the vote because there will be people who are going to say: Let's table it.

How can you table the injustice that is taking place? How can you table this? What is wrong with you?

□ 1200

You are going to vote to table these lives that have been lost—this is an injustice—one, two, three, four of them. At some point justice has to prevail.

No. There will be Republicans and Democrats who are going to vote to table these lives.

What is wrong with us? Once they are tabled, they will go into a never-never land, a committee, never to be heard from again, or when we have a majority, when we can win, then we will take them up.

No. We may take them up, but we won't avoid the vote. There has to be a vote.

Here is why there has to be a vote. Many people like to quote Dr. King. They like to talk about Dr. King's quote, wherein he proclaimed: Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about the things that matter. Many people like to quote this: Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about the things that matter.

Well, actually, that is not Dr. King's quote. Let's just say it is. It has been paraphrased. This is not his quote. Someone has paraphrased it. You can do the research.

I am going to give you Dr. King's actual quote now. Dr. King had a powerful quote that has been reduced to these words. Here is the quote of Dr. Martin Luther King. Dr. King reminds us—I think I will hold this one. This is a precious quote.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., March 8, 1965—a significant day, because on March 8, 1965, it was the day after Bloody Sunday, the day after Bloody Sunday. These are the words of Dr. King. He proclaimed: "A man dies"—I would paraphrase and say a person. "A

man dies when he refuses to stand up for that which is right." When he refuses to stand up for that which is right, a man dies.

Well, I think that standing up for justice for the four persons that I have called to your attention is right. Standing up is right. I think we should take a stand.

Dr. King goes on to say, "A man dies when he refuses to stand up for justice." That is what we have been talking about: Justice for persons whose lives were taken at the hands of a paramilitary force, a vicious paramilitary force, a vicious paramilitary force driven by a quota system, a quota system that has caused persons to lose their lives at the hands of persons who were judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner. That, my friends, is an injustice.

So when a man refuses to stand—I would say person—refuses to stand for justice, the man is dying, or has died in some cases, I suppose.

But Dr. King then goes on to say, "A man dies when he refuses to take a stand for that which is true." "A man dies when he refuses to take a stand for that which is true."

Friends, I have spoken truth not only to power but about power today. The truth is, the President is engaged in a coverup—in a coverup. The President knows that he should not have spoken so quickly about the lives that were lost. Before there was any investigation, he proclaimed the officers innocent—not with those exact words, but by talking about them and demeaning the victims, proclaiming that the officers, in some cases, were victims. Those people who lost their lives, their families are still suffering.

So the President, having done this—and I have given you the truth today—the question becomes: What are we going to do? What are we going to do?

I enjoy quoting Dr. King, as you can see. He has another quote that I will paraphrase, that I am quite fond of. Dr. King reminds us, in one of his better known quotes, that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Injustice for these four people is a threat to justice in your community and to you. To know that it can be covered up ought to be an affront.

I suppose, when the first person's life was taken, we bemoaned it, and we were very much upset about it. That was Renee. At that point, we didn't know that there would be Alex to follow. We didn't know that there would be Lorenzo. We didn't know that there would be Johan.

Injustice against Renee was a threat to justice against the other three. We didn't know it at the time. "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

We know not for whom the bell will toll next as it relates to these injustices. We have got to stop it. We can't wait until we have a majority to stop it.

I would also call to your attention another quote from Dr. King. He reminds us that the truest measure of

the person—Dr. King spoke a lot about truth. He reminds us that the truest measure of the person is not where the person stands. He didn't say person. He said man. The truest measure of the person—I am paraphrasing. The truest measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure is, where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy?

Where do you stand when four lives have been taken without justification, when the President himself is engaged with the officers and others in a cover-up, when they are hiding information and preventing it from being exposed?

That is a coverup. There are many of us who are too afraid to say it. We would rather say: Well, he is blocking; they won't let us see; there is a lack of transparency. Well, that is the cover-up. It is okay to say it. So he is engaged in this coverup. Where do you stand?

Where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy, not in times of comfort and convenience, when all of your bills are paid, all is right with the world, and you are on vacation. That is not the truest measure. Where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy, when lives have been lost, when people have died at the hands of officers who were judge, jury, prosecutor, and executioner?

Where do you stand? That is the question before this House today. Where do you stand? Will you stand with the lives that have been lost, to bring some justice to them? Will you stand for justice for the families of these victims?

Will you stand for justice, or are you going to stand against the victims? When you take that vote to table, just remember: If you vote to table, you are standing against these victims. You are standing with the President if you vote to table. If you vote to table, you are standing for the injustice that has been perpetrated.

If you vote not to table, then you are standing with these victims—justice for them. You are standing for justice for the families of the victims.

□ 1210

I say to you, my dear brothers and sisters, my friends, my fellow Members of Congress, vote for justice. Vote not to table so that there can be some justice for these victims and their families. Otherwise, you are voting with a President who is engaged in a coverup, and you are voting to table the lives that have been lost.

I can tell you, I will stand with the victims. I have been censured, not silenced. I will stand with the victims. I will stand with their families.

I will do so because Rosa Parks was right: On some issues, it is better to stand alone than not stand at all. I will feel good about myself. How will you feel about yourself if you stand with the President and against these victims and their families?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING FIREFIGHTERS FROM CALIFORNIA'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(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, in recognition of International Firefighters Day 2026, 11 firefighters from California's Third Congressional District were nominated by their leadership teams to be recognized for going above and beyond the regular call of duty in service to our communities.

As such, I wish to honor today the following firefighters: Ben Westmoreland with the Truckee Fire Protection District, Fred Stump with the Long Valley Fire Protection District, Kevin Colson with the Roseville Fire Department, Brock Benton with the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District, David Calloway with the Big Pine Fire Protection District, Matt Dargan with the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, Buck Sims with the Auburn Fire Department, Justin Finley with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, James Janney with the White Mountain Fire Protection District, Keith Taylor with the Rocklin Fire Department, and Tracey Kincheloe with the South Placer Fire Protection District.

These firefighters have demonstrated an unwavering devotion to fire prevention, medical aid, rescue operations, emergency preparedness, and community education. Their dedicated efforts make a lasting and meaningful impact in our communities.

Throughout their careers, they have earned the respect and admiration of department leadership, fellow firefighters, and the community alike. They have each individually built distinguished records of excellence, consistently upholding the highest standards of professionalism, integrity, courage, and selfless service.

Each day, firefighters answer the call to protect lives, property, and public safety, often placing themselves in harm's way for the sake of others. These firefighters embody the very best of that calling. It is an honor to represent remarkable individuals like these public servants here in Congress.

Therefore, on behalf of California's Third Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I am proud to recognize these firefighters for their exemplary public service, steadfast leadership, and enduring commitment to safeguarding our communities and protecting our quality of life.

CONGRATULATING DAVID GORDON ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Sacramento County Superintendent of Schools David Gordon on his upcoming plans to retire, following 21 years of leadership in the Sacramento educational community.

Superintendent Gordon leads an office which provides financial oversight and support services to 13 school districts and more than 235,000 students.

Superintendent Gordon holds a BA from Brandeis University and an EDM and certificate of advanced study in educational administration from Harvard University.

His career in the field of educational leadership includes being appointed as the superintendent of the Elk Grove Unified School District, the State's fourth largest school district, for 9 years.

During this time, he was appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Education to the National Assessment Governing Board, which oversees the Nation's report card. He also served on the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education.

Prior to his work in Elk Grove, he was the deputy superintendent for the California Department of Education. Additionally, Superintendent Gordon has served on numerous boards and commissions in California, including his current service as a Governor's appointee to the State Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission.

He also finds time to generously give back to his community through his volunteer work as a member of the board of trustees of the Sierra Health Foundation.

I have gotten to know Dave over the years, and he is a widely admired leader in education in our communities. He has been an invaluable source of wisdom and guidance to me, and his leadership will be greatly missed, but I know that he will continue to contribute to our communities in many ways.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and California's Third Congressional District, I am honored to recognize Superintendent of Schools David Gordon's long and distinguished service to the Sacramento educational community and wish he and his wife Deborah the very best in retirement.

HONORING SACRAMENTO REGIONAL BUILDERS EXCHANGE

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange for their 125 years of service to the Sacramento region.

The exchange is the development industry's oldest and largest association in the Sacramento region, with over 1,100 member companies and 65,000 employees. Their members include area contractors and subcontractors, suppliers, and industry support organizations. They provide educational and