

long ago we voted more than \$3 billion. I have been a supporter. I am still a supporter of the people. I am not a supporter of the Netanyahu administration. I support the people, not that administration, because what they are doing to the people of Gaza is ungodly. It is shameful. It is disgraceful. I will not support that.

Let others do what they may. If there are people who believe so strongly about this in the Ninth Congressional District that they want somebody who will tolerate this and go along with this, then send them on up here and take me out because I don't go along with it. I am not going to go along so that I can get along, not when it comes to this.

By the way, I am not a saint. I don't claim to be a saint. I just claim to be a person whose conscience dictates that I shall not support this kind of behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: Notwithstanding all that I have said, I still love my country. I am an American. I believe I am of African ancestry. I have not checked my bloodline to find out, I don't know, but I love this country. It means something to me to say to people that I am an American.

I love it more than it has loved me. It segregated me. The rights that the Constitution recognized for me my friends and neighbors in the South took away from me, but I still love my country.

How can you love your country when your country has treated you the way it has: the back of the bus, balcony of the movie, step off the sidewalk when people come by, separate line for you at the grocery store, and colored water fountains, how can you love it?

It is because I love what it stands for and its noble ideals, the ideals of liberty and justice for all as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance that we said at the genesis of this message. I love the ideal in the Declaration of Independence that all persons are created equal and endowed by their Creator with these inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This is why I have said that because I love these ideals, I believe we should export them to other people, but not export them in the sense that we want them to simply obey them and treat other people right, I think that is a good thing to do, but in the sense that we ought to respect her life, her liberty, and her desire to pursue happiness. We ought to respect her life. Export that to people across the globe, especially people who are trapped, trapped in Gaza and who can't get out. They have no place to go and are told to move from one place to another.

Let's give them the benefit of these noble words: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I will do so in every way that I can. I believe in this country, and I love it to the extent that I believe we ought to make that noble ideal real for people in this country

and without this country, especially the people who are in Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud Member of this Congress and a proud American in the sense that I love my country because of its great ideals, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at three major issues. Sometimes with the minor day-to-day issues one forgets to analyze the major issues that I think are going to determine the fate of our country.

In the last week, one more time, we got the results on the number of people crossing the southern border. While the results keep pouring in month after month, it is, in my opinion, and I think in most people's opinion, the most significant issue that Congress has to address.

In March of 2024, and these, of course, all are estimates, we believe 220,000 people crossed the southern border and stayed in the United States. This has something in common with every other month this year, and it goes up and down depending on the time of year; one more time, we hit an all-time record of the number of people coming into this country by that month.

In March of 2024, it was 220,000. In March of 2023, it was 130,000. In March of 2022, it was 166,000. In the final year of the prior administration, it was 11,000. One more time, we see the increase from 11,000 people coming here in a month to 220,000 people coming here in a month.

We recently had a hearing on the border in a subcommittee related to the Oversight and Accountability Committee, and on that committee, the sheriff, Sheriff Waybourn, pointed out that right now about 25 percent of the Venezuelan prison population dropped by 25 percent.

This is consistent with concerns raised by the Border Patrol that in addition to just plain taking people we can't afford to take, other countries are dumping their undesirables into this country.

Does President Biden care that the number of people in Venezuelan prisons has dropped by 25 percent?

That by itself should be a banner headline.

The next thing to look at in addition to that drop is an anecdote from Sheriff Waybourn from Texas. He points out that someone asked a member of the cartels: Do they care about the fentanyl coming into this country and all the people who are dying?

His quote was that they were okay as long as the fentanyl was killing Americans.

Now, think about that, Mr. Speaker. This is consistent with what we think

the worst possible motive for bringing fentanyl into this country is. They want to destroy the United States. China itself is playing a role in the amount of fentanyl coming in this country.

The young people of this country may feel they are not involved in a war. They never enlisted in the Army, and they never enlisted in the Navy.

Be that as it may, like it or not, you are involved in a war. As a matter of fact, more people are dying in the war that you have signed up for than in any of the wars that our armed services have fought in, about 108,000 people a year.

They are dying in a war because the Mexican drug cartels and foreign countries that produce the fentanyl do not wish the U.S. well. They apparently like to see young Americans die, and young Americans have to realize that there are people gunning for them.

We talked about those 110,000 people. That is about twice the number of people every year who die in the war on drugs compared to the number of people who died in Vietnam.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. I am old enough to remember Vietnam. People were dying all the time. Headlines said that people are dying in Vietnam. Twice as many people die every year as died in 12 years in Vietnam. It is just unbelievable.

□ 1230

Now, there are some people who get confused and think, well, we just have to take these people coming here illegally because we are, otherwise, cruel and not allowing enough people into the country.

Here is something else that we ought to be talking about a little bit more. The number of people who come into this country or are sworn in as legal citizens goes up and down from year to year.

First of all, the last year available, a total of 969,000 new people were sworn in as immigrants in the United States. If you break it down in 4-year increments—things go up and down—at least back to the year 1910, there has never been a 4-year period when so many people from other countries were sworn in, in the United States. There is no reason to feel guilty if we turn these people around because, right now, a record number are coming here.

In that 4-year increment, there are a little bit over 800,000 people every year being sworn in. It is kind of interesting. If we go back and look at the 1960s, which I remember well, normally you were around 110,000 to 120,000. Therefore, we have gone up in the 1960s to swearing in about 110,000 new Americans, and now we are well over 800,000.

That is before we add in new people who are becoming citizens by birth-right citizenship. This is a new thing that barely existed in the 1960s or 1970s, but in which you may have mothers fly over here from China, have the baby in San Diego, and fly back, and that is another citizen, as well. We are kind of

changing America more quickly, in my opinion, than at any other time in our history.

In summary, when we view the border crisis, we are one more time at an all-time record for March. We are not being callous or cruel because we are at all-time records in the number of people who are coming here legally, as well. We are allowing over 100,000 Americans to die every year because of drug poisoning, and at least there is anecdotal evidence that the countries or the people bringing the fentanyl here want Americans to die. They have declared war on America, and their attitude is: The more Americans who die, the better.

There is also evidence that foreign countries are letting people out of their jails and into the United States, taking advantage of our weak and uncaring President, who apparently does not consider it a priority that over 100,000 people die and apparently doesn't see a problem with having other countries emptying their jails into the United States.

The border is the number one problem facing this country right now, and this body has no business taking up any other issues until the border is dealt with.

Now, one of my colleagues from Texas decided to address the situation in Israel, and I think there is a lack of a narrative being talked about there as well that ought to be addressed at this time.

People, such as my colleague, like to tear down Israel, say they have done something wrong, say they must stop fighting, and kind of imply all the way around it is not that nice or a good country. As a matter of fact, if there is one country Israel is probably more like than any other, it is the United States of America. One way we can see it is like the United States of America is that people from all over the country want to come there.

Indeed, I was recently at a mosque in my district, and they, with pride, pointed out that their sect of Islam had recently built a mosque in Israel, of all the places in the world that you would want to go.

There are many people who, with the whole world to go to, are trying to get into Israel.

When you read about the attacks last October, you may remember that some of the people who died were from Thailand, and some of the hostages taken were from Thailand. You might wonder: I didn't know there were so many Jewish people from Thailand. Actually, the reason people are going there from Thailand is because there is so much opportunity there and so much freedom there that, if you wanted to get a job anywhere in the world, people from Thailand or other places in Asia have decided to come a significant way around the world to work in Israel.

There were newspaper articles—we don't know what has become of it—but tens of thousands of people from Ecua-

dor apparently are thinking about coming halfway around the world and work in Israel. Why don't we ever hear about that?

There was a time a while back in which Israel began to embark on a, perhaps, two-state solution—something they regretted. In any event, at the time they did it, maps were drawn up so that people could move from one part or the other. Presumably Arabs would want to move to areas controlled by Arabs and Jews would want to move to areas controlled by Israel.

To their surprise, the Arabs who were living in Israel proper did not want to move. They would have rather lived in the new country or the new lines. They would have rather lived in Jewish Israel than in a new Arab State. Isn't that interesting?

Nevertheless, all we get is criticism about Israel. However, when push came to shove and you see where people want to live, people everywhere—be it in Asia, be it in South America, or be it in and around Israel—want to live in Israel and want to live in Israel more than a new country.

You look at it and say: Why aren't things better in Gaza? Has Israel done something wrong? In fact, Gaza has been a corrupt country. Foreign aid which flows into Gaza, particularly from Europe, winds up going to the leaders of Hamas, who may be living in Qatar and may be living in Turkiye and may be living in France.

Indeed, many of you know the name Yasser Arafat, who for many years was the voice of the Arabs in Israel. When he died with all the money that he got—I don't know why he got it all, obviously taking money, foreign aid from around the world—his ancestors got out of Gaza. They weren't going to spend money there. They got out of Israel. They are living in Paris, France, right now, another Western country, rather than living in the Arab parts of Israel.

Therefore, when people say Israel must call for a cease-fire or stop fighting, in fact, Israel is a very desirable country. They have every right to protect their country from horrible people who try to cut off the heads of little children. If anybody should surrender, it is Hamas who should surrender. They at any time, I am sure, could come out of their tunnels and say: We surrender. We are going to escort the Israeli Army through these tunnels so we see exactly what was here.

The war would end. Any killing would end.

Instead, people tell Israel they should stop fighting, and I think I know the reason for that. If you look at a parent and they have a 10-year-old child and a 4-year-old child fighting in the back seat of the car, which child do the parents address? They address the 10-year-old child because that is the older child and the more likely one to understand what is right or wrong.

I kind of think, when I see these protesters outside of this building every

day when we walk by them, that purport to care about the people of Gaza, they ask us to tell the Israelis to stop fighting. They don't have demonstrations to tell Hamas to stop fighting.

I think that is because they know, deep down inside, they want to treat Hamas like children and don't expect them to wake up and realize that their behavior is causing some civilians, innocent civilians, to be killed.

In any event, to summarize, everybody should remember: People from all around the world are trying to go to Israel, not just Jewish people, but people from Ecuador and people from Thailand. There are mosques of people from Islam who are apparently happy to live in Israel. You do not see Jewish temples in Gaza because that is not a country that naturally wants peace or is willing to live with people other than—or largely other Arabs.

In any event, I will call for Hamas to stop their fighting. If they care about their people, just step out of your tunnels and say: Here we are, Israel Army.

That will be the end of a war in which, sadly, too many civilians have died.

Now, the third critical issue that we should be addressing right now, and we have not talked about enough, is what I will call the war on the American family. I think it is probably the biggest issue facing America today.

The war on the American family started in earnest with the Great Society programs in the 1960s. The Great Society programs were programs in which material things were given to families, not always, but usually families without a man in the house. Sadly, there are ideologies which want to get rid of families in which you have a man in the house, families which are self-supporting.

The type of programs which are, not always, but usually available to households without a husband or a father around, are many. The big ones are the nutrition programs; very generous housing programs; healthcare programs; education programs, such as Pell grants; other cash programs, like the earned income tax credit.

All of these programs require that you not work too hard or make too much money in order to get these programs. All of these programs have in common that, if there is a man in the house making a relatively decent wage, that family is not considered in poverty, and they will not be eligible for their free low-income housing or free food or earned income tax credit, which can result in a check of 10 or \$15,000. You are not eligible for special cash benefits that go to parents with disabled children.

All the way across the board, we seem to be encouraging the breakdown of the family. Now, you may say: Oh, Glenn, family is like mom and apple pie. Everybody wants families.

However, that is not true. If you look at Karl Marx and his ilk, they believe

the key to destroying the West, including the United States, was getting rid of the American family.

More recently around here, we had the Black Lives Matter group. I realize not everybody who had a sign in their yard agreed with this, but the founders of the group did. They wanted to get rid of what they referred to as “the Western-prescribed nuclear family.” In other words, they viewed a family with a husband at home as being a problem.

I recently ran across a quote in a book that somebody gave me, and I just opened the book, and I came to a few lines which I think everybody in Congress ought to be aware of. The lines were from a woman by the name of Kate Millett, who, if you are my age, you frequently remember she was a very prominent feminist in the 1960s, the decade which really began to result in the decline of America. Her sister quoted her as saying that a goal of feminism should be destroying the American family.

Therefore, one more time, we run across not a huge number of people, but disproportionately influential people saying that a goal should be to weaken the family. Then you look at, one more time, President Biden proposing increases in programs, be it low-income housing programs, be it the earned income tax credit programs, be it the Pell grant programs, all of which are really made for families without a husband earning a decent salary at home. All these programs are being increased by President Biden.

In fact, what we ought to be doing is we ought to be doing the opposite. Right now, it is not surprising if a man is not in the house because, in some cases, his family would be materially better off without him being in the house.

In particular, some of the low-income housing projects, particularly section 42 projects, are new buildings which are superior to the buildings or superior to the rental units that American families are sometimes living in.

□ 1245

Of course, the healthcare programs designed for the poor people don't have sizable deductibles in them. In that regard, they are, in many ways, superior to the healthcare plans the working poor get.

There are programs, like I said, for college scholarships. I will recite, again, a quote from a gal I ran across when I talked about the marriage penalties in Wisconsin. I recited all the benefits that people were able to get if they didn't marry a man with a decent income, and I asked her what she thought about my speech. She told me: Well, I am married and have a child, but none of my friends are getting married. They get free college.

Here was another program, the Pell Grant Program, designed to encourage the breakdown of the American family.

It is important that when we go into the budget negotiations and the appro-

priations negotiations for the year beginning October 1, that our appropriators and leaders go to bat and say no more special benefits for making sure there is a man not in the house.

As a matter of fact, we should go backward because, not surprising after Lyndon Johnson—in my opinion, the worst President of the United States until Joe Biden came along. It is not surprising that what used to be called the out-of-wedlock rate has skyrocketed since the 1960s and with it a variety of problems that come with not having a father in the household.

It is time to look at these programs again and, rather than pay people to keep the husband out of the house, encourage people to have the father at home.

This is not just a material matter. It is a matter of it is better for the children to have a father at home, and it is better for the father himself to be at home.

As George Gilder points out, an author that I think we all ought to be reading, the number one person hurt by the war on the American family, be it Karl Marx's war or Lyndon Johnson's war, whatever you want to say, the number one problem is to men who now don't have a function in life.

If you look at certain areas of our society, it is the men who are more likely to do the drugs or commit the crimes. If they were a father with responsibilities at home, I think these crimes would happen a lot less. I think there would be less drinking. I think there would be less drug abuse. I think America would slowly work its way back to the more wholesome, less crime-ridden, less drug-ridden time of the 1960s.

I hope both parties pay attention to the impact of incentives or disincentives that their programs have on having men in the household.

In any event, there are three issues that we have dealt with today.

We have dealt with the border, where we hit record numbers and the fact that it has become apparent that we are not getting the best people. Apparently, other countries are emptying out their prisons.

We have dealt with what is going on in Israel and what a wonderful country it is as people from all around the world, including people who aren't Jewish, try to get into Israel. It is kind of like people from all around the world trying to get into our country, but ignoring this, they are still subject to criticism by people like the protesters outside or my predecessor here in Congress who just got done talking.

Finally, I hope the press and the Republican Party pay attention to the increase in benefits to families without a father at home that he wants to put in this budget, which I am sure if it was enacted would, again, push up the number of families in which, sadly, there is not a father at home to help raise the children.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 382.—An act to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 19, 2024, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3825. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Farm Service Agency and Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Pandemic Assistance Programs and Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs [Docket ID: USDA-2021-0012] (RIN: 0503-AA75) received April 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3826. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Farm Service Agency and Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Supplemental Dairy Margin Coverage Payment; Conservation Reserve Program; Dairy Indemnity Payment Program; Marketing Assistance Loans, Loan Deficiency Payments, and Sugar Loans; and Oriental Fruit Fly Program [Docket ID: FSA-2021-0003] (RIN: 0560-AI59) April 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3827. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Agricultural Disaster Indemnity Programs [Docket ID: FSA-2020-0011] (RIN: 0560-AI55) received April 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3828. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honey Bees, and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP) Programs [Docket ID: CCC-2022-0001] (RIN: 0560-AI63) received April 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3829. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Agricultural Conservation Easement Program [Docket ID: NRCS-2019-0006] (RIN: 0578-AA66) received April 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3830. A letter from the Chief, Legislative and Regulatory Staff, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Regional Conservation Partnership