

mission of this organization continues to withstand the test of time.

I congratulate the Pennsylvania Grange on 150 years of service, education, legislation, and fellowship.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TARAS G. SZMAGALA

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week, America and we in Ohio lost a true patriot, family man, successful business leader, and community champion, Taras G. Szmagala, who passed away at 90 years of age.

To his wife, Katherine, of 64 years; son, Taras; grandson, Gregory; and a vast network of extended family and friends, I know this is a difficult time. Yet, I also know that you carry forward in all you do the living memory of your beloved husband, father, and grandfather. Please know many others feel the sharp pain of your loss.

Taras inspired us all with his gentlemanly manner, easy smile, and dedicated passion on matters that mean the most. There was no stronger advocate on behalf of liberty for Ukraine than Taras. He knew the stakes.

His life was a classic, committed to family, profession, Nation, and liberty, and he was resolute. He made and kept his promises. He maintained resolve in all pursuits. He was jovial, loving, dependable, and visionary, and he made our world a better place.

May he rest in peace as he takes his place at a high altar of praise, as his spirit helps guide our world, including freedom for Ukraine. May he help usher her into the birth of liberty to which he dedicated so much of his life.

Sending deepest sympathy and abiding gratitude of friendship.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF GRANT GAUTSCHE

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the director of Riverside County Department of Veterans' Services, Mr. Grant Gautsche, on the eve of his retirement from public service.

Grant, a United States Navy veteran himself, has selflessly attended to veterans throughout California's 39th Congressional District, as well as the entire County of Riverside and beyond for the past 25 years with esteemed honor.

Since beginning with the County of Riverside in 2014, Grant has served local veterans, their dependents, and their loved ones in obtaining the resources, guidance, and benefits entitled to them. He has worked closely with my district office, ensuring those who have bravely put their lives on the line receive the recognition and care they deserve.

Grant's hard work and devotion are a testament to the way we should all express gratitude to our Nation's veterans, and his retirement is well deserved.

OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EZELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to do a couple of things, and what I am going to sort of walk through is what we are seeing in the numbers.

There is a sense of theater around here that I am trying to break through, so let's see if we can have some fun with some math.

For those who were complaining about the caps, the spending reductions in the recent debt ceiling, for those who wanted more over here, for some of our brothers and sisters around this place who didn't think any of it was necessary, I need to break through and help this place get its head around the fact that we actually were allowed to negotiate on 11 percent of the spending.

Remember, your government is functionally an insurance company with an army. The vast majority of our spending is on autopilot. It is earned benefits. You earned your Medicare. You earned your Social Security. You worked your 40 quarters. Veterans earned benefits. You get certain things if you fall under a certain income. That is called Medicaid. You get certain things because of treaty agreements, the Tribal populations.

Those aren't formula. We don't vote for them. As a matter of fact, it is almost radioactive around here if we tell the truth, that it is the vast majority of spending. So, I am going to do some of this backward.

A week ago Friday, two of the lead economists at Bloomberg—they call it Bloomberg Intelligence. You have to sort of go to the Bloomberg Terminal to get this. I subscribe to a couple of things, so I got the top line.

Have you ever started to read something and go, oh my God, what are they talking about? That number can't be real. Then you bother someone who has an actual Bloomberg Terminal, and they pull the full printout on it.

Here is the reality, and I don't know how to get folks to actually understand the math. Bloomberg Intelligence, the two economists said their model—Bloomberg has this fairly fancy model, just like we do at the Joint Committee on Taxation, the CBO, the Tax Foundation. Everyone has their models. Theirs is fairly impressive. Their model said, in 10 years, we are at 130 percent of debt to GDP.

Now, understand that the cuts we just did, the rebalancing, the flattening, the slowing down, the debt growth that we just fought through in the debt ceiling, we sort of took our-

selves from 119 percent of the size of the economy at the end of the decade, or 10 years from now, to around 114 percent. That is a big deal.

You figure, 10 years from now, you have a \$39 trillion economy, so a percent is real money. We pulled it down from 119 to 114 percent. I think I have a board on it.

Then, to read through the analytics from these economists saying: Here is your problem. Interest is dramatically higher than we have been modeling.

They see inflation and, therefore, interest running longer. They also see healthcare costs growing faster and larger.

If you actually think about the reading you have done this last week, because I know all of us around here read the technical aspects of, you know, whether—I am sorry. I was going to get sarcastic, and I am trying to dial that back.

You start to see we are seeing this huge, very substantial spike in Medicare spending. It turns out a lot of our seniors actually had postponed lots and lots of procedures.

You just saw, for one of the major health companies that caters to part D, their stock just cratered yesterday because of utilization.

They had some other interesting things in there. Interest is up. Healthcare costs are up fairly dramatically. The thing I have tried to explain here that no one gets their head around, before the agreement—and I am going to use rough numbers. The nondefense discretionary spending is \$700 billion. We, functionally, just removed \$100 billion. So, now it is \$600 billion.

Just that reduction of that \$100 billion over those 10 years, they actually calculated that, next year, the GDP growth will be down a whole half a percent.

That is huge because we were already starting to see, because of our demographics, we have gotten very old in society and are getting older very fast.

You all know what has happened to fertility since the early nineties. Last year, we were down to 1.67, so in 18 years, the United States has more deaths than births. Half the States today already has more deaths than births.

You start to say, okay, we are going to be at 1.8. There were a couple of projections for next year. We are a little higher than that if we just shaved off another half a percent.

Then, I have folks running around here saying: Look at our pretend budget. We can balance in 10 years.

Absurd.

The borrowing this year, have you seen the numbers? Realize that you don't do budgeting this way. We have a fiscal year. Year to date, so if you do a 12-month cycle, we have now borrowed \$2.1 trillion this year. That does not have the backfill of all the extraordinary measures that are getting done right now, as now the debt ceiling has been raised.

\$2.1 trillion is more than all defense and all discretionary, meaning everything you think of as government—the FBI, the White House, the Supreme Court, the State Department, all of it—all of government is, functionally, living on borrowed money.

We weren't supposed to hit that for about 9 more years, and we have already hit it this year.

Look, I hope this is wrong. I desperately hope these numbers are wrong, but this was Bloomberg Intelligence. Two of their lead economists said that when you put in these factors of the cuts in spending, which we have to do—you have to deal with the reality that it does slow down the economy, the higher interest rate cost, the dramatic increase in the utilization of healthcare, particularly in Medicare and Medicaid but mostly Medicare, 130 percent debt to GDP. That is 9 budget years from now.

I beg of someone, pull out your calculator, put some batteries in it, and do a little math experiment for me.

If you had 130 percent of debt to GDP, if today publicly held debt is—let's call it \$25 trillion, \$26 trillion. That is publicly held. That is where you haven't been borrowing from the trust fund. Publicly held—you had to go to market. That is doubling publicly held debt.

Let's say it is \$51 trillion. You can almost do that math in your head if you said you had a 5 percent strike rate, which is high. That is well over \$2 trillion a year just in financing costs.

Nine years from now, the interest cost is functionally equal to every dime you and I think of as government. We were not supposed to hit that for like 15, 18 years.

□ 1130

With the higher interest rates, the increased costs of healthcare, the fact that the economy does not look like it is going to grow much more than a point if we even hit the consensus number of 1.7, 1.8—9 years, \$2 trillion a year in financing costs.

I hope it is absolutely wrong. I hope our projection on interest rates is way off, but this is coming off the Bloomberg model. These aren't slackers. These are some of the best in the world at analytics.

Let's go to something that was more optimistic, Moody's Analytics. We have Bloomberg Intelligence and Moody's Analytics. Their number was much more optimistic. Instead of being at 114 percent of debt-to-GDP functionally in 9 budget years, they had it as 121 percent of debt-to-GDP.

Now, understand, we are supposed to be 114. Even Moody's has a few points above that; meaning, we will have broken through the debt-to-GDP more than in World War II in just the financing costs, let alone the drag on the economy.

Because this government, in trying to finance all this spending—I will come back to where the spending is

coming from—is going to consume much of the world's capital. We don't have a high enough savings rate in the United States to have an economy that grows and the financing. We are going to have to reach out all over the world and grab stunning amounts of capital.

How much discussion have any of us heard this week, last week, the week before that behind these microphones about dramatically changing the cost of healthcare?

When the President got behind that microphone during the State of the Union and said: You are not allowed to talk about Social Security, even though in 9 years the trust fund is gone, and we double senior poverty.

If you are on Social Security, start planning for it. We have made it radioactive here to even have an honest conversation about it. In 9 years you take a 25 percent cut in your check, therefore, we are going to double senior poverty and that is the morality of the State of the Union we had. You are not allowed to talk about it. We won't cut it. We won't touch it.

How about Medicare? The Medicare Trust Fund is also gone in this window. The Medicare Trust Fund only pays for—I will be generous—40 percent because it is mostly the hospital portion, the rest comes right out of the general fund.

So please understand when you read something like that—and CBO was over here originally before the debt ceiling agreement at 119 percent of GDP, they brought it down to 114. Then the other analysts are saying, yeah, but you haven't calculated the costs of higher interests. You haven't calculated the fact that, as you are trying to start to slow down the growth of spending, you actually slow down the economy and the healthcare costs are going off the charts. Yet we are terrified to get behind these microphones and tell the public the truth.

So one more time, an oldie but a goodie—and I will make a new slide one of these days. Don't look at the 1965 date. This is 2022. Seventy-one percent of all spending in 2022 was just Medicare, Social Security, what we call entitlements. They are earned benefits. Some are not earned; some you get because you are part of certain groups or certain incomes.

Defense was about 13 percent, meaning the rest of discretionary is 16. We actually took some of that off. You couldn't negotiate on it, so when we were doing our negotiations, we were down to 11 percent of the budget. This red part of the pie grows and grows and grows. Everything else is flat. This consumes us, and yet we have made it politically dangerous to talk about it.

You talked about Medicare. You talked about Social Security. Oh, you are right. My passion, one of the reasons I keep running, is I am trying to save them. It is a moral argument that you deserve to have security in your retirement. It is like having cancer and refusing to actually go to the doctor and talk about it.

This is a malignancy, and it is growing dramatically faster. Just look at the data that came out in the last 10 days of the growth and spending in Medicare. In the first 7 months of this fiscal year, Medicare spending went up 16 percent.

Now, a lot of that is healthcare inflation, a lot of that were seniors who had postponed medical services during COVID, but 16 percent in the first 7 months.

Here is part of the punch line: When we talk about these big numbers, particularly in the time of inflation, we often use, oh, that is a trillion dollars. The more eloquent way is to say we are all officially economists, we went out and got our Ph.D., and you would talk about a percentage of the economy because that stays constant.

You can have lots of inflation, a little inflation, but the percentage of the economy that is going to debt servicing, that is going to borrowing, we were projected in 9 years to be about 7, 7½ percent of the economy being borrowed.

You sort of see over here—this is just the running-borrowing chart. We had that huge spike substantially because of COVID spending, but in 2023, we were supposed to be at 7½ percent of the economy, the entire United States Government would be borrowing, but we are only growing at about 1.8.

Remember that delta. It is simple math: 1.8 and over here you are borrowing 7½, but if we go back to what Bloomberg said, their economists, in 10 years that is not 7½ percent of the economy being borrowed, that is 13. You are growing at 1.8 and you are borrowing 13 percent of the economy. This is Armageddon, and it is in a 10-year window.

The clown show around here is either terrified to talk about it or we are going to make up numbers. Unless you see budget documents talking about dramatically changing the cost of healthcare, this starts to become real. Now, all of a sudden, running 7½ percent of the economy in borrowing will look good because if we get up near 13 percent in a 10-year window, you think we are going to have money for defense. You think you are going to have money for education. You think you are going to have money for research. Where are you going to have any cash at all? You are going to be struggling for every dime you have to keep the retirement security benefits.

It is math. It is demographics. What is the primary driver of U.S. debt? Demographics. We got old. Today, for every dollar we spend on young people, we spend \$5 on seniors. In the 1970s, for every \$5 we spent on young people, we spent \$1 on seniors. It flipped because those young people were the baby boomers and they have moved through the python and now they are here, and we still have about 6 more years of baby boomers moving into retirement.

There are 10,300 Americans turning 65 every day. Many of us weren't giddy,

but we were pleased we had started to make—understand that the debt ceiling deal is actually the largest cut in U.S. history. You wouldn't hear that from the propagandists who are trying to raise money from scaring the crap out of you, but it is.

We went from 119 percent of GDP down to 113. Think of that. Our math in our office was 114. This is the Center for Responsible Budget. They had us down to 113, but our math in our office is, we picked up about four points of GDP in reduction in spending and just the higher interest rates consume maybe two, three times that savings.

Let's sort of walk through some of what we are seeing. I try so hard to try to convince people because if you go right now to our social media for our office—and I am sure it is the same for other Members here, look at the crazy that you get. If you just cut foreign aid, we could balance the budget.

Foreign aid is about 12 days of borrowing. At the end of the decade, it is half that. Just get rid of congressional salaries. Trust me, we are probably overpaid for our work product, but every dime of a Senator's salary, Members of Congress' salaries are like 18 minutes in an entire year of borrowing.

We borrow a little over \$50,000 a second and in 9 years, we are over \$90,000 a second every day, 7 days a week, 12 months a year. That is per second, and it is all Social Security and healthcare entitlements.

Do you see this delta here? Functionally, you can get rid of every dime of defense, every dime of government. There is no government at all, and you still will be borrowing trillions of dollars at this rate 10 years from now.

There is a model out there that we have talked about—now this was on the CBO numbers from last February that said in 9 years you can get rid of all of government, all of defense, and you had to borrow \$300 billion. Then a couple weeks later, we got the data that the Social Security Trust Fund would be emptied.

I apologize for talking too fast. I had a lot of caffeine today.

With the backfilling of Social Security, add another few hundred billion dollars a year. If these new numbers are correct, we are about to hit the numbers that we are supposed to hit in 9 years and we are hitting them now.

Part of that is that tax receipts have taken a huge fall in the last month or two. If you actually dig into the data you may wonder what has happened. Turns out it was capital gains receipts, which makes perfect sense.

Let's say you have an asset. It has gone up substantially in value because of inflation, not because you are more productive, not because it is some incredible technology. It has gone up because of inflation.

If you sell it, you are going to pay all this capital gains tax on inflation because another asset you are going to go buy has also been inflated. There is lots of data in the literature that talks

about when you hit inflationary cycles, the fact you have devalued the dollar, you have devalued people's savings, you have devalued people's retirements, but you also create such a distortion because you don't know what is actually a gain or just fluff. It is inflation, and now we are starting to see it in our tax receipts. It has already begun to hit us.

I am going to do this board one more time. The number of times you hear, particularly our colleagues on the left, talk about, well, you need to just get rid of this debt ceiling. It is not right to have these stressors. It makes people nervous. That is part of the point. I know this sounds like I'm being a jerk, but you have got to understand, this place is incapable of doing adult work unless there is a stressor, whether it be the budget or the debt ceiling.

I come here and ramble. I bring my charts. I bring my calculator. I have my handful of Ph.D. economists from the Joint Economic Committee. We do our data. You preach it to your brothers and sisters, both on the right and the left, and they just stare at you. It is not till you have something like the debt ceiling where everyone on financial television has their hair on fire, even though it is mostly theater because we have plenty of cash flow to cover the interest on our bonds, and it requires those inflections.

Yet when we hit the debt ceiling when the Democrats controlled this place, they required more spending. Remember, the 2019 bipartisan debt ceiling agreement, it is scored by the Center for Responsible Budget as costing—that is Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats because they ran this place. They took a Republican President and said: We won't pass a debt ceiling unless you spend, in their number, \$1.4 trillion.

How many of you heard anyone talk about the fact that just a couple of years ago, the left demanded more spending by \$1.4 trillion plus for them to vote out the debt ceiling?

□ 1145

Then there is rage from my brothers and sisters on the left that we asked to flatten the spending growth. That is how duplicitous the media is here. When you talk about numbers and they have lots of zeros, I think people immediately tune out and go hit their Netflix account.

Here is the history. When the Democrats have been in charge and we hit debt ceilings, it is more spending. When the Republicans have been here, at least we have gotten some inflection of some fiscal sanity.

Once again, I have used this chart every month for probably 3 years now, because I am trying to get it to sink in. One hundred percent of the next 30 years of borrowing is interest, Medicare, and if we choose to backfill Social Security. Everything else is flat.

The new number on this chart, we had calculated to be about \$128 trillion. With the new numbers coming in on in-

flation and, therefore, interest costs, we think we may be a few trillion short.

Understand what that means. If I tell you right now that 30 years from now, the United States Government, when you add in the cost of Medicare and the financing, the backfilling of Social Security and its financing, we have borrowed \$130 trillion. If any of you plan to be working 23 years from now, the CBO's own math says the United States will have to double all U.S. taxes just to maintain the baseline services. That is nothing new. That is baseline services. This is the reality.

Then you have the irony. We haven't had time to put together all the boards, because it turns out it is a lot more than I thought, the incredible duplicity where our brothers and sisters on the left attack us: They are trying to cut things.

So the Inflation Reduction Act, which is just an Orwellian title, Goldman Sachs says the actual spending of the grants, handouts, tax specialties for their favorite companies, equals \$1.2 trillion. What is the financing cost? Remember, that is all borrowed money. So you hand out borrowed money to these favorite companies. This is the Democrat bill. Not a single Republican voted for it. What is the financing cost of \$1.2 trillion over forever? Because we won't have a demographics balance for 30 or 40 years before you can actually start to pay down this debt. That is the math.

The CHIPS Act, here is \$50 billion or \$60 billion. You have got to go to the White House to get a grant, but you have got to be nice to Democrats in the White House to get your grant.

The number of soft nationalization that the Democrats passed—now, understand, Goldman Sachs said this would be \$1.2 trillion of spending in their Inflation Reduction Act. CBO came back about 3 weeks ago and doubled their estimate. Remember, when they were voting on this, they told the American people it will only be \$2.8 trillion—excuse me—\$280 billion over the 10 years. CBO just came back and said it is \$500 billion plus. That is partially with the assumption that you can't get all the credits because you can't get all of these components made in the United States. If you could, yeah, it is 1.2.

I know people glaze over when I use math like that. Where I am simply going with this is the left has spent a stunning amount of money in the last couple of years when they controlled this place. Then they attack us for trying to slow down the spending. Our beg is, hey, we want some caps. We want to cut discretionary spending, that 11 percent of the budget we were allowed to work on, that \$700 billion, we are going to roll it down \$100 billion over the 10 years, and we are heretics for wanting to slow this down. At the same time, interest, Medicare, and healthcare costs explode.

What is the solution? Seriously, what is the solution around here? You can't

cut unless you are willing to wipe out government to get us anywhere close to balance. We are now heading toward the death spiral of interest.

The argument we make is if the pre-dominant driver, almost all of the driver of spending is healthcare, we have got to come up with a way to revolutionize the cost of healthcare.

When was the last time you saw Members, both Democrat and Republicans, get behind this microphone willing to have a discussion about obesity? When have you seen us get behind this microphone and talk about the stunning growth of diabetes in America?

Diabetes, it is type 2. Diabetes is 33 percent of all healthcare spending, 31 percent of Medicare. Maybe the discussion of our brothers and sisters are dying in this country, there is something horribly wrong, but we are not supposed to talk about it. These are the same people that 30 years ago made the moral argument that stopping people from smoking was good for society and good for those individuals, but today we are not allowed to talk about the fact that we have about 3½ million prime-age males missing from the labor force. Some of the best data we have says the number one cause is probably obesity and number two is drugs.

Now, it is complicated. People are complicated. When we look at the data and what we did during COVID of forcing people to stay home, the stunning growth of morbid obesity in the United States, is it moral? Is it moral that we are not willing to talk about it? Do we care so little about our brothers and sisters that we are not going to reach out and save them?

You have some opportunities. You have the farm bill coming. Are we willing to think like revolutionaries both in what we grow and what we do for nutrition support? Is it moral to hand someone an EBT card, which is the replacement of Food Stamps—it is the newer, better, faster, whatever way—and say you can use that EBT card to go buy onion rings?

I believe you should be able to eat whatever you want, smoke your cigarettes, but you should also carry your own cost, not pawn it off on the rest of society. If you are willing to cover your own cost, have a party. If the rest of us have to pay for it, because right now it is borrowed money—I have an 11-month old at home we are adopting. That little boy, when he is functionally 23 years old, his taxes have to be doubled. Is that moral?

Make the moral decision today. Change the farm bill. I know it is politically hard. I know it is a balancing act. Democrats have to care about people, too. At least I hope they do.

Second thing I would do, there are now over-the-skin blood glucose monitors. We are told that there is actually now—forgive me. I won't say the company. One company already now has it in the watch. There is another one that

actually has something that would actually calculate your calorie intake. We are told a couple of generations from now, even the Apple Watch will have blood glucose on it.

If we could stabilize prediabetic populations in the United States, it is one of the most dramatic things you could do to stabilize debt.

Have we ever had a conversation about that? Can we get the Budget Committee to actually put that in one of their footnotes that here are a couple positives? Republicans and Democrats—because I don't know if we have made that partisan yet—could actually work with each other to say we need to stop having our brothers and sisters in the country dying.

The third one—and this one I will get crap for—is the new GLP-1s. The data is remarkable on how they are as appetite suppressants. We are doing math right now, and it is going to take us another month because it turns out the math is hard if you are going to do it like adults.

If you took your populations of Medicare, Medicaid, Indian Health Services, VA—these are government-paid-for populations—took those who were morbidly obese and said: We actually love and care about you. We are going to give you access to these because we want you to live. We want you to be able to participate in society.

Here is one of the punch lines. On Monday, we had maybe the Nation's leader in healthcare statistics do a little forum down the hall. His data says—remember, this is the guy with 70 million U.S. health records, and it is used for mining and used for setting up drug trials, but he is sort of the demagogue of data. He said there are functionally 4,000 human diseases. Of those, 2,000 have direct relationships to obesity. That is half the human misery.

So we are a moral body, right? We care about people. We are going to have a—oh, we are not allowed to talk about it, except an idiot like me who is willing to get behind the microphone.

Would it be good for productivity? Of course. Would it be good for people's future economic vitality, their ability to save for retirement? Of course. Would it be good for the debt and deficit? Of course. Would it be good for my little boy's future, not having to pay for the borrowing of today? Because that is what we do. We borrow today so our kids and grandkids can pay it off tomorrow.

That is number three, the willingness to actually do the math. What would happen if with the GLP-1s we made a government decision that the math is so compelling, the economics are so compelling that we are going to roll these out in our populations who are suffering.

The fourth thing, on Monday, we had one of the teams here that is about to begin their phase 1 on a cure for type 1 diabetes that they believe is applicable to type 2. It is a stem cell that does not require antirejection drugs. They lay it

into the lining of the tummy, and apparently it produces these islet cells which produce insulin.

At the end of the decade, we may have an actual cure. The math is like this. If someone is a type 2—type 2 is actually complex. There are lots of things within it. If it is the traditional type 2, obesity is the driver. If that weight gets back down, in about 70 percent of Americans, their bodies will start to produce insulin again. Thirty percent, the damage is done. For that 30 percent, at the end of the decade, it looks like there is hope.

These are four simple, moral steps that are great economics. We are going to come here and complain about the debt and deficit, but at least I am standing here giving you one idea that actually can pass this body, unlike some of the fake budgets that the left, and even some of my friends, will roll out here that will just be pretty words, no math, and we will say: You see? I can get you there if we just pretend that we are going to grow at this rate and get rid of all of government.

I will argue, and I have the math to prove it, that the path of taking on diabetes and its primary causes is the most elegant, most moral, and something that can pass and get a Presidential signature.

If someone else has a better idea that equals trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars of savings in 10 years, please send it to me. I am happy to steal brilliant ideas.

Mr. Speaker, how do we get our brothers and sisters, who are all smart—some are smarter than others—but our brothers and sisters that work here, whether it be staff, whether it be elected Members, to understand that sounding like it is the 1990s policy-wise isn't going to save us. The numbers are crashing dramatically faster than any of us even expected a few months ago.

There is a path. There is hope. The hope only exists if we actually start dealing with the realities of a path that is actually doable.

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

□ 1200

COUNTERING CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY THREATS

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 50 years ago, during the Cold War, Soviet Russia was the enemy of the people and the biggest threat to the free world.

Fast forward to 2023, and it appears that history is repeating itself once again as the threat of nuclear annihilation comes full circle as two opposing ideological blocs dominate the world.

General Secretary Xi Jinping has imitated Soviet Russia's playbook ever since he came to power more than 20