

on small businesses would require Ex-Im to deploy their resources more effectively across the country. That is something Chairwoman WATERS and I agreed to, on that need for greater outreach from just a couple of urban centers where they are currently planted, as has been said.

So while I support the laudatory goal of this, the functionality of it is not workable. I would like the Bank to actually work. Of course, that is not part of the debate that I would actually have that view, but I actually do want the Bank to work and be effective for American businesses. It is really just the technical problem of how the gentleman allocates the resources here, and that is why I oppose it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROUDA, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4863) to promote the competitiveness of the United States, to reform and reauthorize the United States Export Finance Agency, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONGRATULATING FORT WORTH'S NORTH SIDE HIGH SCHOOL FOR MAKING IT TO THE STATE HIGH SCHOOL PLAYOFFS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a high school in the district that I represent, North Side High School. They are also known as the Steers, and for the past couple of decades, this school has excelled in sports like cross country, soccer, baseball, and volleyball, but not under the Friday night lights of Texas in football.

However, for the first time in 40 years, the football team has made it to the State high school playoffs, and if you are from Texas, you know that that is a really, really big deal.

The school has a population of around 1,800 students, and 95 percent are Latino. North Side High School is hoping to dispel the myth that the community can't succeed on the grid-iron.

I want to congratulate Principal Antonio Martinez and Coach Joseph Turner—who was given the job 5 years ago despite having zero head coaching experience—and all of the football players on the Steers team for their historic accomplishment. They are really a prime example of hard work and dedication and how far it can take you.

I hope that this will not be the last time the Steers make the playoffs. This has been just a great story for the entire Fort Worth Independent School District.

Tomorrow night, on Friday, go Steers.

HOPE FOR VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly announce the introduction of a bipartisan bill to combat human trafficking, the HOPE for Victims of Human Trafficking Act.

Too often, trafficking victims are forced to do things that they would never choose to do, and sometimes they are forced by their captors to break the law. This bill creates a legal presumption which states that human trafficking victims who commit a covered offense while being trafficked are presumed to have committed that offense under coercion unless the prosecution can prove otherwise.

Consequently, this bill will stop many unjust convictions human trafficking victims face, which will then better allow them to find employment, seek additional education, and recover from their trauma.

I am proud to reintroduce this bill with my friend Representative ALCEE HASTINGS.

On behalf of the many human trafficking groups that supported the bill, including Shared Hope International, Rights4Girls, Selah Freedom, and others, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, too.

THOUGHT EXPERIMENT IN GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUDA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is something we try to do every couple of weeks is come here and actually, typically, our opening board here is we are talking about what are the headwinds to our society, what are the headwinds to our country, particularly over the next 30 years.

The reality of it is—and we will get to that. We have it on some of the boards that come a little bit later. They talk about our economic promises: Social Security, Medicare, certain healthcare entitlements. The fact of the matter is they consume every incremental dollar. We will get to that.

But one of the reasons I am actually starting with this board here is, this week, I believe the Democrats actually held what they call a Member Day with the global warming or environmental change committee. Forgive me for getting the name wrong.

We weren't able to be there because we had Jay Powell and other people here this week. But we wanted to come here and actually start to share with our brothers and sisters in this body some of the amazing technology that is here that I don't know how to get individuals in this body who care about the environment to start to understand.

We are living in the time of miracles. We all saw last week, MIT had a major breakthrough in ambient carbon capture; right? Okay. So the frustration is that I will hear people get behind these microphones and talk about how much they care about global warming, how much they care about greenhouse gases, how much they care, and then they don't spend time reading miracles that are happening in the technology.

This is technology that just came out in a paper from MIT. They crashed the cost of yanking carbon directly out of the air.

□ 1700

It is negative carbon capture. It is ambient. It is basically, if you have a generation source, let's say you are a concrete plant, a power generation—this and that—you could actually be using this. It uses shockingly little electricity.

They basically came up with this concept of: Let's run these plates. Let's actually put nanotubes on it. We will run a certain low voltage through these plates, and it will catch the carbon in the air.

And it doesn't matter. The technology doesn't care whether you are at 1 part per 400 million or heavy carbon. It is just an example of how technology is about to provide us a revolution on how we protect our environment. And it is here.

How do we actually, as policymakers, incentivize these technology breakthroughs to happen, and how do we get these technology breakthroughs to become part of our society?

It is not enough to come up here and virtue signal, coming up behind these microphones, telling us all how much you care and then not to understand.

The revolution of technology is here, that if you actually care about carbon in the environment and its effects on global warming, guess what? You have just had a major, major breakthrough, because can the U.S. stop China from building its—what?—33 coal-fired plants that are going up right now that basically have no carbon capture? This type of technology becomes part of the solution.

I wish I could get our brothers and sisters here to stop being sort of, shall we say, antiscience and be willing to keep up with the incredible progress we are making in environmental science.

So this is a big deal for anyone who is watching, anyone who is listening, anyone who actually cares. Please, grab your phone. Let's Google "MIT ambient carbon capture." Look at the graphics. They have a great little video of how it works, a simple explanation of how it works. This is a big deal.

What a lot of folks here don't remember is, a year ago, the Republicans actually did something we call the Q45 tax credit. And we have been waiting for the Treasury Department to finish all the rules and the regs, but the concept was: You are an energy producer. If you would capture your carbon, we will give you a tax credit. If you take that carbon and then sequester it someplace or turned it into other uses, we will give you another credit.

Now, all of a sudden, we have the cost breakthrough of capturing that carbon. It is from a pure math standpoint. This isn't Republican or Democrat. This should be hope and optimism that, once again, sort of the Malthusians in this place who thought the only way we could ever accomplish these things is crashing, just crashing our economy, the end of use of hydrocarbons. They are wrong.

We are going to walk through some more of this, and you will see how this will ultimately tie together, at least, I hope you will.

So this is an example of the facility in the current state of technology. This is a facility that I believe is going up in Canada right now. I believe the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and others are investing in it. This is sort of an active type of carbon capture. They thought they could get down to \$100 a ton, and we were all giddy about this. The previous board may cut this price in half.

This is a big deal, when we just had not an incremental improvement, but a major, major, major improvement in what you call ambient air capture. It is functionally mining the air and pulling carbon out of it.

So let's actually now think about facilities like this. This facility is up and running outside Houston. It is a natural gas power plant, and it doesn't have a smokestack. They created something—and I always screw this up. I believe it is the Allam cycle.

This engineer had this idea for, apparently, decades, this concept saying: Okay. We burn the natural gas; we heat steam; we take the steam; we turn the turbines. Why not just blow up the natural gas, send the carbon from that, smash it into the turbines, spin the turbines, and then capture the CO₂ on the other side?

It works. It is up and running today, and, apparently, it is incredibly efficient. They are raising money. I think they are going to dramatically increase the size, but it is natural gas generation—no smokestack—and it works.

And guess what happens? On the other end, they capture all the CO₂, and they use it for enhanced oil recovery. They can sequester it in concrete and other places or just stick it back into the ground. But we know how to do this because it is not a theory. It is running today.

How much discussion, how much praise, how much interest do we get on this from our brothers and sisters here who claim to care about the environ-

ment, the fact that we have had the engineering breakthrough? Because it doesn't sort of fit the commanding control craziness that has become our environmental discussion here that we must shut down any uses of these fossil fuels, of these hydrocarbons.

Many of us are just trying to say: I need you to open up your hearts and your minds to science and the math. We can demonstrate we can actually use our energy and do it in a way where we capture the very thing you were most concerned about. It is here. It is not theory. It is here. Let's have just a little moment of joy that science, once again, ran faster than at least we thought it would.

So the other thing, also, to walk through, and I do this one just because I am fascinated—and I have the microphone. Earlier this year, we had a major breakthrough in, I believe, technically, it is referred to as synthetic biology.

Does everyone remember their high school biology class where we basically learned, hey, you are a plant cell? And since time immemorial, plant cells actually have an inherent inefficiency. They really, really want that carbon molecule so they can grow a sugar, and the plant can grow. And then sometimes the plant cell, though, doesn't end up getting that carbon molecule. It ends up grabbing an oxygen. And now it has to spend all this time and energy purging that.

I believe it is the University of Illinois and a couple Federal agencies that have been playing with this for awhile. Because the original thought was: Could we do some tweaking of plant biology so it would create a greater carbon synch?

Somewhere in that research, they hit the holy grail, and that holy grail is they can now make that plant always grab the carbon molecule, so the plant grows 40 percent more efficiently.

Well, think about, first, what does that mean to society? What does that mean to the world? Well, it means we will probably feed the world for the next couple hundred years.

It also means you need 40 percent less land, 40 percent less water, 40 percent less food, 40 percent less fertilizer.

It also means it is going to be disruptive to the value of farmland; it is going to be disruptive to agricultural pricing; it is probably going to be disruptive to agricultural credit.

But it is here. It is technology. It is coming.

It also means, all of a sudden, if you are someone who particularly likes biofuels, with this type of synthetic biology, did you just change the pricing structures?

This is coming. The technology has already succeeded in tobacco crops. We use tobacco because that was the first one we knew the genome of, and I believe now they are experimenting in a number of row crops.

But, once again, there is an incredible disruption coming to the world

brought by U.S. scientists that actually change everything.

And now I need you to think more creatively. First, just the thought experiment.

World agriculture is said to produce 2.2 times the greenhouse gases of every car on Earth. Okay. If you are using crops that had this technology associated with it so they grew 40 percent more efficient, using these crops would equal removing every car off the face of the Earth and its greenhouse gases. You just have to be willing to eat something that technically is a GMO, but the math equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

So, once again, the science is here. We have had this amazing breakthrough. It is the United States leading the way.

But also, this technology can be used for growing forests, changing the grass in your ball fields, these other things. It is here. We did it. And yet I see no one else coming behind these microphones to talk about the optimism.

If you care about the environment, embrace, learn, listen, read, study, understand the scientific breakthroughs that are here that make a difference.

I do this one just as a continuation of the thought experiment: How many of you live in a community? How many of those of us here in D.C. live in a community where you are not allowed to have a plastic straw? How many plastic straws are in the ocean from North America? Functionally, none. It is virtue signaling. It is theater. We do this to feel better that we care.

But if you actually cared, it turns out the math will set you free. The math says 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers: 8 in Asia, 2 in Africa.

If you actually care about plastic in the ocean, stop the virtue signaling about straws that are in D.C., that are never going to actually be in the ocean, and start caring about the 90 percent of the plastic that comes from 10 rivers. And we know where they are.

Change foreign policy. Change our environmental age. Change our technical assistance. Go to those 10 rivers. Change it, and then remove 90 percent of the plastic from the ocean instead of just talking about it or having this charity group or this NGO or raising money off the issues and having no actual effect.

If you actually care, do something. Don't engage in the political theater that makes you puff up your chest and sound like you actually care. Help us. Those of us on the Republican side, we are working on trying to change those foreign aids, the technical aids, the technical assistance to do this. Help us do it.

This shouldn't be Republican. It shouldn't be Democrat. It is technology. We know where the plastic in the ocean comes from. We have ideas on how to add a value to this plastic so it is collected, so it never ends up in those rivers. Go to the source where

the problem is. Stop the crazy virtue signaling about straws in your community and help us go where 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from.

And I know I may be sounding a bit sarcastic, but I am frustrated. We have been actually sort of demonstrating this one for a year, and I still can't get many of my brothers and sisters on the left to say: Oh, God, that is right. It is math. We know where it is. Let's go get it.

It makes no sense to me. Is it we are going to take away a talking point, a theatrical point? Help us actually make—I love scuba diving. Before I got this job, I used to actually get to spend some time doing it.

Help us. Take credit for it. We just want the right thing to happen, but it is not virtue signaling. It is actually going to where the problem actually is.

So let's actually make a circle and see if I can tie this in to what it means to our future.

This is one of the things I have come to this floor on for years, because we are having the wrong discussion here. We as a country are buried in debt, and the debt is going to get dramatically bigger.

First, we need to pull out our calculators—for those who actually own calculators here on Capitol Hill—and have a moment of honesty.

The debt is substantially driven by our demographics. It is not Republican or Democrat; it is just what we are.

We have 74 million of us who are baby boomers. Congress did not pay attention that there were 74 million of us who were going to turn 65 one day and step into our earned entitlements.

So if you look at this chart right now, 1965, you see the red area, it is 34 percent. That is what mandatory spending was. That was everything from entitlements you get, you earned. You earned your Social Security. You earned your Medicare. You earned your veterans benefits.

There are some you get because you are part of a Tribal group or some you get because you fell under a certain income.

Today, it is now crossing over 70 percent of all of our spending is on formula. When we stand on this floor and vote for appropriations, we don't even vote on that red portion, that 70-plus percent of our spending. We don't even vote on it. It is a formula.

And then what is remaining? Half of it is defense. You see that little blue area over there? That is the defense.

You see there the green? That is all we really have.

And if you actually look at what we call discretionary, nondefense discretionary, it has been substantially flat for the last 10 years. It is just math.

So if I come to you and say Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, just the growth from those over the next 5 years, just the growth will equal the spending of the Defense Department. Let's double it. Hey, every 10 years, we will add two full Defense De-

partments. And that is just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements.

We know where the problem is, but it is terrifying for elected officials to speak about it, talk about it, even think about it, because you have to explain something. It is hard, but it is manageable if we do everything.

And the very last board I am going to show is, once again, our sort of holistic approach of, if we pull all the levers, we have done the math, we think we can keep it at 95 percent of debt to GDP, this isn't the absurd untruthful conversations that we are going to pay off the debt, because every day 10,300 of us turn 65. We need to deal with the truth about the math.

And the math isn't Republican or Democrat. It is math.

□ 1715

So, first off, the number one pillar we have to engage in—because it makes everything else possible—is a robust, a powerful, strong economic growth, the robustness of the economy, the participation in the labor force.

We must do everything possible, whether it be changes in the Tax Code, whether it be changes in trade, whether it be changes in going to smart, crowd-sourced type of technology-based regulation. We must grow. Growth is moral.

Because, if we don't grow, you can't make any of the other math work. And this is the reality.

So, how many of my brothers and sisters came behind these microphones when we did tax reform and told us the world was coming to an end—except for the fact that we, just last month, got the revenues. Excuse me. They are called receipts. Total receipts into the Federal Government: turns out to be the highest ever. We grew over 5 percent in our receipts in a post tax reform world.

We had a parade of economists from the left come and tell us this could not happen, but it happened. How about that parade of economists from the left who came to us and told us we were going to force ourselves into a recession? It didn't happen.

How about those who said, hey, you guys can never get back into the 60-plus, 61, 62, 63 percent labor force participation, but it has happened.

You could never have a society with more jobs than available workers, but it has happened.

You could never possibly see, like we did in 2018, unmarried women with no partner at home having a 7.6 percent rise in their incomes, but it happened.

You could never cut the poverty rate a full half a percent in a single year, but we did it.

You would think things like that would bring joy in this body, joy across the country. We have an economy that is working. We had Jay Powell here yesterday, the Federal Reserve chairman, talking about we are in a sweet spot. It is working. The most stable

economy in modern times. The healthiest labor market in modern times. The best employment situation in modern times.

The debates we should be having behind these microphones should be about how not to screw it up, how to understand what is working and do more of it.

Because, you remember the previous slide that talked about the growth of debt, where our allocations go? If we grow the economy, it gives us a fighting chance. Now, we still have to do a bunch of other things.

And this is back to the ultimate point. I have been trying to argue now for multiple years: There is a path where we don't have to be buried in a financial collapse as a society because we built up stunning amounts of debt. And I know some don't want to hear it, but it is the math.

We believe we have built the math that we could kiss up against 95 percent of debt to GDP and hold it through the baby boomers.

I have a 4-year-old little girl. She deserves to live in an America that works, that grows, that provides opportunities. Remember, we are in a world right now where, if we can keep up this level of growth, about every 30, 35 years the standard of living doubles. Or we go back to the bad old days of just a couple of years ago where the GDP growth was so slow and so fat, the standard of living was only going to double about every 70 years.

So, how do we do this? I just walked through, first, our financial levers that are solely responsible for us in this room. We own the levers. We own the levers of tax policy that grow the economy. We own the levers of immigration policy that goes to a talent-based system, that maximizes economic growth. We own the levers with the administration on smart regulations. We own the levers, ultimately, on trade agreements that are fair and grow our economy.

But we have to do other things. We have to change many of our social entitlement structures to incentivize work. If you are on Social Security disability, don't create a cliff; create a glide path so you are incentivized to be in the labor force. Because, think about it. When the models were done after we did tax reform, the fragility—the smart economists kept coming to us saying: Our capital stock. Will there be enough money to finance the growth?

It turns out, there is. We did it. Americans are saving. Some of that is demographics. Some of it is substantially because of tax reform.

It turns out, repatriation, we had—what was the report?—\$140 billion more come back than we expected. And it turns out, because we have a healthy economy, capital is coming in from all over the world. So we have the capital to invest and grow.

But the other fragility was labor, available workers. What a great problem to have, but we need to think of

every lever we have in society, everything from dealing with the opioid crisis to incentives to participate in the labor force.

Come to Phoenix, Arizona. We have a homeless shelter. There is an organization there called St. Joseph The Worker. It is a 100-year-old-plus Catholic charity. You walk in the door, and they will show you—they have a stack of job opportunities for the most disaffected of our society, people who are trying to get on their program, trying to deal with mental health demons and substance abuse demons and those things. But they are there.

There should be joy that there is such a labor shortage that our brothers and sisters in the business community are willing to take a risk on our brothers and sisters who are living in a homeless shelter. That part, we have proven, works.

How do we expand participation in the labor force? How do we also, now, incentivize the other end? If you are healthy, if you are fit, if you are sharp, if you just want to, do we actually start to say: Well, you are 72 years old. You want to work. We are going to start adding certain levels of taxes. We are going to start taking away parts of your Social Security. We are going to tax these benefits because you are out there working.

Just the opposite. We want as much of our society to stay in the labor force. And if you want to and you are older, let's redesign some of these incentives to stay in the labor force.

Our millennial males that we still have a math problem entering the labor force and the other end of the age curve—let's fix it. Those are policies. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just rational policy to keep the economy growing.

The other one that I come to the floor constantly and speak about is the disruption of technology that is about to crash the price of healthcare. And this is one of those moments I seem to succeed in offending everyone, so maybe it is the right thing.

The ACA, ObamaCare—let's have a moment of truth and reality about it. It was substantially a finance mechanism. It was about who got subsidized, who had to pay.

Our Republican alternative, well-meaning, had a number of kickers, a number of incentives in it, but it wasn't about who got subsidized and who had to pay; it was substantially about who had to pay and who got subsidized.

This body needs to stop having the absurd conversation about the financing part of healthcare and start thinking about what we do to crash the actual delivery price.

It turns out there is a revolution of technology out there, the thing you can blow into that can actually tell you you have the flu. It can bounce off your phone, check your medical records, and then order antivirals. Except for, the problem is, that tech-

nology is illegal under the way our laws are written today.

There is a revolution coming. The other side of the spectrum is drugs like the single-shot cure for hemophilia. You saw that we think we now have the cure for sickle cell anemia. On cystic fibrosis, it looks like we think we may have the drug that stabilizes it. We know we have the drug that stabilizes ALS.

They are all going to be really expensive. These are miracles in the biologic pharmaceutical world. We need to now work on a financing mechanism for the distribution of these pharmaceuticals that cure our brothers and sisters with chronic conditions. Because, remember, 5 percent of our population with chronic conditions is the majority of our healthcare spending.

And we are about to start curing a number of them, because a few years ago the Republicans in this body, we passed the Cures Act, and it is working.

And my terror is the left is moving a bill called H.R. 3. It made it through the Ways and Means Committee, and it breaks my heart because they are about to screw up the very incentives that have created these miracles, that are about to start curing individuals with these chronic conditions.

Understand, if we could get our act together, if we could actually start to understand the technology disruption that is here, we can start to crash the price of healthcare, instead of having the absurd debate of who should get subsidized and who should have to pay.

Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just technology.

But when you work in an environment where rage is the actual commodity of exchange, how do you ever actually get to solutions?

And then the last one, which will be the most difficult one, is we have to have an honest conversation of what to do in the actual incentives, are there things we could do in the incentives of staying healthy, of how you deliver Medicare and Medicare part A and B and D, the incentives there.

Could we actually create some incentives for Social Security that, if you wanted to work longer, you get spiffs and those things?

But, if we do those five things, we can make the math work that we as a society, we as a country do not have to fall off the debt cliff. And it is the hardest thing you can imagine for a body that is completely calcified in its inability to actually do anything of value. Because it would require owning a calculator; it would require thinking; it would require some creativity; and it would require doing everything at one time to make the math work.

You can't just do one of these things, walk away, and pretend you did something. It all has a synergistic feed because the labor force participation needs the strong economy; the strong economy needs the investments for the technology; the technology disruption

needs the strong labor force to grab those who may have been rotated in the economy. It all has to work together.

My heartbreak as I come behind this microphone and the reason I am here is to save this country and save it from that huge monster that is our debt, because I have the world's greatest little 4-year-old girl, and I am going to find a way to fix this for my country, but also for my daughter.

I have been coming behind this microphone now with this for over a year. We have meeting after meeting after meeting after meeting on the fact that there is a path. It requires being willing to accept disruption in technology. It requires being able to actually drop some of the crazy ideology and actually use a calculator on the math on the things that actually grow the economy.

And the ideology of rage has blinded us from, I think, in many ways, doing the right thing for working men and women, for my little girl, for this country.

And I don't care if you are on the right or the left; you should be having your soul ripped out because we are now—we have been here, what, 10-plus months, and we have squandered almost every day we have been here because we know the path we have to go down, yet, in many ways, all we have done is make it worse.

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

IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times, and I build more respect for my friend from Arizona every time I hear him speak. I am very grateful for his presence and his efforts.

At this point I would like to address this ongoing issue, ongoing for only about 3 years, because it was immediately upon President Trump being elected President that we immediately started hearing all of the saber-rattling that we have got to impeach this guy, he is not qualified, he is crazy, he has committed crimes.

And we have been hearing for nearly 3 years; there is no question, there is lots of direct evidence, President Trump has committed crimes, a lot more than you might think; in fact, a lot more than circumstantial evidence. Oh, it is overwhelming.

We have heard from so many people for nearly 3 years—well, actually, over 3 years now—over 3 years.

Then we get down to it. The great hope was the man that I believe did more damage to the FBI than all of the FBI directors for the last 50 years, a guy named Mueller.