

them from the country of Haiti, they instilled that in their children, their four daughters, one of whom is a schoolteacher, one of whom is a speech pathologist, one of whom is an Ivy-League-educated gynecological oncologist in North Carolina, and the fourth of whom holds four different degrees from three different Ivy League schools, and I have the privilege of calling her my wife and the mother of our children.

They come from Haiti. They are evidence of what Haitians have produced for this country and contributed to this country.

For us as America to ignore the current conditions of what is happening in Haiti, to turn our backs on people who need us most, this is a Nation that prides itself on being that beacon of hope. This is a Nation where when you look at one of our most famous landmarks, the Statue of Liberty, it says: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

However, by ignoring the conditions that are currently present in Haiti, we are not living up to that model. We are not living up to that creed. What we are doing is sending people back to an environment where they are certain to meet ends that we would not wish on anybody.

We see the reports of gang violence in the streets. We see the reports of women being raped. We see the reports of children being forced to partake in armed conflict. We see the reports of food insecurity. We see the reports of people who no longer own the homes that they left because they are now under the control of armed gangs. We see the reports that Haiti doesn't have a police force that can protect its people. They don't have a military force that can protect its people.

Yet, we are sending people back to that environment. It is not safe, and it is not the right thing to do. There are ways to lead with strength but decency. There are ways to enforce the law in a manner that recognizes reality and exudes compassion.

This is not that. This is not who we are as Americans. We can do so much better than this. We can be that place of refuge. We can be that place that America and the world still look up to as standing up for people who need us most.

Again, TPS is not about permanent citizenship. This is about a temporary place for people to be safe from gun violence and armed conflicts, from being kidnapped and held for ransom. That is what will surely happen to some of the people who are returned back to Haiti.

These are people who are a proud people and who are a hardworking people. My wife's family is just one example of that. They are just one example. There are millions of Haitian Americans who make vital contributions to this country every single day. For us to turn our backs on them now is simply not right. It is indecent. It is inhu-

mane. Quite frankly, it is un-American.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge, I plead, and I beg of the White House to reconsider its restriction on TPS and extend the protection for the Haitians who are in America.

□ 1300

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks from the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES) and to also urge the White House to move forthwith on that request and other similar requests.

I will say a couple of words before I conclude. The matter of the Tulsa Race Massacre was very important. I hope that, to the extent that anybody paid attention, that it makes a difference in terms of trying to remember how far we have come and why we can't, in fact, go back.

I simply also indicate that it is my intention to come back onto the floor next week to spend time again on the matter of the mass layoffs and firings that have been taking place that are affecting Federal workers throughout this country, 80 percent of whom are outside of Washington, D.C., and many of whom are in my State of Maryland and the city of Baltimore.

I will again urge some sort of prudence. I think most people will agree that we all want to do away with waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and the Federal Workforce, which has been doing just that for the last 2 or 3 years. The committee has been identifying it and trying to make sure that we, in fact, come to grips with it.

I think the thing that concerns most Americans has been the speed and the surgical way that people have been cut out of employment, oftentimes without any kind of review. It is wrong. I have said it over and over again, and I think most people now are starting to recognize that "due process" is more than just 2 words. It is a way that we have to move forward.

It doesn't mean stopping anything, but it does mean affording people the courtesy of a process, and I would strongly urge Members of this body to keep that in mind as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES) for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DESTRUCTION OF THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we just got done with a very interesting week in which this House passed a budget bill, and now we proceed actually to the more difficult process in which, sometime over the next 4 months, we plan on passing both the reconciliation bill and appropriations bills.

Between the two, we deal with all of government spending. As a result, we have an opportunity to look at programs and examine programs the way we haven't before, particularly because we have someone as President who is somewhat of a person who promises change. Clearly, his election meant that they want fundamental changes in government.

Mr. Speaker, different programs have different goals. Just so the public understands, the appropriations bills are for what we call discretionary spending. The reconciliation bills are what are referred to as mandatory spending. Between the two bills that must eventually pass or several separate appropriations bills, we will be looking at virtually all of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, different programs have different goals, and obviously one of our goals has to be to reduce spending given that we have over \$35 trillion in debt.

Some of these programs also have goals that are perhaps intentional and perhaps unintentional. These are the goals that I am going to address today.

By the way, this is relevant whether we are running a \$1 trillion or over a \$1 trillion increase in debt every year, or whether we were, in fact, in a surplus situation.

I am going to look at some programs, which, again, maybe intentionally, maybe unintentionally, penalize people who are raising children while they are married.

We had a hearing a couple of weeks ago in a subcommittee which I have been fortunate enough to chair. In that hearing, Robert Rector, who works for the Heritage Foundation, found approximately 90 programs in which eligibility depended upon having a small income.

In other words, you would lose eligibility for these programs if you either worked and, depending on the program, made more than \$12,000, made more than \$25,000, made more than \$50,000, or had somebody else in the household making more than this amount of money.

This would include if, say, a single parent had a husband or a wife and the single parent was not working or making very little. If they married someone with an income of \$30,000, \$40,000, or \$50,000, they would lose the benefits from that program.

We are all familiar with some of these larger programs. I think most people wouldn't be able to name all 90, but there are things like FoodShare. There is the earned income tax credit, which requires a little bit of work, but

as you work your way up and get a higher income in the company where you work, you would lose that.

Low-income housing, which I think is maybe the worst program of the bunch because you are given housing if you are a young person, allowing you to get out from having to live with your parents as a benefit for having a low income.

Medicaid; TANF, a cash benefit; childcare; Pell grants; payments for children with some disabilities, all of these programs are conditioned upon not making too much money and, of our primary concern today, not marrying somebody who makes too much money.

Frequently, these programs are, in certain ways, more generous than the middle class normally receives. A perfect example would be section 42, low-income tax credits. I have known people who have looked for housing, and the housing they get is not as lavish as the housing available in low-income housing.

The programs are set up in a way that the owners of the low-income housing are encouraged to build very modern, very upscale apartments that maybe some of the average people cannot afford. As a matter of fact, a lot of the average people may still be living with their parents for a while even after they get married.

We have our Medicaid program, which is a fine program, providing healthcare for the poor. Again, there are a lot of people out there working who may have a \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 deductible on their medical payments, and of course the government program has, in most cases, no deductible.

We have the FoodShare. All you have to do is talk to people who work in the food stores, and they will say that frequently people on the FoodShare program can afford types of food that the people who are working at the grocery store feel they cannot afford. Not only do we have these programs which are conditioned upon not marrying somebody with an income, but they even have benefits that are sometimes superior to people who are not taking advantage of these programs.

I mentioned Robert Rector and what he said at the relevant hearing. The penalty for getting married obviously varies from person to person, but, in his example, a young person who married a father or mother of their children would be penalized by \$28,000.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, if my colleagues ask around, they will find examples of people who are living together but not getting married because they want the benefits. Inevitably, they will find the percentage of people getting married when they have children falls because the generosity of the programs is such that there is a feeling of: Why would I get married at all?

These programs also cause cheating or breaking the law because, of course,

they frequently don't catch it if you are getting cash off the books. All of these programs encourage working for cash. They also encourage, I think, earning money by doing things illegally because that is another thing that is not reportable.

We were in a different hearing the other day, and there was a feeling of one of our witnesses who, I think, I would have to say leans toward supporting the Democratic Party. They didn't like the fact that sometimes people are stuck in the muck and are not making as much money as other Americans.

This woman did not seem to realize that one of the reasons that people sometimes make less money is because they shouldn't try to improve their lot in their employer's company because, if they improved their lot, they would lose some of these 90 benefits.

Mr. Speaker, a question is: Is this a penalty for getting married? It has had a huge impact on society. I point out that in the 1950s, 4 percent of the children in this country were born out of wedlock. That number is now over 40 percent. America has fundamentally changed because of these programs.

The question is: Was this on purpose, or was it an inadvertent problem caused by these programs? I think most people would say that people didn't realize what they were doing. The fact that we have had the number of children born out of wedlock skyrocket from 4 percent to over 40 percent was an oversight.

One thing I think America should realize is there were always radicals out there who were trying to get rid of the American family.

Karl Marx, back in the 1800s, made it clear, I think, because he wanted the government to have the absolute power, that he felt that, to have his socialist paradise, we had to get rid of the family.

In the 1960s, the leading feminists, who were celebrated by the left at that time, made it clear that a goal of theirs was to get rid of the nuclear family.

Here is Kate Millett, who has been described as the mother of women's studies classes which dot our universities around the country: "The complete destruction of traditional marriage and the nuclear family is the 'revolutionary or utopian' goal of feminism."

Linda Gordon, another prominent feminist: "The nuclear family must be destroyed. . . . Whatever its ultimate meaning, the break-up of families now is an objectively revolutionary process."

Michelle Barrett, in the book "The Anti-Social Family," wrote: "The family sucks the juice out of everything around it, leaving other institutions stunted and distorted."

There is no shortage of radical feminists. I could quote Angela Davis, who some on the left view as a hero, as another person who was antifamily.

More recently, Black Lives Matter, during their ascendancy a few years ago, in documents written by their founders, wanted to get rid of the Western-prescribed, so-called nuclear family.

Even after that was out there on the internet, before they took it down, a significant number of people in this institution, I think, showed up at rallies, or whatever one would call them, sponsored by Black Lives Matter, a group that at least initially said they were against the traditional family.

It is entirely possible that one of the reasons we have all of these programs is because some of the powerful feminists and Marxists that influence what goes on in this body were in favor of destroying the nuclear family.

Mr. Speaker, people can say that there is nobody in this conference who would yield to these radical feminists. I remind the public that the radical feminists are for abortions at 8½ months.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues would say that nobody here would be for an abortion like that—oh, my goodness—but there are individual States that have that law right now, and that is what the radical feminists wanted.

My colleagues would say that nobody would allow transgender women in women's sports, but, again, that is what the radical feminists want. They want to blur the distinctions between men and women, and almost all Democrats in this institution follow along and vote to allow transgender women in women's sports.

There is the same thing about transgender women in women's bathrooms. My colleagues would say that nobody in Congress would be for transgender women in women's bathrooms, but, in fact, the Democratic Party is overwhelmingly for that.

□ 1315

Now, ask yourself, if the Democratic Party is for these things, all of which would have been considered absurd 40 years ago—8½ month abortions, transgender in sports, transgender in women's bathrooms—is it too much to conclude that one of the reasons our government's programs are designed to destroy marriage is because the power of the radical feminists and the power of the Marxists in the Democratic Party. It has to be in there for some reason. It is something that we should look out for.

I will point out one more time that I think this is the most critical debate that we are going to have over the next 4 or 5 months as we debate our appropriation bills and as we debate our reconciliation bills. This is a debate we should have regardless of whether we are in a difficult financial plight or not.

I want to emphasize that I don't care if we are running trillion-dollar surpluses around here, the idea of putting out programs, substantially generous programs whose effect is to destroy the family, is wrong.

While I certainly know many single parents who are doing a tremendous job and have done a tremendous job, when I talk to people in different fields, they say the explosion in families without a mother and father at home is causing other problems for society. When I talk to law enforcement, they feel one of the root causes of crime is the breakdown of the American family.

I am sure, like everybody around here who has been in politics for a while, you sit in these committee hearings and hear the problems of high crime and murders and such, and people have suggestions as to how to deal with them, but we don't spend enough time pointing out that one way that would certainly reduce the crime rate, maybe back down to where it was in the 1950s, is to do what we can to build up the traditional family rather than what we do now, which is trying to have as few people as possible in the family.

The second thing that I am told is that families of all backgrounds can have problems with drug abuse. Right now, we have over 100,000 people a year dying of drug abuse. It can happen everywhere, but again, when I talk to the professionals who deal with this, disproportionately, the 100,000 people who die every year are from difficult family backgrounds. This drug culture, I think, would be less strong in America if we did more to promote the traditional family rather than doing all we can to make sure the traditional family is weakened.

The third institution I will point out that is harmed by this government's policy of penalizing traditional families is education. I know my friends on the other side of the aisle like to claim they care about education. When I have talked to school superintendents, when I have talked to teachers about the additional money that has to be spent on children with certain problems, again, those kids are disproportionately from families in which you don't have both a mom and dad there.

Again, I know a lot of families like that who do a fantastic job, but I am pointing out that if you really cared about education, you would look at these programs that have caused the children who are born into a family with only one parent there to have skyrocketed from 4 percent to over 40 percent.

I ask the chairman of the relevant committees that are going to have to deal with the appropriation bills and deal with their designated spending limits on the reconciliation bill to pay particular attention to the programs that are designed to penalize the nuclear family, which is so despised by Karl Marx and some of the radicals who were around in the 1960s and 1970s.

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

#### IMPACT OF PRESIDENT ON PEACE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to first announce two pieces of legislation. Thereafter, I will go into my message, which will be the impact of President Trump's engagement in the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians.

First, let's look at the two resolutions. The first resolution is our Black History Month resolution.

I am proud to say that this resolution will be filed tomorrow, and this is the original Black History Month resolution for 2025. We have many persons who have signed up to cosponsor, but it is still not too late for additional persons to sign up.

The theme is African Americans and labor. It deals with African Americans and labor in America. It will trace the history of labor from enslavement through current times.

The second resolution is one that I am very proud to present. This is a resolution for slavery remembrance month. As you know, August 1619 was the month and year that enslaved persons from Africa were introduced into the Colonies. Since that time, we have had an adverse impact on African Americans in the United States of America.

We need to retrace some of the history of what actually happened, but not just on one day. We have a slavery remembrance day that we proposed. Now, we are proposing a slavery remembrance month. There is still time to sign on to this resolution, as well.

We will file it tomorrow, so if Members desire to be original cosponsors of either of these two, they have until the close of business tomorrow or until we have our last opportunity to file tomorrow any type of legislation. I suggest by noon tomorrow for Members who want to file.

Now, let me get to my message: the impact of the President on the peace process. I say again: the impact of the President on the peace process.

The President, as it relates to this process, is not an honest broker. He is not an honest broker because an honest broker has to be impartial. The President has made it perspicuously clear that he is not impartial.

He has already sided with Israel, and the President has every right to do that, to side with one side as opposed to another, but let's be clear about the role that he is playing. He is not playing the role of an honest broker.

The President is not playing the role of a negotiator because the President does not seek to get input from the Palestinians. The President will get input from one side, that would be the Israelis, and he will make his decisions with the Israelis.

It appears that there will be an all-or-nothing offer made. The President has gone so far as to say that certain things must be done, or certain conditions will manifest themselves.

The President doesn't want peace. It appears to me that the President wants to stop the killing, and there is a difference between stopping the killing and peace.

Peace requires more than the absence of tension, the absence of violence, the absence of killing. Peace requires justice. It requires justice. Stopping killing is not going to end the process because you won't have justice for all parties involved, and there must be justice for all parties involved if we are to have genuine peace between Palestinians and Israelis.

The President appears to currently be engaging in a process of ethnic cleansing. This is where his thoughts are. He seems to believe that we can take Gaza from the Palestinians. He seems to believe that the Gazans can be relocated. Just place them someplace else. Give them nice homes in some other place. Let us, meaning the United States or Israel, have Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, that won't happen because the Palestinians have made it very clear that they don't intend to leave their homeland, but there is more to it than simply replacing them, putting them someplace else. We have to think about what the President is saying.

The President is making it clear that we are an existential threat to the creation of a Palestinian state because if you remove the Palestinians from the land that was once Palestine, they won't have a Palestinian state there, then we, indeed, are an existential threat to Palestine. In fact, if the language that the President is using as it relates to the Palestinians, if it were used as it relates to the Israelis, the President would have some serious problems.

You cannot say with any degree of credibility that we ought to remove the Israelis from Israel, which is now in land that was once labeled "Palestine." You can't say that. If you say "from the river to the sea," you are saying that you are proclaiming an existential threat to exist as it relates to the State of Israel, the mere statement, whereas Israel's Knesset has already, by way of resolution, indicated that there will not be a Palestinian state in the land of what we now call Gaza, in the land of what we now call the West Bank, that there won't be a Palestinian state. If there is not going to be a Palestinian state, then Israel is declaring that it is an existential threat to the creation of a Palestinian state.

The President doesn't want a Palestinian state. He is with the Israelis. The President wants Gaza. He wants the West Bank to be controlled and possibly become a part of Israel. This is not the way to achieve justice.

Remember, you cannot have peace without having justice. You have heard