

What makes the environment cleaner is knowing when someone has done something stupid and stopping them.

Crowdsourcing. The data is living. Use a living data model. And guess what? You can do that for water, for sound; you can actually do it for health. You can do it for all sorts of things.

How many hearings has this place had to discuss dragging our regulatory environment; and it is not deregulating, it is smart regulating. Make us more efficient.

It turns out, the data says that we would be healthier, cleaner, faster, and you would get the bad guys, and you could build a model where you just leave the good actors alone.

If you are the motorcycle paint shop, and your filters are working, and your booth is working, why should you be bothered? Just leave them alone; and if they screw up, a crowdsourced environmental sensor model will catch them instantly.

You would be amazed the pushback you get because, well, we are a consulting firm. You just put us out of business. Hey, I work for the group. I shove paperwork in the file cabinets. Why do you want to unemploy me?

We are going to have to have the discussion if we intend to survive, where we are going population-wise, debt-wise.

Remember, functionally, in 10 years, we have two \$1 trillion running deficits, and it is demographics. It is trying to pay for healthcare. We have got to have the growth, and we have got to have the technology disruption and healthcare, or we are in for some very dark times.

The fact of the matter is, we could have incredibly prosperous times for the future. But that prosperity is only going to come if I, and you, and the people who are willing to listen to this are willing to pound on Members of Congress and our staff and the lobbying communities and our creative thinkers out there and say, okay, guys. There is hope out there. There is hope. We just need to be willing to think differently and embrace the disruption and embrace an economy that actually starts to do good things for our people, instead of basically being a protection racket for incumbent models.

It is uncomfortable, but there is hope. But there is no hope if we keep doing the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for letting me do this. We are finding the only way it is going to sink in is if I keep coming and giving more and more examples that there is hope if we just do things differently. So I thank the gentleman for giving me some of his time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his insight. I have nobody else to speak in this hour, so I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Arizona being down here, as always, enlightening the American people and using the floor time in the honor of our soon-to-be-leaving-the-House friend, LOUIE GOHMERT, and making sure that we use the time here to inform our constituents back home.

As usual, the American people understand I am speaking to a mostly empty Chamber, with the exception of the Speaker and my friends who are now leaving who were just here. This is pretty much what we get in terms of debate here in the House Chamber.

Earlier today we had a little bit of back and forth on a couple of bills, but they are pre-programmed, like 30 minutes a side, pre-designed, all designed to get right off the floor; and I want to talk about that. That is why I am coming down here today.

Today, we took up two bills on the floor of the people's House. We took up a bill that is ostensibly focused on marriage and allowing recognition of same-sex marriages from one State to another.

But in that bill is something that is pretty significant for the American people to understand, regardless of your views about how the bill is being sold, about it being about recognition of same-sex marriage. Actually, they say it is about codifying Obergefell and same-sex marriage. It does no such thing. It only deals with recognition across State lines.

But even if you think that is good policy, even if you voted for it—and I didn't think it was good policy. I would have voted against it on the merits—in the bill is a sword, a private right of action, a private right of action able to be used and creating the ability of the Attorney General of the United States to go after individuals for actions they carry out, their closely held religious beliefs.

People in this Chamber voted for it, knowing full well that the language in that bill will allow lawyers and organizations to come sue Americans and force them into court; and their response is that, oh, don't worry, you have the Constitution of the United States and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Well, no kidding. I know the Constitution exists. And the Religious Freedom Restoration Act dates back to, I don't know, '93 or '94, sometime in the 1990s.

□ 1545

But now, if you dare, as an organization, a religious school, for example, say: "Wait a minute. It is against our tenets of faith to hire a same-sex couple, or an individual who is part of a same-sex couple, as a teacher in our

school," or maybe another organization makes a choice along those lines, now you are in court.

Now you are having to go defend yourself. Now you are having to go take this up to the Fifth Circuit and up to the United States Supreme Court, trying to figure out how they are going to interpret all of this, whether this law is even constitutional in the first place, all because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle wanted not to just provide for recognition across States—again, a proposition with which I do not agree. But not just that. They wanted to make sure that there was a sword to go after you if you disagree.

Earlier this summer, a member of Parliament in Finland was prosecuted for a pamphlet she distributed 20 years ago in defense of traditional marriage and in opposition to same-sex marriage.

Again, whatever your views are on the issue, let me be perfectly clear: What is happening today, what was decided today on the floor of the House, and all those Members on that side of the aisle and the 39 on this side of the aisle who voted for that legislation, voted for a sword to go after individual Americans, private citizens, and private organizations for daring to carry out their closely held, private religious beliefs.

We will be back here talking about that. We will be back here trying to pass legislation to make sure we can protect them.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules to try to get a vote on the floor of the House, and I was denied even the ability to offer the amendment. We couldn't even offer the amendment. Lord knows, I don't have the power to offer an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Again, I want everybody out there in America to understand that not since May 2016 has an individual of the so-called people's House been able to walk into the well of the House and offer an amendment on a piece of legislation, this time as consequential as marriage and religious liberty.

Again, let me reiterate, whatever your views are on the issue—and I have mine—shouldn't we be able to debate marriage? Shouldn't we be able to debate religious liberty and the ability to protect your views and your closely held religious beliefs?

No, no, no. I was punted out of the Committee on Rules for supposedly, irony of ironies, on a day in which we just authorized \$860 billion in a 4,400-page bill I got 40 hours before I voted on it, because it would score over half a million dollars—yeah, \$500,000—over 10 years.

That wasn't even actually what the CBO said. They said it could because it might create some revenues and some expenditures and, those expenditures, those outlays, would be what? Damages if you went to court and you succeeded.

I want you to be able to understand that my Democratic colleagues used a point of order to shut down an amendment to protect religious liberty if it would be successful to protect your rights. That is assuredly and 100 percent what happened, yet it was just blown over, disregarded here in the House Chamber, including by 39 members of my own party, because that is the way this town works.

The bill was dubbed a gay marriage codification of Obergefell bill. You had 39 members of my party go: Oh, well, I have to be for that because we have to be for our Libertarian-type principles. Never mind that you are trampling on the ability of States and communities to be able to decide how they want to live, how they want to set up their communities, trampling on millennia, thousands of years, of traditional marriage, which is designed very specifically for families and children. There is tons of evidence and research on this.

But, no. We have to do that. We have to ignore the sword and the attack on religious liberty. It was voted on today without debate and without an amendment. It is extraordinary.

What else did we do today in this august body, so much debate and interaction and discussion among the 435 Members here on the floor? What else was done today? I will tell you what was done today. On the desk on the floor of the House of Representatives was a stack of papers up on the second level, 4,400 pages stacked up right there, which I got at 9 p.m. on Tuesday night.

We have a rule in the House of Representatives that you are not supposed to vote on legislation if you don't have at least 72 hours to read it. Why might you have that rule? I don't know. Color me crazy. Maybe I should read what is in a 4,400-page bill. I know that is a radical position. I know that puts me over in the insane camp. Oh, there is crazy CHIP ranting on the floor of the House because, oh, my God, he wants 72 hours to read a bill.

Whenever I say this, how many people go: You know what is in the bill. What is wrong? How long does it take you to read a bill?

How many Members do you think read all 4,400 pages?

Oh, but, CHIP, they have staff for that. You have all the committee staff. The committee staff does that.

We hold the election certificate. How many of your staff do you think read the 4,400 pages? I know my staff was poring over it late night on Tuesday night and all day yesterday just to see what was in it.

Surprise, surprise. What do you find in it? 4,400 pages, \$860 billion authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act. I had less than 40 hours before I was voting on it, in plain violation of the 72-hour rule, because we waive the rules all the time. We set up rules and waive them. Nobody seems to care. They just go: Oh, my God, I have a steak dinner to go to. I have a Christmas party to go to.

I was down here last night debating the rule on marriage. I was solo. I was one, even on my side of the aisle.

When I finished, the House Chamber closed. We were done. I rolled down the street and went to a Christmas party. There were a lot of Members there. There were a lot of Members all over this town rolling out down to their Christmas parties. They sure as hell weren't here debating marriage and religious liberty.

What do we get in getting this NDAA passed? We got a vaccine mandate repeal. Or did we? I think we got a really important step forward to say that the members of the military shouldn't be fired if they dare question whether they must take a needle in their arm for a vaccine that has not been proven to be actually effective in halting transmission and certainly not necessary for those who are young and healthy, by virtually any account by any doctor that we have had testify on this. So you reject the needle and you get fired from the United States military.

For 2 years, we have been calling to get rid of the vaccine mandates. Finally, in December 2022, right on the way out, Democrats say: Whoa, okay, in order to get this 4,400-page monstrosity across the finish line, we will accept that we will, in 30 days, undo the memo at the Department of Defense.

That memo could be reissued. In fact, the Democrat chair of the Committee on Armed Services effectively said that.

Are we going to get anybody reinstated? Are we going to get everybody honorably discharged? Are we going to be able to say maybe you shouldn't be harassed? Because that is what happens.

You didn't take a needle; you are not getting that job. You didn't take a needle; you are not necessarily getting that promotion. Retaliation, again, for a vaccine that doctors and the CDC today acknowledge does nothing for transmission, that is unnecessary for people who are healthy and young.

Here we are. We passed an NDAA in order to get—oh, man we finally got that vaccine mandate repeal language.

Look, I am glad to get it. We have been fighting for it. We didn't get half a loaf. We got the crumbs of one piece of bread. But it was so important so we could stop the next person from getting fired. We sure as hell didn't help the guy who got fired last week.

It is \$860 billion, \$45 billion above the President's request, 9 percent over 2022 levels.

I am for more money for lethality. I am for more money for a Department of Defense fully capable of killing people and blowing stuff up because that is what you want your Department of Defense to be capable of doing when called upon to do it. I am not for a social engineering experiment wrapped in a uniform. Unfortunately, that is what we are turning the Department of Defense into.

Authorizing a Department of Defense center for excellence in environmental security on how and why environmental stresses to human safety and water and energy will cascade to economic, social, political, or national security events; renewing the DOD's annual environment and energy reports; establishing a joint working group on prioritization for energy systems, which "may reduce conventional air pollution"; creating a pilot program for electric vehicle charging stations; having zero emissions by 2035 for non-tactical vehicles.

Meanwhile, China is just pumping out aircraft carriers and boats, building their military, building coal-fired power plants. We ain't building any coal-fired power plants. We are barely building any gas-fired power plants. They are out building their military, and we are focused on the coral reef, which appeared 286 times in the text of the NDAA.

Well, what else do we do? We establish a commission on reform and modernization of the State Department to offer recommendations to the President and Congress related to personnel-related matters, to strengthen diversity and inclusion, to ensure that the Department's workforce represents all of America.

Well, I am sure China is shuddering. We order the DOD to submit a report on its efforts to increase marketing and advertising to adequately reach racial and minority communities. We require the Coast Guard to implement a recommendation by the RAND Corporation to increase representation of women and racial and ethnic minorities. We require the Coast Guard Commandant to develop a 10-year strategy to enhance diversity.

We talked about the coral reef before. We got the Global Food Security Reauthorization Act. We have a program for projects to combat coastal erosion in Alaska. What we don't have is a repeal of the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. It has been there for 20 years, and we are not even using it.

Why do we leave these in place indefinitely? What do we have in there? A provision that undermines Second Amendment rights, creates a pilot program on the safe storage of personally owned firearms for members of the Armed Forces. It is on a voluntary basis, but here is the problem: It establishes a structure for the DOD to be providing storage devices for members of the military.

We know what the next step is: another grant program, another funding program through the Department of Justice, another program through another agency to be telling you that you must take or you can volunteer to take—you take these but you must put the gun in whatever storage device the government gives you. That is where this is headed.

We all know this. They act like it is minimal, doesn't matter, but that is

what happens. Then we embrace it, and that program never goes away. It just gets bigger. No little pilot programs try something and then get out of the way. When did the government ever start something and not make it bigger?

We are sitting here with \$32 trillion of debt, and all we are doing is talking about how much money we are going to spend.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Why don't you increase taxes? I tell you what, why don't we have that debate? You can't tax enough to spend all the money we are spending. You literally can't. Run the numbers. Put up a spreadsheet. If we ever actually debated and came down here and had a serious conversation, we could have that debate. I would love to have that debate, but we just keep writing checks we can't cash.

□ 1600

What else are we doing? Authorizing and extending security support to Ukraine at \$800 million without inspector general oversight.

Amendments were offered in the Foreign Affairs Committee just the other day, saying: Well, shouldn't we have more oversight with Ukraine money?

Democratic colleagues said: Well, we are for oversight, but not right now. Why in the hell would we want to have oversight right now over the money we are now spending in Ukraine and how it is being used?

No, let's just figure it out later because then what will we do? Nothing. We will do the same thing we always do: Spend more money that we don't have.

Not one Member of this body can come down here and refute that because every Member of this body knows it is true.

I will throw that out there, a challenge. I would love any Member of this body, any of my 434 colleagues, to come on down. Let's debate the proposition that we are going to do anything other than spend more money that we don't have.

I will wait for the takers because the fact is it is true, and it is both sides of the aisle.

Here is what will happen: Next year, Republicans will be in control. Next year, there will be all sorts of debate about appropriations bills. We will go through all the motions. Maybe we will pass some really good appropriations bill that holds spending in check to inflation or frozen at 2022 levels or whatever. Come up with something, anything that any normal budget, family, business would do.

Our guys will come down and do all that, be all proud, pat ourselves on the back, "Oh, yes, look at us. We just passed something that is fiscally responsible." Even if it is not, we will say it is.

Then what? We will barrel forward. The Senate won't accept it. Sometime in August or September, right before a

big government shutdown threat, Senators will say, "We are not taking that."

A whole bunch of people will say, "Oh, no. Defense, they need their appropriations." A whole bunch of people will say, "We need nondefense discretionary."

Hey, I have an idea, why don't we just spend it all? Let's just do that. Let's just say, yes, we will get a 10 percent increase for nondefense discretionary and a 10 percent increase for defense, and we will just call it a day and say, "Well done us." We just spent our children's inheritance so we can go give a speech saying how we helped our military; we wrote a whole bunch more checks for a whole bunch more government bureaucrats and agencies because we have more grants and more programs to promise you more stuff at the United States house of free stuff. We are just going to dole that out without regard to any responsibility whatsoever.

Not one Member of this body can refute what I just said other than the maybe hyperbolic examples, although I don't know that they are that hyperbolic. I will wait and see next September where we are on the numbers.

"Inflation is high. Don't you understand, CHIP? So why don't we just spend at inflation levels?" Oh, good. Let's just increase the entire budget of the United States by 8, 9, 10 percent when we are \$32 trillion in debt and when mandatory spending is on autopilot to continue to blow through the roof.

What about those interest rate payments? Those have gotten a little crazy, huh? Sitting here with now 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 percent interest. We didn't see that one coming, did we? Except that we did, but we didn't care because both sides will retreat to their postures, and then they will just kind of throw their hands up and say: "CHIP, it just is what it is. Biden is President. You need 60 in the Senate. We have a thin majority, so, man, what are we going to do?" And here we sit.

I will give this speech again in January, and I will give it again in March, and I will give it again in May, and then we will be here in September, and I hope someone can prove me wrong, but I will take the bet. There will either be a CR because we can't come to an agreement, which means we are spending at this year's levels, which is I guess somewhat fiscally better, but bad for defense and bad for how you do things, or there will be a massive bunch of spending. That is it. Those are your choices.

There will not be a reasonable sit-down to do the job that we are supposed to do.

I believe I am going to get in trouble, but I need to go do a radio interview, so I am going to have to walk off the floor now.

Here is the thing: I am just asking any one of the Members of either side of the aisle to say we are going to stop

doing that. At some point, we are going to stop doing that, stop spending money we don't have, stop cooking all these bills up in back rooms and dropping them on the floor like happened just today with a 4,400-page, \$860 billion National Defense Authorization Act, airdropped onto the floor, take it or leave it.

So, I left it, and I had to vote against defense, which is not exactly where I want to be, but I am sure as heck not going to continue to go down this road and look at my kids and grandkids one day and say: Well, too bad. Your country is bankrupt.

I hope my colleagues will wake up tomorrow and say they want to avoid having to say the same thing to their kids or grandkids.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8404. An act to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023, SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHIFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the Explanatory Statement (the "Explanatory Statement") to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 ("the Act"), which has been included as Division F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023. The Explanatory Statement reflects the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (together, "the Committees"). The Explanatory Statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the Committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning their final decisions regarding funding levels and policy direction. Therefore, the Committees have prepared a classified annex—referred to here and within the annex itself as "the Agreement"—that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations and that describes in detail the scope and intent of the Committees' actions.

The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds as requested in the President's budget and as modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations, subject to applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the Act pursuant to Section 6102 of the Act. It has the status of law. The Agreement supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the Act and in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

This Explanatory Statement incorporates by reference, and the Executive Branch shall