

Mr. ROY. Would the gentleman agree that the fundamental obstacle to achieving what the gentleman just outlined is that it has a lot of complexities in it?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes, but we have a plan. We have a plan.

Mr. ROY. We will go through committees, figure out the work. It is tough work. We will do it.

Would the gentleman agree the primary obstacle to that is, and I am going to use this term broadly, the buildup—the gentleman referenced K Street and the army of lobbyists—the sort of corporatization of all things that we do, meaning healthcare is driven predominantly by the massive corporations—pharmaceutical, hospitals, pharma. My life got saved by great innovation in pharmaceuticals when I had cancer. I am for it.

But the corporatization, the corporate cronyism, the extent you have these massive entities, including, by the way, those that are driving our food supply, all the regulations prohibiting small farms and small meatpacking plants to ship the stuff to have local produce and local foods so that you can eat healthy. It is the massive corporate interests that come here lobbying for benefits and tax breaks that, by the way, are going to be front and center among Republicans when everyone says that we must go back and put in place all the tax benefits, which some are good, as I was talking about earlier.

Does the gentleman agree that some of these are part of the problem?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. This is probably going to be the first time you have ever heard this, CHIP. I don't think you are cynical enough. That is actually very funny for those of us who know CHIP.

We have actually created a motto in our office: Money, power, vanity, but most of the time, it is about the money.

I would argue that Congress has become substantially a protection racket. We protect incumbent bureaucracies and incumbent business models. When someone comes to us and says: Hey, I have this thing you can blow into and, boom, it will tell you that you have the flu, and it can bounce off your medical records and order your antivirals that Lyft can drop off in 2 hours. That technology exists. We will find a way to make that illegal. We will make it so you can't be reimbursed. It will be illegal for an algorithm to write a prescription—those sorts of things.

There is a revolution of technology around us where we can make our lives so much easier. You and your family can have more time, and we can crash the debt and deficit, and young people don't have to live poorer than their parents because that is what the math says.

This will be the first generation coming up right now that will be economically more disadvantaged than their parents. That is immoral, and we can

stop it, but we have to think disruptively.

Maybe I am a little bit of a utopian on some of this stuff. The Democrats, all their taxes, you get about 1.5 percent of GDP when you do economic effects. I have offered some pretty brutal amendments here, which are never going to pass, on cutting spending and nondefense discretionary. If you let me have everything, I can get 1 percent of nondefense discretionary, 2½ percent.

The runway rate this year, I think it is going to go down near the ending of the last quarter of this year, but we are burning 8, 9 percent of GDP in borrowing.

Here is my problem: If you are borrowing about 8 percent of GDP and everyone's proposal, because this is our campaign talking points, is down here, we have to revolutionize policy.

There is our problem because there will be an army of people in the hallways here really cranky at us because we are forcing them to compete, have a vibrant economy, and bring technology, disruption, and productivity to market.

It means they have to change their business models. The bureaucracies have to actually be, in many ways, replaced with technology.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Are you talking about, to be clear, crashing the cost of healthcare?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. And government.

Mr. PERRY. You are talking about bringing down substantially, almost cataclysmically—

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. No, no, no. Don't use a word like that. Just morally. Morally.

Mr. PERRY. That is fine, but substantially, the magnitude. That money is going somewhere right now.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. Wherever that is going, those folks want that money.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Of course. How much of that is on borrowed money right now?

Mr. PERRY. It is all borrowed money.

So who is going to be unhappy if we do that?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oddly enough, I get this crazy thing where I will get business models that are built on today's way of healthcare reimbursement, which need sick people to exist. They will come in and say: Okay, I am wearing two hats. For my business, I need to stop you, SCHWEIKERT.

It is like the fights we had here on telehealth and digital medicine, those things. They fought like crazy to stop that, and then, in the next sentence as they are walking out the door, they are saying: But we want it for our family. We want the technology. We want the time. We want to be healthier. We want this.

That is actually why I am hoping at some point the morality of what people would want for themselves and their families, they will see actually it is good business, moral, and really important for the future survival of this Republic.

Mr. PERRY. I am not going to hold my breath.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You have to keep trying. My argument is that there is a path.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate you tolerating us, but there is a path where you can make this math work. The problem is it is going to be hard. There are going to be people who are upset because you are making them rethink how they do their business. You are going to make bureaucrats either rebuild their bureaucratic model or actually go find a job in the private sector, but we don't have a choice.

Be prepared. There is a way to save us. One of our economists has played some math games, and the theory is depending on where interest rates are at, because functionally the bond market is getting close to running this country, depending on where interest rates are, you may have 3, 5 years, could be longer, where a movement in the bond market starts to consume all your variability.

At that point, it is almost too late to do major policy. At that point, you are doing policy to pacify those whom you are trying to sell your debt to.

□ 1800

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. This election you just saw, you have the prosperity of your family and the tax code, but you have an opportunity to use that stressor.

Mr. ROY, this is actually where my punch line at the end was going to be: Are we nimble enough to use the stressor of the expiring tax provisions to get us to think about things we could do to change the cost of government because it is like the debt ceiling around here and other things? Without those and without a stressor on this place, this place will not do anything that is hard.

Let's think creatively. Let's do quality math. Let's be hopeful, but let's demand that the public understand the scale of the problem and that there is hope. It just is that hope isn't perpetual. We may only have a few more years, and then the revolution is too late to be able to make the difference.

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

CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my colleague and friend, for his steadfast dedication to ensuring

the American people are informed, at least the 72 people that were watching C-SPAN while you were extemporaneously educating them.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. My own family doesn't watch.

Mr. ROY. In all seriousness, we were able to push this out. We were able to do clips. It is important that we continue to have this conversation.

The gentleman is correct, in very broad terms and very specific terms, about the extent to which we have a fiscal crisis looming. It is incumbent upon this body to do something about it.

We have structural reforms we could put in place that the gentleman is talking about. I think we just covered that quite nicely, but we also need to be aware of what we need to do with our discretionary spending and using the power of the purse, both to constrain the bureaucracy that is still a third of that annual spending and constrain that spending also for the purpose of limiting tyranny over the American people.

This is one of those things that frustrates me among my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican. The gentleman from Arizona is not in that group, by the way, because the gentleman from Arizona, I think, largely would agree with what I am getting at here. I have colleagues who will always slip into saying: It doesn't matter. Stop worrying about discretionary. Stop having a fight about \$100 billion or \$30 billion or whatever your debate is about constraining discretionary spending.

When I say that to the average listener, what I mean is what we spend every year on the stuff you see in the bureaucracy, such as the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense, all of those things that make up the alphabet soup of government that, frankly, are the things impacting your life every day, or undermining, frankly, your freedoms every day.

The thing that drives me crazy in this town is you will hear Members of Congress who come down here and they say: Chip, we have a razor-thin majority. Don't you understand? Chip, it is all mandatory spending. You don't have to focus on this \$100 billion. We are talking about \$35 trillion in debt.

That happens all the time. I assume the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) would agree with me. I assume, in his career, since he has been here a few years longer than I have, that we hear that as an excuse for ignoring our job to constrain the bureaucracy, using the power of the purse, almost every single day that we come down here to the floor, when we are in committee or in our conference meetings. I assume the gentleman agrees with me on that point.

Mr. PERRY. Of course I do. We have fought bitterly. I mean, even if you just look at the last few years here

since the pandemic, the pandemic was unexpected, decisions were made, and in hindsight we obviously made some wrong choices.

Be that as it may, it was expensive. People were out of work. The government forced them out of work, forced them to close their businesses. It was only right, since the government had the authority and the power to do that, to make them as whole as possible.

Now, we can debate that as long as we want to, but subsequent to the end of the pandemic, it should have been reasonable for the people in this room on either side of the aisle to say: Well, let's just reset back to prepandemic.

Believe it or not, at that time, if we had just gone back to that number, the budget would have balanced.

Mr. ROY. You are quite right.

Mr. PERRY. We would actually have taken in enough revenue to pay for the things that we were buying, but a substantial portion of this body, unfortunately, my friends, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, said: No, no, no. We are going to keep spending now at the pandemic level even though the pandemic is over.

Mr. ROY. The gentleman is correct. I think that is one of the things I want to stress. I came down here not to talk about spending. However, on the heels of our friend from Arizona, I want to make the point and then pivot to what I think is important to talk about. I am sure the gentleman will agree.

In the context, it matters, right? What we fund matters. We are funding the Department of Homeland Security and for them to utterly fail to secure the homeland and endanger our own people and empower migrants to be able to actually flood in and get dumped into the United States, including the individual who was paroled into the United States and killed Laken Riley, including individuals who were dumped into the United States and shot those two police officers in New York just last week, including the individual who killed a woman named Lizbeth Medina in my own State—killed her, and her mom found her in the bathtub when she was supposed to be cheerleading on the streets. I can give example after example. We are funding that. We are funding the DHS that does that.

We are funding the FBI that has been politicized against the former President, against our own people, like Scott Smith and Mark Houck and other people around the country. We are politicizing the FBI and the Department of Justice that is using the FACE Act to put a 75-year-old woman in jail for 2 years for praying at an abortion facility.

You are paying for that, ladies and gentlemen. You, the American taxpayer, are paying for that, and guess what? With all due respect to my Republican colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans are funding it.

They are funding it, and they come down and they say: Well, we have a duty to do that.

Our Democratic colleagues will say: We must do all these things. You are politicizing this. You are making it this way.

My Republican colleagues will say: Well, CHIP, of course, we would like to do that. Of course, we would like to fix it, but you don't understand. You can't do math. We have a razor-thin majority. We can't possibly get it done.

By the way, when did they ever talk about the razor-thin majority in the Senate, which exists?

Mr. PERRY. Right. It does.

Mr. ROY. One last point. Has my friend from Pennsylvania heard the same issues? I won't say who, but I have already heard very important Members of this body, in terms of their rank and committee, already talking about the fact that, no matter what happens in November, if we win the White House and President Trump is in the White House and if we win the House of Representatives, even grow our majority, and if we win back the Senate and have a majority of two, three, or four, depending on how you go look at the scoreboard, that we will not have 60 votes.

We are told: Unless you can do something on reconciliation, which is a maneuver—for all you Americans out there—to find a way to bend around the 60-vote threshold in the Senate, well, then you are just stuck. We are sorry. You just have to accept it, CHIP.

Does the gentleman hear that all the time, and has he already heard Members already setting the stage for January to say: We can't do the things that we said we would do?

Mr. PERRY. Of course, I have heard it. I have heard it ever since I have been here. There is always some reason: We have a slim majority. We don't have a majority at all. We don't have 60. We don't have the Presidency. We have this House, not that body. It is the courts. There is always some reason to say we can't do it.

I was in a committee hearing today talking about waste and abuse on foreign affairs. I found out that we send money to Nepal to support atheism. We send some of your money to Nepal, which is a highly religious society, to support atheism.

What I am told is: Well, not all bills are perfect. Nobody agrees with that, but we had to get the bill passed.

Well, somebody agreed with it. It ended up in there.

Mr. ROY. Right.

Mr. PERRY. Somebody wanted that, so I am supposed to go along with that. The people that I represent that wake up early in the morning and go to work and pay their taxes, their money is going for that when they can't afford their electricity bill, their food bill, or their daycare bill. It is insane.

This whole thing about a wide-open border, not only can they not afford to pay the bills, but their kids can't even get jobs now coming out of high school because they are competing with people who are here illegally who will take

those jobs where you start out, where the only skill you have, Mr. ROY, is, I can show up on time with a good attitude. That is the skill I had when I was 13 or 14 years old, right? That is the skill I had when I started.

You start out doing things that maybe a lot of people don't want to do, but now there are other people in this country with a work permit. Your kids can't even get started anymore. That is the insult upon injury.

You are being taxed out of your homes. You can't afford your bills. Other people are taking your work. You are being told to sit down and shut up and just take it, whether you are in Congress or, Heaven forbid, you are at home and you are watching on TV and you are saying: What do I do about any of this? I told my Representative, and they said they can't stop it.

Mr. ROY. In the meantime, I want to pivot to the border point you just raised, but I would like to make the point. We are funding all those rules and the requirements that are driving the American family out of the ability to afford a life.

Just today, I had a crack in my windshield, and I was just there at the dealer's getting it looked at and getting it worked on. We couldn't go do a non-dealer part for reasons I won't get into. It was \$1,100 for a windshield. They used to be 200 bucks. You would call Safelite or somebody to come out, and they would replace the glass. Now they say: Well, you can't just replace the glass because it has all these sensors in the windshield.

Mr. PERRY. Mandated by the government.

Mr. ROY. Right. Guess what? Now, increasingly, all of these things are mandated by the idiots in this Chamber.

Mr. PERRY. Like the kill switch.

Mr. ROY. Right. The idiots in this Chamber voted to cause that to happen and back up what the regulators down the street are forcing on the average American.

Here is what I don't get, right? All my colleagues here, if I forced my colleagues, one by one, to go down to the microphone on any one of these issues and explain to their constituents: I am going to vote—as some Republicans did last fall—I am going to vote against eliminating a kill switch in a car, which is going to dramatically increase the cost of that car, dramatically increase the cost of that windshield, dramatically increase the chance that that car is going to shut down in the 20-below-zero cold in North Dakota and leave you on the side of the road because you have a computer determining whether you can start the car, if I made every Member go defend that, they would start to think twice about it because that is a hard thing to defend.

However, they didn't want to vote against it because MADD came around and lobbied for it. They didn't want to be against that, so 19 Republicans say:

No. Sorry. I can't vote against killing the kill switch.

If you put it out there and start really telling the American people: Hey, should we have something in there that protects people from drunk driving, they will say: Well, I guess so.

What if that would cost you another \$10,000 for the car?

They would say: Are you out of your freaking mind?

However, we do it, and we do it for the same reason Mr. SCHWEIKERT was talking about why our healthcare costs are high. It is because there is an army of lobbyists in town, or there is an army of people who are going to go out and say certain things. The one thing Mr. SCHWEIKERT said, when he talked about how we are going to make sure that we are protecting incumbents, he didn't mention about protecting the incumbency of the people in this room, people who hold onto their election certificate like it is the most important damned thing they will ever have in their life, instead of the opportunity to come here and do what we said we would do.

Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. PERRY. I do agree. I do agree with that completely. Protecting that, and, of course, what we are seeing right now is the protection or the attempted protection of that at the Presidential level.

For 3½ years, I have watched the President say: I can't do anything about a wide-open border. I can't take any action. There is nothing I can do. It must come from the legislature.

Yet, somehow, now that all the polls have turned around and it looks ominous in 5 months, somehow, he found the wherewithal to say: Well, shazam, I can take executive action.

Who knew? Well, the American people knew because, before he got there, executive action was taken, and the border was relatively secure, much more secure than it is now.

For 3½ years, it has been wide open, and, essentially, our President just acknowledged what we all knew, that this has been meaningful. This has been by design, the wide-open border has been intentional, and he could have done something about it, but he chose not to until he had no other choice politically.

Even at that, I am sure that my good friend from Texas, who is on the front lines in Texas, is going to talk about the provisions of this. The one I find interesting, we are going to stop these people coming in once we hit the threshold unless they are minors, unaccompanied children. Unless they are minors, unaccompanied children, we are going to let—so we are going to allow the sex trafficking of children to continue, even as we know that our Federal Government has lost track of literally tens of thousands of children illegally in our country, unaccompanied.

Mr. ROY. There were 85,000 documented in one case, for sure.

Mr. PERRY. Yes, 85,000. Right. Yeah.

Mr. ROY. And I am glad the gentleman brings this issue up because I would note that, today, while I was sitting in the House Judiciary Committee with the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY)—who just came in to join us, who is going to take the microphone, I am sure, in a little bit—we had the Attorney General before us. We were questioning the Attorney General in the House Judiciary Committee.

In that exchange, I was asking the Attorney General about the extent to which he believes that it is wrong for Texas to have passed what we call SB4 in Texas to empower Texans to do the job of stopping people from being released into the United States, contrary to law, and endangering the people of Texas that has led directly to the death of Texans, does he believe, as the Attorney General of the United States, that it is wrong for Texas to do that?

The reason I asked him that question is because, as the Attorney General of the United States, he is, of course, leading litigation to stop us. He is suing Texas, taking us to court to try to prevent us from doing it because of the Supremacy Clause. The Federal Government is supposed to do this, and you don't have a say.

Well, hold on a second. If the Federal Government is supposed to secure the border of the United States and manage this inflow of people and it is violating the laws and dumping people into the United States, are we saying that the people of Texas can't, under the invasion clause or otherwise, say: It is our duty as the people of Texas to protect our citizens and our people?

□ 1815

The Attorney General, of course, said no. He has got to take us to court and go sue us. The fact is he is, therefore, ignoring—

Mr. PERRY. When is the invasion clause operable then?

Mr. ROY. I think he would say it is not.

Mr. PERRY. When is it? Never?

Mr. ROY. I think he would say if you have got a literal army of people coming across the river, I suppose. I think they would probably fight us on that.

Mr. PERRY. If you came across with a gun and you were wearing a uniform with your name on it, that is an invasion. If you don't have a gun and you don't have a uniform, no matter what your intentions are or the scale, that is not an invasion.

Mr. ROY. I am not sure that they have stipulated the former, but they certainly want to try to stop us from identifying and recognizing the latter. The reality is that the people of Texas are fed up and they are asking their leaders to do the job the Federal Government won't do.

I will compliment Republicans. I am not afraid to criticize both Republicans or Democrats. I will compliment Republicans for having done a year ago what we have never done, which is set

aside the absurdity of saying you have got to do amnesty and setting aside the absurdity of saying you have got to open the floodgates to more people coming into the country, even though we allow about a million people a year to come in.

Mr. PERRY. Legally.

Mr. ROY. Legally.

Even though we have 51.5 million people in the United States who are foreign-born. You have the Chamber of Commerce and all of the big interests coming down here saying: You guys have got to open up more immigration. You have to do it.

We always bow down. We always say: Okay, we will do that. We will do amnesty, but can we just get some security? We beg for crumbs.

A year ago, we did something different. We came together as Republicans, and we passed the most comprehensive and strongest border security bill we have ever passed.

Frankly, I don't think my colleagues fully understand the historical importance of that, even many who support it and talk about it and tweet about it.

I have been here in some various forms, now 5 years as Member of Congress. I was here as chief of staff for Senator TED CRUZ. I was on the Senate Judiciary Committee as a lawyer. I watched the debates and the failures and the Gangs of Eight and all of the machinations. I watched in 2017 when we had two different bills, so-called Goodlatte 1, Goodlatte 2. We left President Trump stranded. We blew it.

Last year, we came together, we set the terms of what we will now do next year. That matters.

When Republicans unite to achieve something, not unity for the sake of it. I get so tired of hearing my colleagues talk about unity. I say something like: To do what?

It doesn't matter. We have just got to unite. To do what? Right?

When we unite to say we are going to stand up and say we are going to secure the border of the United States, we did it. We didn't always agree, by the way. People swept aside our differences of opinion a year ago.

We fought through it. We met, we worked, and we passed the best border security bill we have ever passed. The Senate has sat on it. They tried to pass a sham bill, which the President today went to the microphone and gave up the game. Remember the Senate bill? The Senate bill said: Oh, don't worry, guys. We are going to cap the flow at 5,000.

Mr. PERRY. A day.

Mr. ROY. A day. Which, by the way, Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, said a thousand a day was basically a crisis.

We are going to cap it at 5,000 a day, rest easy, but we are going to have all these exceptions. We are going to have exceptions for unaccompanied children; exceptions for parolees when we are violently just dumping people into the United States under parole; exceptions

for foreign nationals who use the CBP One app, which is another version of parole.

We objected. All the Democrats said: You guys are not doing this bipartisan bill.

Guess what the President did today? He went to the microphone, and he looked at America and he said: "We need to regain control of the border."

The President of the United States today acknowledged to everybody watching and to every American that we do not have control of the border. That is what the President did today.

The President also went to the microphone today and said: "I will cap it at 2,500." If the President of the United States has the authority today to issue an order to cap it at 2,500, did he not have that authority 2 months ago or 6 months ago or 2 years ago or 3½ years ago? Of course, he did. That gives up the game on the Senate bill when they said they would cap it at 5,000 and the President comes in 3 months later, why?

It is because he is looking at the polls and he is looking at his butt getting kicked and he is looking at losing the House and the Senate. Now, he is, like, oh, crap. I have got to do something to actually look like I care about the border when everybody in America knows I don't.

Madam Speaker, so he did it. He went to the microphone, and he said it and he made a joke of the Senate bill that all of those Senate Democrats and all of our Democratic colleagues have been lying to the American people that we have been obstructing good bills when they are the ones that put forward a sham bill and the President made it clear today.

Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. PERRY. I agree completely. The historical perspective of what we accomplished in the House over a year ago now with the most righteous border security bill ever to pass out of the House is to give Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate the alternative, so when the President says: Well, you haven't done anything over there. You haven't passed anything, and you won't pass the bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, it doesn't matter. I mean, it is awesome when it can be bipartisan, but what is more awesome is when it can be correct, when it actually is the solution to the problem.

The Senate bill, the so-called border protection bill that allows 5,000 people every single day to hemorrhage across our border illegally, is not a solution. It is not a solution to an open border. It is just a codification of an open border.

The fact that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle didn't want to vote in favor of securing the border shouldn't be a reason for the President to say: You haven't done anything.

We get that he doesn't like it. He doesn't like it because it actually would have secured the border. That

goes to the point. It was always his intention. It has always been his intention. It has always been the intention of my friends on the other side of the aisle to leave the border wide-open as long as they possibly could and get away with it. The only reason it is changing now is because the polls reflect that the American people are, number one, sick of it; and, number two, know they are being lied to and know that the President has the authority and the ability to secure the border.

Mr. ROY. I will ask the gentleman a quick question, then I will leave both of us a little time at the end. We have got about 9 minutes left.

I will give a chance for us to talk about June 6, which is coming up in a couple days. I want to ask one thing today, in that we just talked about the border. We just talked about the extent to which they are wide-open, being ignored, endangering the American people. It is purposeful.

We just talked about the attorney general suing to get in front of Texas trying to secure our borders. I just want to point out the extent to which the current administration is defying and undermining the rule of law on a daily basis.

As we sit here in this Chamber and we sit here under Moses and we sit here in recognition of the importance of the rule of law, this administration is at war with the rule of law: the borders are open, ignoring the law; student loan repayments, ignoring the Supreme Court and the law to try to buy votes. You have got wide-open streets and criminals on the streets, and we are not prosecuting crimes that we need to prosecute.

More importantly, you have an administration hell-bent on trying to use the political apparatus to target a former President and to use it in direct violation of everything we understand and know about the importance of blind justice. You cannot get away from that reality.

Today, we have an attorney general who is choosing to target one President and say: I am going to charge you with a crime. Right? And then choosing not to charge the other President for basically the same crime with the classified record stuff. You have got the Attorney General of the United States saying, I am not going to turn over audio of the very rationale for why Special Counsel Hur said: No, we shouldn't go after the current President because, frankly, he is not mentally able to do it, and he will be a sympathetic figure.

They don't want to turn over the audio, even though it is the same material, and the attorney general testified to that today.

That is an abomination to the rule of law that you have got the New York prosecutor in complete and obvious coordination with the attorney general, where the deputy to the number three goes up and works with the D.A. in

New York and they prosecute the former President of the United States.

They prosecute him on a State law charge, but then they bastardize and shoehorn in a Federal charge they won't even define. Then they use that to run through multiple charges that most observers say may not even get through the State system without their supreme court in New York throwing it out.

We have got 6 minutes. I will get to this other issue.

Does the gentleman see the problem with what is happening to the rule of law, the very foundation that causes migrants to want to come here and the strength of this economy and this country?

Mr. PERRY. I do, and I lament this. I say this often. The gentleman from Texas has heard me say that this is the Constitution of the United States of America, Madam Speaker.

It is a quick read. You can probably read that in less than an hour. Everybody can see it is a piece of paper. It cannot defend itself.

Mr. ROY. Correct.

Mr. PERRY. There it is, laying on the desk. This is the owner's manual. This is the operator's manual. This is the set of instructions for running your country. We all take an oath to follow this thing. However, if you are not going to, if you choose not to, this Constitution can do nothing about it. It can do nothing.

It takes people of integrity. People that are willing to sacrifice their own personal viewpoints on occasion or what I call the avarice of man, their own personal greed; the things that they want for the sake of this. When people refuse to do this, refuse to do that, and just use the awesome authority granted to them in a position whether it is electoral or otherwise in places like the Department of Justice, well, that is what we have today.

That is what we have today, which is a Soviet-style show trial to go after your political rivals. This is the thing of dictators and tyrants.

One of the practitioners I saw this week before I came in said: It is crazy. It is crazy. I said: It is not crazy; it is tyranny. It is tyranny.

Mr. ROY. I assume the gentleman would agree with me—and I am going to switch topics, but it is a transition that makes it more meaningful—that when the boys walked into the wall of bullets that they walked into at Normandy in 1944 that they weren't doing it to toss aside the rule of law and the Constitution, all that this country stands for.

I have chosen not to go to Normandy and to make the trip. I didn't wear the uniform. I want to leave it to those who did. Some who wore the uniform aren't going. I want the gentleman to comment on this as he has served for almost three decades or something along those lines in the United States Armed Forces—just so everybody knows, today is June 4.

In 2 days, it will be 80 years since those men got in those boats, jumped out into the stormy seas, ran on to the sand, ran into a wall of bullets, went up the cliffs, and then went all the way to Bastogne, to Germany, went through all of what they went through, this is the message from General Eisenhower on the order of June 6, 1944:

“Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force!

“You are about to embark upon the Great Crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you. The hope and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you. In company with our brave Allies and brothers-in-arms on other Fronts, you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, the elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

“Your task will not be an easy one. Your enemy is well trained, well equipped and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely.

“But this is the year 1944! Much has happened since the Nazi triumphs of 1940-41. The United Nations have inflicted upon the Germans great defeats, in open battle, man-to-man. Our air offensive has seriously reduced their strength in the air and their capacity to wage war on the ground. Our Home Fronts have given us an overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war, and placed at our disposal great reserves of trained fighting men. The tide has turned! The free men of the world are marching together to Victory!

“I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full Victory!

“Good luck! And let us beseech the blessing of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.”

Those words speak for themselves. We honor and tribute those who lost their lives, those who fought, those who came home, those few World War II veterans who remain with us.

I will turn over the remaining 1½ minutes to my friend who wore the uniform that I did not wear.

Mr. PERRY. No words that we can use today can adequately honor the sacrifices of those who gave the last full measure and signed up to do it. There is just no way you can describe what they endured and what they knew they were going to endure.

Many of them never made it off the beach. Many of them never made it out of the boat. So many of them even joined up and lied about their age so they could go fight for what they believed in: this country, this idea.

□ 1830

The idea is that everybody is equal under the law, that no one person is more important than another person, that you can make decisions for your life based on what you want to do. You

can buy the gas stove that you want or not buy any stove at all. You can buy a car with a windshield sensor in it or no windshield sensor in it.

Madam Speaker, they didn't give their lives for this government that we have now that bankrupts families, that puts the fear of the government in them if they say something, that they are going to be hauled off to jail in the middle of the night or be drawn out on the lawn in their shorts in the wee hours of the morning. Yet, that is what we have right now.

Madam Speaker, we need to honor the commitment they made for the country that they loved that existed then. That is the best thing we could do.

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

SOUNDING ALARMS ABOUT AI

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

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm again about the rapidly advancing capabilities of artificial intelligence systems.

I will say at the outset that while in a sense this is alarming, it is also incredibly exciting. The level of innovation and the expansion capabilities that we are seeing hold the promise of making life better in countless ways for people across the country and around the world.

Yet, at the same time, the pace at which these capabilities are growing has unpredictable risks, as well. We are seeing more and more people who work at or have worked at the leading AI companies who are starting to sound this alarm, as well.

Today, we got a letter from employees of OpenAI, former employees and other researchers. This is according to WIRED reporting. A group of current and former OpenAI employees have issued a public letter warning that the company and its rivals are building artificial intelligence with undue risk, without sufficient oversight, and while muzzling employees who might witness irresponsible activities.

These risks, the letter says, range from the further entrenchment of existing inequalities to manipulation and misinformation and to the loss of control of autonomous AI systems.

As long as there is no effective government oversight of these corporations, the letter says, current and former employees are among the few people who can hold them accountable.

What the authors of this letter are calling for is protection for whistleblowers at the companies who bring to light information about what might be going on there that could be of public concern.

Now, there might, perhaps, be some role for us here when it comes to the question of protecting whistleblowers,