

we fought for rare earths. I can build you the math model that says this decade and the next three decades, we are going to fight for smart people, the entire world. We educate people here, and then we send them away. Are we out of our minds?

Madam Speaker, I am going to skip a bunch of the boards and just try to close this out with just a couple more. This is 2023. Total outlays, total spending, \$6.1 trillion; total receipts, \$4.4 trillion. What is that? \$1.7 trillion borrowed. This year, borrowing is going to be about two-and-a-quarter, and this is a time when the economy is doing remarkably well. Now, it is subsidized, so it is basically a sugar high, but it is still doing well.

Now, our problem is, in 2023, gross interest was about \$700 billion. This year, we are heading toward \$1.14 trillion, \$1.16 trillion, but this differential here, almost every dime of that \$1.7 trillion borrowing, the growth on it—now, much of it is Inflation Reduction Act, the shortfall from tax reform, but we have never been given the run to show how it is growing tax receipts. I am showing you even corporate tax receipts where the different rates are up.

It turns out it is healthcare and interest now. As we are moving back to more normalized interest—How many of you live in a fantasy world where you think interest rates are going back to 0? You realize the current interest rates on 10-year notes still aren't at historic norms when you take away the years of suppression on the rate.

For my brothers and sisters on the left, who like to say, well, you gave away to rich people, today, the rich, as defined by you, pay a higher percentage of Federal income taxes than they did before. The Republican tax reform was more progressive than the previous Tax Code.

When we get to some of the other charts, here is my chart showing that President Biden in the debate said something insane about covering Social Security. Let me see if I can find one. In 10 years, gross debt will be \$56.8 trillion.

However, here is one of the points I desperately want to make. Historically, when we have had very high marginal rates, we get 17.6, 18, 18.2 percent of GDP in taxes. When we have had very low marginal rates, we get 17.6, 18.2 percent of the economy in taxes because the economy changes in growth. When you look at it, the black line is receipts, revenue. The line above it is interest and healthcare.

When our friends keep saying, well, we are going to tax the rich more. Great, but I have already shown you if every tax worked absolutely to its maximum efficiency, you get a point and a half, a percent of GDP, and we are borrowing 7 this year.

We will make this the last one. Until we are actually willing to first have the same definitions of here is the drivers of debt, here is the innovations we are willing to bring into our society,

this is our future, our future is just absolutely crushing, and it is percentages of GDP. We expect Social Security and Medicare outlays, as we start to head to the 30-year budget, 17.6 percent of the entire economy, where revenues are 6.3. Okay, no one has any idea what you are talking about. My basic point is, today through the next 30 years, it is demographics. It is mostly healthcare, and then the cost of financing that shortfall.

Helping people live longer, live healthier, live freer of disease is moral. It isn't Republican moral, Democrat moral, it is just moral, and yet every piece of legislation I have brought here over the last few years can't get a hearing or gets shot down because the bureaucracy despises it. The interest groups care more about their money than they care about my 8-year-old's future.

There is a path where the math can be made to work, but for everyone around here, you think there is a simple solution. My father used to have this great saying, for every complex problem, there is a simple solution. That is absolutely wrong. We will have to do complexity to save our future, save my retirement, save my children.

We have put it on paper. We have done economic modeling; we have had multiple Ph.D. economists do the math. There is a way it works. Will this place step up and buy a calculator and put batteries in it and then sit down with those of us who want to save our future and make this another American century? Instead, we run around terrified from doing what is hard.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the therapy session of letting me vent. I am going to bite my tongue from saying what I have to say, but I am going to throw one last thing. There are a number of people who watch these presentations on YouTube. Half the comments are bots, they are fake, they are Russian troll farms. Half the remaining half are people who care more about saying ideological insanity, but there is about a quarter of them that help, that actually have sometimes brilliant ideas, are engaged in saying, what if you did this, what if you looked at that? We are diving into ideas on things of consolidation, things that are mandatory. Those ideas actually came from the population that has been willing to watch these presentations over the years.

One of my last great hopes is when I would do these economic presentations 5 years ago, 12 people would watch them. Today, I will have several hundred thousand. Maybe, just maybe, Democrats, Republicans, the people who are Independents are tired of being treated like children, and they are ready for us to start talking to them like honest brokers of policy.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9½ minutes remaining.

TAX NEUTRALITY FOR MONETARY METALS

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, my constituents are getting crushed by inflation caused by out-of-control Washington spending, which reduces the purchasing power of their dollar.

Many Americans turn to gold and silver for a better store of value, yet the IRS classifies gold and silver as "collectibles" alongside artwork and baseball cards, which subjects them to a punitive 28 percent capital gains tax, despite the U.S. Constitution affirming gold and silver as money. The IRS does not let taxpayers deduct losses they suffer from holding U.S. dollars, so it is unfair to assess a capital gains tax when citizens hold gold and silver to protect against inflation.

My legislation, H.R. 8279, the Monetary Metals Tax Neutrality Act, would end the Federal income taxation of gold, silver, and bullion, and I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense measure.

PERMANENTLY ALLOW LOCALIZED HIRING AUTHORITY AT HAZELTON FEDERAL PRISON

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to call on the Bureau of Prisons to permanently allow for localized hiring authority at the Hazelton Federal Prison in Preston County, West Virginia, in my district.

The prison has struggled for years to fill critical staffing shortages, which has resulted in unsafe conditions for both correctional officers and inmates.

I helped lead the charge for the authorization of retention bonuses at the facility and am pleased that the Bureau of Prisons has authorized local hiring to speed up the process and provide jobs for hardworking West Virginians.

Prior to this authorization, applicants were required to apply through the Bureau of Prisons headquarters in Texas. This bureaucratic process slowed down and discouraged hiring. Local hiring authority has already resulted in a class of seven new officers, which are desperately needed at this facility, which doesn't have enough people there.

I join the correctional officers' union in calling for this authority to be made permanent as the prison works to fill the 90-officer shortage.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have someone running for President, a former President, who claims that there were no deaths of our soldiers in Afghanistan for 18 months under his Presidency. Clearly false. Identified as false. We will see the statistics. We see

that 163 of our best and finest died in Afghanistan during the Trump Presidency, and they died in every year he was in office.

Now, more died under the Obama administration, but at least under the Obama administration, we got something. We got bin Laden. Let us not forget that on 9/11 we lost more Americans than Pearl Harbor, we lost more Americans on American soil than had been lost at any time since 1865.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, 163 of our soldiers and marines died in Afghanistan under Trump, and what did we get for it? Did Trump leave Afghanistan better than he found it? Did Trump leave Afghanistan at all? No.

The Afghanistan he left his successor was identical to what he inherited from his predecessor, but 163 Americans died. He left the withdrawal, knowing it was very difficult, to the Biden administration, and then the attack is that we lost 12 soldiers under the Biden administration. We lost 163 under Trump. He did not leave Afghanistan better than he found it. He did not leave Afghanistan at all.

While focused on 9/11, we have to remember Dr. Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped us get bin Laden and has been in a Pakistani jail for a decade and a half since then. We should leave no man behind, and certainly not Dr. Afridi.

There have been proposals to trade Dr. Afridi for Dr. Siddiqui, a terrorist who tried to kill Americans, but didn't kill any Americans, who is now a mental patient in a prison hospital. We should make that trade whenever it becomes available.

Pakistan, right now, is in a period of unrest. We have to demonstrate our dedication to democracy and human rights around the world and particularly in Pakistan.

Yesterday, I got a commitment from the State Department official who deals with all of our policies in South Asia to consider directing Ambassador Blome to go visit Imran Khan in jail. For this man, a former prime minister—more votes than anyone else in Pakistan—a demonstration by the United States that this statesman should not be killed in prison is very important.

CONDEMNING ANTI-ISRAEL, PRO-HAMAS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I join Vice President HARRIS in condemning yesterday's anti-Israel, pro-Hamas demonstrations.

The demonstrators may not know that their leaders are funded by Iran and Qatar, which fund the organizations and the propaganda. These same leaders glorified October 7. They rejoiced at the death of every Israeli civilian.

They condemned Israel on October 7 before Israel had done anything to respond because their demonstrations were not about whether Israel should

not respond. Their demonstrations were a glorification of the death brought by Hamas.

Now, the followers chant, "From the river to the sea," but some of them don't even know which river, which sea. What they don't know is the background of that slogan, "From the river to the sea, Palestine shall be free." It is a declaration that every Jew who lives from the river to the sea should be killed or ethnically cleansed.

Since, as we saw in the 1930s, there is no country that wants to accept millions of Jewish refugees, that means they should all be killed. That is the chant that we hear, "From the river to the sea."

Prior to October 7, we needed to see a two-state solution, and I hope we get there, but there is this effort to convey the life of those who lived in Gaza as being somehow equivalent to the Rohingya refugees, refugees living in camps in Bangladesh.

The fact is that those living in Gaza had longer life expectancies than the average person in the world, considerably longer than those living in Russia, roughly equal to those living in Saudi Arabia. All of that was destroyed on October 7.

Hamas knew exactly what they were doing. They conducted this attack for the purpose of the response because they know they cannot achieve their political objectives, which, remember, is to expel or kill every Jew from the river to the sea.

They can't possibly achieve those objectives unless they massively change world opinion. They know and have said on the record in their own comments that every death of a Palestinian civilian helps them achieve their ugly purpose.

That is why we had, in our great Capital, the waving of the Hamas flag while they burned the American flag. Make no mistake about it, those who hate Israel also hate America. We see our statues desecrated, and we see a call by the demonstrators for the final solution. At least a few of them understand that "from the river to the sea" means killing 7 million Jewish Israelis.

PROBLEMS WITH CRYPTOCURRENCY

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, we have seen a discussion of cryptocurrency. It was the one thing the Biden-Harris administration agreed with Donald Trump on. We know that the Biden-Harris administration has been relatively tough on crypto, but here are the words of Donald Trump from 2019: "I am not a fan of Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies, which are not money and whose value is highly volatile and based on thin air. Unregulated cryptoassets can facilitate unlawful behavior, including drug trade and other illegal activity. . . . We have only one real currency in the USA, and it is stronger than ever, both dependable and reliable. It is by far the most dominant currency anywhere in the world."

That is what Donald Trump said until he realized that he could get tens

or hundreds of millions of dollars from the crypto billionaire bros if he was willing to change his position, and that is exactly what he is doing.

He is going to the Bitcoin 2024 Nashville conference to pledge his allegiance to the bitcoin billionaires. You can be sure his campaign will get tens of millions—no, hundreds of millions into supersecret PACs to try to propagandize the American people. God only knows whether he will personally get tens or hundreds of millions of dollars in cryptocurrency. We will never know because, as I will explain, cryptocurrency is the favorite device, a well-tailored device, for those committing bribery and other crimes.

Some consultants have come to Vice President HARRIS—and thank God she has not yet taken the suggestion of these consultants—and told her to go to Bitcoin 2024 Nashville, and there will be hundreds of millions of dollars for her campaign.

Why do these bitcoin bros have so much money? Well, they are in the business of making money. Everybody else in business has to actually make a product and sell it to get money. With crypto, you just call it a currency, and it is money, and you make sure you have a billion coins for yourself before you sell the rest.

There are those in the Harris campaign or some outside the Harris campaign who will tell the Harris campaign, hey, the political thing to do is to get money from the crypto billionaires. The fact is that is not the case.

I have never seen a political year in which there is so much money available for candidates to communicate their messages. What will win in 2024 is not money but message.

The message has to be clear: Democrats don't sell out.

When Trump didn't see money on either side, he said he was not a fan of Bitcoin. Now, he is going to become a Bitcoin fanboy in Nashville. Our candidate won't sell out.

What is the risk posed by crypto? When the crypto bros tell you what they plan to do, you should believe them. Right now, crypto is just something interesting to bet on. You buy Ethereum today, maybe it is worth less tomorrow. Maybe it is more tomorrow. It seems as harmless as betting on the Dodgers or the Angels, but that is not the purpose of cryptocurrencies.

Cryptocurrencies aspire to be a currency. What have the crypto bros told us? That they plan to displace the dollar as a medium of payment and as a store of value, as a reserve currency.

How important is the dollar's current role as a reserve currency? Our fiscal policy, our budget deficit, is enormous. It would make Argentina blush. Our trade deficit is larger than any country in the history of the world, yet we continue to have a relatively prosperous country. We do that because of the role the dollar plays in international finance because the dollar is the reserve currency for everywhere around the world.

The bitcoin billionaire bros say, hey, that is a good idea. It supports the lifestyle of over 300 million Americans. Maybe we can divert those profits to ourselves. They tell you upfront they want to challenge the dollar's role.

If that role is successfully, even partially, challenged, we will have to cut expenditures, including Social Security. We will have to raise taxes. We will be in a very difficult circumstance.

I know people come here and say that we are going to have a balanced budget. We last had that under Clinton. Nobody has proposed a system for getting there anytime soon.

Yet, it is not just a potential reserve currency. It is designed to be a payment system. Now, how is it going to be better than the dollar? Well, it is electronic. So is Venmo. So is a host of other things that already exist.

I am sure that millions of transactions will take place where people are buying things today using the U.S. dollar in an electronic system. Most people can go a week or several weeks without touching a paper dollar or paper check. What is the thing that the crypto bros think makes their currency better? It is not the fact that it is electronic. It is that it is a perfect device to evade the law. The crypto transactions are on the blockchain, but no one knows who owns any blockchain account.

It is the preferred method—growing method—for bribery, drug dealers, human traffickers. It is, though, particularly valuable to tax evaders. The goal, the self-expressed goal, of the crypto bros is that income tax will only be a tax on wages and maybe a bit of voluntary contributions from those who make their money elsewhere.

Trump's Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service testified that we have basically a trillion dollars a year of uncollected taxes, mostly from the very wealthy. That means they have to conceal \$3 trillion of income to avoid paying taxes or evade \$1 trillion of tax. That means, in every decade, we are talking \$30 trillion of assets that need to be concealed.

□ 1300

Cryptocurrencies are the perfect device to achieve that if they become currencies, if you can buy a yacht for a bitcoin or a bunch of bitcoins.

HARRIS will have a powerful issue in demonstrating that Trump knows full well that Bitcoin is a crock, that he sold out and that we won't, that her loyalty is to the American people who benefit from the role that the dollar plays in international transactions and as a reserve currency, that they benefit from a system in which we are able to collect taxes not just from those who get W-2 forms but from everybody who makes money in our society.

Now, I am not sure that the government will stop crypto, but I believe that crypto will stop crypto. There are a limited number of government currencies. You have a U.S. dollar. You

have a Uruguayan peso. The Uruguayan peso will always have value because there will always be a Uruguay. The U.S. dollar will always be more valuable in total than the Uruguayan peso because America will always be bigger.

There is no inherent value of any cryptocurrency. Sure, we have bitcoin, but why isn't hamster coin worth more than bitcoin? There is no particular reason.

We have hamster coin. I always thought it was a joke and said so in a hearing until my staff said: No, boss, there is a hamster coin. Then I said, what about cobra coin? Well, no. We have cobra coin. A cobra could eat a hamster, but there is already a cobra coin.

I said, well, gee, there could be mongoose coin, and I proposed it in a hearing as a joke. Lo and behold, by the end of the day, they had created mongoose coin, which leads to the question: What about skibidi coin? I thought that was a joke until I was told that there already is a skibidi toilet coin.

Once they make the skibidi coin, skibidi toilet movie, will skibidi coin go to the Moon? We don't know. Why is bitcoin more valuable than skibidi coin? It is today, maybe not after the movie.

The promoters of crypto say, well, there is a limited number of Ethereum. There is a limited number of bitcoin. You can't have anymore, but you can have an infinite number of competing coins.

There are roughly 200 countries in the world, not an unlimited number, and it is obvious that by the order those countries are in, Uruguay will always be smaller than the United States.

ENGINEERED INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to focus on engineered intelligence. There are two groups of engineers who are in a race that they don't know about.

One are the bioengineers creating new DNA, perhaps a new species. By the end of this century, who says they won't have a thousand-pound mammal with two 80-pound brains, which will probably beat my grandkids on the law school admissions test.

We all know even more about computer engineers, and we know the upside of artificial intelligence. We heard our good friend, JENNIFER WEXTON, address this House, thanks in part to artificial intelligence.

We are not going to stop artificial intelligence. Hopefully, we will make sure that it does not somehow lead to bias and discrimination, but we do have to make sure of one thing, that artificial intelligence remains a tool, not a creature.

We need to do the research so that we have the capacity to monitor for and to prevent artificial intelligence from becoming self-aware, developing volition, developing ambition, and developing a survival instinct.

I know it sounds like science fiction, but if somebody describes for you the future, and it seems like they are describing a science fiction movie, they might be right in their description of the future. If somebody describes the future, and it doesn't look like a science fiction movie, you know they are wrong.

Our kids and our grandkids are going to be living in a science fiction movie. We just don't know which one. I hope it is not "Terminator."

We need to take seriously not only how artificial intelligence can be used as a tool to carry out, hopefully, benign objectives of its human programmers, but we do have to also monitor whether artificial intelligence becomes a creature, a self-aware entity interested in its own survival, aware of its surroundings with volition and ambition.

NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I have cringed again and again when I have seen Republicans condemn immigrants by identifying individual crimes committed by individual immigrants.

Madam Speaker, imagine how much crime is committed in this country by bald people. All those crimes would be eliminated if bald people were somehow excluded from the country.

Every group has its saint and its sinners. You can turn to any group, God forbid bald people could be your choice, and identify individual criminals.

What I haven't heard is somebody coming to this floor and talking about the hundreds of thousands of lives of Americans who have been saved by immigrants, immigrants who are emergency medical technicians, home healthcare workers who are the difference between life and death for those they care for, those they feed, those they help prevent from falling, from our hospitals where you may have an immigrant as a janitor, preventing the spread of biological diseases throughout the hospital, or a hospital where you have the emergency room physician who is an immigrant.

Let us have a Republican come to this floor and say they don't care about the hundreds of thousands of Americans who are alive today because of the lifesaving work of immigrants.

Let us work toward a more sensible immigration system. We had a chance of getting there with the bipartisan bill that was being worked on in the Senate that would have brought order to our border. Instead, it was killed by Donald Trump, who was remarkably honest and simply declared that he didn't want us to solve the problem because as long as the problem was there, it helped his campaign.

Let us realize that we are a Nation of immigrants, that every group, including immigrants, includes both life-savers and includes those who commit crimes. Keep in mind that on a per capita basis, immigrants commit less crime than those of us who are native born.

Let us remember and praise all of the immigrants that have saved American lives and continue to do so today.

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

MAINSTREAM MEDIA ISSUES

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, let's address some problems that ought to be covered by our mainstream media, but I don't feel are adequately being covered. One more time, I would like to review what is going on at the border.

So the American citizens know, our fiscal year ends on September 30. Sometime in the next 2 months as information keeps flowing out from the administration on the number of people crossing our southern border, we are going to hit the all-time high in the number of immigrants who are coming here, what I believe to be the all-time high.

Right now, at the end of June, we have let in, in our current year, over 2.1 million immigrants. When the prior administration left, in his final year, we were probably around about 120,000. The American citizens ought to know, when we hit the all-time record, it was 20 times as many people who had crossed the southern border as who crossed the southern border in fiscal year 2020.

Of course, in addition to the skyrocketing high number, you have the huge cost of immigrants. Immediately when they come in, they are given school at probably 12 or 13 or \$15,000 a year. They are housed sometimes in hotels. They are fed. They are given free medical care or largely free medical care, as President Biden promised he would do when he ran for President 4 years ago.

I hope that when these final figures are released—they might be released in the middle of September, they might be released in the middle of October—the American public is immediately given time to digest the numbers.

This is also a humanitarian problem, in addition to a huge fiscal problem. It is a humanitarian problem in that along with this group, it appears as though we are going to approach—probably won't get there—but approach 90,000 unaccompanied minors.

Can you imagine a 10-year-old, a 12-year-old child, without either parent there, being let into the United States? They will try to find a foster parent, and maybe it will be a relative, maybe it won't be, although the Biden administration no longer does DNA tests to make sure if somebody claims to be an uncle or a parent that they really are.

There was a time we were upset about tiny numbers of people when their parents broke the law and they were separated from their parents for a

week, 10 days, or something. Here we have a situation in which we are going to have almost 90,000 unaccompanied minors separated from their parents for life. Talk about a humanitarian problem.

I should also point out that when we have an open border, people die making the dangerous trip—I have been at the border eight or nine times—be it drowning in the Rio Grande, be it drowning in the Pacific Ocean, or be it dehydrating in the Arizona heat.

Every year, people are dying because they think they can come to this country because President Biden has created the expectation that people can come in this country without concern.

I also want to point out, and I hate to be too tough on President Biden here because, of course, soon after he took office, he named KAMALA the border czar. I would have thought at the time she would be so grateful for the responsibility.

President Biden had rescued her from political oblivion after her Presidential run in 2020 came to naught, but when she was given this responsibility and opportunity to shine—and even if she didn't want the responsibility, Joe Biden gave it to her.

Our boss doesn't always assign us responsibilities we want to have, but it was interesting that for over 3 years, nothing at all was done with the responsibility. It looks like then Joe Biden had to step in and do a little bit of something.

It is something that as we go through our lives and the full impact of letting over 2 million people in this country every year hits this country, we remember the tandem of President Biden, and even more, Vice President HARRIS, who he assigned to solve this problem, what they did and the permanent crisis that we have.

I should also point out because sometimes when people talk about the border, they say, oh, people just have to get here, and we have always been a country of immigrants.

People should remember that if you look in 4-year increments, as far as I can tell, we are now hitting all-time records of legal immigrants coming in this country.

We have legal immigrants coming in at about 850,000 people a year. I don't think we talk about that as much as we should. We have 850,000 new citizens a year.

The other thing while I am talking about the number of new citizens coming here, I would like to touch on where the people are coming from. I touch on it because there are people who like to tear down America, you know, Eurocentric, that sort of thing.

I dug up where our new immigrants are coming from, and kind of from—it may be surprising to the people who like to run down America and talk about being racist, that sort of thing. In the most recent year that I could find, 2022, immigrants from Mexico are coming to the U.S. and being natural-

ized the most, then India, then Philippines, then Cuba, Dominican, Vietnam, China, Jamaica, El Salvador, Colombia, Pakistan, Haiti, Iran, South Korea, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and Brazil.

□ 1315

Those are the top 17.

Madam Speaker, do you notice anything about those 17 countries that are the leading countries in sending us immigrants?

None of them have a primarily European population. You have to get down to Britain where you come in at 18. The 17 countries that our new citizens are coming from the most are from all around the globe. None of them are from a primarily European country. I think that is something that we should tell our children and should be taught in class to counteract the people who like to run down America and scream racism, racism.

In any event, to summarize, I hope that when we hit the all-time record of people coming across the southern border, which is going to happen sometime in September or October, it is the banner headline in this country as well it should be.

The next issue that still has not been taken up but ought to be taken up is the large number of people in this country who are born into families in which they won't have a dad at home. Sometimes that is inevitable. However, it has changed America from a time when the Great Society kicked in until today.

There are over 70 programs in this country in which it is much easier to get government benefits if one is a parent not married to the other parent.

This is because we give out various things, food, medical care, and housing, if someone is perceived to be "in poverty." If they are married to somebody with an income, then they are not in poverty. There are over 70 programs that you are eligible for that if you are married and the other parent has an income, then you would lose that program.

You have a very generous earned income tax credit program that can get you \$7,000 or \$8,000; you have the food share program; you have, as I mentioned, the healthcare that you could lose if you married somebody with a decent income; and you have the rental assistance which can give you a benefit of over \$10,000 a year.

I don't know why politicians don't talk about it. I think it ought to be a subject for debate. There have always been people in this country who do not want children to be raised in what we call the old-fashioned nuclear family going back to Karl Marx and his disciples in the 1960s. His disciples are part of Black Lives Matter. It is not as if this decline in both parents at home happened in a vacuum. It happened I think because of government policies and the fact that there is a small but powerful group of Americans who wanted it to happen.