

swiftly on passing legislation that would stabilize Medicare payments to physicians and other providers to ensure that our seniors maintain access to quality healthcare.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, we submitted a bill, H.R. 6683, a couple weeks ago, and while ENC was able to keep the cut at 1.25 percent, we are actually desiring to not allow the cut at all. We are taking money from the Medicare Improvement Fund, which is what the money is for, to solve problems within Medicare.

Unfortunately, as this was a wonderful bipartisan discussion this evening, we are oftentimes imprisoned, if you will, sometimes to the will of some of the leaders over in Senate, sometimes even here in the House.

Leaders over in the Senate didn't want anything for a doctor fix. The Democratic leader said, no, we want this huge wish list of things done, and we will trade that for the doctor fix.

Well, guys, you can't take poison pills to try to help physicians. This is where there should not be politics whatsoever. We saw both sides tonight, Democrats and Republicans, speak about the healthcare of patients in this country.

Mr. Speaker, at some point it is going to snap. At some point, whether it be what Obamacare was trying to do, absolutely starve private practice so that everybody would either be bought out by private equity or have to be assumed by hospital systems. Where, by the way, physicians don't work as efficiently, physicians cost more, and they see fewer patients. It is a closer ownership care of patients.

When I was practicing full-time, if another doctor called me and said, hey, can you see somebody? My response was always: Do you want me to see them today or tomorrow?

The sad fact is once physicians become employed, not only do they cost more to the system, but the work ethic is not as good. That is just point-blank what is seen.

What we need to understand is that private practice is the most efficient way of delivering healthcare in this country, but it is also the one where we care the most, and we follow up. We are always happy to see that next patient and make sure that we keep our doors open.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, we are going to approach a calamitous cliff, if you will, in the next 3 to 5 years with the number of surgeons that are available to take care of patients.

I am a urologist. I take care of disorders of the kidney, prostate, and bladder—those type of things. We are the most critically short specialty in the country.

Right now, the median age of individuals practicing urology is my age, the age of 60. If now we are not paying doctors enough to stay in business, they are going to quit. We are going to make a bad shortage even worse. We have to pay those who take care of patients what they need to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this was a bipartisan discussion this evening, something that is easy for our leadership to fix. I ask that they do that.

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

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address a few issues tonight that have been brought to my attention by my constituents back home.

First of all, I rise to address the current policy of so much of the left of trying to encourage more and more people, and, in California, even require people, to build electric vehicles.

Now, I am very concerned, given other policies, that we are making it harder and harder in America to become a member of the middle class. One of the things that has kept America a free country is the fact that we have always had a large, strong, middle class, who when they go to the polls, protect the freedoms our forefathers have given us.

In order to become a member of the middle class, to me, you have to buy three things: you need a house; you need food; and in America today, you need a vehicle.

Americans have been in love with their cars for over 100 years, and that has been something owned by not only every member of the middle class, but even people who don't have as much money.

I am very afraid that the high-income, leftwing, liberal element has taken over the Democratic Party, and by pushing electric vehicles, that they are creating something that will make it very, very difficult to achieve middle-class status.

Mr. Speaker, I have been alerted by some insurance agents that when you buy an electric vehicle, your insurance can go up 125 percent. That is right, 125 percent.

Now, that is not something that the uber wealthy have to worry about; they always have money to pay their bills. And, quite frankly, it is not something that the incredibly poor people have to worry about, because a lot of times they don't have any auto insurance anyway, or they try to find a way to get around it.

□ 1845

However, for the average American to have their auto insurance go up 125 percent is devastating, and you are hitting the most responsible members of society. Not only is your cost of auto insurance going through the roof, but I am informed the cost of a new vehicle, if you have to buy electric instead of buying the old gas engine, will also go up by 25 percent.

On one shot, the policies we are seeing in California, the policies we are encouraging on a national level, are going to make it much more difficult to buy that automobile that all Americans need, make it much more difficult to obtain middle-class status, much more difficult to have enough money left over to have children.

It was also recently brought to our attention, at least in Chicago—we have had a snap of a bit of a cold spell in the Midwest—that it is frequently true that when the weather gets cold enough you cannot get a decent charge on these vehicles anyway. Even if you do get a charge, I am told the maximum mileage you can make on a full charge may drop 35 or 40 percent.

In other words, it may not be a problem for people in Hollywood, it may not be that big a problem for people on Martha's Vineyard, but I will tell you, it is a big problem for people in a lot of America, including Wisconsin.

I think before we continue the laws which encourage more and more use of electric vehicles, we ought to have a look and see how well they operate at times like today, when the temperature is under 10 degrees in my district back home. It is time to stand up to the leftwing, wealthy set who think it is all cool to buy an electric vehicle, because they have always got enough money to deal with the insurance, deal with the high cost, and probably have another car that they can use when the temperature gets below zero. For the average person, this is really a body blow as you try to achieve the middle class.

The next thing I am going to deal with is an issue I touched on briefly last week, and I think some people wrote about it incorrectly. That is with regard to anchor babies.

Anchor babies are babies that somebody comes here, is not a citizen, and has a child. By custom today, we are calling those children U.S. citizens, but this is not guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution. It is important that all Americans understand it is not guaranteed under the Constitution. People get the idea that you should be able to come here, have a baby, and go back to China, or go back to wherever, and that child will immediately become an American citizen. They get that from looking at the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

To understand why this did not create birthright citizenship, you have to look at when the 14th Amendment was passed and why it was passed.

At the time, when the Civil War wrapped up—so many Americans fought and died in the Civil War. I had at least two ancestors myself who fought in the Civil War. At that time, there was concern that as the other party regained power, they would claim that since Black people who were slaves at the time in the South, that the Southern States would claim that they were not citizens and their children were not citizens. At the time,

you became a citizen if your parents were citizens.

They passed the 14th Amendment to make sure if you were in this country when that child was born, that child was a citizen. Of course, it was designed to make sure that—some of the people in the South didn't want to give up the fight—they did not try to say that if your parents were slaves, you were therefore not citizens.

It was not designed—and it makes no sense to say it was designed—that if somebody wanted to come here from another country and just have a child and return back home, that that child would automatically become an American citizen. That would make no sense.

There are two Supreme Court cases that misinform people and sometimes try to confuse people into thinking we have birthright citizenship in this country. One of those cases was in 1898. The court case revolved around people who were here legally, legal citizens, having a child and saying that then that child was a citizen. I don't really think that is what the Congress, after the Civil War, meant. At least it was restricted to people who were legal citizens here.

Later on, there were some dicta put in there by Justice Brennan, which is not binding on anybody, talking about birthright citizenship. Of course, Justice Brennan was one of the most far-left Justices we had in my lifetime. In any event, that was a case not reaching a decision on birthright citizenship; that was just some language that Justice Brennan threw in a decision, but it is not determinative.

When we look at this, we should rely on our common sense. In America today, while there are bills out there—and I have cosponsored the bill to get rid of birthright citizenship—any President, if they want to, can say that the 14th Amendment solely applies to situations which were anticipated by the Congress after the Civil War. There are really none of those situations left today, because all the children of slaves have long since passed away.

It is scandalous that people will take the work done by that Congress, including people who were related to and were so familiar with the people who gave all to end slavery in this country, and they would try to take this amendment designed to protect children of slaves and claim that creates a situation in which you have a tourist industry in which somebody can fly here from Asia, come up here from Latin America, just step across the border, have a child one week after you are here, go back home, and forever that child is an American citizen. That obviously makes no sense.

Insofar as journalists try to confuse the public, you have to remember that the Supreme Court decision in the 1890s was not all encompassing, was not intended to be all encompassing, and the Supreme Court decision in which there were some dicta put in there by Justice Brennan is also not binding.

We should pass legislation, if we have to, but hopefully, we will get a good President in here who will get rid of birthright citizenship. The idea that somebody who just comes across the border can have an American citizen child makes no sense.

My final comment for the day is with regard to a hearing we had earlier, and that hearing was with regard to deportations or the lack of deportations under President Biden.

A lot has been talked about with regard to the huge number of people who are crossing the southern border. I have talked many times at this microphone that we have gone from under 20,000 people coming here a month 3 years ago to right now over 300,000 people being left in the country every month.

It is not as publicized that not only are we trying to change America by letting an unlimited number of people come here, but we are also trying to change America by not deporting people even after they have committed crimes. Right now, we have dropped from a situation in which over 250,000 people were being deported during the Trump administration. Perhaps people will remember that under President Trump, he was rightly criticized for not deporting enough people. That was one of the few times the Republican Party stood up and was critical of President Trump.

After getting over 250,000 people deported a year, that has fallen now to under 75,000. We are in a situation in which we are at about one quarter the number of people being deported as were deported 3 years ago. Not only are we changing America by letting so many people in here; we are also trying to change America by not kicking out people who I think the average American citizen wish would be deported.

I hope this is something that our leadership team, in negotiating the appropriations bills with the Democrats at this time, bring to the floor and insist President Biden deport people at least at the low rate that President Trump was deporting people. When you see less deportations today, at a time when there are so many more people that you could deport, so many more people committing crimes, so many more people we wouldn't want to have here.

I call upon President Biden to look out for the future of America, to look out for the future of your children, and not only not let so many people in the country who we have not vetted but begin to remove the people that we used to remove after they had committed crimes in America.

Those are three issues that I don't think have been adequately covered in the press: Both the degree to which the electric vehicle scandal is going to put vehicles beyond the reach of the middle class or create a situation in which you have to spend so much on vehicles you won't have enough money for food, you won't have enough money for a house,

and you won't have as much money as you should to have children.

The next issue for the press to cover is the lack of deportations in this country, which goes hand in hand with the unlimited people crossing the southern border.

Finally, I hope we cover a little bit more accurately the laws in this country regarding birthright citizenship. We should not say that someone can come in here from another country, fly in on an American airline, have a baby within a week, go back home, and forever that child is an American citizen.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2929. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Market Development Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Changes to Board Membership and Administrative Committee [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-22-0041] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2930. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order for Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Pummelos Grown in Florida [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-21-0054] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2931. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Chemical Substances Designated as Inactive on the TSCA Inventory; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2022-0867; FRL-9655-02-OCSP] (RIN: 2070-AL10) received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2932. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; NAAQS Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2022-0673; FRL-10900-02-R5] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2933. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines