

I hope this is discussed over the next 3 weeks back home so that when Congress reconvenes and works on our appropriations bills we try to do what we can to get rid of these DEI specialists.

The final topic of the day is with regard to two different groups who are being treated very differently, and it is time we got rid of the differences.

Beginning in the 1960s, the Federal Government began to institute widespread use of income-based benefits. Some of them were low-income housing benefits, some of them were at the time what we called AFDC benefits, some of them were food benefits, and some of them were healthcare benefits. Nonetheless, they all gave more benefits to people who were considered to be in poverty.

Frequently, being in poverty meant that you couldn't get married because if you have a couple together and one of them has a job, then they usually are not considered to be in poverty, so they don't get free housing, free food, and free checks. There is a flawed program called the earned income tax credit in which people also get more money.

All these programs have two things in common: They largely penalize people who get married to someone with an income, and they largely discourage people from working. In my experience talking with people on a lower level of the income scale, they all know when they should stop working to get the maximum benefits.

□ 1345

There is a sweet spot if you are a single parent, around \$16,000 to \$18,000, and you get your earned income tax credit. You get your rent-free apartment or almost rent-free apartment. You get your food share. You get your medical care. You may be getting some separate individual checks. As a result, we are discouraging two things: We are discouraging marriage, particularly marrying somebody who has got an income, and we discourage work.

There is a bill working its way through Congress right now, which is adding a new class of Pell grants. Pell grants are what amount to college scholarships for people who are perceived to be low income.

What happens with Pell grants—and the same thing should be said about food stamps, the same thing should be said about low-income housing—if one couple gets married and raises a child on their own, under most cases they are not eligible for free government scholarship.

If they decide not to get married and maybe you have one parent with a small income, their children get what amounts to a college scholarship. I had a woman approach me saying that her and her husband got married and their daughter was \$35,000 in debt when she graduated from college. She thought that was unfair because her sister didn't get married and her daughter was getting what amounted to almost

free tuition for 4 years because of the marital status of her parents.

The child from a married couple is \$35,000 in debt, compared to very little debt of the child of the unmarried couple.

In America, we are supposed to be treating people equally. Obviously, we are not treating people equally here. It is like it is the policy of the Federal Government to discourage marriage and particularly discourage marriage if you have children. This is not something that has been talked about lately. It hasn't been talked about in depth here, as far as I can tell, since the 1990s, but since equity or "equality" or something is the catch word that you hear a lot of around here, I think we ought to look at these programs and stop penalizing people who get married and have children.

It is a shame, but a lot of people feel they can't afford to have kids anymore, maybe they have no kids, maybe one child, and you hear it is because they don't have enough money; meanwhile, we have no problem taxing them to make sure people with a different lifestyle have a variety of things.

It is not going to change in January or February, but I hope the people in this institution begin to think about that. Was it right to set up programs and the only way you can get them is if you don't get married when you have children?

I will recount a little anecdote with regard to the Pell grants. I used to speak on this back in Wisconsin before I was a Congressman, and I would go through all the different programs which you lose if you get married and have a job. I talked to a young gal who was in the room at the time—because sometimes I think I have to know more how young people think—and when talking about the grants that went out to people of supposed lower income—of course, this also encourages working off the books. All these things do—the gal said, me and my husband got married before we had a child, but none of my friends are getting married. They get free college. I think people in this institution have to stop and think, is that right? Should we be teaching the young people that you get free college if you don't get married when you have a kid?

That is what we are teaching them right now. That is what we taught that young gal in Green Bay if she is listening. I have heard what she said, and I hope it is something that is talked about a little bit more in this institution.

The three topics for the American public to chew on over the next 3 weeks: The record number of people coming across our border and permanently changing America and bankrupting America. The obsession over identifying people where their great-great-grandparents came from as if their view of the world is the same of somebody who was born in Mexico or China or somewhere else in the 1890s.

Lastly, our rather strange policy of trying to discourage people from getting married before they have children. I hope the American people chew on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague has been covering a lot of very important subjects here. I know he is frequently in the area of immigration and the invasion of our border, so I appreciate Mr. GROTHMAN's strong efforts on highlighting that so the American people understand.

It really boils down to when we are looking at the border invasion that we have quite a battle. I do not understand why the Biden White House is simply sitting by watching it happen, even having personnel propping the gates open to allow this to happen.

We do not understand fully who is coming in. It is not just people from Mexico or even Central America. There is a lot of very dangerous people coming across the border. They apprehend many people on the known terrorist or mayhem list, at the very least, and I wonder whose side are they on. Whose side is the administration on when they allow this to happen? Whether it is the drugs coming across, the fentanyl, the people who are setting up and going to be the potential terrorist cells that are going to hit this country at some point, and we see all these protests going on over Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, they are just waiting for the green light on this. It is completely irresponsible and antithetical to the constitutional vows we take what is going on with the Biden administration and their nonenforcement of the border. Much work needs to be done.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 115), as amended by section 1601 of Pub L. 111-68, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center:

Mr. BACON, Nebraska

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ADAMS MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2406(b)(3) of Public Law 116-9, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Adams Memorial Commission:

Mr. GRIFFITH, Virginia

Mr. MOOLENAAR, Michigan
Mr. LYNCH, Massachusetts
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. BUCSHON, Indiana
Ms. MCCOLLUM, Minnesota

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY AS- SEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Member on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. NORCROSS, New Jersey

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOP- MENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. COLE, Oklahoma
Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, New Mexico

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2670. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZA- TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024, SUBMITTED BY MR. TURNER, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PER- MANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the Explanatory Statement to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 ("the Act"),

which has been included as Division G of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024. The Explanatory Statement reflects the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (together, "the Committees"). The Explanatory Statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the Committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning their final decisions regarding funding levels and policy direction. Therefore, the Committees have prepared a classified annex—referred to here and within the annex itself as "the Agreement"—that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations and that describes in detail the scope and intent of the Committees' actions.

The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community to obligate and expend funds as requested in the President's budget and as modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations, subject to applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the Act pursuant to Section 7102 of the Act. It has the status of law. The Agreement supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the Act and in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

This Explanatory Statement incorporates by reference, and the Executive Branch shall comply with, all direction contained in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (S. Rept. 118-59) and in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (H. Rept. 118-162). The Agreement supersedes all classified direction related to programs and activities authorized by the Schedule of Authorization.

The Executive Branch is further directed as follows:

INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW OF DISSEMINATION BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION RICH- MOND, VIRGINIA, FIELD OFFICE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENT

The Committees are committed to ensuring full transparency in the FBI's actions implicating the rights of the American people to the free exercise of religion and speech. Therefore, the Committees direct that, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct and submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, a review of the actions and events that served as a basis for the January 23, 2023, dissemination by the field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation located in Richmond, Virginia, of a document titled "Interest of Racially or Ethnically Motivated Violent Extremists in Radical-Traditionalist Catholic Ideology Almost Certainly Presents New Mitigation Opportunities." The review shall cover any orders or direction regarding the document from any official in any field office concerning purported proximate links between any religion, any political affiliation, or the intent of this report.

The Committees further direct that, not later than 10 days after the date of the enact-

ment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the same committees identified above the unredacted August 22, 2023, Inspection Division report associated with the Richmond Domain Perspective.

FUNDING LIMITATIONS RELATING TO UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA

Section 7343 of the Act provides for funding limitations relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena because of perceptions of insufficient transparency in this area. Section 7343 is also intended to avoid technology and security stovepipes and expand awareness regarding any historical exotic technology antecedents previously provided by the Federal Government for research and development purposes if they are shown to exist.

Section 7343 further provides a limitation regarding independent research and development funding to ensure that certain indirect expenses are prohibited. That provision is intended to be interpreted consistent with Department of Defense Instruction Number 3204.01 (dated August 20, 2014, incorporating change 2, dated July 9, 2020; relating to Department policy for oversight of independent research and development), or any successor instruction.

SCREENING AND VETTING OF VISITORS OR AS- SIGNEES FROM SENSITIVE COUNTRIES AT THE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The Committees are concerned that the Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at the Department of Energy (DOE-IN) does not require the comprehensive screening and vetting of foreign visitors or assignees from the People's Republic of China (PRC), Russia, Iran, North Korea, and Cuba who work or otherwise collaborate with scientists in our National Laboratories. United States Government-funded research carried out at National Laboratories is incredibly important and sensitive. Whether a laboratory supports a science mission or is oriented toward supporting national security, it is critical that all foreign visitors and assignees from countries of concern receive appropriate vetting in order to mitigate counterintelligence risks. In fiscal year 2023, more than 7,000 nationals from the PRC visited 16 National Laboratories. Russian visitors numbered more than 3,700. The Committees understand that international cooperation on matters of basic, fundamental science helps maintain the United States' technological edge. At the same time, we need to protect both the classified research as well as unclassified research that result in technologies with dual-use applications, and which can be adapted for military or economic gain, from getting into our adversaries' hands.

The Committees therefore direct that DOE-IN require a robust effort to screen and vet visitors or assignees to our National Laboratories from the PRC, Russia, Iran, North Korea, and Cuba. The Committees also direct DOE-IN to ensure appropriate oversight over such screening and vetting to ensure that counterintelligence threat information related to potential assignees or visitors is appropriately identified and tracked. The Committees further direct that, not fewer than twice per year, the Director of DOE-IN shall submit to the Committees a report noting each instance in which a visitor or assignee from the PRC, Russia, Iran, North Korea, or Cuba, identified as a significant counterintelligence risk was permitted access to a National Laboratory.

BRIEFING RELATING TO CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES OF THE COAST GUARD

Section 416 of H.R. 3932 provided the Commandant of the Coast Guard with enhanced