

take a moment to recognize their sacrifice. Their commitment and bravery exemplify the highest values of service, and we are deeply proud of their dedication to our country.

From Alto High School, enlisting in the Army National Guard, Viviana Aguilar.

From Alvarado High School, enlisting in the Air Force, Lauren Melson; Air National Guard, Aaron McGowen; Army, Mason Cheek and Garret Lowrey; and Marine Corps, Nicholai Sims and Guillermo Martinez.

From Cayuga High School, enlisting in the Navy, Molly White, Christopher Marcus, and Tristin Wilson.

From Corsicana High School, enlisting in the Navy, Johnny Mirafuentes.

From Elkhart High School, enlisting in the Army National Guard, Hayden Moore; and Navy, Alexis Millyard.

From Ferris High School, enlisting in the Army National Guard, Marc-Anthony Calderon, Jr.; Marine Corps—these guys must have gotten together and decided this—Luis Sanchez Correa, Leandro Gonzalez, Arturo Contreras, Jr., and Tanner Eckert; and Navy, Ladamian Blue.

From Grandview High School, enlisting in the Army, Christopher Gonzalez, Jr., and Jaxson Mackey; and Marine Corps, Caleb Quintero.

From Hubbard High School, enlisting in the Marine Corps, Trent Causey.

From Jacksonville High School, enlisting in the Marine Corps, Alvaro de la Luz, Alex Lainez, and Yael Aldama-Vazquez.

From Mansfield High School, enlisting in the Air Force, Kevin McKinley III; and Army, Gary Frazier, Jr., and Jason Randle.

From Mansfield Summit High School, enlisting in the Air Force, Chrishauna Bee and Kennedy Jefferson; Army, Anna Mootoosammy and Beverly Bailey; Army National Guard, Brendan McCollum; Marine Corps, Jayden Porter, Michael Reynolds, and Randy Apodaca; and Navy, Logan Boyd.

From Mansfield Timberview High School, enlisting in the Army, Steven Kirk, Christopher Gallegos, and Oscar Contreras; Army Reserve, Melissa Contreras; and Marine Corps, Christian Wiggins.

From Maypearl High School, enlisting in the National Guard, Emanuel Sanchez.

From Midlothian High School, enlisting in the Navy, Kaleb Borcharding; Army, Payton Brummet; Air Force, Olivia Butterworth and Markale Nienhuis; Coast Guard, Grayson Colvin; Marine Corps, Andrew Duncan-Moore; Texas Air National Guard, Chelsea Jackson; and Army National Guard, Shyanne McBride, Tatum Murray, and Leah Villalobos.

From Mildred High School, enlisting in the National Guard, Brynleigh Perkins.

From Nimitz High School, enlisting in the Marine Corps, Kinnedee Martin, Violeta Montes, and Brian Fernandez;

and Navy, Iris Sosa, Jabaica Tecumseh, Yandel Flores, and Ashley Estrada.

I recognize Andrea Alvarado for receiving a Navy ROTC scholarship and Emma Huckeba for receiving an Army ROTC scholarship.

From Penelope High School, enlisting in the Marine Corps, Miguel Angel Flores.

From Red Oak High School, enlisting in the Army National Guard, Chloe Draper; Marine Corps, Wyatt Fogle and Reese Tiffany; and Navy, Ahmani Cooks.

From Rice High School, enlisting in the Army National Guard, Laura Sanchez; and Marine Corps, Eli Gibson.

From Sam Houston High School, enlisting in the National Guard, Henry Hewton and Regina Balderas; Navy, Erik Quiroz; Army, Alfonso Perez, Jr., Cesar Ramirez, Alexandra Sandoval, Jared Ramirez, Ximena Gonzalez, and Rene Arevalo Mendoza; and Marine Corps, Roland Tuiel and Isaac Nieto.

From Waxahachie Global High School, enlisting in the Army, Hayden White.

From Waxahachie High School, enlisting in the Navy, Logan Ojeda, Jazzmen Roberts, Lizeth Fuentes, and Asia Parrish; Marine Corps, Ernesto Alvarado Mata, Hailey Avellaneda, and Rubi Nieto; National Guard, Mason Contreras, Vincent Sallie, Skyler Howard, and Carolina Suarez; Army, Ella Crow; and Air Force, Thomas Hernandez, Jr., and Mateo Martinez.

From Westwood High School, enlisting in the Marine Corps, Brody Ander Latner and Tristan Alexander Fitzgerald; Navy, Jonathan Alexander Castillo and Christian James Flores; and Army National Guard, Kurtis Michael Brown.

From Wortham High School, enlisting in the Navy, James Rissmiller.

□ 1245

These are just a few examples of some outstanding people living in a place I am blessed to call home.

You need not worry about the future of our country. The 114 young men and women believe in our country so much, they are willing to put their lives on the line.

When you are told that there is no hope for our country by the media, people in this body, that we can't do something, we can do anything we set our minds to because we are the United States of America. We are the light-house of the world. We are the bright, shining city on a hill.

There are a lot of good people working in Washington. They get a bad rap, a lot of elected folks up here, a lot of folks sitting up here doing their jobs as clerks here in the House, folks who are working very hard every day to make our lives better. They are working hard on your behalf, and we have the best system in the world.

We have great people in our district. It is a real privilege to serve them as their Congressman. It is my privilege to honor them on the House floor.

Keep all Americans in your prayers. Keep the Israeli hostages in your prayers. Keep joy in your hearts, hope in man, and faith in God.

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POSEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to address some issues that I have addressed from this podium in the past, but I think the American press corps has still not picked up on them. They are issues that ought to be debated in the upcoming elections because I think over time, they have a profound effect on America.

When I talk to people my age and up, they are almost uniformly concerned about where America is going, and they feel America is not particularly as great a country to raise children in as the America that they grew up in in the seventies or sixties or fifties.

When I ask them why, they sometimes have a hard time placing it, but they list different things. One of the things they all talk about is the breakdown of the family.

You have to wonder why this has happened or why they feel the family is not as strong as they used to be, but they are right if you look at the statistics.

If you look at the number of children born without both a mother and a father in the home, around 1960, that was only 5 percent; it was rare.

Then the Lyndon Johnson-led Federal Government began a so-called war on poverty. I call it a war on marriage. Between 1960 and the mid 1990s, that 5-percent figure went up to 40 percent.

Now, you may ask, was this just a coincidence? Did people believe in God less? Was getting married first as important? How did it happen?

The American public should be aware that there are some people who always did want it to happen. Going back to Karl Marx, founder of Marxism, very connected with communism, the scourge of the 20th century, there was a goal to break down the family.

They felt for the government to become preeminent, the family must shrink. The most important factor in raising children was no longer a mother and a father, it was the government.

Beginning in the sixties, a variety of programs were passed, and it is kind of surprising because today we talk about equity which is close to equally. You would think the government would treat all Americans the same, but these programs provided benefits to people who had a certain income level.

If you had a very low-income level, either because you weren't working yourself, or let's just take a woman as an example because there is no husband in the house working, you therefore became eligible for a variety of

benefits, some of which began in the sixties and some of which have been added since that time.

We are aware of these benefits, and one of the most generous is housing for people without a major breadwinner in the home, and that can amount to a \$700 or \$800 or \$900 a month benefit.

We are all aware of the food stamp benefit, which you are eligible for if there is not, say, a man who is a breadwinner in the house.

We have medical benefits. We have something called Pell grants, which provide free college both to parents of people who are in poverty or a parent in poverty and to that person themselves.

I would like to recount an anecdote on Pell grants. I have given a talk like this for many years in Wisconsin. I would always give them to what used to be called the Tea Party movement, which was usually made up of a bunch of guys who were over 60 years old, but I talked about the benefits that the government gave to people that weren't married at that time.

I talked to a young gal, because she was different from anybody else, and I asked her what she thought about my talk. She said, well, me and my husband got married before we had children, but none of my friends are getting married. They get free college, which is right.

I wonder whether Senator Pell, before he came up with the Pell grants, knew that within 30 years of introducing the Pell grants, the young people would catch on that the government wanted them not to get married so that way, their children would get free college or they, themselves, would get free college.

We now have the TANF program, which gives cash benefits to people.

Indeed, there are over 70 government programs in which your benefits are based on percentage of poverty, which is to say you get benefits if you are not working hard and if you are not married to a spouse who is working hard. As soon as you have one person who is working kind of hard, they are going to make enough money, then they are not eligible for all these programs. When you consider the powerful forces who wanted to get rid of the family, perhaps this is not a coincidence.

In the 1960s in addition to the Marxists, we had the angry feminist movement. There were feminists like Kate Millett, a name I remember from my youth. If you look up her speeches or comments, she wanted to break down the family and not have men in the family.

I don't think it is a coincidence that at the same time these programs were expanding, the power of the feminists in this institution increased, and the result was we are going to have to have less men in the family.

There is another big program, the earned income tax credit, which could easily give \$6,000 or \$7,000 or \$8,000, which was formed by Jack Kemp, an

entirely misguided Republican, who felt it was good to put out another program conditioned upon not having a good breadwinner in the household.

In any event, I think when all these programs are done, we did work our way up to a point in which 40 percent of the children were born without two parents in the house. The effect of this, not only on the children but on the men, was huge.

There is an important author by the name of George Gilder who we have long since forgotten. He is still alive, still kicking, and I hope he is listening to me.

George Gilder investigated what was sometimes called the ghetto in Albany, New York. He followed a young couple, an unmarried couple, when the gal got pregnant, and he expected—back in those days when you had an unmarried couple and the gal got pregnant, that was cause for concern. People were not happy that the gal was pregnant. It was, like, what are we going to do?

He found out already by the 1970s that it was actually cause for celebration. The mother and the father went from government office to government office picking up all these benefits.

It meant that she would no longer have to live with her mother, and he wouldn't have to live with his father. He shouldn't be living in the household but as a practical matter he was. So a benefit for having a child out of wedlock was, all of a sudden, you got housing.

Now, since that time, we have done something called a title 42 tax credit in which the government pays for 70 percent of housing that a property developer, who may also be a campaign contributor, is able to build low-income housing, new low-income housing, superior to rental properties, which most other people get, and people below a percentage of poverty are able to live in title 42 housing.

The property developer, who has now built very nice properties because the government is paying for 70 percent of them, he becomes very wealthy, and the new family or the new mother and child wind up living in an apartment nicer than most other people live.

But in any event, George Gilder's observation was not only does this put the child in the long run in a more difficult position—and people who work hard, there are all sorts of family backgrounds, and they are doing a tremendous job, I understand that. Another effect that I don't know was necessarily anticipated by Lyndon Johnson is they kind of took the purpose out of a man's life because now they have a basket of goodies for the mom. She may be making \$40,000 a year, \$30,000 a year, and pretty soon, the couple realizes that if the guy is going to come in and make \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year, materially, he has done nothing to add to the family.

□ 1315

He winds up eventually realizing why am I going to live here? Maybe he

moves out on his own, maybe mom kicks him out, but, in any event, we have made the man superfluous, which I think George Gilder would argue is the major effect of the war on poverty. They have taken away the purpose of the man to be part of a family.

In any event, here we are in 2024 in a situation in which about 40 percent of children are born to a couple out of wedlock, and, obviously, with divorces or people breaking up, that number can wind up even higher, which is a huge tragedy for America.

If we want to get America back to 1960, when this was almost unheard of, we have to fundamentally change these programs. Of course, as you have a family breakdown you have other problems that we are trying to deal with here. As you have less marriages, you have a higher abortion rate, so a lot of these abortions have to be attributed to the war on marriage begun by Lyndon Johnson. You have children who maybe don't do as well in school, which can be attributed to this or who are more likely to be depressed or more likely to commit crime or have guys who don't have a purpose in life and are more likely to just hang out and do drugs and that sort of thing.

I think this is a huge issue, and it is something our slumbering press corps ought to take up with our candidates for President and see if they plan on doing anything about it since the war on poverty in the 1960s, I think, can universally be declared a complete failure. I would ask the press corps to look at this, and I would also ask leadership in both parties as they plan what they are going to do in January of 2025: Do you view this breakdown of the family as something the government should do something about? As far as I can tell it was largely caused by the government in the first place. People who wanted the breakdown of the family, people like Angela Davis, a well-known communist, people like the feminists who were so important in the 1960s, it appears that—not for everybody but for some of the principals who designed these programs—a goal was the destruction of the family. Of course, they have succeeded in that these single-family units are much more likely to depend upon the government.

Every year, of course, I am lobbied by people who want the government, therefore, to take up an even greater role in their children's life, be it daycare, be it preschool, be it after-school programs, whatever. They clearly want the children raised by the government.

I hope the press corps picks up on this, and I hope Republican and Democrat leadership put together some sort of plan for January in which we work our way back to where America was in the 1960s.

The next issue I am going to take up, and it was debated on this floor quite a bit yesterday, but I don't think a certain tact was taken with regard to the bill. President Biden, one of the many

things that he champions and is proud of that he has done here, weighed in on Title IX and is trying to force a certain view of transgenders on American schools.

It would seem to me that in life today the transgenders, at least we are told, are very unhappy people compared to their peers. Nevertheless, the Biden administration has adopted rules, the message of which is if a young person feels a little bit like a transgender or wants to be a transgender since it is kind of portrayed as a positive lifestyle in the news, if someone wants to be that way, the schools have to go out of their way and accept this lifestyle and maybe even I would say accept it to the degree to which you would say you are promoting the lifestyle.

We have to say the best studies of gender dysphoria show that between 80 and 95 percent of the children who claim to have a gender identity problem will snap out of it. If you read a book—what I think is the best book on the topic that I have read—maybe one of the worst things you can do to children like this is encourage them down the path—in other words, praise them for doing this, accept them for doing this, and you wind up in a situation in which they may not bounce out of it.

This is my problem with the Biden rule.

The rule is such that I believe that children who play with this sort of identity are more likely to wind up permanently experiencing this identity, rather than bouncing out of it as 80 to 90 percent are.

In Europe, they have kind of backed off of the extreme view of this lifestyle situation because they realized that the more they talked about transgenderism, the more kids began to adopt it. They, therefore, feel that going all the way toward puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones may be very damaging, and the children will just wind up getting back to the norm on their own.

I think as we discuss this topic, a lot of the verbiage is aimed at men participating in girls' sports, but I hope we are also looking at the more we normalize this lifestyle, which seems to be connected with depression and unhappiness, the more we do that, the more children will go down that path, the more it will give the medical profession an opportunity to prescribe more drugs, and even in some cases, do more surgeries.

When we have a President who in extreme cases is even telling boys that it is fine, you can pretend you are a girl, we will accept you as a girl, go out for the girls' soccer team or whatever, I think we are very likely harming that boy who would probably, according to the statistics, snap out of it, but, instead, he is going to start down a lifetime, which may include puberty blockers and may include depression as he comes to accept the norm of being something which he is not.

I hope this side of the story will be taken up not only in this body but by conservative press outlets who just solely focus—which is an outrage too—on the unfairness of having a boy compete in a girl's sport but also think on what you are doing to the poor misguided people, boys who think they are girls or girls who think they are boys, because as you affirm this choice you are going to get more and more people going down that path and more and more people, I think, winding up with unhappy lives.

I have other things to talk about, but I think I will leave that for next week.

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

GROWING CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been growing concerns among many Americans relating to the capabilities of the President to carry out his duties. Not only that, but there have been concerns about the extent to which some in the White House, perhaps also in the Congress, have limited the ability of Americans to get access to the information that they need to form their own judgment as to those capabilities.

I think there is a lot that is going to need to be investigated in the weeks and months ahead in that regard.

I wanted to just highlight today what might be the most disturbing facet of this situation, and that is the systematic efforts by the Attorney General, the Justice Department, and the White House to illegally defy a congressional subpoena in order to deprive Americans of access to this sort of information.

I want to specifically highlight what is perhaps exhibit A, you might even call it a smoking gun, that the White House acted in a consciously political way and deprived Americans of access to information, defied a congressional subpoena, defied the idea of the separation of powers and checks and balances for purely political reasons.

For months, the Judiciary Committee, under its lawful oversight authority, asked for the Justice Department to produce the interviews that President Biden had with Special Counsel Hur. These interviews were conducted, of course, as part of an investigation into the President's mishandling of classified information. The ultimate report produced by Special Counsel Hur stated that there was significant evidence the President had broken the law, but he was not going to recommend charges for, among other reasons, the fact that the President exhibited diminished faculties and a poor memory in the course of these interviews.

The House Judiciary Committee had several legitimate bases to request ac-

cess to those interviews, and, indeed, the Justice Department appeared to agree in as much as they did produce transcripts of those interviews. However, they have adamantly and consistently refused to actually provide the best available evidence of materials that they have agreed are pertinent to our oversight responsibilities, and that is the recordings themselves.

These recordings exist. There are audio recordings that continue to be suppressed and concealed from the American people.

What I have here is the letter from the White House counsel Edward Siskel written to the chairman of the Oversight Committee and the Judiciary Committee formally invoking executive privilege. This happened after weeks and weeks and weeks of stonewalling from the Justice Department. It happened moments before a hearing was convened to hold the Attorney General to cite him in contempt. Suddenly, the President exerts executive privilege.

What they said in this letter, this line right here, is really the giveaway. You might even call it a smoking gun. It says: "The absence of a legitimate need for the audio recordings"—of course we had a legitimate need for them cited repeatedly in correspondence, but this is what he said: "The absence of a legitimate need for the audio recordings lays bare your likely goal—to chop them up, distort them, and use them for partisan political purposes. Demanding such sensitive and constitutionally protected law enforcement materials from the executive branch because you want to manipulate them for potential political gain is inappropriate."

First off, this might remind you of what we have been hearing now for weeks and for months about various videos posted online, that these were somehow selectively edited, these were deepfakes, these were eliminating context. We now know that all of that was fairly bogus in terms of what Americans have now seen plainly with their own eyes.

What is clearly going on in this paragraph is the White House is relying on a political justification for withholding materials, but they know they can't state that explicitly, so they simply accuse us on the committee of having a political motivation. You don't even have to read between the lines. It is stated right there directly that they are afraid that these materials would be used against the President for potential political gain. In other words, they are afraid that they would be politically harmful to the President. That is not—that is not—a valid legal basis for defying a congressional subpoena. It is not a valid basis for asserting executive privilege, and it is very revealing as far as what the White House knew about the recordings and about the concerns that the American people have in overwhelming numbers right now is they feared that what was