

would like to talk a little bit about the Knights of Columbus.

We live in a society that claims to value diversity and tolerance; however, sometimes things bubble up in this town. It is apparent that some people are hated and the intolerance applies to them.

I am speaking, of course, of the fact that, about 2 years ago, a little over 2 years ago now, a U.S. Senator from California, in part of a confirmation hearing on a Federal judge, decided to weigh in and felt that, if you were a member of the Knights of Columbus, perhaps you shouldn't become a Federal judge.

Recently, rereading the statements made there and the lack of outrage at what, apparently, was a religious test, or close to a religious test, to become a Federal judge, I thought I would like to talk a little bit about the Knights of Columbus, which is very active in my district.

The Knights were founded as a Catholic group in 1882, in Connecticut, and, currently, there are about 2 million Knights, almost exclusive to the United States, but there are also some in Canada, New Zealand, England—or Britain—and a few other countries.

They have been active during that time, and they do a lot to help people. They seem almost ubiquitous in my district with all the fundraisers they have.

A few weeks ago, I attended a meat raffle for the Princeton Knights of Columbus in which they were helping out a Vietnam veteran who had cancer.

I want to point out that the Knights will help out not just Catholic people, but people who aren't Catholic as well.

The Princeton Knights were also doing a chili fundraiser to help a gentleman with prostate cancer.

Other groups I see around, can be seen: the Cedarburg Knights selling Tootsie Rolls for Special Olympics or pregnancy health centers; the Fond du Lac Knights having fish fries for youth hockey and handicapped children.

You see the Neenah Knights running concession stands at the Packers games, the Mayville Knights doing a calendar fundraiser for the local food pantry, the Oshkosh Knights doing a bowling fundraiser for coats for kids, or Men for Christ. I mean, you see the good works that the Knights are doing everywhere.

I wish I had time to go through all the other organizations and list exactly the fundraisers they have. The Two Rivers, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Fredonia, Horicon, wherever I go, I see the Knights are active helping people out.

I always kind of consider the Knights of Columbus kind of like mom and apple pie. You know, you could stand here in Congress, and Congressmen would go out of their way to praise groups like the Knights of Columbus and be seen with the Knights of Columbus.

But, apparently, they are not so much like mom and apple pie anymore.

We have had Members of this body, and not from small, insignificant States, Members of this body apparently now feeling that that is something to be attacked for. And, of course, it is not.

They are helping out at the Special Olympics or helping out at youth hockey that has caused them to be hated or feel that they shouldn't be part of the public square. It is, of course, that they are active in the Catholic church, a church that is pro-life, that apparently some Members around here feel that the Knights of Columbus, therefore, should step aside and can't be trusted to make decisions as far as where we are going in the United States of America.

Recently, Joe Biden came out, actually, and even said that the Senator from California would make a great Vice President. I mean, can you imagine that?

Can you imagine, 40 years ago, in this country, somebody saying that the Knights of Columbus, that a member of the Knights maybe shouldn't be a Federal judge?

That is a great thing she says. Let's make her a Vice President. I think that is a great thing.

In any event, speaking on behalf of myself, I would like to thank the Knights for all they do around the Sixth Congressional District. I hope they continue to speak out on Christian issues, on Catholic issues.

I hope the other clergy, clergy who may not be Catholic themselves, realize that they could be next to be targeted by these Members of Congress. But, again, I thank the Knights of Columbus for all they do.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have a few minutes more here. I have, what, 5 more minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

IMPEACHMENT AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we spent a lot of time up here, too much time on this impeachment thing. I think the reason people want to talk about impeachment is they don't like to talk about all the things that ought to be getting done that Congress isn't doing when they are talking about impeachment.

I want to, one more time, talk about what I think is the number one issue that is going to destroy America, and that is the immigration situation. We continue to have people come across the border.

President Trump, on his own, has dropped the number of people coming in this country from over 50,000 allowed in this country and placed in this country last May to under 1,000 by the Border Patrol in December.

Nevertheless, laws should be changed quickly to make sure that this does not continue, or should be changed quickly before some of these Federal judges decide to stop President Trump from trying to do what he is doing.

The Congress should be brought in to change the credible fear standard to

make sure everybody under the Sun can't say that they should be a refugee.

We want to change the laws with regard to the Traffic Victim Protection Reparations Act. Right now, so people understand, if we get somebody under age 18 from Canada or Mexico—from Canada or Mexico—we can send them back; from other countries, we are forced to keep families apart.

I know President Trump would desperately like to return a minor from Honduras or Venezuela or Cuba back to their parents, but right now he is forbidden from doing that because Congress refuses to act.

We should be cracking down on welfare for illegal immigrants right now, which serves as an inducement for the most irresponsible of people to come to the United States, but Congress doesn't act.

We have built, or we are soon going to build, 100 miles toward the wall, but we still need more money. We hope we have enough money to get to 450 miles by the end of the year. But that is not going to be enough, particularly when you consider that, right now, the DEA thinks that 95 percent of the fentanyl, cocaine, heroin, or meth in this country is coming across our borders.

I will guarantee you there are people who are going back to their districts next week and, at their townhalls, are claiming that they care about the over 60,000 people who died last year from these drugs, but they aren't doing anything to enforce that border where 95 percent of these drugs—fentanyl, cocaine, heroin, and meth—are coming are cross.

It is time we act there, as well. We need more money for what we call non-intrusive technology so we can determine when these drugs are coming across in cars or otherwise, as well as it would be a good thing to get more dogs.

I have been down at the border myself and seen how effective they are at preventing these drugs from coming across that are killing so many people.

In any event, I hope the rest of the public and our mainstream media, as well as our conservative media, don't fall apart and don't fall into the trap of being all impeachment all the time over the next 3 or 4 months.

Remember all the people who are dying because of the drugs coming across the border. Remember the huge burden on the United States as more people come across the border for things such as welfare-type benefits, and imagine what type of future America has if we don't begin to enforce our laws.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the Managers appointed by

the House for the purpose of exhibiting articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate, and that at the hour of 12:00 noon, on Thursday, January 16, 2020, the Senate will receive the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, in order that they may present and exhibit the articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate notify the House of Representatives that at the hour of 2:00 p.m., on Thursday, January 16, 2020, in the Senate Chamber, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the articles of impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

AMERICA IS BECOMING MORE PRO-LIFE

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. And given that we have had some serious discussion here this evening, I really appreciate my colleagues, CHRIS SMITH and others, who have spent an hour addressing the life issue here.

As we come up on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, January 22—I believe that is a date that will live in infamy—America is becoming a more and more pro-life country. And as we watch the transition that is taking place in this country, that has to do with the March for Life that comes out here every year, when thousands of people, many, many young people ride from my neighborhood about 18 or 20 hours on a bus to get here, and they gather on The Mall for the events and the speeches and the rally and then march to the Supreme Court building. We often host them here with some hot chocolate.

Each of these years that go by, I meet more and more young people that have become part of the pro-life network. So the network that is here, it strengthens people. They look around and they see that they are not alone. They come from churches; they come from schools; they come from families; they come from neighborhoods; and they understand that they are not alone, that there is a patchwork of people that are active across this country that is emerging into the majority in America.

I will submit that we are now a majority pro-life nation, and that would be consistent with polling, the Barna poll that we did about, I suppose, a year and a half ago or a little more that showed that, just on the Heartbeat bill alone, which I happen to be the author of, H.R. 490, that we saw 61

percent support for the Heartbeat bill, without exceptions. Republicans were up at about 85 or 86 percent; independents were around in the 60th percentile; and Democrats are even in support of it, in the majority, at 59 percent of Democrats.

So it may have been that America was a little bit ignorant about the beginning of life and the science of life and the moment that life begins, but we all knew that in our hearts when, in 1973, it was one thing, and it was a political agenda that was driven.

And Norma McCorvey regretted that she happened to be Jane Roe. So she actually didn't get an abortion, and she became pro-life in her later years and became a pro-life activist.

So it didn't serve her, and it surely didn't serve America. But some number of over 61 million American babies have been aborted since that period of time.

And there have been struggles in this city. There have been women that come to this city and march for abortion, and so many women who come and march for life.

But here is what I see. In 1976, Mr. Speaker, our firstborn child came into the world; and, of course I anticipated that with eager and nervous anticipation.

But when that little boy—actually, not so little. He was almost 9 pounds. When he went into my hands and my arms and I looked at him and I held him in awe at the miracle that he was and is today, it was just stunning to me that, from my wife, Marilyn, and I came this little baby, this miracle.

To look at him, to look in his eyes, to see his dark hair, and he turned out to be a blue-eyed, dark-haired little guy, and he had a lot of hair on his head, and it was just such a miracle to see and count the fingers and toes and look how perfectly they were formed.

□ 1945

As he lay in his crib, I would sit and look at him, and there was an aura about that little baby boy. There was an aura about him. And you could have convinced me that he was the second coming of Jesus Christ, that is how strong that was to me, that little boy miracle.

As I looked at that, I thought this little guy here, how could anybody take his life now in these first minutes of his life or how could someone take his life the minute before he was born or the hour before or the day before he was born or the week or the month or the trimester, the first, second, or third trimester?

And I just thought that through as I held that little miracle in my hands, and I knew that this life was precious and a miracle the moment that I could hold him and touch him and see him and feel that warmth and smell that fresh baby smell on him. And within minutes I went back through this process of development of this miracle from the moment of conception until birth.

And at that moment I knew that you couldn't take that little baby's life at any point in this stage. I knew that his life began at the moment of conception. And from that moment on this miracle and millions and millions of other miracles needed to be protected from that moment on, that life begins at the moment of conception. That was 1976.

Twenty years later I went out to San Diego to the Republican National Convention, and certainly I had all of my colors on and all the things that are attached to your lapels and your delegation credentials that are out there. And on a Thursday afternoon at 3:00 I see on the tri-fold schedule there that said Christian Women for Choice are gathering there in San Diego at a location about a block and a half away from the convention center.

Something called me internally and said, you have to go down there and see what is going on. I was curious. What scripture would be quoted to me from Christian Women for Choice? I took a friend with me and we went down and found this area. It was about an acre, I suppose, in size, maybe a little less, chain-link fence all the way around, stage in the middle, big old speakers up there and microphones. There were people still milling around, but there wasn't a program going on on the stage at that point.

I went to an individual that looked like he was at least associated with somebody in charge and I asked him who was the leader of this and who is the head of the Christian Women for Choice. And he said, that is my wife, and he pointed to her and took me over and introduced me. We ended up on the stage. And as that conversation began, it became a debate.

And I remember there in San Diego, for every delegate—I remember the number they told me—there was as many as 15,000 press in that city to cover the convention.

So we had quite a lot of press in that protest zone where they would be looking for controversy. So the leader of Christian Women for Choice and I went at it in kind of a no-holds barred debate that just clashed back and forth between us. And several of the others would chime in for her, and every once in a while her husband would put his chin up over her shoulder, and he would bark some things at me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I was far enough from home and convicted enough, having enough conviction for those that don't understand what that means, that I could just unload all of the things that needed to be said in the middle of that debate.

She began to demand that we go out and collect the billions of dollars in child support that is owed by deadbeat dads is what she called them. And I said, I am happy to do that. I think they need to pay their child support, and I will be working to do that—it turned out in the Iowa Senate for starters—but you can't make that