

Because remember, 10 years from now the trust fund is gone. Our brothers and sisters who are on Social Security that rely on it are going to take what, around a 25 percent cut.

Are we going to let that happen?

It is coming. The math is real. You can't pretend it away. And you start to look at some of the lunacy that we get from our friends on the left. Oh, let's just tax more. Even a 100 percent tax rate on small businesses and upper-income families, you can't even come close. So take all their money, and just assume that you live in some magic fantasy world where everyone keeps working. Let's live in fantasy.

This is what you get. My spending in 30 years is—my borrowing is about 12.4 percent of GDP. If I take every dime of someone who makes \$500,000 or more, the next dollar, we just take it, you get about 5 percent of GDP, and that is pretending people would keep working. The math is the math, and we need to stop lying.

Look, if you don't believe me, you go look up CBO. Go to Brian Riedl, Manhattan Institute, he does a beautiful job of taking OMB data, CBO data, some of the others out there, and puts it on charts so that it is absorbable. He walks through all of your solutions.

What if we repeal the tax cuts and raise the taxes on low-income people?

How about if you get rid of every tax idea that is out there?

All the Democrat solutions. You still fall incredibly short. You get a fraction of what is required. You go on some of the other solutions that have been offered. No easy pay-fors for Social Security or Medicare programs. Everything falls short. I need more than 6 percent of GDP. And if I take almost every solution, I only pick up a fraction of that. The math is the math, and the math will win.

Now, here is the point where I am going to make some of my own friends on my side a little cranky; I am going to tell the truth. Many of the solutions we run around here and tout: We are going to balance in 7 years. We are going to balance in 10 years.

Do you understand the fraud?

We say: Well, we are going to cut Medicare. Okay. We are going to shift it to the individual. We are going to do this. We are going to take Medicaid and we are just going to cut our spending because we handed it back to the States. They are shell-gaming the math. They are not willing to actually tell the system we are going to legalize technology.

This exists today. The thing that looks like a large kazoo, you can blow into it, it tells you you have a virus. It bangs off your phone to know you are not allergic to certain antivirals, and orders your antivirals, allowing that algorithm, that technology, to write a prescription.

You can't do that?

Why?

Do you know anyone with a diabetic pump?

All day long that algorithm is prescribing to them.

We have got to get this out because if you can't have that type of technology disruption—my other idea is a much grander theory.

Five percent of our brothers and sisters who have multiple chronic conditions are over half of our healthcare spending. We are in the time of miracles where we are seeing cures. We, as a body, need to basically do an Operation Warp Speed as a way to save ourselves from our own crushing debt. Bring those cures.

If it is true that a San Diego company—which has just been bought up and was working with CRISPR—has now cured about a half a dozen people of type 1 diabetes—and we are trying to bring out one of their researchers to come talk to us in February—if it is true, if there is just the slightest opening of a door, there is a path there.

I know that is type 1. I know type 2 we have our health issues. What we do in our farm bill—the fact that so much of our society has become almost self-destructive with obesity—yes, I may have just hurt your feelings—but dammit, when government has to pay 70 percent of all healthcare costs, we as a society should care.

I represent the population of probably the second highest per capita diabetes in the world, one of my Tribal communities in Arizona. When I meet people who are blind in that community, who have lost parts of their feet, is that compassion?

So what would happen if we can marry up legalizing the technology that will make your life easier and more convenient and make you healthier?

Yes, it means that you don't walk into the urgent care center, because you have a breath biopsy in your home medicine cabinet. Legalize the technology.

Then we push as hard as we can, if we are in the age of miracles, cure, cure, cure because that is more moral and compassionate. And, dammit, it has an amazing effect on U.S. debt.

Do you remember how many times I showed you that 31 percent of all Medicare spending is related to diabetes? What would happen if you cut half of that?

Yes, it is lifestyle. Yes, it is what people eat. Yes, it is exercise.

What would happen if we can give people back islet cells that produce insulin again?

We found a way to cure hepatitis C. When I first got here, this body was getting ready to try to figure out how to have hundreds of thousands of people get liver transplants, and it was going to bankrupt Medicaid systems all over the country. Then someone came up with a hepatitis C cure. It was really expensive, and we bitched about the cost of it, except for the fact that it cured them. And 7 months later there was a second drug that crashed the price.

Was that moral?

Of course it was.

Was it really good economics?

Was it just compassion?

Yes.

I need this to become part of our lexicon that the solution is disruption through technology. Optionality. But it is also the morality of we need to push those cures out because it is really good economics.

Instead of giving lists of things of here is how we are going to cut the debt and deficit, we are just going to shift it to someone else to spend.

Is this body—and particularly to the freshmen and the freshmen staff that I have been trying to talk to with this speech—this will be the most important stuff you deal with in your time here. It is not the shiny object that may get you on FOX News tonight. It is not the shiny object that gets you applause when you go into your town-hall meeting. Oh, we did this.

This stuff is hard. It is complicated. You are going to be lobbied like a war. They are going to spend money in your district beating the crap out of you because you are taking away their money.

It also saves this country and gives my little Matthew, who is 6 months old, a future. That is the morality.

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

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### THE JOB OF A CONGRESSPERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Arizona. As he so often does, in outlining the extent to which we have significant fiscal challenges that could be met with the kinds of reforms that we don't often talk about: the need to reform healthcare policies, healthcare decisions, and things that get well beyond the rhetoric of balancing budgets, on that he and I agree enormously.

I look forward to engaging with him on the floor of the House and other places on that topic again. But I do want to say one thing that is true about what the gentleman from Arizona was talking about with respect to addressing mandatory spending, reforming so-called entitlements with respect to Social Security and Medicare, and otherwise reforming those complex areas of our government. If you can't tackle discretionary spending, you are

not going to tackle mandatory spending.

And importantly, this is the critical part, you have got to have the political willpower to address these things. That is actually why I came to the floor this evening.

□ 1745

America was drawn into an engaging debate among the Members of Congress who represent them in the people's House last week.

C—SPAN, not constricted by the rules of the House, was able to have cameras zeroing in on the Members of this body as we were debating last week. People were drawn into the conversations, the people on both sides of the aisle, on the drama of the debates and how we would choose the Speaker of the House and then whether we would pass the rules package.

But here I am on January 11, 2023, in the new Republican majority, and I am alone in the Chamber again with the Speaker. That is the requirement, by the way. There has to be a Speaker and then a Member on the floor. But I am alone again.

Now, we passed some bills today.

But what are we going to do as a body to make good on the reforms we passed last week and actually extend on them and build on them?

I would ask my colleagues why we don't have full debate right now on a number of the important issues of the day?

Why we don't have full debate tomorrow, next week, and the following week on the crucial issues of our day?

Today, I called a colleague on the other side of the aisle to inquire as to which Members of the minority party would be willing to sit down with me and anybody else to figure out how to deal with the debt and the deficit spending that is plaguing our country.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle engaged in conversation about what that would take, but the fact of the matter is that I don't know the answer.

What I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is: Come on down. Where are you?

Are you going to simply take potshots at any effort by Members of my side of the aisle—the majority now—who dare to raise questions about how we might tackle \$32 trillion of debt, a trillion dollar-plus deficits every year, and tackle the question of interest rates going up causing our interest payments to go up every year?

Every 50 basis points—every half of a percentage point—that goes up adds about \$100 billion a year in additional interest expense. I think in the next year interest is going to eclipse our national defense spending.

Now, where are all my defense hawks?

Where are all of my Republican colleagues who like to stand up and say: We have got to fund our men and women in uniform; we have to buy

more planes and more bombers; we have to have more guns; and we have to make sure we have the strongest defense in the world?

Great. I agree. Peace through strength sparingly used, non-woke, and trained to kill people and blow things up. That is what I want our military to be and to do, and I want it to continue to be the best in the world.

But we are not going to be able to do that if we are spending more on interest to the debt than we are on our own national defense.

As the gentleman from Arizona rightly is pointing out about the state of our "mandatory spending" and "entitlements," we are not going to be able to maintain our country, have a strong national defense, and ensure a peaceful world for our children and our grandchildren. These are just facts.

We used to have a lot of political back and forth between Democrats and Republicans. We would accuse our colleagues on the other side of the aisle of being tax-and-spend Democrats—and they were tax-and-spend Democrats. But something changed along the way. We stopped debating tax policy for the most part, and now everybody in this Chamber for the most part are spend-and-spend Members of Congress, spend-and-spend members of a uni-party.

Mr. Speaker, I am all on board with the enthusiasm, the unity, and the energy coming out of last week that we are going to transform this institution. I believe it.

I believe by offering amendments in the appropriations process on the floor of this body we will be better.

I believe that by having 72 hours to read bills and not waiving that rule—that we actually do it—that we will be better.

I believe that by having single-subject bills without them being multisubject, complicated, and thousands of pages that we will be better.

I believe that by requiring amendments to be germane—that is, actually related to the underlying purpose of the underlying bill—that we will be better.

Those are all things that will make us better.

But they will only make us better if we are all united in the purpose of what we are trying to do.

I know I have got very strong disagreements with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I have significant disagreements with a lot of my friends on my side of the aisle. But, Mr. Speaker, you will never solve those disagreements if you never sit down at the table and work.

The only way to work is to put some sort of constraint on our spending. So with all due respect to my friend from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) with whom I agree about mandatory spending and about having to solve those problems in the long term, discretionary spending matters. Discretionary spending matters because it charts the priorities of a Congress that represents the

American people. We have to make the tough choices on discretionary spending.

Oh, by the way, that they are only 20 or 25 percent of the overall spending does not mean that they are not insignificant. If we do not balance our budget right now and chart a course to balance that budget over the next 10 years, we will spend an additional \$10 trillion over the next 10 years—that we don't have.

But what will happen is—and here is what is going to happen, this is important for the American people to understand—we reached an agreement as a party last week to ensure that we return to 2022 levels of spending—that is a top line level of \$1.471 trillion—and that we operate with that cap in spending that says nothing about what the levels are for defense or nondefense discretionary, just that we would cap at 2022 levels of spending.

But here is what will happen. We will have a debate about that, and we will pass some appropriations bills. If we do our job as Republicans, we will pass good, solid bills for this year's spending that stick within those caps and stay under the 2022 levels of spending.

We will send them to the Senate, and CHUCK SCHUMER will say—with all sorts of wailing and gnashing of teeth—that we are taking food out of the mouths of orphans and babies and that we are undermining the ability of people to survive and live and that we are taking away their medicine; we are killing people; and we are doing all sorts of horrible things.

As a result, it will be September, and we won't have an agreement, and then there will be some brinkmanship, a bunch of politics, and a bunch of messaging and speeches, and then there will be a continuing resolution that funds government at the current levels that were passed in December under that \$1.7 billion omnibus spending bill that was passed on December 23 using Christmas as a backstop.

That is almost certainly what is going to happen if we don't stop it.

There are two ways to stop it: Democrats and Republicans sit down and work honestly around a table to stop it, or brinkmanship, forcing the question by bringing it to the brink. Those are the two possible ways that we can try to stop what I just described will occur from occurring. This is the reality of what we have got to change in this body.

What else is going to happen?

Come summer, at some time undetermined—usually chosen by the executive branch as the maximum moment to be able to extract some sort of pain on the body—we will be told that the debt limit is going to be reached. That might be May or June or July or August.

Then we will be told: You must raise the debt ceiling.

If any of us say: Wait a minute, why are we going to raise the debt ceiling if we don't stop doing the things that are causing us to accumulate more debt?

If any of us dare to say that, what will happen?

Oh, my. It is already happening. The Wall Street Journal, all of the bond traders and the stock traders on Wall Street, all of the investment bankers, all of the brilliant economists, and all of the opposing political party will all say:

Don't default on the debt. You can't default on the debt, so don't you dare demand that we actually change the things we are doing that are causing the debt because we might default on the debt.

So let's keep spending money we don't have and keep accumulating more debt increasing our interest payments and making it more difficult to service that debt while we undermine our own fiscal accountability and our own bonds ratings in the future.

But no, no, don't you dare, Congressman ROY, say that you might use the debt ceiling as leverage to extract fiscal reforms to stop the insanity.

Let me just be clear. I think it is critical that we change the way we are doing business, and I intend to use the debt ceiling to ensure that we get fiscal and structural reforms. I am not going to bow down just because a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and a few pundits on TV write nasty editorials and some of my donors, some of the people out there in the world and activists text you and say: Oh, my Gosh, what are you doing? You are going to risk default on the debt.

Do you know why I am not going to do that?

Because it is my job not to back down when people are afraid of what we are supposed to do here. What we are supposed to do is bring things to a decision in this body responsibly.

All last week while we were debating the Speaker, a whole bunch of my friends and supporters—financial supporters—were blowing up my phone with text messages. A whole lot of them were saying:

Attaboy, stand up, fight for the American people, change the institution, and let us actually try to make that place work rather than continuing down this road of destruction.

But a whole bunch of them were also texting me saying:

What are you doing? What are you doing? We are not going to have a Republican Speaker. We are going to get a Democrat Speaker. You guys look like clowns.

What are you doing?

You look ridiculous. You are making the Republican Party look ridiculous, CHIP. Stop doing it.

Come Friday after 15 votes, we came to a conclusion. Nobody died, and nothing went crazy. We got a Speaker of the House, and we got some agreements among all of us about how the body should proceed, about ensuring we open it up, have transparency, offer more amendments, and give greater ideological diversity among the committees.

Let's have a real debate on these things, and let's get a really strong committee on the Judiciary Committee—a Church-style committee—to look at how government is acting.

That is what we got by standing up and fighting and ignoring all of the handwringers who can't stand the heat. Or to state it differently, all of the handwringers out there in the chamber of commerce crowd and the donor class who basically want us to do their bidding so they can get richer.

That is the truth.

Don't default on the debt. That might hurt my financial bottom line, CHIP. Don't you dare rattle and have debates on the House floor that might rock the boat, because my boat is pretty good, CHIP. I am doing quite well.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole hell of a lot of people in this country who are not doing well, and I am not here to represent the donor class. I am not here to represent the talking heads. I am here to represent every hard-working American across this country and particularly in my district who are sick of the direction of this country.

So I am glad that we had the debate that we had last week. I am glad that we captivated the American people's attention. I am glad that C-SPAN was free to show the conversation and the debate. I am glad that we did something we hadn't done in 100 years because it is the two-party system entrenched that has broken down the ability of Members of this body to actually be Members.

That is actually our job.

Putting politics and partisan politics aside, it is our job as individual Members of this body to come here and do our job. It is not our job, for example, to get on a committee and say and do whatever the chairman of the committee says which, by the way, is one of the things that happens in this town.

Our job is to get on the committee and work, debate, put good bills on the floor, amend those bills, debate those bills, and pass some of those bills.

□ 1800

It is also not a race to introduce bills. It is not a race to pass bills. What would be wrong if we only passed about 30 bills this whole Congress? Would that be a bad thing? What if we only passed the 12 Appropriations bills, did our job, sent them to the Senate, passed a handful of bills that would actually make our country better, and then just sat back and worked a little bit and talked a little bit rather than running down to the desk to file another bill to introduce another statement to do another press conference to then run around and say: Oh, we have to pass a messaging bill. Oh, this is such-and-such week. This is the week for police officers, or this is the week for breast cancer awareness, or this is the week for whatever somebody in the Hallmark industry decided the week was for. Oh, well, we have to pass a bill.

Why? Do you think we lack laws? Do you think we lack regulations? Do you think we need to spend more money that we don't have? Why don't we just stop, pause?

My message to my Republican colleagues is the best thing we could do for our country is to stop doing all the things that this body has been doing for as long as I can remember. Whatever this body has been doing, let's do the opposite. How about that?

How about we actually have this Chamber full, like it was last week? Why don't we have hundreds of people on the floor and debate issues in front of each other? Why don't we pick a day like Tuesday and have 50 Members from one side and 50 Members from the other side and call that debate day?

Let's debate Ukraine in full view of the American people. Maybe the next week we can debate spending restraint, how we are going to tackle spending. I would like to listen to my colleagues tell me how you plan on tackling spending because, right now, my basic understanding of how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would tackle spending is tax people or keep spending money or both.

My view on this side of the aisle is that we don't want to tax people, but we want to keep spending money in the name of defense. Anybody want to come challenge me on that assertion? I am happy to debate them. Either side of the aisle, come on down. Let's debate it. I don't think anybody will take that debate on because they know I am right.

Why don't we change that? Where are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when it comes to spending? I would like to know. I think the American people deserve to know.

Do you believe in modern monetary theory, just keep spending money and it doesn't matter? I don't. I think that is foolish. I think it is reckless. I think it undermines our dollar. I think it undermines our financial stability.

More importantly, I think it makes it impossible for us to make good decisions about how to make policy and execute policy. How can you make a tough decision about whether or not you need to buy a bomber or whether or not you need to fund a particular grant program or fund a particular entitlement that is way oversubscribed and out of money? How can you make a decision about that if the answer is just to keep printing money?

I mean, that is my question. I suggest there is no more important question for us to answer because if we don't, then we are never going to come to agreement on the policies, ever.

If I go home and talk to my wife and say, "Look, we are going to cap our spending at our 2022 levels of spending," then we have to make choices. We have to decide, well, are we going to just not make our mortgage payment? No, we have to do that. Are we going to not feed our kids? Well, no, we have to feed our kids. Are we going to have electricity and heat? Well, we would like to have that.

Then comes the discretionary questions: Do you take a vacation? Do you get a new car rather than patching together your 15-year-old car? Do you

send your kids to a certain school? Do you save a certain amount of money for college? Maybe you forgo college because you look at college and say, "Why am I going to spend \$300,000 to send them to college where they will teach my kids that America is evil?" I will save that for another rant.

That is my point. We have to do that as families, but this body never does it, ever. We pretend to do it.

The point of the agreement reached last week was to open this body up, empower rank-and-file, but also, importantly, establish some parameters for how we fund the Federal Government. Those parameters should be that we set limits. If you set limits, now you have to sit down and figure it out.

Here is the problem. I don't believe that CHUCK SCHUMER and Senate Democrats want to sit down at the table and figure out how to limit spending. I don't believe that the President of the United States or his current Director of Office of Management and Budget or any of his team wants to sit down at the table with us and figure out how to limit spending.

I have not even heard them come down and say, "Well, fine. You are right, Chip. We are spending more money than we have, and we are racking up more debt, so we believe we need to increase taxes." Okay. Come make your offer. We will raise taxes. Show me how raising those taxes is going to eliminate the deficit. He whispers, "It is not."

Show me how raising those taxes is not going to undermine economic growth, make it more difficult for American people to get jobs, undermine the prosperity of the American people. Show me that. Come demonstrate that. He whispers, "That is not really that easy to do."

But our job is to responsibly represent the American people. It is not to govern. We often use that word. That is crazy. We don't govern. We represent. Our job is to represent our constituents. I don't know any constituents—frankly, even my most left-leaning constituents, to be honest—saying, "Oh, yes, please go up there and spend more money we don't have."

I would just suggest that, according to the CBO, we are going to see another \$15.7 trillion in deficits over the next 10 years. That is the truth. The truth is that, in fiscal year 2022, we collected a record \$4.9 trillion in taxes, nearly a trillion more than the previous year.

We don't have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. We have an overpromise problem.

I had a reporter come up to me in the hallway a minute ago and say: Mr. ROY, are there any circumstances in which you are going to support providing more aid to Ukraine?

How on Earth are we having that conversation on January 11 after, on December 23, we just added another \$45 billion for Ukraine?

The reporter responded and said: They say that it is really important to get more money to beat Russia.

Oh, really? What do our experts say? What is our responsibility to pay for that? Do we just write a check anytime a world leader comes and says, "But it is really important for my people that you write me a check"?

I want someone to write me a check, minus all the ethics stuff. Don't go write all that.

Look, the truth is, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is 100 percent correct that mandatory spending—Social Security, Medicare, all the related expenditures that go along with that—are driving the vast majority of the debt that we are accumulating every year. That is correct. If you are not willing to take on discretionary spending, how are you going to take on Social Security, Medicare, and reforming those to work when the first ad that is going to be run is going to be pushing granny off the cliff, if you dare even have a conversation about the issue?

I will make an invitation to any colleague in the Chamber, but particularly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, come down here and talk about Social Security and Medicare and all of our mandatory spending.

I will issue the same request that my colleagues on this side of the aisle acknowledge, that you cannot hide behind Social Security, Medicare, and mandatory spending to say that we shouldn't limit discretionary spending, defense spending because that is an insignificant part of the budget.

It is significant, and it is significant not just because of the trillions of dollars of debt that those spending accounts for Defense, Education, Department of Justice, Commerce, and every other agency, Homeland Security—it is not just because we are spending too much money there, and it is adding up to deficits and debts. It is because we are funding the very agencies that are undermining us.

We are funding the bureaucrats who are undermining the current individual in America who is out there as an entrepreneur trying to get a job started. It is undermining my friend Scott Smith in Loudoun County because we label him a domestic terrorist because the FBI was brought in along with the National School Board Association. They all coordinated and said: Okay, let's label him a domestic terrorist.

We are funding a Department of Homeland Security that wants to continue to create or execute policies that invite more people to come to our border, endangering them and us.

The reason you care about discretionary spending is because it funds the policies of government, of the bureaucracy, of the administrative state that undermines our well-being, undermines our prosperity.

We have the opportunity now, right now, as Republicans to lead the House of Representatives forward to change. We should, in fact, change.

Last week was a monumental step forward to changing this institution, to

opening it up, to allowing rank-and-file Members to have a say, to putting more diversity on our committees, to having more debate in committees, coming down to the floor, and fighting for the people that we represent. All of that will be for naught if we don't embrace wholeheartedly the mission, the hard mission, of limiting the spending that is destroying our country and demanding that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle come sit down at the table so that we can actually do our jobs for the people we represent.

Then, finally, send a message to the United States Senate, to the Democrat-led United States Senate, to the Democrat President of the United States at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that it is not enough to give speeches. It is not enough to oppose what we produce out of the people's House.

The American people spoke in November. They want us to be responsible. They want us to limit spending. They want us to secure the United States. They want us to have a secure and sovereign border. They want us to get out of their business. They want us to stop being at each other's throats. If you want to do that, then embrace fiscal responsibility and stop spending money you don't have to fund the bureaucrats who are undermining our liberties.

Stand up in defense of liberties, civil liberties and the freedoms of the American people, by calling out the bureaucrats in our committees and exposing it through oversight.

Stand up for a strong military that is nonwoke, that is sparingly used but ready to go fight when needed.

Secure the border of the United States with the policies that are necessary to do so and embrace radical federalism where we return power to the States so we can agree to disagree and stop being at each other's throats.

Do you want to do those things? Then there is one key thing you have to do. You have to fight the swamp. You have to take on the bureaucracy. You have to take on the powers that be.

That started last week. We have some of the tools that we need, but that battle is just beginning. We are going to take this town on for the American people.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 12, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,