

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,

but about 20 percent of the current Federal spending is borrowed. When you are around \$23 trillion in debt, the idea of providing generous public benefits to people who are not citizens is preposterous.

Secondly, insofar as efforts are made to increase our citizenship through things like DACA, we do want to make sure that we are not collecting immigrants who are eventually, themselves, going to become a public charge or coming here because of our generosity rather than the opportunities that take place for people who work hard.

I have introduced legislation which will say that any local unit of government that gives benefits to people who are not citizens will lose its ability to give those benefits, because we have to crack down on this. Otherwise, the future generations of Americans will no longer be like past generations who came here to take advantage of the opportunity to get through hard work, but we will begin to get some people here who will take advantage of the opportunities that are available from government benefits.

I hope President Trump, as he continues to discuss this immigration situation, talks about this.

The third thing I think he should talk about, and something that I don't think the mainstream media has highlighted enough, is what we are going to be spending money on in the next budget.

So the viewers back home are aware, when we pass our annual spending bills, we break it into 12 separate bills.

Now, right now, as we have 100,000 people a month crossing our border illegally, I would say that it is probably the number one concern for the future of the United States.

Sadly, the majority party, as they let us know where their priorities lie, told us the percentage of increases in each one of these 12 bills. For example, Labor and HHS was due for a 6 percent increase; Defense for a 3 percent increase; State and Foreign Ops, a 5 percent increase; the Legislative Branch, I think, about a 3 percent increase.

Who came along in last place at 1 percent? Homeland Security. In other words, a sign that the least priority in the next budget should be enforcing our borders, this at a time where groups estimate the cost of illegal immigration to our country to be between \$50 billion and \$100 billion.

Not to mention, when we talk about the moral fiber of America, which has kept us going for so long, we begin to have the next wave of immigrants, who will become the next wave of Americans, whose first action coming to this country is breaking the law.

□ 2115

I want to point out that neither I nor President Trump is anti-immigrant. I think it is tremendous that every year in this country we swear in another 700,000 citizens. I think it is wonderful in this country that we have 4 million people here on work visas, and it is possible that number will go up in the future.

But there is a difference between people coming here on work visas; there is a difference between people going through the appropriate steps and getting sworn in legally and people who are crossing the border illegally.

These are three suggestions of things that I would think would be minimal requirements before an immigration compromise is reached.

Again, I emphasize we should get rid of birth right citizenship. The idea of people flying here from other countries or crossing the Rio Grande and saying "my child automatically becomes a citizen" must end.

I think the practice of having people who are here illegally or anybody who is here who is not a citizen getting public benefits—and frequently those public benefits, particularly in the area of healthcare, are superior benefits to those which the average working American has. As a matter of fact, frequently, public housing today is superior to some of the housing that people who have to pay their own rent can afford. But I hope we step up to the plate and make sure that, with regard to immigration, there are no public benefits.

And finally, with so many people flooding across the border, I hope we aggressively fight the idea that the least important part of our upcoming appropriations bills is Homeland Security.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASSIE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a U.S. Army Advanced Individual Training graduation ceremony.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1208. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2379. An act to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 17, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 987, the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 987, AS AMENDED

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019–2024	2019–2029
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Effects	0	-79	-177	-167	-38	59	83	195	269	297	454	-403	895

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.