

piece and put it into the markets? Today, you would have dramatically greater wealth. That decision was made. The public spoke—actually, the leftist unions spoke and scared the crap out of people.

The real battle is that we are almost to the point of, for every dollar you put into Medicare and that payroll tax, you are almost taking out, well, \$7. That right there is the primary driver of U.S. debt.

Do you cut things? No. My argument is modernize, change it. My little example of the duplicative MRIs and scans and those things, why are we so terrified to modernize how we deliver Medicare? How many of you went to Blockbuster Video last night? The fact of the matter is technology changed because you now go home and hit a button, there are all your movies. Oh, well, that made my life more convenient.

You are telling me that the thing you can blow into, the thing you can wear on your body, the technology on this, you couldn't also use it to keep yourself healthy when obesity is the single biggest expenditure in this government. Think about that. We modeled last year that obesity will add another \$9 trillion of additional spending, \$9.1 trillion on the top end of spending over the next 10 years.

Maybe the revolution is the way you stabilize U.S. debt is to stop being fearful of technology, be willing to actually modernize and cut spending where it is not working for the American people, and help our brothers and sisters get healthier.

That means taking on farm bills, nutrition policy, how we deliver healthcare. Maybe things like Medicare Advantage and these things should be rewarded for making their populations healthier instead of running around scoring them as sicker. There are solutions here.

We have known this chart for decades, that this is coming. Why the hell can't this place have an honest conversation? "Oh, David, that is hard."

The President stood there just a couple of days ago, gave us a list of things he wanted to help the middle class. He also asked us to find a way to balance the budget. I am not sure I can make that happen, but I think I can get us to 3 percent, which is what the Treasury Secretary asked for.

Mr. Speaker, my question is, who is willing to join us? I handed out my binders with research for months and months. I footnote everything, and you guys just beat the crap out of me for trying to tell the truth and trying to save us. Screw me. I am an idiot who runs for this job. You have kids. How many of you have grandkids? How many of you would like your retirement? How many of you are prepared for a 20 percent cut in your Social Security in 8 years? Help us. This Republic is worth saving. Maybe we should actually buy calculators.

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

INCIVILITY IN CHAMBER

(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 still I rise, a proud, liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, and unafraid.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of the House, this place that I revere and, notwithstanding recent events, that I have great respect for.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to a censure, a censure that took place as it relates to my behavior. I have been told by some that they did not have an opportunity to hear the actual resolution as it was read. I have here H. Res. 189, the censure resolution as it relates to my behavior.

I believe this resolution should be read. I am not in any way upset with the Speaker. I want people to know that the Speaker did what he was supposed to do. He did what he was supposed to do when we had the joint session of Congress.

When I interrupted, the Speaker called it to my attention. He did it on multiple occasions. I have no reason in my heart to be upset with the Speaker.

Later, persons came over and escorted me out. I appreciate them. They were very kind to me, the officers, very kind. They said kind words to me.

As a result of my behavior, I have been censured.

I am going to read the resolution and give some commentary. It reads, "H. Res. 189. In the House of Representatives, Mr. Newhouse submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on"—and the copy that I have does not have a committee. I am not sure it was referred to a committee. It may have come straight to the floor. Regardless as to how it arrived, it did, and I am not contesting the procedure.

The resolution reads: "Censuring Representative Al Green of Texas.

"Whereas, on March 4, 2025, during the joint session of Congress convened pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 11, the President of the United States, speaking at the invitation of the House and Senate, had his remarks interrupted by the Representative from Texas, Mr. Green;

"Whereas, the conduct of the Representative from Texas disrupted the proceedings of the joint address and was a breach of proper conduct; and

"Whereas, after numerous disruptions, the Representative from Texas had to be removed from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms:

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that—

"One, Representative Al Green be censured;

"Two, Representative Al Green forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

"Three, Representative Al Green be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker."

That concludes the resolution.

Some things bear repeating: I respect the Speaker. I have no ill feelings toward the Speaker, none toward the persons who escorted me away from the floor because I did disrupt. I did so because the President indicated that he had a mandate—and I wanted him to know that he didn't have a mandate—to cut Medicaid.

I did this because Medicaid is the only insurance many people have in this country. I am blessed. As I stand here now, there is a physician waiting. If something should happen, I will be taken to that physician. I have the best healthcare in the world.

There are other people who have less than I. I would have them have what I have, but I surely would not stand by and see them lose what little they do have.

Medicaid is for people who don't have the kind of healthcare that 435 Members of Congress and 100 Members of the Senate have, but they do have some healthcare.

It has been approved by legislation that the Energy and Commerce Committee would cut \$880 billion from their budget. The overwhelming majority of that budget has to do with healthcare. I see no way for this cut to take place without cutting into Medicaid.

I am going to fight the cutting of Medicaid. I hope that this comment, this message that I am giving today, will deter them and cause them to go a different way. Then, they can say: "We were never going to do it. Al Green just had this false notion." Well, let me have it. Don't cut Medicaid. It is all they have.

This is the richest country in the world. Mr. Musk has doctors. He will get the best healthcare. Let him understand that he should be on my side. He should be on the side of the people who need this healthcare. He has the ear of the President.

Mr. Musk, speak to him. He listens to you. But for the grace of God, dear brother, you could be on Medicaid. You just have been blessed. Don't assume that it was your intellect that has caused you all of these great blessings that you have received. You have just been blessed beyond measure. Speak to the President and tell him that Medicaid ought not be cut.

But I continue. I interrupted.

I was set to be in need of sanctions. I came to the floor today, and while the Speaker was reading, I recalled what happened in the sixties. I recalled that when we were faced with adverse circumstances, we would sing a song that would inspire and encourage us to move forward with alacrity.

□ 1230

The words were:

We shall overcome,
We shall overcome,
We shall overcome some day.

Oh, deep in my heart, I do believe we shall overcome some day.

That was an act of incivility.

Why, AL GREEN, would you come to the well before your colleagues and the world and commit an act of incivility?

Here is why: It is because when the President of the United States right there at that podium addressed the Members of Congress, Democrats seated on this side, seated, many of them saying nothing, the President of the United States looked upon them, pointed toward them and said: Lunatics. The President of the United States at a joint session of Congress called Members of Congress lunatics.

That was an act of incivility.

There comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when you cannot allow the President's incivility to take advantage of our civility, and that is what is happening in this country. His incivility is overwhelming our civility. We cannot allow this. That act of incivility was in direct response to the President's incivility.

Mr. President, you, sir, were wrong when you pointed to the Members of Congress and called them lunatics, Democrats, I might add, you called them lunatics.

The President hasn't been sanctioned. The President hasn't been reprimanded. There has been no censure of the President. The President is above the law. The Supreme Court has said as much. He can do things that no other can do. He is above the law as it relates to certain things, but not as it relates to all things, not all. He is still subject to the norms of society, the decorum that you expect from me, you have to respect and expect from the President.

Why would we allow him to use his incivility and expect me to continue to engage in civility as it relates to his incivility?

Mr. President, there are some of us who are going to stand against your incivility. We have reached a point in our history where we have to hearken back to that which got us to this point in our history.

I remember the sixties. I remember Dr. King. I remember the movement. I remember what it took to get me in this House. I am not here because I am so smart. I am not here because of brilliancy or good looks. I am here because people made great sacrifices. It was incivility, and it was disruption, but they were prepared to suffer the consequences.

We are going to have to resort to the same tactics that we used in the sixties, but we did it for a worthy and noble cause. Calling the people of Congress lunatics was not noble, Mr. President. It was an ignoble act of incivility.

I remember how we marched and how we protested, and I am prepared to do it again. If you treat me like you treated me in the sixties, I am going to respond the way I responded in the sixties.

It is time for us to use the same level of incivility that was used in the six-

ties for a noble cause: to save Medicaid, to protect Medicare, and to prevent the demise of Social Security. It is time for us to take that stand. Incivility emanating from the highest office in the land cannot be tolerated and has to be negated.

I did it, and I have said to people that while I respect others and while I absolutely was cooperative when they led me away from the floor, but if circumstances permitted, given what I know, and I have to be candid, I would do it again. I would do it because I care about these people on Medicaid.

For edification purposes, the State of Texas was accorded \$100 billion—100 billion Medicaid dollars—100 billion Medicaid dollars were sent to the State of Texas to help poor people.

What did the State of Texas do?

The State of Texas rejected \$100 billion for poor people on Medicaid, 100 billion, not million, 100 billion. The State of Texas does not have the goodwill necessary to manage Medicaid dollars. If we block grant this money and send it to Texas, then those who are in need of it will get less of it. We have to stand up for them. They are among the least in our society. Unfortunately, we have to stand up for them.

I am standing up for those people. I will continue to stand, and I will continue to tell the world that this incivility has to be dealt with. We have to deal with the President's incivility.

The name-calling never ceases. MAXINE WATERS has assaulted verbally and Ms. WILSON of Florida. The list goes on and on and on. As Congresswoman WATERS is known to say: on and on and on.

We sit and we watch with civility as he employs incivility. Yes, I have said earlier, and I am retreating to the point, that he has been given a certain amount of immunity. He has not been given absolute immunity, but he seems to have an inordinate amount of influence with his party. It is inordinate. I see people doing things that I never thought I would see them do. I have seen people who are conservative and that I have great respect for doing things that I never thought I would see them do.

I am not calling names. I am just saying to my friends that the President has an inordinate amount of influence. He has an inordinate, unusual, and incomprehensible amount of influence.

The courts have given him a certain amount of immunity. His party has given him carte blanche to say anything and to come before the joint session of Congress and use the word "lunatics" as he refers to Democrats. The only thing left in ordinary times would be the courts.

The court orders ought to be obeyed. I don't always like them, but I remember what John Lewis explained to me about peaceful protests: Protest, the court orders you to do certain things, you don't have to agree with it, but you do it. You be willing to suffer the consequences.

The courts are right now in the midst of, as best as they can, trying to give us the laws necessary to prevent certain things from happening. Mass layoffs have to be taken to court. There have been mass layoffs with no due process and no thought of what is happening in the lives of these people. You just take a pen and with the stroke of a pen they are off. There is no concern about children in school, there is no concern about loved ones who may be ill, whom they are taking care of, being the chief breadwinner for the family. There is no concern.

You have got billions, Mr. Musk.

Why should you care about the concerns of people who have much less and who are working every day to eke out a living?

You have billions. You shouldn't worry about them. Worry about making more money. Go to the Moon.

They don't have that luxury. I am going to stand for them and mass layoffs without any consideration.

I just believe that this level of behavior if it were conducted, committed, and engaged in by one Barack Hussein Obama when he was President, if he behaved in this fashion, then he would have been impeached. He would have been impeached. I will go to my grave with this belief. We wouldn't allow these mass layoffs. We wouldn't allow these cuts to veterans, and we wouldn't allow Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security to be on the chopping block.

He would have been impeached.

To be very honest, I would have voted for the impeachment because I don't think that we should allow a President to circumvent what we know to be the requirements associated with the legislative process and with due process which should be accorded people who are being fired as it were.

When you do these things, the courts are acting, and the courts should act. However, there is a point, Mr. President, if your incivility allows you to disobey court orders given that your party has given you carte blanche and given that you believe you have absolute immunity by virtue of what the Supreme Court has accorded you—and you don't have absolute but I think you believe it—when you cross that line, when you cross that line and you, Mr. President, decide you will no longer honor orders from the judiciary, when you decide that *Marbury v. Madison* means nothing, when you decide that you are the supreme law of the land, then on that day we will have a dictatorship.

We are close because you are continually inching right up to the line, you are looking over to the other side, and at some point, regrettably, you may cross over.

Mr. President, I beg that you not do so. I beg that you would not do so and that you would honor the third branch of government designed to settle disputes among us, not always in a favorable way to some, obviously, but that is what it is there for.

I beg you, Mr. President, that you would not dishonor the judiciary in this country.

Here is what I know: I know that you have the ability to say to a judge: You have issued your court order, now let me see you enforce it. That is my Justice Department—not AL GREEN's, the President's—that is my Justice Department. The head of my Justice Department has pledged fealty to me—not AL GREEN, the President—that is my Justice Department. Let me see you get my Justice Department to enforce your order, Mr. Judge.

More specifically, Mr. John Roberts, get my Justice Department to enforce your order. Let me see you get my marshals to enforce your order.

This President, whether wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that the Justice Department has pledged fealty to him.

Generals in the military: You don't get these positions now unless you have pledged fealty to him.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves to allow such a thing to have happened. Yes, generals in the military, the Justice Department, the courts, many of them are bending knees and genuflecting.

□ 1245

Somehow, you believe that you are showing respect, I suppose, or maybe you are just currying favor.

Be that as it may, the Justice Department, generals in the military, and many of the courts are giving a genuflect. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is setting himself up such that he is in a position and such that, at the end of his fourth year, he might attempt to do what he tried to do and failed to do at the end of his last term.

He tried his best to prevent the transition of power. He did all that he could. He encouraged persons to come over to the Capitol. People came, and they literally broke into the Capitol. I was here. They came, and they marched through the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, for doing it, the President has been given them the ultimate reward. You, you, and you—yes, you, too—all of you, you are pardoned. You are given some sort of amnesty. You are okay.

This is what the President has done. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is now in a position to make that same effort. Only this time, the Justice Department is with him, not with the Constitution. Generals in the military are with him, not with their oath that they have taken.

The President, wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that if he chooses to stay on beyond his term of office and if he chooses to do what a Member of Congress has suggested that might be done by law, which is to give him a third term—I hold no animus toward the Member of Congress who has filed the legislation; I have no animus to you, dear brother—but what we have done is

witnessed a President who, wittingly or unwittingly, has put himself in a position such that he will have the power to enforce the inanity of not allowing a peaceful transfer of power.

He literally is putting himself in that position. Wittingly or unwittingly, he is.

As a result of his doing this, we have to not allow his incivility and his requirement of fealty to prevent us from taking the necessary actions to protect liberty and justice for all and to protect government of the people, by the people, and for the people. To protect what this country has in its great and noble ideals, we have to do what is necessary.

I believe that we have to engage in a level of positive, righteous incivility—positive, righteous incivility, the same kind of incivility that Dr. King engaged in and that John Lewis engaged in. This incivility would only be a counterbalance to the President's incivility.

I am not saying that we get into the name-calling and stoop to the level that he does. I am saying that, when there are moments for us to have righteous incivility, we should.

Now, I am back to where I started. I stood there in the well of the House, other Members with me. I never suggested to anybody that you do a certain thing. We did sing "We Shall Overcome."

It was an act of incivility, but I want people to know that it was in direct response to the President's incivility at the joint session of Congress. He has not been reprimanded. He has not been censured. He won't be reprimanded. He won't be censured.

However, there is one, as the President uses it, in his parlance, one card. There is one card that we have. You told the President of Ukraine: "You don't have the cards." Well, Mr. President, we have the cards.

There are 435 of us with the cards. The card, Mr. President, you know well because, on two occasions, these cards have been utilized to check you. You don't always get convicted when you are indicted, but you do get indicted.

If you continue with this line of behavior, you may not just simply be indicted. That means impeached. You may be more than impeached. There may be a Senate that has the will to live up to the ideals in the Constitution. When that Senate does so, you will no longer be President.

There are 435 cards. Mr. President, I have one of those cards. I have one of them. You are a Goliath. You are Goliath. You now have control of the Justice Department. You have the generals pledging fealty. You are a Goliath, Mr. President, but there are 435 Davids—435 Davids—435 with the power accorded to us by way of the rules of this House to bring Articles of Impeachment.

You may not be impeached the first time, but there is always a second, and there is always a third.

In the end, if you, Mr. President, continue with this behavior, you will be impeached, and I believe there will be the will in the Senate to convict.

I am not threatening anyone. I am talking about the rules that have been accorded to this House, which I happen to be a Member of and proud to be a Member of, and accorded to the Senate.

You are a Goliath, but, Mr. President, there are Davids among us. Your incivility can no longer be tolerated. It has to be met with righteous indignation and righteous incivility.

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

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

FINDING COMMON GROUND

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, we just heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) speak passionately on a number of topics.

It is his prerogative as an elected Member of Congress to speak from this floor on any topic he chooses. What is not his or any of our right is to stand up during the State of the Union and interrupt the President of the United States.

Imagine if everyone did that. Imagine if everyone took whatever grievance they have in the moment and decided to use the State of the Union to air that grievance. Imagine if, during President Biden's speech, each and every one of the Republicans in the House had stood up and objected to the President's open-border policies or his runaway inflation policies. The State of the Union could not be delivered. The institution could not function.

What is even more remarkable, though, than the conduct of this 1 Member is the fact that all but 10 of his colleagues on their side of the aisle chose not to censure this eminently censurable conduct. We held a vote today, and there were 10 Democrats who joined with the Republicans in voting for the censure. They are AMI BERA of California, ED CASE of Hawaii, JIM COSTA of California, LAURA GILLEN of New York, JAMES HIMES of Connecticut, CRISSY HOULAHAN of Pennsylvania, MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, JARED MOSKOWITZ of Florida, MARIE GLUESENKAMP PEREZ of Washington, and TOM SUOZZI of New York.

The other 200 Members who were present chose not to censure that conduct. I find that remarkable. Indeed, the antics on display during the joint session truly exemplified everything that is wrong with politics in this country today and exemplified everything that Americans are so tired of.

There was, of course, the outburst from the gentleman from Texas (Mr.