world, responsible for the feeding and care of the military personnel—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines—their equipment.

The purchases of new equipment is in another subcommittee, but once that equipment is purchased, is it ready to be used? Are the troops ready? Are they properly trained?

And, as I said, we are responsible for the installations.

We asked a question when I became chairman, and the question was this: Is the Department of Defense ready for the era of climate change? It turns out the answer is: Not really.

Out there across America, there are thousands, tens of thousands of men and some women who served at Camp Lejeune, the Marine Corps camp here on the East Coast, famous. It was hit by a hurricane last fall. The deluge went on for hours.

The damage done at Camp Lejeune, trees falling, flooding occurring, roofs being blown off, leaking, water damage, hundreds of buildings seriously damaged and uninhabitable, could not be used, including the headquarters—Camp Lejeune.

Next to it, Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, similar damage.

It is estimated that here at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point, more than $3 billion of damage has occurred that will have to be made up for in the days and weeks ahead.

Now, you may think that was a wake-up call. Indeed, it should have been. However, the wake-up call was occurring just a few days earlier.

That is a picture of Tyndall Air Force Base, a key Air Force base on the west coast of Florida in which our fighter bombers and fighter jets do their training, the new F–35, the F–22, all of them.

This base, it was literally blown off the map. It is right on the edge of the Gulf. Hurricane came through—I think it was a 5 hurricane—and literally blew this base off the map, obliterated major parts of the base.

This is just one of perhaps 100 pictures I could put up.

Is the military ready for climate change? Well, certainly not the Marines at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point or the Air Force at Tyndall. This is probably a $4 billion fix-up to rebuild it. And I will tell you what we are going to do about it here after I put this up.

This is actually 2019. You have heard of the Strategic Air Command. That is the bombers that carry our nuclear weapons. This is Offutt Air Force Base in the Midwest, underwater, the Missouri River, probably a billion dollars damage here.

You say: Oh, that is just flooding. No, it is extreme flooding. Extreme weather events. Three bases critical, absolutely critical to the training and the readiness of our troops.

I think the water has subsided, but the damage to the buildings has yet to be repaired—a billion here, $4 billion there, $3 billion there, and that is not all.

We know that out in California we have had our fires. I just showed the Camp fire, but you may not know that Port Hueneme, the Naval base in Ventura County just north of Malibu, fire raged down the hill. They had to evacuate the homes for the servicemembers, and there we have it.

□ 2030

So we are looking at the new National Defense Authorization Act, and in that act writing in the following changes to the law, and that is that the U.S. military, in all of its future construction, will build to the maximum threat in that area, maybe a tornado, as it could have been in the Midwest, or a flood or a hurricane or a deluge or sea level rise or a fire out in the West. All future construction will be built to the maximum threat at that specific base. That is it.

We are not going to build for yesterday and just go back and have another flood or build for yesterday at Tyndall and see the next hurricane come through and wipe it out one more time. We are not going to do that.

At the same time, we are going to make sure that in that construction and in the improvements, that they maximize energy conservation.

The single largest consumer of petroleum in this Nation is the U.S. military. It is expensive. We are spending a pile of money, billions of dollars on energy consumption in the military. We will emphasize energy conservation, things such as windows and insulation. And when we build new, we will build to the maximum standard for energy conservation, as well as for resiliency; that is going to be in the new National Defense Authorization Act. It is in the work of the Readiness Subcommittee. We are going to drive this, and I think we are going to drive it to success.

And I will say, this is not all new. The military is aware that climate change is a threat, but they haven't been focused sufficiently, in part because we, the Congress of the United States, have not focused it and we have not said: In your construction, in your reconstruction, and in the upgrading of your facilities, you will build to the maximum threat that you face in that area. Tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, fires, floods, whatever it is, you must build to the maximum threat, so that you are resilient, so that you can come back to provide the necessary support that may be desperately needed.

This is not just in the United States. There are major construction programs going on in Guam, out in the Pacific where we know there is going to be another typhoon, probably within the next 9 months. So those facilities also will be built for resiliency.

So these are just a few of the things that we are working on. We have many, many others. We know that we can do better.

We know that as we said with the words of FDR: ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.''

That may be a senior on Social Security; it may be a young man or woman that wants to get an education and is paying a very high interest rate; it may be a military family that is living in a house somewhere across the United States or around the world, in a house that is owned by a contractor that is providing housing for the military that is not up-to-date, that is filled with mold or some other contaminant; it may be a military person that is exposed to some sort of toxic chemical or toxic smoke, we are going to make sure that we follow this advice. It is not for those who have much, it is for those who have too little, wherever they may be.

That is our value, that is our goal.

I appreciate the opportunity to share with everyone several pieces of legislation that I will be working on together with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

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

THE FIVE PILLARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I would say of the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), it is always fun listening to him, because, look, we are friends. We are ideologically separated by about, let's call it a small ocean, but I think there is this passion of we can do things in our society that are good.

Mr. Speaker, I have really appreciated Mr. GARAMENDI sort of embracing in some of our personal conversations my sort of techno-utopianism that the problems the gentleman sees, the problems I see, that there may be technology that is about to disrupt society in an incredibly positive way.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does realize how many people are creeping out at this moment that we are friendly to each other.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, a Republican and Democrat talking to each other across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman. I have followed him, and he has followed me, and we have had the opportunity to talk. I am just not prepared tonight to go into the kind of detail the gentleman is about to, but he is absolutely correct. There are solutions. There are solutions to the problems that confront this Nation, confront individuals in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. SCHWEIKERT is going to pick up some of that in the next few minutes as he talks about it, and I am going to sit down and listen to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we really need to talk about Mr. GARAMENDI's idea of entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, look, this is actually a point I wish more of our constituents would actually see. We are actually quite friendly to each other, even those of us who may have, you know, what is pictured as an ideological chasm. Oddly enough, we all see many of the same problems, and we are trying to find a way to get there.

So tonight I wanted to do just one or two things, because I have picked up a couple of articles in the news over this last week that I actually find greatly optimistic.

So let's actually sort of start with our five pillars. And I do this over and over, because, one more time, what do many of us, the economists, the staff, the really smart people that are here, and then those of us who are regular Members who were just elected, what is in many ways the greatest threat to our society?

We have made lots and lots of promises, and we don't have the resources to keep those promises to those who have earned benefits.

We actually have a demographic curve. As a country, we are getting older very, very fast. In about eight and a half years: two workers, one retiree. In about eight and a half years, 50 percent of the spending in this body will be, less interest, to those 65 and older.

Are we as a government, are we as a society going to keep our promises?

Mathematically, this has been a passion of mine for a few years now, trying to find a pro-growth, optimistic way we keep our promises so my little 3-and-a-half-year-old daughter has the same opportunities I have had.

So the five pillars we have been working on is how do I start with—I am going to start with the very top—technology disruption.

Tonight I am going to talk about a couple of really optimistic things that are happening in healthcare technology that will keep us healthier and potentially crash the price of healthcare.

I am going to talk about some things that are happening in environmental technology that are going to lower the costs, make energy available so the economy can keep growing and yet the environment is cleaner and healthier.

We are going to talk about employment. How do we actually have more of our brothers and sisters out there enter the workforce, stay in the workforce?

There is this concept of labor force participation. And the economists for years now have said as the baby boomers are moving into retirement, labor force participation is going to crash mathematically.

We have also had this fragility, this difficulty of millennial males—oddly enough, about 6, 7 months ago, millennial females really started to enter the workforce in droves. We still have a problem with millennial males.

There is also some really interesting data popping up that the number of Americans, by choice, who are over 70 years old, but they are happy, and they are healthy, are choosing to stay in the labor force. We have had almost, I think it was like—the article was talking about a 50 percent rise in seniors staying in the labor force just as a choice by lifestyle, some because they need the money, many because they are healthy, and they want to be productive. And that is actually really good for society.

We are actually going to touch on having to deal with earned benefits and how we should design those earned benefits. Could we make some offers within those, saying, if you are willing to stay in the labor force, if you are healthy and you can do that, should we give you some spiffs in your benefits. If you are able to stay on your private insurance for a while, could we do some things.

It is sort of entitlement reform in a very positive fashion. It has to do with, how do we maximize economic expansion and choice for those who are seniors?

Population stability. Birth rates have collapsed in our country. We just have to deal with the reality of the math. How do we incentivize family formation in an effective way? This one has been really difficult.

We have had an ongoing sort of research project in our office for a couple of years now looking at things being done in Canada and Scandinavia and other parts of the world, even Hungary, and how ineffective so many programs have been in encouraging family formation. We are going to have to come up with sort of an American version of what works there.

Let's face it. Having a little person, they are expensive. It is the greatest joy of our lives, my wife and I, but we are going to have to talk about how we help in family formation.

Then also the other side of that concept of population stability is, what do we do in immigration? How do we design immigration to maximize economic vitality?

This is going to be a little off subject, but close; I was sort of heartbroken about a vote we had here 3 hours ago. H.R. 6, it was dealing with the DACA populations. What happens when the body here engages in votes that become theatrical, become about exciting your base, and have no chance of becoming law?

If the majority here had been serious and really wanted a solution for the young people in DACA, there would have been this opportunity to come over, talk with Republicans, because many of us have voted for immigration reform that actually had modules that solved much of the DACA issue, but they had to come together, because that piece of legislation will not move through the Senate, will not get the President's signature.

In some ways, it is actually sort of cruel to exploit a population with promises and a piece of legislation that we know is never going to move, and that there was an opportunity to do something that could have, if we had actually worked together.

I don't know if the fear is doing something that would be seen as bipartisan with this White House, whether the issue is too powerful, but it breaks my heart when there are actually paths that, if we had done border security, if we had done some rationalization of the dysfunctional mechanisms we have right now on those asking for asylum, we could have packaged that with a solution for much of the DACA population and it could have actually moved through the Senate, it could have gotten the President's signature.

Instead, we just did theatrics.

Sorry to go off sort of the script here.

So population stability.

Then the last one here, economic growth. What do we do as a government, as a legislative body to maximize economic expansion?

My theory here is economic expansion is moral. Think about it. Whether it be the Tax Code, whether it be doing smart things modernizing regulation, whether it be doing smart things with trade, it is moral when we have economic growth.

How many of our brothers and sisters—that if you read the economists' papers a couple years ago—who hadn't finished high school, they were being written off as the permanent underclass in our society. And today that very population is the population that has the fastest growing wages and almost full employment. That is a moral thing.

If you actually will come to downtown Phoenix, we have this homeless campus in downtown Phoenix. There is an organization called St. Joseph the Worker. My understanding is they have been around for a hundred-some years, and their job is to get populations that have had some of the most horrible experiences in life and find them jobs.

□ 2045

You walk in the door and they have a stack of job offers on top of the desk saying: We just need someone to come to our restaurant and help us. We just need someone to come to our little warehouse and help us stock shelves.

What does it mean in a society where you have more jobs than you have available workers? I will argue that that is incredibly moral, and there should almost be joy in our society right now if we could pull away the sort of rage partisan blinders right now and say: Isn't this a neat thing? How do we do more of it?

It turns out that economic growth is crucial if we are going to keep our promises, if we intend to keep our promises on Medicare, if we intend to

keep our promises on Social Security. Unless you do all five of these things and do all five of those well and very soon, mathematically, it is almost impossible to keep our promises. It is not Republican or Democrat; it is demographics.

I want to talk about some of the positive things that technology, that some of these things are bringing, and that is one of our key points here. This is the week we call sort of Member Week, where Members come to different committees of jurisdiction and sort of pitch their ideas.

So two or three times today in the Ways and Means Committee, we had Members come and talk about their passion for dealing with different types of cancers: colorectal screening, lung cancer, these other things, and then the current mechanism.

My pitch to everyone who cares about those issues is: You are absolutely right. We need to protect our brothers and sisters in this country by having those types of screenings to find those cancers as early as possible and deal with them, but we need to write the legislation in a fashion where it is future proofed.

I am sure everyone saw these articles that have popped up just in the last couple of weeks. It turns out there is a breakthrough in blood tests.

Where, in the old days, we would do a blood test, you would look for a certain titer, know your body had had an immune reaction to something, what happens when you can do a blood test that looks for the cascade—we will call it the throwing off the dead parts of a cancer cell—and finds that and says: Hey, we just found this little piece of this DNA; we know that is a cancer DNA; we know what type of cancer it is; and because of that marker, we can even know where it is?

It turns out this is in trials right now, and it is having tremendous success. We need to future proof our legislation around here that it is not enough to care about our brothers and sisters and that we are going to make sure our society is providing cancer screenings, but that it is future proofed that when a blood test is the least invasive, most efficient, cost efficient, easiest to provide, and actually will crash parts of the price of healthcare in finding these cancers early, but also being available as a methodology, when we do this in large scale, being dramatically less expensive than what we use today.

So part of my pitch here and the reason I do this every week or two is: Understand this disruption of these technologies are here. We need to future proof what we do legislatively because this is a big deal.

Think of a blood test where you can find several types of cancer if you have it and you can find it within a couple of hours. This is a big deal. So this is exciting.

The next one I have talked about two or three times here, but it is the simplest example of another thing we need to do here.

As we are talking about economic growth, it is also, what do we do to disrupt the price of healthcare? Remember the stupid conversation we have had in this place for years now in regards to healthcare hasn't been about the cost, it has been about who pays and who gets subsidized. My passion is we need to think differently.

I have come here and done multiple presentations on the new wearable technologies: the pill bottle that tells you when you have opened it, the things where you can blow into it and it will diagnose whether you have a viral infection, and the algorithm can bounce off your phone's medical records and instantly order your antivirals. That is a disruption. That lowers the price of healthcare. You got healthier, and you didn't infect everyone else in your family and your business.

We need to promote these technologies, but there is the other side that is coming.

Well over 50 percent of our healthcare spending is to those with chronic conditions. So 5 percent of our population has those chronic conditions, but they are well over 50 percent of our spending. What happens if we started to invest in curing them, curing our brothers and sisters of chronic conditions?

Well, guess what Congress did a few years ago? The Cures Act and some of these other things, we put lots of money into researching cures. And now, with some of the new technology and now the next generation of CRISPR and all these other things that are coming, we are going to have pharmaceuticals like this. I think they are often referred to as biologicals. My hope is it is November, but sometime within the next 12 months, we expect to have a single shot cure for hemophilia.

I use this as an example because, apparently, there are a number of drugs in this sort of category that are coming: a single shot cure for the 8,000-plus of our brothers and sisters in the country who have hemophilia A. Now, maybe a million and a half dollars a shot.

So over here we have talked about the technology that keeps us healthy. Over here, I want us to talk about and start to get our heads around: How do we finance really expensive but miracle cures? How do we build a healthcare bond, a mechanism where, hey, we are going to have all these savings in the future. Can we pull some of that forward or commit that savings to actually finance a bond so, when a pharmaceutical like this is available, you cure the 8,000 Americans who have hemophilia?

Back to our 5 percent of our population who have chronic conditions. What happens if we can cure just a couple percent of that? It is a big deal. It would change the cost curve of healthcare. This is a radically different way of thinking about healthcare.

So what happens when stories like this actually prove out to be true that those who are suffering with ALS, that sometime in the next year or two, we are going to have a pharmaceutical, it does not cure at this point, but it stabilizes the horrible regression of one's life and abilities that are chewed up by ALS?

Stop. You may have to have this injection a couple times a year, maybe four times a year. It may be $100,000 per injection. How do we come up with a methodology that finances such a thing because the cost of the progression of this disease is stunningly expensive, and it is just the right thing to do?

It turns out the debate we have had in this place for years of who pays and who subsidizes now can be a discussion of: How do we use technology to disrupt the price of healthcare? How do we get healthier and personal control of our healthcare instead of a collectivist vision? And how do we finance these incredible disruptive pharmaceuticals that are coming that either stabilize or cure that portion of our society who have chronic conditions, who are suffering, but are also much of our healthcare cost?

This is good news. These are exciting. There should be joy in this place that we are part of a time that can have this type of curative approach to healthcare and make these sorts of differences.

So, look, those are a couple of the happy things. If we do our job well, if we get the financing right, we can have this type of disruption and see it in the cost curve of healthcare.

So now I want to sort of jump to some of the other discussions that have been around this body, particularly today, a little bit yesterday, on greenhouse gases, on climate change, on those things. My frustration with this is great rhetoric, really bad math.

So let's actually talk about a couple of things that have been going on and why the rhetoric doesn't match reality.

I believe, actually, technology and those on the more conservative side actually have solutions that grow the economy, provide opportunities for our family, provide the opportunities. Remember our five points that, if we don't have the economic expansion, we can't keep our promises.

So just as a point of reference, I brought these two slides again. This one is from 2015. The yellow over there is all the photovoltaic in the country that was added in 2015. It was a miraculous year, over 38 gigawatts of new generation, power generation, solar. Isn't that wonderful? Except we took 33 gigawatts of power generation out of nuclear.

We really didn't gain that much in clean noncarbon-producing or non-greenhouse-producing energy. You can't have one without the other. You can't run around and say: Didn't we do

great? Look, we added all the solar, how much cleaner the world got. Oh, by the way, we shut down all this nuclear, so actually our baseload didn't really go anywhere.

Well, it turns out that math was pretty much the exact same the next year. Once again, the yellow is the photovoltaic that was added. The multicolor here is the amount of nuclear that came offline. It turns out more nuclear came offline, in a weird way, because of the loss of all that nuclear baseload generation.

The photovoltaic that came to the market, which is wonderful—I am from Arizona. I love it. But we didn't get any better on power generation that doesn't produce greenhouse gases.

So once again, around here, we need to open our minds and understand just sort of basic math that you can't be joyful about one and not be supportive of the other and actually be making mathematical progress. It is just math.

So back to a thought experiment. I did this on the floor the other day, and I am going to do it again just because it did create some really interesting phone calls.

I am going to believe this one here might end up being the single biggest disruption in my life. And forgive me if I don't get everything perfect here, but about 4 or 5 months ago, reading some strange journal—that is what happens when you are on a plane 10 hours a week; you read a lot of stuff—there was this article. We have vetted it repeatedly, and it appears it is real.

U.S. labs from universities have sort of broken the Holy Grail in regards to plant biology. Bear with me. This is a big deal.

What would happen tomorrow if the next generation of agriculture was 40 percent more productive? It would be a miracle. You would feed the world for the next 250 years.

Think about if you had a 40 percent improvement in agriculture, how much less water, fuel, what does it do to land prices?

Well, it turns out if you really care about the environment and greenhouse gases, here is your thought experiment I want you to struggle through.

World agriculture produces about 2.2 times more greenhouse gases than every car on Earth. So if you had a 40 percent improvement in agriculture productivity, it would be as if you removed every car off the face of the Earth. You just have to be willing to eat seed stock that functionally, actually, is a type of GMO.

Now, all they did is change some of the cell biology so it grabs the carbon molecule every time instead of accidentally grabbing the oxygen molecule and then spending lots of energy trying to purge the oxygen, which apparently is just one of the inherent faults in nature. They fixed it.

□ 2100

They did it with tobacco plants. We always use tobacco plants because that is a genome we have known. I guess that is the first one we broke. But now they are moving into other types of agricultural stock.

Be prepared. Watch for this. This technology may be one of the biggest disruptions.

But as a body, when we talk about global warming, when we talk about this, how much of this body is ready to understand there is technology coming? Are Members willing to embrace the technology instead of the sort of Malthusian view that we need to shrink as an economy, that we need to be controlled, that we need to be managed? Or do Members allow these market forces to be incredibly disruptive?

I didn't bring the slides this time, but in that same stock, think about some of the other things going on. Apparently, there has been a huge breakthrough in the technology of pulling carbon right out of the air, being able to take that carbon, mix it with some other chemicals, and turn it back into a fuel stock—negative carbon emission, economically done. I am looking forward to the joy coming from my environmental friends who understand.

We have already proven that carbon sequestration works. We have proven that we can generate power with coal, with natural gas, without a smokestack, and capture every bit of carbon and then reuse it, sequester it, if we choose. But now we are going to negative carbon mining.

Why that is really important is, how many people believe that China with the 30-plus new coal plants that are going up as part of the Belt and Road Initiative, that they are going to have lots of great scrubbers on them?

Once again, if the goal is to punish the United States, great, the rhetoric is brilliant. If the goal is to grow as a society but still be cleaner, go with pro-economic expansion embracing of technology and let us have jobs. Let us have economic expansion so we can keep our promises.

The last thought experiment I am going to give tonight, remember how a little while ago I mentioned this is sort of Member week? We call it pitch week, where a Member will come pitch their priorities, pitch their ideas in the different committees of jurisdiction. We are hoping that Members we are already working with will go to the committees that do certain types of foreign aid.

How many out there care about plastic in the ocean? How many think banning straws in communities is going to do anything about plastic in the ocean? If a Member believes that, they have been conned. It is great virtue signaling, ''Hey, I am banning straws,'' but it is absurd.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, eight of them in Asia, two in Africa. Let's do something that actually works.

If we are going to have foreign aid and some of the environmental programs and these things that are out in the world, let's go to those 10 rivers and start removing the plastic.

Let's add value. Let's do those things. If 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean is coming from 10 rivers—eight in Asia, two in Africa—we know where it is coming from. It may not provide the virtue signaling opportunity that we enjoy around here, but it would make the oceans cleaner.

For once, could we drop some of the political theater? Just like the vote we had earlier today, where it is great politics, gins up the base, gives us something to rally around, but it doesn't accomplish anything.

Mr. Speaker, please, to my Democratic friends, to my Republican friends, are we here to do good?

My pitch to Members is that we know the problems, and we know the math—let's be honest about that math—so let's actually do things.

In the next week or two, when we are starting to put together our appropriations, our policy sets, is there anyone out there on the other side who will help me say, for the 10 rivers in the world that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean, can we adjust that bilateral aid, the foreign aid, the environmental guidance, the other things we do, go to those 10 rivers and start to do something? We might lose the political issue and make the environment better. Or will we just stick around here and say that we don't need to solve the problem because we want to be able to talk about it?

Sorry for the sarcasm, but I am frustrated that we are living in a time of amazing opportunity, of technology disruption, where if Members really care about healthcare, we are on the cusp of a crash of its price, but yet its quality and its cures are here. Can we break down some of the barriers that are stopping us from getting there?

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

CRISIS AT THE BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recount observations I have after spending 2 days of the Memorial Day recess at the Laredo Sector of the Texas border.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCHWEIKERT for giving me good information on his musings. I feel very honored to follow Congressman SCHWEIKERT.

Now, we have a crisis. I think it is perhaps the biggest crisis of my lifetime, as far as the future of America, going on at our border.

In May, 133,000 people attempted to cross the border and were recorded by the Border Patrol. It is worth remembering that they do not record everybody. There are people who sneak