

moment. He was concerned about our country.

America has come a long way during his lifetime, but he knew it would not take much to undo the progress that we have made, and he was worried about it. It was an honor to have such a conversation with an American icon, civil rights legend, and my father on the floor of Congress. It is a moment I will treasure forever.

**HONORING HEAD START AWARENESS MONTH**

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Head Start Awareness Month.

Since 1965, Head Start has been one of our best tools in the war on poverty, helping over 35 million children from ages 0 to 5 reach their full potential through high-quality early education.

This month, as we paid tribute to the game-changing program, I rise to honor Head Start programs in California's 21st Congressional District and the vital work they do to support Central Valley communities.

This summer, I brought my esteemed colleague Congresswoman BARBARA LEE to the Rosa Parks Learning Center in Hanford, a top-tier Head Start center operated by the Kings Community Action Organization. It was truly an honor to see talented Central Valley educators at work and to join them in the classroom. We even got to read a couple of books to the classes, as well.

We all know that even part-time early childhood education has a lasting impact on young kids, helping them develop reading, writing, math, and even social skills on an accelerated timeline.

I am also proud to support legislation like the Community Services Block Grant Act so we can keep providing quality education to all of our kids regardless of ZIP Code.

**SALUTING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALEXANDER VINDMAN**

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the State of Texas has a large number of Active-Duty men and women and veterans. I rise today to salute Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman, who appeared in uniform today to the United States Congress to tell the truth.

Unfortunately, there were those who wanted to analyze Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's early beginnings. As a 3-year-old, he came from another country. But I think it is important to say what he is: a patriot.

I read his testimony. It was straightforward, detailed. It certainly was without exaggeration. You could clearly

see that this man cared about his Nation.

We should respect the men and women of the United States military, particularly a Purple Heart recipient, a wounded warrior who fought for his country and was wounded.

I thank him for coming forward as a patriot, as a man in the United States military, as one who has no issue with any person. He simply wants to tell the truth.

Since we need just a little bit of expression here today, I conclude my remarks by saying: Go Astros. I wish them well. That is what America is about.

**STAND AGAINST INVIDIOUS DISCRIMINATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCANLON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country.

And I rise tonight also because we had a hearing today in the Committee on Financial Services. We had the hearing today because of words that Dr. King called to our attention. He reminded us that, in a real sense, all of life is related. He said that life is an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny. What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly.

He went on to say that I can never be all that I ought to be until you are all that you ought to be, and you can never be all that you ought to be until I am all that I ought to be.

This hearing was held because we wanted to highlight and recognize the fact that invidious discrimination exists for persons who are members of the LGBTQ community. Tonight, I want to talk about this invidious discrimination not only as it relates to the LGBTQ community, but also as it relates to other communities within our country. In fact, all of these communities are a part of humanity.

With reference to the LGBTQ community, we had empirical evidence that proved beyond reasonable doubt that members of this community are being discriminated against when they apply for loans. They are being charged higher interest rates and a greater percentage than persons who are not members of the LGBTQ-plus community. They are being discriminated against on their jobs. They are being discriminated against when they apply for jobs if it is known or suspected that they are members of the LGBTQ-plus community, discriminated against in being promoted, in pay raises.

The LGBTQ-plus community is being discriminated against, and it does not make good sense to do this. It is irrational. But it also does not make good dollars and cents to do this because we

are talking about millions of people. The estimates are as high as 16 million. Some say more, some say less. We are talking about a \$1 trillion economy within the community.

It just makes good sense for us not to discriminate against people who want to put their money into the economy, who want to put their work product into the economy, who want to help America succeed. It does not make good sense for this level of discrimination to exist, but it does.

One of the salient messages that we wanted to impart at this hearing today was the message that you are not alone. There are persons who are allies of the LGBTQ community who are going to stand with you, who are going to stand for you, and who are going to stand against the invidious discrimination being perpetrated upon you.

Life is an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny.

The Muslim community is being, has been, and most likely will continue to be discriminated against until there is some change in this country. We have had from the highest office in the land an indication that Muslims should be banned from the country. An attempt was made to perfect such a ban of Muslim persons from the country.

Life is an inescapable network of mutuality. If you can ban one religion, you can ban another. Muslims today—only fate knows which it will be tomorrow. We must protect every religion if we want our religion to be protected.

This is the way life works, the mutuality. What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly.

□ 1815

People of color are being discriminated against in an invidious way. In the Latinx community, the family separation that took place at the border was unconscionable.

It is hard to believe that this country that holds out the welcome torch, the Statue of Liberty, this country that has brought in immigrants from across the globe would turn away children who are fleeing harm's way in the way that we did it; this country that has a history rooted in immigration would do such a thing, babies crying for their mothers as they are being torn out of their arms.

It is a sad thing when you contemplate it. It is a very sad thing when you see it perfected.

We cannot allow this to happen to children who are coming here trying to flee harm's way, because the truth be known, but for the grace of God, there go I and possibly you. We all can have dates with destiny that we cannot contemplate in the present.

So we ought to protect the rights of people who are fleeing harm's way, who are only asking for what the law provides in this country. And the law in this country does provide for people who are fleeing harm's way to come and say, "I am here. I am here because

I need help. Will you help me? Will you give me the opportunity to demonstrate that I qualify for the opportunity to become a part of this country?" rather than summarily turn people away or send out a clarion message, "We have no more room. Don't come. Go back."

This is not the country that does this.

To borrow a phrase from a great and noble American who has made his transition, the Honorable Elijah Cummings: We are better than this. This country understands that we must continue to be the light for the world when it comes to righteousness.

When it comes to African Americans, we have a history, a long history of invidious discrimination, a very long history. A Civil War was fought because of the invidious discrimination being perpetrated, the hate, if you will, that was being perpetrated upon African Americans.

And today, within the last several months, perhaps a year or so, we have had the Chief Executive Officer proclaim that we have some s-hole countries, countries that are predominated by persons from Africa, where Africans are the indigenous population.

But persons in this country, persons of color, of African ancestry, are being discriminated against as I speak, as is the case with the others that I have mentioned earlier, I might add, also being discriminated against.

And there are people who say, when we talk to people about the issues that are of concern to them, we ought to talk about kitchen table issues. Well, I can tell you without question, reservation, hesitation, or equivocation, when African Americans talk about kitchen table issues, they talk about invidious discrimination. They may not use this terminology, but the import of what they say is the same.

They say: I am being discriminated against on the job.

They say: I have suffered discrimination when I have tried to apply for a loan.

They say: I have suffered discrimination when I have sought to get a promotion.

They talk about discrimination. It is a kitchen table issue. But there are those who don't see it as such, or if they do, they don't talk about it as such. It is a kitchen table issue: invidious discrimination in the African American community.

There is invidious discrimination in the Asian community. We have been working to try as best as we can to deal with the question of linguistics.

We have seen this happen in the Latinx community, the Latino community, as well. People will advertise in one language, and when you come into the place of business, they will conduct business in another language.

So you are induced to come in and transact business, let's just use this as an example, in Spanish, induced to come in and transact business in Span-

ish, but once you arrive, the contract is in English.

There are many who would say, well, what is wrong with that?

Well, here is what is wrong with that. If you know that you are going to communicate in English when you bind the person with the contract, why would you entice the person to come in in Spanish? If you know that you have no intentions of conducting your business in Spanish, why would you entice the person to come in with Spanish?

This is a form of perfidy. It is ill will. It is not the way people of good will treat other members of society. We respect people to the extent that we want them to understand what they are doing.

In the area of housing, we have tried, on a contract, to have language that simply says: What language would you prefer to do business in? We indicate that you do not have to complete this portion of this document if you choose not to—this is a person who is applying—and we also indicate that this is not going to be binding upon the person who has presented the contract. We are trying to get some sense of the linguistic needs that are prevalent in our society, just trying to get some sense.

However, that language that we had worked and toiled to put in place has been rejected. It has been rejected, and we are trying to protect it.

I have traveled to many places in my lifetime. I have had the good fortune to travel to many other continents and many countries, and in so doing, I have always appreciated the fact that people would try to communicate with me in English. In each and every country, there were people who would assist me in English. There may have been some exceptions, but generally speaking, English.

People moving through airports in distant places can have the announcements made in English.

I have gone to hotels where the persons who were working in the hotels in foreign countries could speak multiple languages. One of them would be English.

People have catered to us across the globe. We have had the welcome mat extended to us because we are Americans and we speak English and they want to do business with us. They want to roll out the welcome mat. Unfortunately, we have not shown a similar characteristic.

It is my belief that we ought to show a level of respect to other people who come to this country. Many of them are here to do business. Many of them are here as immigrants. Many of them are here for lawful purposes, yet we do not concern ourselves with the linguistics.

We have had difficulty putting up street signs in communities that are in multiple languages. There are many people who oppose this.

When I have traveled through airports and through other countries, I have seen the signs in multiple languages, including English.

Life is an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny; what impacts one directly impacts all indirectly.

This discrimination must end because it not only impacts the persons who are being discriminated against—the LGBTQ, the Muslims, the people of color, the African Americans, the Latinx, the Asians—it not only impacts these people directly, it impacts all of us indirectly, because Dr. King was right then and his words of profundity still ring with truth today:

I can never be all that I ought to be until you are all that you ought to be, and you can never be all that you ought to be until I am all that I ought to be.

All of this has been called to the attention of Members of this House because I believe that there is still work to do with reference to the question of impeachment.

I have said on this floor before when I spoke here last, and I say again, we cannot allow invidious discrimination to be weaponized so that people suffer to the extent that the weaponization is creating the suffering.

And it starts at the top. And because it starts at the top, this House has a duty to start at the top. And if we do our duty and start at the top, we will understand that just as we can impeach a President for issues related to national security, we can impeach a President for issues related to invidious discrimination.

The Republicans did it in 1868—Republicans. Some things bear repeating: Republicans impeached a President in 1868 based upon issues rooted in invidious discrimination.

We had just fought a Civil War, and those who were called freedmen—freed persons, if you will—were working with a Freedmen's Bureau to try to acquire the same rights as others. But there was a President, Andrew Johnson, who was of the opinion that they did not merit the same rights, and he fought against the Freedmen's Bureau. He fought to maintain white supremacy.

But radical Republicans, radical Republicans, radical Republicans, radical Republicans stood up to him. They impeached him, and President Johnson changed his tune, to borrow a phrase. Oh, he was still the bigoted racist of his time, but he did tone down. And he did not get reelected, by the way.

He was a successor to Abraham Lincoln, but he did not get elected—I should not say, "reelected." He was Vice President, and he did not get elected President.

The point is this: Radical Republicans cared enough for newly freed people—radical Republicans. They cared about invidious discrimination. We had just fought a war. They stood up.

By the way, I have an opinion that I will share with you.

I believe that the Republicans in this House right now would do a similar thing if a Democrat happened to occupy the White House and behaved the

way the current occupant behaves. I believe that Republicans of this time would respond the same way the Republicans of that time, in 1868, responded.

I believe that if any person in the White House who was there with the title of Democrat behaved the way the current occupant behaves, that person would be impeached, and Republicans would lead the charge.

□ 1830

Life is an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny; what impacts one directly impacts all indirectly.

The inaction that we take today will produce an action in our future. Our failure to act today is going to say to the next occupant: You cannot conclude that this is the last person who will disregard all the protocols and rules. You cannot assume this. You can only assume that we have this one, and you can hope that there will not be another, but there can be.

If we show that there are no guardrails, if we demonstrate that we don't have the courage to do what Article II, Section 4, of the Constitution mandates, in my opinion, our inaction today will result in future actions that would be harmful to this Nation.

This is our calling. Only we can bring justice to all of these that I have called to your attention tonight who are being discriminated against. We can't bring the kind of justice that is needed by ignoring the harmful discrimination that is taking place.

More than 50 percent of Americans, according to a Quinnipiac poll of just a couple of months ago, I believe, maybe 3 or 4, indicated that more than 50 percent of the people in this country believe that the President is a racist. We ignore it because it is uncomfortable. It is easier for us to take on the challenge of national security.

Well, invidious discrimination that causes white supremacists to march up and down the street screaming “blood and soil,” invidious discrimination that allows persons to traverse the country so that they can murder people of a certain hue from a certain place, that is harmful to this country.

This level of invidious discrimination should not be tolerated by this Nation. We have a responsibility to stand up for those who are not in this Chamber to stand up for themselves. This is our calling. I am here tonight on behalf of all of these who I have called to your attention. I stand for them.

I may stand alone, but it is better to stand alone than not stand at all. I stand for them because I know the harm that they can and have suffered. And I believe that we ought to have at least one Article of Impeachment that deals with invidious discrimination. I believe it; I encourage it; and I support it.

I understand that we want to get back to bigotry as usual. I understand that, to a limited extent, I stand in the

way of getting back to bigotry as usual, back to bigotry as usual when it is a talking point, not an action item, when you don't have to vote on Articles of Impeachment that deal with bigotry. That is too hard.

I understand that we want to get back to bigotry as usual, when we can say that we are for principles above politics, when we can proclaim that we do not put party above country. I understand. I want to get back to bigotry as usual. I am sorry that I am one of the impediments. But I assure you, my dear friends, I can't let it go. I can't. I know what the suffering is like.

I suppose it is my destiny to be here to call these things to our attention. We can ignore them. We can tolerate this bigotry. But remember this: Those who tolerate bigotry perpetuate it.

There are people and organizations that have built their reputations fighting bigotry. Yet, when there was an opportunity to vote to deal with bigotry at the highest office in the land, well, the argument was the Senate won't convict so why would we do it.

Well, it is the same argument for discrimination as it relates to national security, as it relates to abuse of power. The same argument, but we now put principle above politics—the same argument.

There are those who said that: Well, you know what will happen if you remove the current occupant.

Well, the same argument could be made now. But it is because we have a different issue, it is not invidious discrimination.

We now can put principle above politics. We now are not concerned with who the next occupant might be. We now say that the Senate has to just do its job and that we are going to do our job.

Things have changed, and thank God they have. I am appreciative that they have changed. I really am. This is why I am calling to our attention the necessity to have an Article of Impeachment related to invidious discrimination.

There are those who believe that, in this country, invidious discrimination has become a tool, a tool to be used by political parties, a tool to be used to rally the vote, to get out the vote, to create a constituency to vote, just a tool to be used. And that tool is being managed so that the political parties can continue to play their games—a tool.

I don't want to manage; I want to end. I do not want to see us manage invidious discrimination. I want to see us end it.

That is why I stand here tonight. Life is an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny. What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly.

Dr. King's probably most famous words were: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” Injustice in any community in this country is a threat to justice in every community in this country.

I love my country; I didn't come to Congress to make this speech. I love my country; I didn't come to Congress to impeach a President. But because I love my country, I am making this speech. And because I love my country, I have brought Articles of Impeachment.

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

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

#### BUILD ROBUST ECONOMY TO KEEP PROMISES

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is one of those moments where, in listening to my friend, Mr. GREEN, we are friends. We, I think, always voted against each other on most everything, but we were always civil to each other. That is sometimes hard to communicate with a lot of our brothers and sisters, our folks at home, that you can sometimes have very contentious issues that we absolutely disagree on, but it doesn't mean that we have to be jerks to each other.

We have a family motto—I don't know if it works for someone on the left—“conservative but not a jerk about it.” And we try very hard.

Let's see if we can actually do something that actually is interesting and real on the math. Because our other saying is: It is about the math, and the math always, ultimately, wins.

The reason we often start these presentations with this board up is if you look at our future, instead of the chaos that this place seems to be bathing in so far this year, and care about what is happening to the country, care about people like my little 4-year-old daughter, who turned 4 last week, best little girl ever—what is her future going to be like?

When you look at the CBO data, there are some really important data points that are not Republican, not Democratic. They are math.

In the next 5 years, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements, just the growth, every 5 years, equals the Defense Department spending. That means, every 10 years, two full Defense Departments is just the spending growth.

We expect, over the next 10 years, 91 percent of the spending growth for your Federal Government will be Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements.

Over the next 30 years, if you remove Social Security and Medicare, we have \$23 trillion in the bank. If you roll Social Security and Medicare back in, we are \$83 trillion in debt. That is not inflation-adjusted. If you inflation adjust it, it is somewhere in the 50s.