

earned that honor not even 5 years ago, in 2020.

I share these names and stories because these are women and women of color who are an integral part of the rich history of the United States Naval Academy that I have the privilege of representing. It is not just the Naval Academy. They represent our military and, proudly, our Nation.

I want to be clear that this administration's unrelenting and reckless attack on the stories and the history of persistence, diversity, and opportunity only serves to set us back.

When faculty at our five world-class service academies are told to avoid divisive concepts like racism and sexism, that only threatens to erase the stories and experiences of these brave women who just wanted to serve our great Nation.

I strongly believe that we should have a Navy and Marine Corps that look like our country, where our midshipmen receive an education that teaches the accurate and full history of this Nation, where the stories of women and people of color aren't skipped over because they are inconvenient.

This is all critical to our national security and strong democratic principles that we embody abroad. It is for these women and the hundreds of thousands of women serving our Nation at home and abroad that I am here today.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, as the first woman in history to hold my seat in Congress, I am always thinking about the history-making women of the past, present, and future. I am honored to highlight a few stories of history-making women Michiganders now.

I am honored to highlight Michigander Harriet Quimby, the first American woman to earn a pilot's license and the first woman ever to fly solo across the English Channel. Her career in aviation was short but accomplished.

Flying from the U.S. to England, Mexico, and more, Harriet's legacy serves as a reminder that women can soar to whatever heights they set their minds to.

We are so proud to claim that Sojourner Truth made her home in Michigan for the last 27 years of her life, a fearless abolitionist and women's rights advocate who used her powerful voice to demand justice. Born into slavery, she escaped and dedicated her life to fighting for freedom and equality. Her famous "Ain't I a Woman?" speech challenged the exclusion of Black women from the suffrage movement, leaving a legacy that continues to inspire generations.

Anna Howard Shaw was a trailblazer in every sense of the word, becoming one of the first female ordained ministers in the United States and later a physician. She dedicated decades to the fight for women's suffrage, serving as the president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Her leadership and relentless advocacy helped

secure the right to vote, proving that determination and conviction, as well as persistence, can change the course of history.

Clara Arthur, known as the Mother of the Playground Movement, believed in creating a better world for future generations. As president of the Michigan Equal Suffrage Association, she worked tirelessly to advocate for women's voting rights. Her activism extended beyond the ballot box. She championed education, labor reforms, and public spaces for children, ensuring that progress didn't just mean progress for some. It meant progress for all.

Lucia Voorhees Grimes was a dedicated suffragist who played a pivotal role in Michigan's fight for women's voting rights. As a leader in the Michigan Equal Suffrage Association, she traveled the State organizing campaigns, educating voters, and pushing for legislative change. Her unwavering commitment helped pave the way for Michigan women to claim their rightful place in the democratic process.

These are the stories of past historymakers who have changed the course of our Nation. The freedoms we enjoy today are because they refused to sit idly by, and now, as we see unprecedented attacks on our healthcare, on our rights, we also see everyday women, especially in places like my hometown in Grand Rapids, Michigan, who refuse to sit quiet.

I refuse to stand by while Republicans, Donald Trump, and billionaires like Elon Musk try to gut essential programs like Medicaid, a lifeline that millions of families rely on.

No parent should have to choose between their child's health and paying their bills. We are fighting to protect the care that women and families depend on because healthcare isn't a privilege for the wealthy; it is a right for everyone.

I highlight a brave mom from my district, Abby Koroma, a mother of two visually impaired daughters who depend on Medicaid. Without this critical program, Abby would be forced to make impossible decisions: whether she has enough in her bank account for treatments that could save her children's vision or putting food on the table.

No parent should have to face that choice, but Republicans in Congress right now, aided by Donald Trump and Elon Musk, are willing to rip away this essential healthcare from families like Abby's just to hand out more tax cuts to the ultrawealthy.

We won't let it happen. We are the women who are standing in the gap and standing up for these families. We will fight every day to protect Medicaid, to stand up for families who depend on it, and to make sure that no one in this country is left wondering whether they can afford the care that they need for themselves or their families.

I stand here today so that no one has to wonder who they have fighting for them. We are here, standing together

and fighting for families across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the women who joined me here today to stand up and highlight the powerful women of their home States and the impacts that they have had on changing the course of history.

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

#### EDUCATING YOUNG PEOPLE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to hear from legislators on the experiences they had before this week as they toured their district and as they talked to normal people to see whether their concerns and observations squared with those of the people in this building.

Donald Trump has done a great job of trying to remove the diversity, equity, and inclusion from our government, including our military. We have, to a degree, gotten rid of some of the bureaucrats who pushed this odious ideology in our businesses and our schools.

Nevertheless, these bureaucrats everywhere are waiting to gain a foothold in America again as soon as we have another administration, and it is important to educate the young people in this country as to the degree to which America is really a broken system, a racist system, and whether white supremacy is a major problem, as Joe Biden said.

□ 1530

While I was back home, I had an opportunity to speak to a mosque of Ahmadiyya Muslims. Ahmadiyya Muslims have a little bit different theology than Muslims in general. They are persecuted by those members of Islam who live in Pakistan, and many of them have had to flee Pakistan even with regards to their own personal safety.

Nevertheless, when I met with the Ahmadiyya Muslims, there were two things that hit me: First of all, they were all successful, at least the ones I met. I asked them whether they knew of any of them that were having children out of wedlock. They knew nobody like that. They all seemed to be working hard and succeeding in America.

This, of course, is at complete odds with the DEI ideology in which people who are not Europeans are struggling or can't succeed in America. Indeed, the Ahmadiyya Muslims are one more example of a group of people who are succeeding in this land of opportunity.

Actually, they were very thrilled to praise America. They praised us not only as being a much better place to live than Pakistan, but they pointed out we are a much better place to live than Europe. They laughed at Europe, which they referred to as a "socialist continent" and one in which there was

no room for people who wanted to work hard and get ahead. One more time, we have an example of foreigners who come here from other places who seem to appreciate America more than the native born and certainly appreciate America more than the average college professor.

I would like to point out that another, I guess you would call, minority that is very common in my district is the Hmong, who came here from Laos. They as well are achieving, doing well, having strong families, succeeding in the realm of education, and all seem to have jobs. This despite the fact that when they came here from Laos, again, many of them didn't know the language. It, again, shows it is a lie for any of these DEI professionals—be they in business, government, or education—to say that America is not a place where people can succeed.

As a practical matter, while I don't think the Hmong are a large enough minority to have statistics on how well they are doing economically, it is apparent subjectively that they are probably doing better than the average American who was born here and, indeed, larger minorities for which we have statistics.

I remind everybody that people who come here from India, who are the most successful minority, Philippines, China, Japan, Cuba, the coast of western Africa all are succeeding wildly in America. All it takes is hard work and strong families, and all these groups have strong families.

I encourage our educators and all our policymakers to educate the people back home on all the groups from all around the world who are doing a fantastic job. I think they are doing, in part, a fantastic job because they don't listen to the naysayers who want to run down America and apparently say that if you are not succeeding and things aren't going right, it is because of prejudice.

The next thing I would like to point out is immigration is still in the news. There are some people who complain about Donald Trump doing what he so desperately has to do, and that is to remove the people who snuck into this country illegally.

I want to point out to everyone that, again, in the last year we had many new Americans who were naturalized. There are people who say about the people who are being removed: Why can't we let them stay? We have a system in this country to make sure that we are getting the best people, the law-abiding, the self-reliant people, which is all we should need here.

We took in 850,000 last year on a rolling 3-year average. I still believe we are at the all-time high of even more than that. We should be reminding anybody who says we are mean or not doing our share of taking in people who would rather live here that, in fact, we took in 850,000 naturalized citizens; those are new citizens.

That is not including the approximately 10 million people who are here

on student visas, work visas, or tourist visas. As far as people who want to spend a short time here, particularly to work, we are even more generous that way. I have heard of no strong efforts being made to greatly reduce these numbers.

Again, we have to remind our young people, our constituents, not to put up with this anti-American rhetoric of why are we kicking these people out. We have to remind people every year that in this country we wind up swearing in about 850,000 new people legally. I think if you think about that number for a little bit, something that is far higher than the historical average in this country, you will realize it is ridiculous to say this country is in any way xenophobic.

As I mentioned, one of the strong predictors of success in this country for everybody—for women, men, and children—is that of strong families. I think we have to spend some time pondering why it seems to be that people who are used to the American culture seem to have weaker family ties than those people who are coming here from other countries.

It is my personal belief that the reason we have weak families in America—and one of the reasons why our American children cannot do as well as children whose ancestors come from Pakistan or India or Philippines—is that we have such strong incentives in America, through a horrible broken welfare system, to discourage mothers and fathers to stay together with their children.

This began in the 1960s under Lyndon Johnson, who I felt, before Joe Biden, was the worst President in this country's history. In the 1950s, we only had about 4 percent of American children born without a mother and father at home. We now have over 40 percent who are born without a mother and father at home.

This doesn't mean there aren't wonderful single parents. I know some single parents, particularly emotionally strong single parents, who have done a fantastic job of raising their children. Anybody would be proud of them. However, the statistics make it obvious that overall children would be better off if they had a mother and father at home.

Almost every program in what would be referred to as "the welfare state" has incentives to discourage there from being a mother and father at home. This is because eligibility for almost every program is based upon percent of poverty. If you are a single parent and don't have a job or are working part time, you are eligible for many other programs. I think probably the most damaging is that of low-income housing where if, say, a single parent has a child, even when they are a minor without another parent at home, you are eligible for low-income housing, which means almost no rent and the ability to get away from your parents.

Other programs that also discourage marriage, programs that you would

lose eligibility for if both parents were working and had a child are the food-share programs, the Medicaid programs, the earned income tax credit, the Pell grants. Indeed, I could go on. There are about 90 different programs in America which are designed to go to a single-parent family, but if you have a two-parent family making a decent income, they are considered not in poverty and, therefore, they are not eligible for a program.

This is why, anecdotally, if you get out in your district, away from the fundraisers and such, you find so many stories of single parents who may even live with the other parent—sometimes illegally—but they don't want to get married because they lose all this money.

Nobody is eligible for all 90 programs at once, but I don't think it is difficult to find hypotheticals in which a parent alone is eligible for maybe \$25,000 or \$30,000 that they would lose if they were married to the other parent. In other words, it seems like the policy of the United States is to try to discourage the strong families, which are one of the reasons why so many immigrants—be it the Ahmadiyya Muslims or the Cubans or the Mexicans or the Filipinos—seem to do so well in America, indeed frequently better than so many of the native born.

We are soon going to pass a reconciliation bill, and that reconciliation bill will be a tremendous bill, a revolutionary bill. The bill, I think, is going to try to get America back to its roots. Certainly, one of the goals of this bill has to be to get rid of the huge marriage penalty, which has such an impact on causing there to be many fewer children with a mother and father at home than are necessary.

I think it is important to look at all the programs I just named off, as well as a few others, particularly any low-income housing programs, because it is not right that a young person can receive their dream of renting an apartment, not in their parents' home, by having a child out of wedlock.

I also want to point out with regard to these immigrants coming here, there are so many more than there used to be when I was growing up. Right now, as far as the people who feel we are not allowing enough people in this country, in the 1960s we were around 200,000 a year. Now we are around 850,000 a year. We are about four times what we were when I was a child. By historical standards, we have been very, very generous.

The next question is: Why are we seeming to subsidize or have set up programs with an apparent hatred of having both a mother and father at home? You might think that every politician would be encouraging having both a mother and father at home, and this must have been an inadvertent thing.

It is important for the young people today that they know that there is a strong number, it is a small number,

but a strong number of intellectuals going back to the 19th century, actually even going back to the 18th century who are hostile to the idea of having a man in the home.

Certainly, there were people who felt this way during the French Revolution when we had the atheistic mobs killing the clergy. It continued through Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the 1800s. The Marxists were hostile to the family. A goal of theirs was to get rid of the family. It winds its way all the way up through communism and the feminists in the 1960s.

Let me give you a couple quotes of people who are famous, who were well-known to people in the 1960s. We have Simone de Beauvoir: "As long as the family and the myth of the family . . . have not been destroyed, women will still be oppressed."

There is also Germaine Greer: "I'm passionately opposed to the nuclear family."

Then we have Kate Millett, who some people would consider to be the mother, or whatever, of women's studies programs, which are all over our universities: "The complete destruction of traditional marriage and the nuclear family is the 'revolutionary or utopian' goal of feminism."

Eventually, Angela Davis, another person prominent in the revolutions that were taking place in the 1960s, was very antifamily. Even since I have been in Congress, we had the Black Lives Matter movement, who came out against what was referred to as the "traditional family."

This is not only a problem for children, it is a problem for the men. I think men are frequently more likely to cause problems and be less productive if they are not connected with a family, and social scientists like George Gilder have pointed this out. One of the reasons why I think we have a disproportionate number of men in prison, men doing drugs is because they are not connected with a family,

and that was because of all these programs which provide financial incentives to make sure that one of the parents, usually the man, is not part of the family.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, Black Lives Matter stated that they want to get rid of what is known as the traditional nuclear family. It is a group that a lot of people in this building were happy to stand with, despite stating that on their website. Eventually they took it down, but it shows the power even today.

Mr. Speaker, you might ask why in the world anybody would be antifamily. Why would any politician do that? I mention these powerful people who seem to have a stranglehold on the Democratic Party. Who is for having men participate in women's sports? Who is for an abortion at 8½ months? Who is for men in the women's locker room? The same group is for them all.

It is the same group that is against having children raised in a nuclear family. It is the radical feminists and their successors from the 1960s. As long as they have such a vise grip on the leftwing of this body, I am afraid they will continue to break down the American family.

In any event, I think those are three things that we have to look at and remember to tell young people. It is the fact that people who are not from Europe come to America and succeed wildly again and again. Statistically, these groups are doing better than the native born, be it the Muslims, Hmong, Chinese, Filipino, Cuban, Nigerian, what have you.

I think we have to remember that it is the welfare structure which is right now creating huge incentives not to raise children in a nuclear family. Frequently there is a penalty of \$25,000 or \$30,000 for getting married to the father of one's children. This affects so many

other problems that we have in America.

The crime problem is a family breakdown problem. The drug problem is certainly not exclusive, but it is a strong element of the family breakdown problem. In talking to teachers, particularly in the area of special education, frequently the problems stem from a breakdown in the family.

We have to do something to remove these horrible marriage penalties. I really don't think America is truly going to be great again until we have a dramatic cut in 40 percent of children who are born without a mother and father at home.

Those are three big issues today. We should educate the young people on all of the issues. Until they realize what our government is doing, they may go back to the days of Joe Biden, a time in which he tried to divide people by ethnic background.

We will continue down the path of having huge incentives not to get married, and our young people will continue to be educated that America has a huge race problem and that we should not be adequately proud of America.

As I mentioned, right now there are many examples of ethnic groups who are doing better than the native born today, which puts a lie to the idea that anybody is not succeeding in this country because their ancestors did not come from Europe.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 2025, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2024 and the first quarter of 2025, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 10 AND FEB. 15, 2025

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Speaker Mike Johnson .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Hon. Adam Smith .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Hon. Adrian Smith .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Hon. Jack Bergman .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Hon. Lloyd Smucker .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Hon. Troy Carter .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Garrett Fultz .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Courtney Butcher .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Brittany Smith .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Taylor Haulsee .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Josh Hodges .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Meredith Turton .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
William Johnson .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Kate Knudson .....	2/10	2/15	United Kingdom .....	.....	2,605.00	.....	965.81	.....	.....	.....	3,570.81
Meghan McCann .....	2/10	2/15	United Kingdom .....	.....	2,605.00	.....	1,833.31	.....	.....	.....	4,438.31
Steven Bertolini .....	N/A	N/A	United Kingdom .....	.....	1,400.00	.....	N/A	.....	.....	.....	1,400.00
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	27,609.12

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.