

House Judiciary and Education and Labor Committees. He is a lawyer and serves as an Assistant Commonwealth Attorney and was also chief of staff and—I didn't know this—chief of staff for my good friend, Bob Goodlatte, who is one of my heroes from Congress.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman RUTHERFORD for yielding and putting together this event this evening.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities, States, and Nation with honor and bravery. These are our friends and neighbors who willingly face danger in order to protect their fellow man and make our cities better places in which to live.

Just this week in Lynchburg, Virginia, I joined several hundred with the police chief, mayor, and members of law enforcement from around the region to honor the lives of two law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice in the last year.

□ 2030

Virginia State Trooper Lucas Dowell, who was shot while serving a search warrant, was only 28.

Winchester Police Department Officer Hunter Edwards, who died in a vehicle collision while responding to a fight in Winchester, was only 30.

As this week draws to a close, I ask that all Americans remember the more than 150 officers this year who died in the line of duty and consider the danger that all officers face each day in order to keep Americans safe.

Your lives are a shining example of what is right in our world. By getting up each day and donning a uniform and badge, you are making a difference in our communities across this great Nation. Every single day, you have our gratitude.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

In particular, I want to offer, again, our condolences to those officers, those heroes from Virginia, who gave their lives in service.

Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize Representative CLAY HIGGINS from the great State of Louisiana, their Third District. He was a National Guard military police officer for many years, a SWAT operator. I am sure he will have some great words for us.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize American men and women who put on a badge every day, men and women of every color and creed, ethnicity, heritage, and background, of varied ideology and political affiliation. They are American patriots, one and all.

As a police officer, our job begins with an oath. That oath is not to a chief or a sheriff or a marshal. It is to the constitutional principles that represent the badges that we wear, badges like this.

In this body, we stand within the people's House. We serve within the parameters of our ability. We wear a small pin upon our lapel to designate our status as Congressmen and Congresswomen.

In humble service and an honor, yes, it is. But forget not, America, the men and women in your community, unseen, unheard, far too frequently unappreciated and unrecognized, who patrol your streets, your neighborhoods, your counties, your States, and the parishes in my State of Louisiana.

For they serve unknowing if they shall return home. They do so willingly. They place great faith in their Lord. The Word tells us that the Lord is my strength and my shield.

In many ways, we should recall that this small shield that we wear begins with faith, that this Chamber began with faith, and that the shield that officers wear from sea to shining sea maintains itself by faith.

This week, we honor the Thin Blue Line. You are known. You are loved. You are recognized. We honor you.

Madam Speaker, I thank the sheriff for allowing me to speak.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Louisiana for all his service those many years.

I would like to recognize, again, my cohort for tonight, Representative KATIE HILL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL).

Ms. HILL of California. Madam Speaker, I wanted to finish out by thanking the 2,200 Capitol Police officers here who protect us and the 3 to 5 million people who visit the U.S. Capitol every single year.

They do the job that often goes unnoticed, but we are ensured our safety and protection, and that of every single person who comes to visit us, because of their hard work and service.

To every single law enforcement professional who dedicates their life every single day, we are eternally grateful. I am so proud to be working with my colleagues to continue to fight for recognizing our officers and to take this forward for many years to come.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, it has been an honor to be here with the gentlewoman tonight to recognize our law enforcement community.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this. It is from Ralph Waldo Emerson. He said:

The purpose in life is not to be happy. It is to be useful, to be honorable, to be compassionate, to have it make some difference that you have lived and lived well.

Madam Speaker, the 158 lives that we honor tonight, all the thousands of law enforcement officers serving this moment, they live well. For that, we are grateful.

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

ENSURE FULL PROTECTION FOR LGBTQ COMMUNITY THROUGH THE EQUALITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to uplift my LGBTQ neighbors at home in the 13th Congressional District. I want them to know that I uplift them today, and always, as their unwavering advocate in the United States Congress.

There are ideals and values we all should attempt to live up to in this country. I know many of us ran to be in this Chamber to ensure that our laws match those values and ideals as well.

When I think of these issues we confront as people and as a representative body, I always feel that we must use an approach that is rooted in values that uplift our whole communities. The values of equality, justice, and acceptance come to mind when I think of the need to pass the Equality Act.

Far too long, our LGBTQ neighbors have been forced to live a life of fear, a life in hiding, a life of oppression, and a life of instability.

We have come a long way in the LGBTQ rights community, but we have a long way to go. The Equality Act is a step in the right direction on this important path toward justice.

I think of the right side of history, when the right to marriage was afforded to same-sex couples, the moment when our LGBTQ neighbors in Michigan were able to create that special bond with their loved ones.

But I am also reminded of the stark reality that they faced being in States where they could still be fired from their jobs the day after their wedding for being gay.

I think of the trans community across the country that still faces discrimination and violence, especially trans women of color who are disproportionately targeted and killed. Our laws still do not protect them.

LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and, too often, have little recourse. Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in States where, though they have the right to marry, they still have no explicit nondiscrimination practices in other areas of their daily life.

One's identity could still mean deep harm and even death for some communities in this country, and we must change this.

I think of our LGBTQ neighbors who are denied public accommodation just because of who they are and whom they love. I think about how we are failing them by not living out our values rooted in justice.

This week, we have a chance to begin to change with the Equality Act. We now have a pro-equality majority,

Madam Speaker, in this Chamber, and I am so glad we can change the fact that LGBTQ folks are being denied housing, services, and employment in the majority of our States.

I am so glad to be part of ensuring that everyone has full protection in our civil rights laws, regardless of who they are and whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my colleague.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I rise on behalf of non-cisgender Americans, on behalf of QPOC Americans, on behalf of drag kings and drag queens, on behalf of all non-heteronormative Americans.

I rise today to let you know that you are seen and you are heard, and I am proud to stand in solidarity with you.

It is our mandate as legislators to protect all Americans, yet we are failing entire communities. In my home State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a leader in marriage equality, we have the second largest LGBTQ population of any State in the country. Even though our queer pride extends far and wide, 61 percent of transgender Bay Staters experienced housing discrimination in the greater Boston area, and 65 percent of LGBTQ Bay Staters experienced discrimination in public spaces, from public transportation to retail establishments, places of worship, restaurants, and healthcare settings.

As we consider H.R. 5, we must remind ourselves of our values. My former President Barack Obama once said: "When all Americans are treated as equal, no matter who they are or whom they love, we are all more free."

It is true. When we defeat hate with love, we all win.

During a time filled with fear, bigotry, and public turmoil, it is unconscionable that we are still debating the liberties of people who ask only to be received as their full selves. It is our fundamental right as Americans to live happily, peacefully, and unapologetically. It is our fundamental right to live free of harassment and discrimination. It is our right to pursue happiness.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Congressman CICILLINE, the author of the Equality Act who has worked tirelessly for years to affirm the rights and liberties of LGBTQ Americans.

Thanks to the leadership, H.R. 5 takes a comprehensive approach to making the pursuit of life, love, and happiness a reality for all of us, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. The Equality Act ensures that LGBTQ people are protected by a nationwide standard for nondiscrimination.

It is time for us to live up to our values. It is time for us to strike out against injustices that devalue our humanity.

Together, we can affirm that our diversity is our strength and that our collective safety is nonnegotiable.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 5.

Ms. TLAI. Madam Speaker, I also would love to recognize the fact—it is pretty historic—that Madam Speaker who is presiding over this Chamber right now is a member of our beautiful community, of the LGBTQ community. That, to me, is pretty historic as we now are debating and putting forward the Equality Act. That is Congresswoman ANGIE CRAIG.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), my colleague.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Before getting into my message, I would like to acknowledge that I am an ally of the LGBTQ community. I do this and announce my support for H.R. 5 because of a debt I owe.

I haven't always had the privileges that I enjoy now. Someone stood and suffered so that I could come in the front door of, probably, this very facility. Someone suffered so that I would have the opportunity to go to some of the schools that I attended.

I believe that there is reciprocity in life and that you don't get where you are and fail to appreciate those who have suffered so that you could have the opportunities that you enjoy.

I support H.R. 5 for a multiplicity of reasons, the least of which is not the fact that I am repaying a debt. I am going to help make sure that others don't endure the pain and suffering that I endured and that my predecessors endured. No one should be punished or treated with disrespect because of how you look or who you are.

□ 2045

Every person's dignity is given to them from a higher authority, and we all should respect the dignity and humanity of every individual. So I support H.R. 5, and I do so proudly because of a debt I owe.

I thank my friends for bringing this to my attention. It was not to be a part of my message this evening, but it is a part of my life, to make sure others are treated properly.

Madam Speaker, and still I rise tonight to address a crisis that our country finds itself engulfed in, a crisis that, if we are not very careful, will cause the Congress of the United States to be seen as a "less than" when it comes to the coequals that it is supposed to be on the same plane with.

This crisis is a constitutional crisis. And while there are some who would differ with me and say that this is not a constitutional crisis, remember this: There is no hard and fast definition of what a constitutional crisis is, so whenever I give my thoughts or someone else gives their thoughts, we are giving opinions.

Tonight, I would like to share my opinion about this constitutional cri-

sis. Remember, all of these thoughts are opinions; just as the thoughts of persons who hold themselves out to be constitutional scholars, they are opinions.

There are some who say that you don't have a constitutional crisis in the circumstance that we are dealing with with the President, who has refused to honor subpoenas by and through his various administrators.

There are some who say that this will not be a constitutional crisis until the case gets to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court has to rule on whether or not the subpoena must be honored. And if the Supreme Court rules that the subpoena must be honored, and then the members of the administration refuse to obey the Supreme Court, there are persons who conclude that this, now, is a constitutional crisis.

I would conclude that if the President of the United States fails to honor a subpoena, after having been so ordered by the Judiciary, that this is more than a constitutional crisis; you now have a constitutional collapse.

The crisis occurs when the President is at odds, meaning the executive branch, with the legislative branch; and currently, the legislative branch and the executive branch are at a stalemate.

The executive branch is declining to cooperate, declining to allow the legislative branch to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities associated with oversight and investigation. And, as such, there is a crisis, and that crisis, clearly, is rooted in the Constitution, because the legislative branch has this responsibility pursuant to the Constitution.

So this is a constitutional crisis, and we have a duty to address it, and we must do so, or we will have failed on our watch to take up our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

This is our watch, and we have a responsibility to make sure that this House takes its proper place in the annals of history, with reference to the question of impeachment.

Impeachment is something that we should not take lightly; but it is also something that we have to take seriously because, if we fail to do so, we will have allowed this august body to become minimized.

You see, there are checks and balances in the system. The check on the executive branch is impeachment. That is the check. That is the sword of Damocles that hangs above the head of the executive. And if we fail to exercise this duty when it properly should be, we, then, do not provide the checks to make sure the balance of power remains as it should be.

I fear for what is happening to this Congress. I am gravely concerned because I don't see us aggressively pursuing the checks so as to make sure the balance of power remains in place.

Checks and balances are in place to make sure that there is no concentration of power in any branch of government. If we don't become the last line of defense with reference to the President, if we fail to do so, we then say that there are no guardrails; that there are no rules that the President has to obey. He doesn't become just another president. He metamorphoses into a monarch.

The Framers never intended for us to have a monarchy. The Framers intended for the President to be checked by the Congress.

My hope is that we, in this Congress, will take up our responsibilities, and we will provide the checks necessary to make sure that this President, and no other President, is above the law.

I hear many Members of Congress say that the President is not above the law. No one is above the law. And they go on to say, however, this President, notwithstanding his actions, we should not impeach.

How can we say that he has committed impeachable acts, and then conclude that he should not be impeached? We, literally, are saying he is above the law when we say that he has committed impeachable acts, but then decline to impeach.

Anyone else breaking the law will have to answer to the bar of justice, except the President. We know that he has done it. The Mueller report is replete with examples, yet we have not exercised our constitutional responsibilities and, as a result, we, the Congress of the United States of America, are allowing the President to be above the law.

This is unacceptable. I refuse to allow this to continue. And I say, as I have said, that the President will have to come before the bar of justice, which is the House of Representatives. If we fail to do so, we will have literally allowed him to be above the law. Not in this country, and not on my watch.

I take my oath seriously, and I assure you that this will not be the final word; that the President is not impeachable, because he is, and we will have to have a vote on it.

Tomorrow will be the second anniversary of the date that we initially called for the President's impeachment. I believe that we cannot have another anniversary without another vote.

There will be one. My hope is that it will come through the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives. But, if not, it will come. And I don't know that there will be others who will vote to impeach him, but I do know that I will.

And there are times when you may have to stand alone; but I know that it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the time that I have had. I thank you all for allowing it to take place, and I assure you, I love my country, and I only speak these words because I see a country in peril because of a reckless,

ruthless, lawless President that we are allowing to be above the law.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND).

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act. America must live up to its values by treating everyone as equals and ending discrimination once and for all.

The Equality Act is about making sure all Americans, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, can participate in our society without fear.

New Mexico is home to diverse religious and traditional communities and has stood up for its LGBTQ population for a very long time. The Equality Act allows us to adhere to our faiths, while prohibiting harmful and isolating acts of discrimination against the LGBTQ community.

No one should have to worry about being discriminated against when interviewing for a job or struggling to find a healthcare provider that will treat them.

Tomorrow morning, when I vote for the Equality Act, I will be proud to stand with my colleagues, with New Mexicans, and with my daughter, who is a proud LGBTQ American. The time for equality is now, and we must pass the Equality Act to live up to our values.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, despite the enactment of marriage equality in 2015, same-gender couples continue to experience persistent and pervasive discrimination when it comes to home ownership.

A recent study by Iowa State University found systemic discrimination against LGBTQ borrowers. The study found that, despite having a lower credit risk overall, same-sex borrowers are 73 percent more likely to be denied a mortgage loan. And when they are approved, they face mortgage interest rates that are 0.02 to 0.2 percent higher, on average, translating to tens of thousands of dollars in extra repayment.

Twenty-six States across the United States do not have statewide housing protections for the LGBTQ community, and the Fair Housing Act does not protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals. The Equality Act would change this.

This bill would not only improve the lives of members of the LGBTQ community, it would make neighborhoods across the country more diverse. And making our neighborhoods more diverse means more Americans get to know and understand their neighbors who are gay, trans, or queer; and with that understanding and the friendships and the neighbor relationships, we hope to get tolerance. This is how we magnify the wave of LGBTQ accept-

ance this country has experienced in the last decade.

Imagine growing up in a community where you never have any LGBTQ role models; where students in your school were harassed for even being perceived as gay.

Imagine growing up in a neighborhood where you never met someone who expressed themselves like you; where you were taught that your sexual orientation or gender identity was wrong or immoral.

Imagine what it would be like to have waited years for your country to recognize your loving relationship as legal and equal under the law. Now, you are finally able to get married, and if you choose to, start a family.

You have saved enough money for the downpayment on your first home. You find that dream house in an area with good schools, plenty of parks for your dogs, and friendly neighbors.

You and your spouse go together to fill out a loan application at the local bank and wait eagerly for it to be granted. However, despite doing everything right, you are outright denied for that loan without reason.

You go to another bank, assuming that this is a mistake, because both you and your spouse have great credit. You apply for a mortgage loan again.

Maybe this time you are approved, but the interest rate would amount to tens of thousands more dollars than you had anticipated; tens of thousands more dollars than your credit risk should have you pay.

You found your dream home, but now you can't buy it because of an artificially, discriminatorily-inflated interest rate.

□ 2100

The Equality Act is vital. By amending existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity as protected characteristics, no person may be lawfully discriminated against for their sexual orientation and gender identity in housing, education, employment, public accommodations, and so much more.

Not only would it protect LGBTQ families who want to buy a home or take out a loan, but it would allow individuals who identify as gay or trans or queer to see people who look and love like them in their communities, and it would allow their neighbors to see that LGBTQ families are like them: They care about their neighborhoods; they care about their communities; they love and want the best for their children like anyone else; and they take the same pride in home ownership.

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and discrimination against the LGBTQ community is a deep injustice. Allowing that discrimination to continue in our country flies in the face of the principles of equality and opportunity that form the basis of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support the Equality Act, and I urge my

colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Detroit, Michigan, for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, you heard it just a moment ago, those words from the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere." That is why I am so proud to support this historic legislation that will be on this floor tomorrow, H.R. 5, the Equality Act, that will truly provide equality for members of the LGBTQ community.

Now, many people might argue, Madam Speaker, that we have made important strides against prejudice over the last few years, and it has been amazing. We have had States pass legislation outlawing discrimination based on a person's sexual orientation. Likewise, we have had Federal courts that have ruled that discrimination based on someone's sexual orientation or gender identity is illegal under existing laws. Yet tens of millions of Americans live in areas where these laws have not been passed and Federal courts have not made the same determination.

H.R. 5 is the remedy for making sure that we don't have this checkerboard of rights and checkerboard of discrimination among our LGBTQ community.

My district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, is notable to mention here. LGBTQ youth, in particular, face significant obstacles and barriers because of their LGBTQ identification.

We have 500 youth in my district who are homeless, and more than 40 percent of them identify as LGBTQ, many permanently homeless because they have been abandoned by their families and turned out onto the streets.

To add to their distress, the overly represented LGBTQ youth in the foster care system in Milwaukee and around the country face huge disparities in treatment and higher rates of harassment than their non-LGBTQ peers.

There are many foster care organizations that are turning away potential loving families and homes based on discriminatory practices even though LGBTQ couples are seven times—did you hear me, Madam Speaker?—seven times as likely to adopt and are more likely to adopt minority children or disabled children as compared to heterosexual couples.

Here is what we know. Every child wants a loving home. Trans people, like all people, just want to be treated like people.

For these reasons, and so many others, I fully support H.R. 5, and I look forward to voting for it tomorrow.

I applaud our leadership's commitment to protecting our LGBTQ community and all communities from pernicious forms of hate and harm of discrimination.

We are all in this together, Madam Speaker. And in order to protect all of our rights, we ought to remember the oath that we take as we stand under this "e pluribus unum"—"out of many, one."

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, who puts this Special Order together every week, has truly been committed to the rights of our LGBTQ neighbors, and I am very pleased that many of my colleagues tomorrow, in a very bipartisan way, are going to be supporting a historic, historic bill: the Equality Act.

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

#### IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank President Trump for earlier today, one more time, bringing the issue of immigration to the forefront. I think President Trump's speech was an interesting speech and provided a nice starting point for the immigration discussion ahead.

I would like to highlight three issues that I hope the President will consider as we move forth on some sort of compromise on this problem.

The first issue that I really wish President Trump would have addressed today, but I am sure he will address in the future because he has dealt with it in the past, is birthright citizenship.

If we are going to get control over who is in this country, we cannot allow the continuation of something which was certainly not intended by the Constitution, and that is something called birth tourism. I know somebody from California, and they see, on a regular basis, people coming to California to have a child here.

Now, I know in the future we want to vet our future immigrants. We want to perhaps have a balance between different countries. We want to make sure that the immigrants who are coming here learn English, the people who are coming here are going to be hard-working people and not become a public charge.

Under current law, the United States interprets, wrongly, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution as requiring that, if someone is born here, they will become a citizen here. That, of course, was not the intent of the Amendment, and President Trump, I know, knows it was not the intent of the Amendment.

The 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution was solely put in for the purpose of making sure that slaves who were born in the country prior to the Emancipation Proclamation would become citizens. There was a fear at the time that some unethical, particularly Southern, States would say that people who were not citizens

prior to the Civil War were not citizens after the Civil War.

Obviously, that Amendment was not designed to say somebody who was a tourist here, somebody who was here illegally or whatever, if they had a child, that that child would become a citizen.

It is time that President Trump do what he talked about doing in November and October, and I applaud him when he will do it, and that he get rid of the birthright citizenship. I think he can do this as President by himself, though it would be nice if Congress would pass such a law.

Right now in this country, we estimate that 7.5 percent of the births in this country are births of people who are here illegally. There are a variety of problems with that.

First of all, it encourages illegal immigration, in part because, once somebody is a citizen, under the family laws that we have right now in the United States, the parents, perhaps the siblings, will eventually become citizens outside of the way we want to pick our future citizens and make sure that they are appropriately vetted.

Now, we know that there are, I call them devious one worlders on both sides of the aisle who will fight this.

The reason this has remained a practice in the United States for several decades is, unfortunately, perhaps even Republican Presidents, for whatever reason, did not want to have our immigration laws be treated seriously.

But I do call upon President Trump to stop this policy. I think it is important not only to discourage illegal immigration, but I do not think right now that, when people come here on work visas, it is the intent of Congress that these people's children will automatically become citizens.

I think we want to stop the excessive policy of chain migration which follows, as then the parents who broke the law when they came into this country would be able to turn around and become citizens themselves, kind of a reward for breaking the law.

So I hope as this immigration law moves through the process and President Trump fine-tunes things, he does what we were all so happy to hear him say he would do last October, and that is end birthright citizenship.

The next thing I think we want to look at is the idea of public benefits for illegal immigrants. First of all, under current law, you are not hypothetically supposed to get public benefits if you are here illegally.

I would like to thank Housing and Urban Development Secretary Carson for stepping to the plate and making sure that people who broke the law to come here do not take advantage of our generous low-income housing benefits.

However, we should go beyond that. We should pass a bill saying, outright, that public benefits are not things that we should give to anybody who is not a citizen.

First of all, we are broke. I don't think it has been publicized enough,