

Blockchain is a revolutionary technology that is going to change the way Americans do business. The question today in front of us is whether we would like America to lead that change or let somebody else take the reins.

We are planning on marking up two bills next week in the Financial Services Committee: one on digital assets market structure and the other on stablecoins. I am going to focus my remarks today on stablecoins.

I am not new to this subject. In the Nebraska legislature, I wrote and passed a bill that allows for banks in Nebraska to issue stablecoins—State chartered banks. This is an issue that I have worked on and cared about for years.

Since 2017, stablecoins have grown to \$130 billion in market cap. That is the size of a multinational institution like Deutsche Bank.

We are not dealing with a theoretical conversation about stablecoins here. Stablecoins have already arrived. Whether you like them or not is irrelevant, Madam Speaker. They are here, and the question of the day is how to regulate them, not whether to regulate them at all.

Now that we have covered the basic need for this legislation, let's discuss a specific issue in the bill: how to treat State-regulated institutions that want to issue a stablecoin.

Our dual banking system is the envy of the world. It allows us to provide true regulatory tailoring, particularly for small community banks, in our country. Were we to move away from the dual banking system, were we to essentially gut the power and authority of the State banking regulators, like the Nebraska Department of Banking, it would be an absolute tragedy for our community banks.

I do not think there is a banker around that wouldn't stand up for the dual banking system. If you are a small bank in rural Nebraska, Madam Speaker, you shouldn't receive the same scrutiny as a GSIB, and if you are a small bank in rural Nebraska, you probably shouldn't share the same primary regulator as a GSIB either.

The dual banking system lowers burdens on banks, but it also ensures that our small institutions have a line of communication to the entity that regulates them. If every bank had to be regulated by the OCC, I don't know that the OCC would have the bandwidth to ensure every single, small bank in rural America gets the attention it needs relative to larger institutions. That is not a knock on the OCC, it is just reality.

Now that brings us back to stablecoins. Chairman MCHENRY's bill currently has a State pathway for stablecoin issuance. Shockingly, some of the same banking organizations that hail the dual banking system seem to have a different opinion when it comes to stablecoins.

Let me be very clear, if the Federal Reserve becomes the de facto regulator

for all State regulated stablecoin issuers, it will prevent small and midsized banks across the United States from getting into the stablecoin market. It would fly in the face of regulatory tailoring, the very concept that has promoted our current system that allows for community banks to literally exist.

Our State regulators are more than capable of taking on this role. Those who argue for regulatory arbitrage miss the point; we already have a system in place that does this work. There is no reason for a State chartered bank in Nebraska that issues stablecoins to be regulated directly by the Federal Reserve when the Nebraska Department of Banking is equipped to do the job.

Further, the bill establishes a robust floor for stablecoin issuance. The most important part of that floor is the reserves. Under the bill—and listen to this, Madam Speaker—under the bill, issuers must back a stablecoin with reserves one to one.

Let's think about that for a moment. If a consumer has one stablecoin at \$1, the issuer must hold exactly \$1 in reserve on that same stablecoin.

In other words, Madam Speaker, your money isn't going anywhere. The issuer cannot lend out your money, and they cannot invest it in risky assets for their own gain. They must hold it in reserve as ordered by this bill that is in front of the Financial Services Committee.

That requirement alone should go a long way to ease any anxieties over instability. The system itself has reserve requirements that aren't present in other parts of the financial market.

We are truly at a historic moment in the House. It is not often that we get the opportunity to build a new regulatory system from scratch. Regulating stablecoins is just that kind of opportunity.

It is imperative that we get it right so both the State charters and the Federal charters can issue stablecoins.

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

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I am going to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida such time as she may consume when she is ready.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your patience as the clock, as you know right now, sped up on us, and we are all running around like crazy people.

Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time for a moment as the gentlewoman is looking for the poster, we are going to use most of the remaining portion of the hour when we start. We are going

to cover a lot of territory, so for the poor folks who have to try to keep up, just please wave at me if I start speaking too quickly. They never seem willing to throw something at me.

Madam Speaker, I am going to one more time yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR), because it looks like we found the poster.

HONORING CARLOS ALBERTO MONTANER

Ms. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, he had one of the finest pens in the Cuban exile community in its 60 years of banishment from the island.

There are very few writers who could capture the suffering of the Cuban people, a country that has paid the consequences of believing in a toxic political idea.

This was a man who could warn the rest of Latin America what would happen if they followed and believed Fidel Castro's false promises.

His name was Carlos Alberto Montaner, and he just passed at 80 years old.

His great political mission was to see a liberated Cuba.

I wonder how many people like him have died waiting for the island to be freed from the jaws of Communism?

Thousands upon thousands.

How will he be remembered?

We will remember him as a good man, a decent man who was kind and humble. His only preoccupation was to deliver a message of freedom to the Cubans and to his Latin American fellow men.

His articles were impeccable, profound, and yet accessible to anyone to understand. They were full of content and historical analysis thoroughly explaining the falsehoods that Communism promises and never delivers.

Montaner's book called "Guide to the Perfect Latin American Idiot" is a classic. It is a manual for Latin Americans to avoid falling for communist tricks and to avoid falling for what Fidel Castro has promised this hemisphere.

The reality is that the 20 most developed countries in the world are capitalist democracies. They have free markets, and they have freedom of expression and small government where the individual is allowed to decide their fate rather than some unknown bureaucrat in a distant government office.

The government serves only to establish the rules of the game, and the winner is decided by whomever plays it best.

Montaner was my teacher. I read his articles meticulously, and by taking notes on his best ideas, I learned so much from his analyses, not just for their brilliance but also because they were full of goodwill for his compatriots. They were full of freedom.

It was an honor to know him, to interview him, and to be his friend. We will miss him, and I offer my deepest condolences to his widow, Linda and to his daughter Gina.

In the future, democratic leaders of a liberated Cuba will owe Montaner a

special place in the island's conscience. He helped pave the road to the idea that democracy is the best system for humanity.

May God cover him with His glory for he acted with purpose and honor in his time on Earth, always working for the love of his Latin-American family and admiring the American agenda.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I apologize to Ms. SALAZAR for having to speed up our clock here. It is sometimes just the nature of when someone else on the Democrat side cuts their time short or didn't show up.

Madam Speaker, as we start to go, we are going to walk through a couple of things here. Part of this is actually going to be something I don't get to do that often. It is going to actually be optimistic with a potential solution that will functionally soak myself in kerosene and play with matches.

I come here every week. I am incredibly terrified, and I am incredibly dour on what is happening with the debt, so let's actually first set up part of this conversation.

We have borrowed in the last 12 months—does anyone want to give me a guess how much we borrowed per second—per second—in the last 12 months?

We borrowed \$63,000 per second is what the United States Federal Government—Federal Government—borrowed.

Madam Speaker, if you start to actually dig into it deeper, when you start to see stories popping up of cities like Chicago with a \$35 billion debt crisis coming, and that \$63,000 of borrowing is just the Federal Government, that does not include a bunch of other types of pension obligations which are another—I think we had one that was showing another couple dozen trillion dollars of obligations. Now do municipal debt, now do State pension debt.

Do understand, Madam Speaker, the debt monster is not just the fact that the United States functionally right now has, what, \$32.5 trillion, and out of that 25, \$26 trillion of that is publicly borrowed.

That difference we tried to explain is when the Treasury borrows from the trust fund, and the trust funds are given—so you are the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund, the Social Security trust fund, they are given sort of IOUs. They are paid interest, and they have a functionally negotiable security that can only be cashed in with Treasury. So if anyone says that they stole the money, that is just not true. They just inter-borrowed, but they have the obligation.

In the coming weeks, probably when we get back from August, we are going to do a presentation on just the scale of borrowing.

Madam Speaker, do you remember the debates we had here on the floor 2 years ago of the multiemployer pension systems?

They were bankrupt. They had no money, and our brilliant brain trust

around here, instead of fixing them, we just sat here and said: Here, here is \$135 billion, here is lots of cash.

Except even that money now has been pretty much burned up.

We have a crisis. Much of the political leaders, the union leaders, and others from the seventies, eighties, and nineties were unwilling to tell workers that we need to set aside more money to cover these costs.

Then the other thing we didn't prepare for was healthcare costs. So I am going to show in here just the scale from today through 30 years the best calculation, without using the new interest rates on debt as we have had the last year, it is about \$130 trillion of borrowing coming.

□ 1145

Every dime of that is demographics. Madam Speaker, 75 percent of that \$130 trillion is the shortfall of Medicare. The other 25 percent is if we backfill Social Security, because remember, in 8½, 9 years, the Social Security trust fund is chewed up. It is gone.

Seniors take a 25 percent cut in their check, and we double poverty in the senior population of America. It is immoral, but once again, we have no partners here to actually work on it.

If you actually go into many of our home districts right now, the Democrats are running ads saying, DAVID SCHWEIKERT is willing to talk about Social Security, trying to save it. He is a horrible human being. They are doing this because they care more about winning the political debate than saving it. It is just immoral.

Something started to happen the last 2 weeks—and I just brought up one of them—because the number of times the handful of us here who actually care about debt have almost been mocked, and then something happened.

Suddenly, we have some of the most leftist publications in America—I mean, here is *The Atlantic*. It turns out that debt matters after all.

What is happening? Our brothers and sisters on the left all of a sudden had an epiphany, going oh, God. Maybe what some of those people on the right have been saying, that it is out of control—did I mention \$63,000 a second?

The debate used to be you would come behind the microphones and say, don't you care about your grandkids? Then the math got so bad, we started to come and say, well, don't you care about your kids?

It was shocking. It was just shocking, the input we would get. We would often get seniors saying nah, screw them. I hope that is just a tiny, tiny part of the population. You would be just taken back at some of the in-bound to our office when we talk about what was happening in debt and that it was demographics.

I mean, demographics aren't Republican and Democrat. Now the math has gotten so bad, it is no longer your grandkids, your kids; it is now you and I. It is those of us who will be heading into retirement. It is us.

I'm going to show here some of the outside estimates on how bad the math is. If any of those outside estimates are accurate, in 9 years, this place is a basket case.

There is one estimate done by Bloomberg Intelligence, and they have a really sophisticated model. They have some top-end economists. They are saying it is not the 115 percent of debt to GDP at the Congressional Budget Office. They say if their model is correct, it is like 130 percent of debt to GDP, meaning just interest costs 10 years from now is a couple trillion dollars a year.

The other punch line. I came here last week, and we were trying to recalculate what the Supreme Court's decision with regards to student loans meant and was that going to be a placeholder to move up and down some of the debt numbers.

We basically took what Treasury was saying, and we couldn't make the math work. So we spent a couple days saying, okay, if we take the historic of the last quarter we are in of the fiscal year and say here are the tax receipts we typically get, here is the spending we typically get, we will borrow more money this year than all of defense and all of discretionary.

I take back what I said last week saying, hey, we might be getting a bit of a reprieve. It doesn't look like the reprieve is actually in that math.

One of the models, if you use the mean number—not the outliers, the mean—it basically says we will borrow more money than every dime of what you think of as government; all of defense and all of discretion. That is what we get to vote on. We will be on borrowed money.

We were not supposed to be hitting numbers like that for a few more years, and it is a combination of multiple things.

Healthcare costs have exploded. We know because we have documented this one. In the first 7 months of the year, Medicare went up 16 percent. Spending on Medicare went up 16 percent.

Interest is up dramatically. Next year, just interest will be functionally three-quarters of a trillion dollars. How many people have you had talk about it, that interest in just 4 or 5 years will be bigger than all of defense?

Tax receipts have started—because of this great Biden economic economy, well, the tax receipts are starting to collapse because you don't go and sell assets and pay capital gains when your capital gains are mostly inflation. The wheels are coming off, people, and we need to take it seriously.

Let's actually do a couple of our boards here and just sort of set up what we see happening, and then we are going to walk through something that is semi-hopeful.

We always start with this chart, and one day I will actually update it because it is now almost 2 years old. For anyone watching, you see the red? Mandatory. That is on auto pilot. You

see the green and the blue? Okay. Let's just pretend that is like 26, 27 percent of all of our spending. This right here, this year, every dime of that is borrowed.

Your government, if you think the State Department, your poverty program, this, that, you care about if it is not in the mandatory, it is borrowed money.

The brain trust around here that will come in and say, well, if you just get rid of foreign aid, foreign aid is about 12 days of borrowing.

You can make an argument and say we need to think about ourselves. Ukrainian funding—okay—whether you are for it or against it, it functionally might be 3 weeks of borrowing in an entire year.

Now we are actually working on the budgets, and this is just a placeholder. When you have someone tell you we are holding discretionary spending flat, or we are holding it flat from the couple pandemic years, which were incredible spikes, but if you actually do it, the right way to look at a spending chart, go pick a base year, add in inflation, what does that curve look like? Nondefense discretionary is up 154 percent if you use 1990 as your base year, and just say, here is inflation. Here is what the line would look like if we held it steady, but it is up 159 percent. Defense is only up 35 percent over the inflation trend line.

I get more crap for showing this board from the poor folks who are having to try to build the budgets and the hallways in this place being full of people begging for more cash, but there is no cash. Understand. It is all borrowed right now.

The trust funds. So you come in here and say the Social Security trust fund is gone in the 10-year window. It is all gone. The highway transportation fund is gone in 4 years.

The highway trust fund, all that money is gone. The Medicare trust fund is actually gone about a year before the Social Security trust fund being the whole Part A, Medicare trust fund, the hospital portion, which is close to about 40 percent of all Medicare funding. The trust fund is gone. All these are empty—and functionally—within this 9-year window.

It is actually important when the Senate passes something. Ten seconds of levity. When you became a freshman here, you probably had the same experience. You sit down—and it is always a member from Texas. They plop down next to you and go, David, our freshman Member of Congress, you see them on that side? They are Democrats. That is your opposition. Your true enemy is down the hall. It is called the Senate. That joke has been here for, like, 200 years.

Back to being serious. I just showed you a chart that the trust funds are gone in the 10 years. We will need not hundreds of billions, trillions to backfill, particularly when you put in the Social Security trust fund.

How much discussion do you hear? Instead, you see it used as advertising. We had a President that got behind that podium there and basically said, you are not allowed to talk about Medicare or Social Security, and the room applauded.

A number of us have spent the last year of our lives trying to find a way to save it, Republicans and Democrats. Remember, when the President gave his State of the Union, he knifed a number of Democrat Senators, too, who had been willing to have an honest conversation about how we were going to do the moral thing and save Social Security, but it was just too tasty of a political issue.

Then you get this: I get this question often when I am talking about U.S. sovereign debt. Yes, but all of our debt is owned by China. It is not true.

The number one holder of U.S. sovereign debt is Japan. It is a little over a trillion out of that 25, 26 trillion that is publicly held that is not inner transfers.

China now, and for the last several years, has been dialing back their U.S. sovereigns, meaning today, China holds about \$800 billion.

You actually go down—this is the reality. The rest of the world has been slowly over the last few years backing away from buying U.S. sovereign debt.

What do they know that Americans don't know? Why have they decided we are not that safe of an investment? Is it because United States does sanctions? Is it because of our creditworthiness?

The fact of the matter is foreign holdings of U.S. debt continues to fall, meaning we, as U.S. savers, have to finance that \$63,000 we are borrowing every second, much more of that today. We have to finance with our savings.

Then you have the insane policies that this place did over the previous couple years when the left controlled it, when you had a Democrat House, Democrat Senate, Democrat President.

Do you remember the Inflation Reduction Act? Insane name. Had nothing to do with reducing inflation. It was spending money. It kept inflation going.

About 2 hours ago, the Wall Street Journal published an analysis of these grants that they are giving away to big industries.

Now, they are in the clean energy industries, but they are still really big industries. Well, it turns out the vast majority of the cash this government is giving out from last year's Inflation Reduction Act is going to foreign companies.

Yep. Our taxpayer dollars that were supposed to help us build a U.S. clean energy industry functionally structured—60 percent of clean energy projects awarded from the IRA, Inflation Reduction Act, are foreign-owned businesses. Yay, policy.

You see, we are borrowing \$63,000 a second. We are crushing our kids, our grandkids, and many of your own re-

tirements because they are the ones that have to pay this debt back, and we are doing projects funded by last year's legislation that was only supposed to cost about \$280 billion. Only.

Then Goldman Sachs comes in and says, now, the spending on all of these grants and giveaways and these, you know, supplements functionally could be \$1.2 trillion. CBO comes in and doubles their estimates. Now, we find 60 percent of that money is going to foreign companies.

This is not what we were promised. The President, the Democrats, promised us this was to create a U.S.-based infrastructure for clean energy, except the vast majority of their money—our money—is now going to foreign companies. Great job, guys.

It just gets worse because now we are starting to look at what is going on with interest. Do you understand how—well, sorry. I am trying not to be a jerk.

There is a concept of fragility. How many of you have ever—I will use an example from Taleb's book a couple years ago.

How many of you—you are going to go to school. For young people, it might be here, or those who have to go to the airport. You know if you leave at this time, you are always going to get there, except that one time out of 10, there is a car accident, and boom, you miss your airplane. You miss getting to class.

The concept is fragility. If you squeeze it too tight, just-in-time inventories, at some moment, something breaks, and that one time you miss the airplane, is it worth all the other times that you got 5 extra minutes at home drinking coffee?

Interest in a weird way is the same concept. Things are wonderful until they are not. Next year, we are estimated to borrow almost \$750 billion.

None of that buys anything. It doesn't buy you a new bridge. It doesn't buy you a new program. It doesn't help you fund education. All of that is just paying bondholders back. \$750 billion next year.

One of the things that this chart is trying to show is if you actually go out and then look at some of the higher interest rate possibilities, the math says a single point higher interest than what the Congressional Budget Office was estimating a year ago—over the 30 years, it is \$30 billion or \$30 trillion dollars.

Two points higher interest over that time—actually, it is closer to like 25, 27 years, every dime of U.S. tax receipts goes to cover interest. There is no more government. That is called fragility. You become subject to the whims of the debt markets.

□ 1200

This chart is starting to show the changes. We are over here, and here is our historic. All of a sudden, what happens to the cost of these programs with just simple marginal increases in interest?

When I talk about that \$30 trillion—I am going to show it to you in a chart in a moment—how much of the financing of Medicare is actually not the delivery of healthcare but is actually the financing of the debt that financed the last increment of that Medicare.

This is a chart that should scare you to death. When you start to realize that if you had 3 percent higher interest, which isn't a stretch—go back 20 years ago, and these types of interest rates were normal for U.S. debt. In that 30-year window, you have over 345 percent of debt to the size of the economy.

You have to understand that this isn't a game. We are already right now at 100 percent of debt to GDP. The wheels are coming off, and we are going to dink around with little arguments saying, well, I have an idea, we are going to work on it all year, and our big success is that we are going to save half a percent on Medicare spending.

We have lost our minds around here with our unwillingness to do the things that are difficult because we have to explain it to a reporter or it will be an attack ad in one of our campaigns.

This is the end of your Republic. This basically means you will live in a country with, functionally, no growth and, functionally, every incremental dollar you have is trying to just cover the interest, the borrowing costs, of your country.

It is not tax receipts. We have chart after chart that demonstrates it is spending. It is mostly demographics. We got old.

A bit of trivia: In the 1970s, when I was a child—yes, I have gotten that old—for every \$1 that went to seniors, \$5 went to young people. Today, it is just reversed. For every \$1 that goes to young people, \$5 goes to seniors.

It is not actually really about a policy shift. Healthcare got dramatically more expensive. It is out of control. We cannot afford it. However, our demographics also changed rapidly.

Last year, we had a 1.67 fertility rate, meaning this country will have more deaths in 18 years than births. Half the States in this country today have more deaths than births. It is demographics from not having children. This started back in 1990. This didn't just happen yesterday. The fertility rates started to collapse in 1990. They just accelerated the last couple of years.

Next year, 12,000 Americans a day turn 65. Each day next year, 12,000 Americans turn 65, and our hallways will be full of people begging for more cash. I can't even figure out how to finance what our current obligations are.

You start to look at the reality of the money, the deficit projections. This is important to understand. When I say the wheels are coming off, go way back in history, May 2022, about a year ago. We were supposed to borrow \$980 billion this year.

Today, our latest adjustment on the expectation—so a year ago, we were

going to borrow \$980 billion. What happened? Why has that number doubled? Within 1 year, we went from \$980 billion to now we are estimating \$1.84 trillion this year. What happened in 12 months?

Well, you have some of the Democratic tax policy, which, it turns out, is not raising any money and is actually slowing down parts of the growth in the economy. We are building factories like crazy with subsidized tax money that we have no workers for and no customers for. That is going to be brilliant.

The best part is that money, as I just showed you, 60 percent of it is going to foreign-owned companies. Brilliant. However, this is pretty much a math-free zone.

This is the one, and I keep showing this one because I almost have bad dreams about this one. I should disclose that I have a 1-year-old and a 7-year-old. As a matter of fact, my 7-year-old is here in Washington with me this week. What is their right? What do they get in the future because, today, the math basically says, in 23 years, all U.S. taxes have to have doubled. All U.S. taxes will have to double in that 23-year window just to maintain base-line services.

When my little people are out of their post-doctorates—because I have high expectations for them—they are going to walk into an economy that looks nothing like what we have today.

How many of you intend to still be alive 20 years from now? Are you ready to live in a country where all of your taxes will have doubled? Everything? That is the math. We can keep pretending it doesn't exist, but the math will always win.

What was so terrifying with what we did here is, when we did the debt ceiling deal, we, functionally, went from, "Hey, we are projecting to head toward 120, 119 percent of debt to GDP at the 10-year window," to saying, "Hey, we are going to get it down to maybe 114, 115."

That is actually real money. That is \$100 billion a year. Right now, we are spending about \$700 billion this fiscal year in nondefense discretionary, and we are going to remove \$100 billion of that. That is real money.

However, because no one here actually does economics, they also don't understand that when you remove that \$100 billion—you have to do it; you don't have a choice because the wheels are coming off—but you also slow down the economy by about half a percent of GDP if you have not adopted other progrowth policies, whether it be fixing parts of immigration, fixing parts of the tax code, fixing parts of regulation.

However, without it, when you are doing the very cuts that you have to do, you also affect the growth of the economy. The really smart economists come in here and do the math. Moody's comes in and says, at the end of the 10 years, and where we are going with demographics, healthcare costs sky-

rocketing, higher interest rates, we don't think you are going to be down to 114, 115 percent of debt to GDP. We think you are going to be at 120 percent of debt to GDP.

Okay, if you do the math, that basically means your interest cost is probably a trillion and a quarter a year, so you are going to spend that sort of money to get nothing, to just pay the bondholders.

However, the one that takes your breath away is when the Bloomberg Intelligence folks ran their model, and their economists said: Hey, we see at the end of the 10-year window that you are going to be at 130 percent of debt to GDP.

If you do the math, when you are holding that sort of debt to GDP, that is like \$2 trillion a year in just interest. Okay, pay attention with me—\$2 trillion just in interest. I told you that this year every dime of discretionary is going to be borrowed. At that time, equal to almost every dime of discretionary, the discretionary will have grown a bit but stayed fairly flat. It will be pretty much just interest, meaning the borrowing 10-year window from now will have to be like \$2.7 trillion in a year.

I mean, this is, functionally, 9 budget years from now. Dear Heaven, I hope this number is wrong, but they walk you through the math, saying you are going to have this many baby boomers in their benefit years. Due to that movement demographically, the economy is going to slow down. Because of what cuts you are having to do, the economy is going to have slowed down.

With the higher interest rates, financing is going to cost this much, and we are terrified to tell our voters this because our voters get all upset and say: Well, if you just got rid of waste and fraud and foreign aid, you would be fine. For the brain trust on the left, it is that if you would just raise taxes on the 2 percent of the population that makes over \$400,000, that will finance it. I showed last week that is all fantasy. You don't get anything close to it. However, the political class here relies on the fact that our voters don't care about the math.

Our interest cost just this year is up 40 percent. That is a punch line. Remember, we were only going to borrow \$980 billion. This year, it looks like we are going to borrow \$1.84 trillion. One of the drivers of that is our interest cost is up 40 percent this year. How many people do you hear even bothering to tell you the truth?

This is the board that also gets me in trouble every time because it is 2 years old, and now the numbers are much worse. It is no longer \$116 trillion. It is about \$130 trillion in debt. A hundred percent of the next 30 years of debt is—I have already said it twice in this; is anyone listening?—75 percent is the shortfall in Medicare. We don't have enough money for it. The other 25 percent is if we backfill Social Security because, remember, functionally, in 9

years, the Social Security trust fund is empty.

This math was done before this inflation/interest rate cycle. You start to look at this and understand how much the direct spending is, how much the interest cost of financing those sorts of debt is. This is \$130 trillion of borrowing over the next 30 years, and it is all demographics. We got old.

Pay attention. We are going to come back to this concept of if the vast majority of our borrowing, of our debt, is healthcare, we are going to get to a couple of points where we are going to have to have the willingness to talk about the drivers of that spending.

The JEC, Joint Economic Committee, on the Republican side, of which I am the senior Republican, Medicare spending will double. Fiscal year 2023, it is \$1 trillion. In 10 years, we, functionally, go to \$3 trillion. We are going to functionally add, over the 10 years, \$22 trillion of—do you get it? Is anyone looking?—Medicare. This is not Medicaid. This is not Indian Health Service. This is not VA. It is just Medicare, \$22 trillion in that 10 years.

Look in the hallways of this place, and it is lined up with people who are wonderful and smart. They worked hard and cared about their patients, and it is more money. We are trying to figure out, with the wheels falling off, is anyone willing to tell them the truth?

JEC estimates—and this is where I am, right now, about to soak myself in kerosene and light myself on fire because, apparently, we are not allowed to actually talk to people and tell the truth. We have been writing the Republicans' side of the Joint Economic Committee report now for a couple of months. There are, functionally, five Ph.D. economists. There is an idiot like me doing some of the math, working on it. We are trying to figure out what moral approach we can take to save the country from the debt crisis that is here.

Did I mention the \$63,000 a second we are borrowing this last 12 months?

There is a chapter 3 in here, and this chapter may get me unelected, but we calculated the cost of obesity. I can't tell you how many Members here are terrified when I start to want to even have a conversation overseeing the math. We know that diabetes—just, functionally, type 2—is 33 percent of all healthcare spending. We know our brothers and sisters out there who have multiple comorbidities, that 5 percent of the population, that is over 50 percent of all of our healthcare spend.

I have shown you chart after chart here, showing healthcare is the driver of our debt. We have 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who are really sick, and the most common morbidity within that population is obesity. Of the 4,000 human diseases—and I have this one really well documented—functionally, 2,000 are related to obesity, so 2,000 out of the 4,000.

Are we willing to basically have a moment of honesty? I am going to

show you a couple of charts here. We are in trouble. Have you seen the latest obesity statistics for our kids? Have you seen the numbers of how many Americans are dying? It is immoral that we are terrified to talk about this.

□ 1215

You are going to see in the report, because we spent a lot of time working on the math, and they wouldn't let us use some of the more optimistic math because it wasn't properly vetted, so we had to find peer-reviewed studies with lots of math that could be recalculated and done.

But we are looking at—if we could stabilize the sickest in our obese population, both with productivity, because you get to come back into society and work, but also the healthcare costs associated, it is a few trillion dollars in the 10-year window.

There is a moral path to save us from the crushing debt. Are we willing to adopt policy that basically say we love and care for people and we would like them to live for a while, we would like them to not be miserable all the time?

Are we willing to discuss the farm bill? Are we willing to actually discuss the technologies that are out there right now where the watch actually has blood glucose, or the portable blood glucose monitor you can stick on yourself.

Are we willing to have—and I am going to show you a board here that talks about the GLP-1s, and this is not even with actually the new generation that is coming out, where FDA approves the first cellular therapy for Type 1 Diabetes.

The first one is now actually approved. It gets the body to start producing islet cells again. It is here, and there are actually four or five others in phase I right now.

Maybe we are on the cusp of technology miracles. The dear Lord gave us the ability to think, and it turns out really smart people are giving us a path. Are we willing to be smart enough?

The Joint Economic Committee estimates related projections, 12.3 percent of the 33 trillion, one out of every 8, functionally is, that spending is directly related to obesity. That is the most conservative of the numbers. Obesity risk.

You all know this. I am showing stuff people know. We all know it. I mean, heart, what is it, 1 in 12 cancers, the number of human misery that is directly associated.

Now, we get in to some of the more uncomfortable things to talk about. Life expectancy, for 18 years old and up, given their BMI class, and look, we all know there is controversy on the body mass index, but we have lots of data around it.

If you care about people, what is happening in society, because remember, functionally, in the last 4 years, Americans' life expectancy has gone down. We are dying younger.

Even when you remove COVID, and even then try to take a look, so for our prime-age working males, we have a data set I presented here a couple of weeks ago that just shocked me. It turned out, it wasn't drugs. Now, drugs was really close. It was actually obesity was killing more of our brothers in America. I didn't have a female data set to look at.

How many of us are willing to actually say, wow, so if we would actually take on the drug problem and the obesity problem, we would add how many years of longevity to Americans' life? That is moral and also it is really good economics.

We can see when we start to see some of these numbers, where 81 was almost healthy, down to 72, so they are losing almost a decade of their lives. You get into some of our minority populations and the numbers are even uglier.

So my brothers and sisters that keep coming here and saying, let's talk about income inequality, it turns out some of the data says health, taking on diabetes, hypertension, obesity may be the single most moral, fast, and economically rational path if you care about income inequality. You have just got to be prepared for the armies of lobbyists who we are about to change—if we did these things and actually took it on, we would be changing their business models.

Look, the number is going off the charts. This one actually just came out, I think, about 48 hours ago. The projections over the rest of this decade of how many of our young people, when we are starting to see some numbers where we are heading toward a time where half—the end of the decade—where half of our young people are technically obese.

This is a country that took on smoking and saved how many lives? We have seatbelts. We have air bags. We did it because it made us safer, healthier, we got to live longer.

When you are seeing a new study out, and it is a good study, and it is detailed, and it is a huge data set and saying, hey, at the current rate, in about a decade, half of our young people—are we willing to take this on?

Because just the economics, just the life span, healthcare costs, you are going to see things in our joint economic report, if it gets passed. It is not a report until it is passed by the committee, and I hope I can get the votes of my fellow members on the committee to support what we wrote.

But if it becomes an official report, you are going to see in there stunning amounts of money—for those who sound like accountants on steroids—that we would save by being healthier year.

Then you have the other side. Look at longevity. Look at the ability to participate in society. Look at the ability to have family formation.

This is as close as I have come up with for a unified theory of what we could do to save ourselves. How many

other idiots are going to be like me and get behind the microphone and be willing to talk about this and get ready for the television ads? He was willing to talk about this.

And here is some of the punch line. I believe this number is dramatically too low, but we are coming up with math that says, look, just the use of the GLP-1s for some of the highest BMI segments, potentially hundreds of billions of dollars in savings, and that is without the economic effect, and that is also without the long-term health effects that are outside that 10-year window.

Madam Speaker pro tem, I appreciate you sitting there letting me go through this. I am trying to make a point. Instead of coming to this mike every week after week after week saying there is something horribly wrong in the debt data, it is getting worse dramatically faster. People don't understand how fragile we are becoming as a society because of the threats that debt means.

I am going to try to be better. I am going to try to demonstrate there is hope. There is a path.

This is only one of about four key things I believe we could do to become a much more prosperous society with dramatically—we are not going to pay off the debt, but we could stabilize it. There is hope, Madam Speaker pro tem, but is anyone listening?

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 423. An act to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4004. An act to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 70. An act to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to process and complete all mortgage packages associated with residential and business mortgages on Indian land by certain deadlines, and for other purposes.

S. 460. An act to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to establish an urban Indian organization confer policy for the Department of Health and Human Services.

S. 794. An act to require a pilot program on the participation of non-asset-based third-party logistics providers in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism.

S. 1308. An act to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend the deadline for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations implementing title IV of that Act, and for other purposes.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I am going to address a topic I have addressed before this time earlier in the week, but it was brought up again yesterday in the Oversight Committee, entirely inappropriately. It is something that is brought up with each authorization bill or appropriation bill, and it is apparent that the other side of the aisle desperately wants a new bureaucracy dealing with what I will call preferences.

It has been in the news lately because there was a Supreme Court decision saying that, for the first time in 50 years, in the United States, we could not discriminate or use—I guess they were primarily focusing on race but they could have used sex as well—in university admissions. It put an end to 50 years of discrimination at universities.

It has also been in the paper because we have a Secretary of Labor appointed, not yet confirmed, that believes that this country was built on white supremacy, and we have a proposed new head of the Joint Chiefs who believes that we should cap the number of White male officers at 42 percent.

Of course, this gets into other areas as well that the Court did not touch. It gets involved in the area of government hiring. It gets into the area of hiring by businesses that do business with the government.

I think a lot of Americans are not aware that if you have at least 50 employees and do business with the government, you are required to submit a statement every year to the government called the EEO-1, listing the race and sex and the amount of money all your employees make.

It also goes into play with government contracting. Frequently, government contracts are reserved for certain people.

It will continue to be an issue as even after this decision, individual universities have gone down the path of not using tests for admissions. Historically, for example, to get into medical school you had to pass a test called the MCAT test. I had always felt when I was in my teens and twenties that we had the smartest kids go on to become doctors.

But the medical schools are shifting away from tests, which are an objective measure of intelligence, and using things like essays to determine who the next doctor is.

I want to make several comments about this preference idea and why it is so important, as we work through our authorizing bills and our appropriation bills, that we do not slide into this.

First of all, for people who claim, like our Secretary of Labor, that we are a racist country, or a Eurocentric country, I want to point out that the

most successful ethnic group in America today are people from India. The second most successful are people from the Philippines. Other groups like Chinese, Japanese, if you look at Latin America, Cubans are all more successful than the average American, at least judged by income earned.

According to Thomas Sowell, the children of immigrants from the West Indies, the children of immigrants from, say, Jamaica or the Bahamas are more successful than the native-born.

If all these people come here and are successful, why in the world would we want the government sticking their nose in and establishing a whole new bureaucracy?

I also had an experience over the weekend with regard to the Hmong. The Hmong are perhaps the most—the largest number of so-called minorities in my district. I talk to a lot of the Hmong at their festivals. It is always enjoyable to be at their festivals. And, it gives me a chance to eat Hmong food, which allows me to become more used to very hot food.

It is always enjoyable to see such happy people as the Hmong are in their festivals. They had a festival in Sheboygan last week.

One of the things I like to ask the Hmong, since if there was ever a group that would have felt like a minority when they came here it would be the Hmong; obviously not European. When they came here they didn't know the language.

I ask either the older generation how many children plus nieces or nephews they have and they all smile. When they get done adding it up, it seems like it is 30 or 40.

I ask, have any of them had any trouble with the law? No. Do all of them graduate from high school? Yes. Do all of them have jobs? Do all those that have children, were the children all with the mother and father at home? The answer is yes.

□ 1230

I find the same thing when I ask the younger generation, and I ask them about their siblings or their cousins. They have to add up in their mind how many there are. There could be 30, 35, 40.

All of them have had no problem with the law. All of them, when they have children, there is a father in the house. All of them are living the American Dream. Again, it drives home the idea that in America we do not have a problem in which we have a European class that is preventing other people from succeeding. Indeed, the new people who come here do better than the people who have been here all along.

That would be one indication that we do not need these new bureaucrats running around labeling people by their racial background.

The next thing I will point out that inevitably all of these programs have is what I will refer to as, "stupid rules."

Let us determine, for example, who is Hispanic and in need of help. If my ancestors were in Spain, came to Cuba for