

people to respect the more than 10 million lives who were sacrificed to make America great.

Madam Speaker, respect them and give them the same respect we give others who have made sacrifice for this country. Others have sacrificed, and they should be respected, as well. We respect the military for the sacrifices made. I respect the military for the sacrifices made. I honor those who are willing to sacrifice and join the military.

Those who were part of the American enslaved didn't join. They weren't recruited, they were forced. They ought to be respected just as we respect the lives lost in the wars. We should respect the lives lost to slavery in this great country made great because of those persons who were enslaved for some 246 years.

Let's respect them. Do this on August 20, and let's respect them to the same extent that we have respected persons who were members of the Confederacy. I say that because in the year 1956, the Congress of the United States of America presented a Congressional Gold Medal to the Confederate soldiers. A Congressional Gold Medal. I believe that we should accord a Congressional Gold Medal to the enslaved. To the enslaved a Congressional Gold Medal should be presented.

If we can present a Congressional Gold Medal to the Confederate soldiers who were fighting to maintain slavery, then surely we can present a Congressional Gold Medal to those who were enslaved. I think we should do it.

On August 20 we will talk about this Congressional Gold Medal and what we are doing to make this Congressional Gold Medal a reality for those who were enslaved, but we shouldn't stop there. The Congressional Gold Medal is something that they have earned by their labor. Their unpaid labor hasn't been properly addressed, but because of their labor and because of the sacrifice of being born into slavery and having lived in slavery and died as a slave, then that kind of sacrifice ought to be honored.

I believe that we will do this at some point across the length and breadth of the country, but that is not enough. I also believe that the President of the United States should award a Presidential Medal of Freedom to the enslaved. We have given Presidential Medals of Freedom to many persons, and I am not in any way contending that we should not have given them their Presidential Medals of Freedom.

What I am saying is that we have neglected the 10 million-plus persons whose lives were sacrificed to make America great. We ought to give them a Presidential Medal of Freedom, as well.

On August 20 we will commemorate their lives with dignity and solemnity. We will explain what we have done in moving toward the Congressional Gold Medal, as well as the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Finally, I believe that we who have suffered ought to be of assistance to each other in helping to commemorate the suffering. When I say we who have suffered, I am talking about our ancestors having suffered. We ought to stand together. We ought to work together.

When there is Holocaust remembrance, I believe people who have suffered as the descendants, the scions, if you will, of those who were enslaved, I think we ought to do all that we can to be a party to Holocaust remembrance. Moreover, likewise, I believe that my Jewish brothers and sisters ought to be a party to slavery remembrance.

We have suffered. The suffering ought not be something that is simply another day as far as the day of recognition and then we go off. I believe that there is a certain amount of unity that suffering requires of people who have suffered. That is because suffering can teach you what you can learn no other way. It really teaches you why it is so important to respect the lives of those who suffered.

You suffer as a descendant. I don't mean suffer in the same sense as your ancestors or our ancestors, but we still suffer, and we are going to suffer, but we ought to commemorate the lives lost. That helps greatly.

I am inviting my friends of all hues to be a party to the Slavery Remembrance Day event. We will say more about it later as far as time and location, inviting everyone, with a special invitation to my friends who are descendants of the persons who suffered the Holocaust.

I extend a special invitation to those persons who are descendants of those who suffered the Trail of Tears and a special invitation to those who were interned. There are American citizens whose Asian ancestors were interned because they were suspected, but never proven, to be antithetical to the best interests of the country.

I extend a special invitation to the Latinos who have suffered in that there is land that was removed from Mexico that became a part of the United States. Many people lost their lives in battles associated with that conflict.

I extend a special invitation to anyone and everyone who, which probably would mean every person alive, has some degree of ancestors who have suffered in a similar sense. They are all separate and they are all different, but I respect all of the suffering. I invite persons to come to the Slavery Remembrance Day.

Let us now start the process of not only remembrance but also making it special by awarding this Congressional Gold Medal and this Presidential Medal of Freedom.

□ 1200

I am a scion of the enslaved persons—a scion, by the way, is a descendant—a scion of the enslaved persons whose lives were sacrificed to make America great. As a scion, I respect all who have suffered the indignity and injus-

tice of having their ancestors suffer. I invite scions of all hues, of all stripes, to come together on Slavery Remembrance Day, August 20.

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

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT CONCERNS AND SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, Congressman AL GREEN and I are almost oceans apart, as a traditional Democrat and a conservative Republican. Yet, since the day I have been here, he has always been remarkably kind to me. He is one of my little girl's favorite people because he is sweet to her.

I think it is a demonstration that we may see lots of the world differently—and he knows I am passionately trying to convince him that the morality of making people healthier is the most powerful thing we can do on income inequality and some of the afflictions that exist in our society today. One day, I am going to close that deal. I thank the gentleman for being so kind to my family and me.

Madam Speaker, this one is going to be a little thick. I apologize right now to the person who has to try to take these words down.

Last Friday, we issued the Joint Economic Report. The Joint Economic Committee has a really neat history. In 1956, I think, it was chartered. Right now, I am finishing up the autobiography of Milton Friedman, and he talks about the number of times he came in front of the committee and presented ideas.

It is a unique committee. It is Senate and House, and we rotate the chairmanship back and forth between the Senate and House. So, this year, Mr. HEINRICH in the Senate has the chairmanship. I have the vice chairmanship. If we are blessed to remain in the majority and the Speaker so chooses to let me keep the chairmanship, it comes back to me.

As Republicans, we tried to do something last year and this year, which was, instead of just taking shots at the President's economic reports, the President's budget, we not only pointed out where they were wrong mathematically, but we also pointed out solutions.

The hardest part here is trying to get the heads around this place, the thinking around this place, the intellectual calcification that is this place, and get them to understand the baseline math and how incredibly difficult it is.

I am going to say this three or four times as we are going through this. I know we are in the time of election year math, so like last night's debate, there were a couple of moments when I

had to shut the television off because I am bouncing off the ceiling, saying that is my President, like what he said about Social Security, that if we tax rich people by like 1 percent or so, we are fine.

I have done presentation after presentation after presentation here with five Ph.D. economists showing, hey, raise the cap for everyone over \$400,000, you cover about 38 percent of the shortfall.

Mr. President, learn your math because when you say that in front of a national audience, you steal away the seriousness of how we have a discussion, a debate, a mechanism to fix the real problem because now you have millions and millions of people saying that the President said it, so it must be true. You make our job so hard, trying to make a calculator do its job, because, at some point, the math is going to win. Your feelings are not.

Let's start to do some basic education on what is in the Joint Economic Report. I am going to walk through the scale that has moved against us, some of the things in the report that we find very concerning, and then we are going to walk through some of our solutions.

The point we have made over and over is the left's tax policy that they are going to tax people over \$400,000, maximize their income tax, their estate tax, their capital gains tax, all these things. You can only get about 1.5 percent of the GDP of the economy.

For us on the conservative side, we want to cut, but if you limit your cuts to only nondefense discretionary, you can only get about 1 percent of GDP. Add those two together, every tax, every cut, and you have 2½ percent of GDP. This year, we are borrowing—what?—8, almost 9 percent of GDP. Does anyone see a math problem? It turns out what is great rhetoric, great campaign slogans, is crap math.

Let's do some real math. First off, for all of my brothers and sisters who—and if you are upset watching at home and see that the Chamber is empty, that is because we are on 1,000 televisions on the campus, and part of this presentation is not only to Members of Congress but to their staff because often the staff are the ones who are young. We are talking about their future, and maybe they will help their Members understand actual math.

We are now at 74 percent of all U.S. spending. Seventy-four percent is now on autopilot. Meaning, 74 percent is mandatory spending, so the next time you have someone from the political class say that if we just get rid of foreign aid, we will be fine, you can point out to them that it just covered maybe a week, a week and a half of borrowing.

If you are burning through \$8 billion to \$9 billion a day, you have to understand—stop lying to the voters. Stop making crap up because, at some point, the bond market will be the ones in charge of this country. When you are borrowing \$80,000 to \$100,000 a second

every day, when you have to bring almost \$120 trillion to market this year, both in virgin and refinance, when the bond market gets cranky, it gets really expensive for us.

Here is a point on this chart. Seventy-four percent is in mandatory spending. Madam Speaker, you and I don't get to vote on any of that. We have done it as a formula. Every dime a Member of Congress now votes on is borrowed and a sliver of Medicare. A sliver of even the mandatory now has to be borrowed money.

When we go home and talk to our constituents about balancing the budget, if I get rid of every dime of defense, we still have to borrow. If we get rid of every dime of nondefense discretionary, that is the State Department, the Park Service, the FBI, all of those, you just get rid of all of government and no military, those add up to \$900 billion and \$800 billion, so \$1.8 trillion, to just make the math simple. We are going to borrow \$2.3, maybe \$2.5 trillion this year. Now, find me the half a trillion dollars in Medicare or other mandatory spending you want gone.

The next time you have someone say just balance the budget, that is not how the math works. Every dime a Member of Congress votes on today is borrowed, and a big sliver of mandatory spending now is on borrowed money. It is math. The math will win, but this place is unwilling to bathe in the facts.

We updated this chart. I don't know about the colors. This number got slightly better. I think there is a mistake in it because it is basically calculated that there are no recessions, no wars, no pandemics, nothing else in here.

From today through the next 30 years, the CBO update from last week basically says, over 30 years, you are going to borrow about \$115 trillion, \$116 trillion. One hundred percent of the borrowing over that 30 years is demographics.

How many times do you hear anyone around here say that? It is healthcare, almost all Medicare, and a decade from now, when the Social Security trust fund is gone, do we just borrow, use general fund receipts to make up that shortfall, or will this place have the guts and a President who stops making crap up and gives us the opportunity to have Republicans, Democrats, the White House, maybe some actual econometricians, and people who have calculators come up with a solution to fix it.

Social Security and Medicare run a \$124 trillion deficit over the next 30 years, but the rest of the Federal Government has about a \$9 trillion surplus because their growth rate is expected to run slower than the growth of tax receipts.

How do I get people to understand here that if you want to save the Republic, legalize the technology and bathe in the ways to crash the price of healthcare? We have done how many

presentations here to say, here are cures, the cures are moral, and here is technology that would free you, give you more time, make you healthier, so can we legalize it?

As I have said over and over, this place has become a protection racket. It is a protection of incumbency, not incumbent Members of Congress but incumbent bureaucracies and often people's business models.

This board is really important. You can go to CBO and look it up yourself, or I think even Brian Riedl of the Manhattan Institute has tried to put out an updated deck of slides to make it easier to read.

Let's walk through a couple other things here. We worked through part of this in our Joint Economic Report, but this was basically straight out of CBO. CBO projects that net interest and mandatory program spending will exceed revenues—it really should say receipts because revenue is something you earn; receipts are something you confiscate—will exceed revenues by \$1.689 trillion over the next 10 years.

It is simply saying that if you put in the mandatory programs and the interest we owe, it consumes every dollar of tax receipts. If you come and say, David, tomorrow I need you to balance the budget, I can do it, but you have to be prepared to have no more military, to have no more government. We are just going to do the entitlements, the earned entitlements, earned benefits, and then pay the interest back to our bondholders. That is reality. It is called math.

What else was in both the Joint Economic Report and then also backed up by the Congressional Budget Office this last week? In 9 budget years, net borrowing—we are going to talk about the difference between net borrowing and gross borrowing—is \$50.6 trillion. When we say net, this is the stuff we have to sell to the public, to the nice family in China that takes their savings and is willing to buy a U.S. savings bond, your retirement that goes out and buys a U.S. savings bond.

We are about to continue to consume—right now, China and the United States are basically consuming much of the world's savings, investment capital. We are just chewing it up. In 9 budget years, we are over \$50 trillion in publicly borrowed money, but where I think that number is a bit of a fraud is because we also take things like the money in Social Security, U.S. Railroad Retirement, and all these others and borrow that.

Now, we do pay interest back, which is something that is a bit of a controversy for us on the economic side because we will show it as a benefit. "Look, we have this money," but we often don't show the interest we are paying back, but we owe interest.

□ 1215

If you add in the internal borrowing, the gross borrowing in 9 budget years is \$56 trillion. Why isn't there a sense

of panic around here? Didn't anyone bother to grab the Joint Economic Report or the CBO report? We went out of our way to write our chapters so they are readable.

Yeah, it is a funky-looking book. It looks like the type of thing where there will be 12 people that will read it, and it will sit on a shelf with dust on it. If you actually give a damn, learn the math because we talk in there about ways to help stabilize U.S. debt.

If I come to you right now and say: In 9 budget years, you are crossing \$50 trillion in borrowing, why wasn't everyone who came behind these microphones this week talking about this? Am I just an idiot for coming behind this mike week after week, year after year?

I get people saying: Well, I am going to save a million dollars on this amendment, and you start to say: Great. I am proud of you. Thank you for doing it. Do you realize we borrowed more during the debate than the amendment saves because we are not willing to talk about the actual drivers of debt?

It is healthcare costs. It is our demographics. Now it is in the interest we have to pay because the United States is now No. 14 on the credit stack. That means Greece can sell a 10-year bond cheaper than the United States today.

I need you to process that. One of the reasons the United States bond rates are so high is, if you read the S&P, read the Moody's, since I am told a bunch of people here are literate, in there, it says: We don't trust the United States Congress' governance. We pay a risk premium because we don't look serious about our debt.

Think of that. There are 13 other countries that get to sell a 10-year bond cheaper than the United States, and we are the reserve currency. There will be some troll on some fake internet site saying: Well, if we just didn't give money to this, we would be fine. Grow up. Just grow up. Deal with the reality.

I am sorry. I have had a stunning amount of caffeine, and I am unwilling to cut back. If someone can start a 12-step program for coffee, I am going to be your first member, but I want to hold the meetings in a Starbucks. Actually, I have been backed off of Starbucks. Let's do Black Rock Coffee or something else.

Interest and mandatory program spending will exceed revenues for fiscal year 2024. Guess what fiscal year we are in right now. This isn't some projection for the future. This is today. All discretionary spending is borrowed. I just tried to create another chart to make the point. Everything you think of as government today is borrowed.

Also, in this, we actually think there are a couple of problems on those total receipts. It is a little quirky. We give ourselves credit for interest received but when we don't actually charge ourselves for the credit paid, that sort of stuff.

Basically, the point is: Everything you think of as government is borrowed. When I would talk about that a few years ago, I would have Members here saying: David, you have to stop making up stuff. You are scaring my voters. Ta-dah, it happened. It is real.

This chart is a little tougher, but I am trying to point out what the majority of income tax pays for. If you actually take every dime of income tax and you add it up, this year, 36.9 percent of all income tax will go just toward Medicare.

Then you add in another 36.5 percent. That is net interest. If you want to be honest, you will do the gross interest, which is closer to 40 percent. Start to think about that. In this year, almost all of the income tax is consumed by interest and Medicare.

When we go out in time, it starts being beyond that. In 9 budget years, you will start having 43.1 percent of all income tax that will go toward Medicare. Another 42.3 percent will just go toward interest. If you, once again, plug in all net interest, it is closer to 45.

That means, in 9 years—remember, we are an income tax-based tax system here and the majority of U.S. receipts come from income tax—we can't cover our interest and Medicare. We actually cross this threshold, I think, in, like, 5 years, meaning every dime of tax you pay will basically just be covering Medicare and covering interest.

Getting older, turning 65, and your earned benefits, is that Democrat? Is it Republican? It is just demographics. I am going to spend some time here talking about what has happened in the world since 1990. We spent a lot of time in the Joint Economic Report talking about this. We slowed down having children in 1990.

I am going to actually walk through a couple of things here in some of the updated reports. There is a very good chance the data is now looking like, last year, the entire world actually decreased in population. If any of you have your economics degree or actually read, you have to start to understand what happens to a world's growth, economic vitality, GDP growth, productivity, when the entire world may be starting to shrink populationwise.

Let's walk through a few more of these. Deficit reduction from granting permanent residency to legal immigrants with advanced STEM degrees. We are going to start to walk through some of the things. We say: We have to understand what is going on around us. If I come to you and say: The population in the United States has just flattened out—and forgive the little Post-its here, but even our own charts were wrong—last year, the best data says the United States fell to 1.62 children fertility rate, basically meaning the United States population has flattened out.

I am going to show you one right here. Let's see if I can make this make sense. We are calculating that, in 15

years, United States will have more deaths than births. The United States, in 15 years, will have more deaths than births. We are a dying society. We need to grow up and accept it and realize the morality. We can fix it.

There is no society in the entire world that has been able to change its fertility rates. It is beyond me. Is it cultural? Is it economic? Is it technology? All I can tell you is country after country after country, they call it natalist policies. It hasn't worked, so maybe we should start to prepare for the morality of is it moral to live in a country where you are having your fifth year in a row where prime-age males are dying younger?

We are going to talk about why. Be prepared. We are now looking at numbers that we were not supposed to see for a decade, and they are already here. Go to Mass. Go to your mall. Go to this. And realize when you look around that we are all gray hairs.

I accept. My wife and I, we are both 62, and I have a 2-year-old, who turned 2 this week, and an 8-year-old. We adopted. It took us 10 years to do that. Yes, I have the old dad problem, but maybe once you have the hug of that child, you start to say: Maybe I have a moral obligation because the math says my children, when they enter the workforce, will be poorer.

It will be the first generation in U.S. history which will be poorer than their parents. Is that moral because that is what we have done? Remember the charts I was showing you before of how much we are going to borrow to maintain the benefits? Remember, in 9 budget years, between 9 and 10 years, 23 percent of this society will be 65 and older.

It is coming. It is not a black swan. It is not going to sneak up and bite us. It is a white swan. We see it. We are just going to live in avoidance because we have people like last night, my own President, say things that were mathematically absurd instead of using the moral opportunity to basically say: We need to take this seriously.

Those children and this senior have the right to live in a society where they can prosper. There are things we can do policywise, but we are terrified to actually think because it requires thinking.

You don't need to see that one. It is basically a chart showing the collapse of populations.

Let's actually walk through solutions. We spent months with economists—many of these staff are much smarter than I am—saying: We already have things like the MedPAC report that was put out 1 month or 2 months ago that actually tells us that, by 2030, so just 5-some years from now, 22 percent of all income tax revenues are expected to be transferred to just Medicare.

It is here. I mean, if any of you act surprised a few years from now, it is your own fault. It has been being handed to us week after week by the economists who were warning us. If I came

to you tomorrow and said: All right, SCHWEIKERT. We are going to do things. We are actually going to find ways to actually deal with our population flattening out and the incredibly high interest because, in fact, we are just moving back to normal, interest coverage and costs.

By the way, we have a population that is getting older very, very fast, and they have their earned benefits. We made a deal. You earned your benefits. You worked your 40 quarters. You get your Social Security. You worked a certain amount. You get your Medicare. It is our societal contract.

How do we pay for it? If someone says: We are just going to grow our way out. Back to the math we already did. All the taxes at about 1.5 percent of GDP and all of our cuts, which we should do, about 1 percent of GDP, the baseline is borrowing about 6 to 7 percent of GDP. This year, we are just a couple of points above that baseline. You have a massive math gap there. Our rhetoric doesn't actually match reality.

Let's actually walk through one. One of the things we have talked about is, if this data is true, that the entire world last year may have had zero population growth, which is crazy to think about. Think about all the things. Growing up in the 1970s and 1980s, you had that book, "The Population Bomb." The only thing that the author actually got right was the spelling of his own name.

It was wrong. The Malthusians have been with us for centuries, and they continue to be wrong. We are Americans. God gave us incredible talents and gifts to solve problems. Why don't we think about that?

I want to make an economic argument. In the 1970s and 1980s, the world fought for hydrocarbons. In the last decade, we fought for rare earths. In the future, we are going to fight for smart people. Why don't we start to fix our policies?

President Trump, to his credit, actually said last week: You know, if you had come to the United States and gotten a university degree and you can contribute to society, maybe we should keep you. That is from President Trump.

We have actually found the economic baselines that are saying you can grow by hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars the size of the economy. Just keep the people who have talent.

My argument is that talent can be a skilled carpenter or a synthetic biologist. If you are going to grow with society at the same time the number of children—remember, we are closing schools all over this country, except we don't like to talk about it because we don't have enough children. Maybe actually keeping those who pay taxes, grow the economy, make your life better, and maybe make you healthier, we should fix our immigration system.

You lock down the border. You don't import poverty. All right. This is a non

sequitur, but let's do it. The immorality of the open border and the cruelty, you are the family whose mom and dad didn't graduate high school. You basically sell your talents. You tell your willingness to work. You hang drywall.

What happens when, tomorrow, I add 4, 5, 6, 7 million people with similar skill sets? What happened to your income? The data is showing that what the President did on the border has made poor people poorer. We are working on a paper right now to also show that, when you add several million people with a limited housing stock, particularly the least expensive types of housing, much of the reason that inflation and that pricing went up: border policy. If you want to understand why you can't afford an apartment and you are working your heart out, it is border policy. It is economics. It is just math.

□ 1230

Oh, DAVID, you are not allowed to talk about that. Screw that. Tell the truth.

Let's walk through a few other things here.

If I came to you and said, interest in healthcare costs are the primary drivers of U.S. sovereign debt. Why don't we find the most moral approach to help our brothers and sisters who are sick?

There is an entire chapter in here that walks through the math, and it has a point in here that drives people insane, but the math is good: Obesity may add \$9.1 trillion of additional costs to the United States.

It turns out that the most powerful thing you can do to stabilize U.S. borrowing and the morality of letting people live longer is take on obesity.

Is this place ready to have a conversation about changing the farm bill and nutrition support? Is it moral or nutritional support to hand somebody an EBT card to go buy onion rings? What are we going to do on the healthcare front?

The technology is out there. We have learned that obesity is not just about willpower. Our brains are all wired differently. That is absolutely certified now. We need to help our brothers and sisters.

The sidecar to that is, we have known for decades that 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who have multiple chronic conditions are over half of our healthcare spending. The dataset for this 5 percent majority is obese. Help them. Don't mock them. Don't shame them. Help them.

Once again, when you are having your fifth year of prime-age males dying younger, we think it is drugs. No. We have looked at the data. Turns out, drugs are way up there. Just above drugs is obesity, actually.

I would argue this place is absolutely immoral because of its unwillingness to tell the truth.

If I come to you and say, the Joint Economic report spent years putting

together the data and refining the data to demonstrate that the excess healthcare costs of obesity to this country over the next 10 years is \$9.1 trillion. Why isn't this an alarm bell?

We have gotten some very nice editorials: It is neat that Mr. SCHWEIKERT is willing to tell the truth about where the real driver of debt and deficits are and things we could actually fix. Yet the brain trust around here just says, let's raise taxes, let's just cut things. It doesn't get you even close.

We need to change policy. Changing policy would require thinking and we would have rooms full of lobbyists that don't want us to change their business model. We need to have bureaucracies that will think differently.

I am going to show you in a couple other slides that you can replace much of the bureaucracies with AI, which is another thing we need to do.

I did a whole presentation a year ago which said in the United States, 33 percent of all healthcare spending is diabetes, mostly type 2. I showed you that Medicare is now the primary driver of U.S. debt, along with interest. Thirty-one percent of Medicare is now diabetes.

If we could actually help our brothers and sisters, why don't we do it?

Because we have an industry around us that needs sick people. It is about the money; it is not about solving their misery.

Instead of me being a complete jerk over here, if you look at the differences in how we approach policy, my brothers and sisters on the left want to build more clinics so we can help people manage their misery. On our side we keep saying we are seeing research that there is a cure.

Move the money and cure people. Ending someone's misery is much better than helping them maintain it. They are radically different views in the morality of cures.

When I come to you and say: If you took this number on, it would be one of the single biggest things you could do to save Medicare and its future and end a hell of a lot of misery for our brothers and sisters who are older.

Let's actually walk through actual solutions. If I came to you right now and asked: What is the single biggest thing you could do to disrupt spending? I am going to give you 6 months to do it. I need you to do a revolution today. I need you to actually think like a utopian economist, and you could execute it.

Sixteen percent of all U.S. healthcare is calculated to be people not taking their statins, their calcium inhibitor.

Can you believe I have hypertension, Madam Speaker? Can you believe I am wound a little tight? As long as I take my calcium inhibitor, apparently, I won't stroke out. The pill is just a few pennies.

It turns out we could help our brothers and sisters with a little \$0.99 pill-bottle cap that beeps at you in the morning, saying, hey, you really

should take your drugs, so you stay healthy.

We calculate this to be almost \$600 billion this year. Sixteen percent of healthcare is about \$600 billion.

How about just the technology of having this stupid thing beep at you in the morning, saying, hey, did you check your insulin? Did you take your calcium inhibitor? Did you take your statin? We have the pill-bottle cap that beeps at you in the morning. This stuff all exists. It is incredibly cheap. We could do it.

Yet we have lobbyists here who oppose trying to get people healthy. It is just absurd.

Let's actually walk through a couple of other technology solutions.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to my time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAGEMAN). The gentleman from Arizona has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, what would happen if I came to you tomorrow and said: Hey, you know that thing you can wear on your wrist, the FDA about 3 weeks ago said it was for your heart, it is a medical device.

Apple got its watch certified as a medical device because the next generation is so at good managing hearts.

What if there is a Dexcom or something else you can put on your arm that is over the counter that helps you manage your blood glucose? What if there is something you can blow into that tells you you have a virus? We are going to order your antivirals.

Those technologies actually exist, and this place lays layer after layer after layer of bureaucratic crap down to make it unable to write you a script.

My understanding is that the AMA is going to oppose me in my election because I am trying to cut the price of healthcare and make your life healthier and better.

Unlike the Democrats who play these stupid games of we are going to help people get their insulin less expensive, let's give Big Pharma \$16 billion and we will buy down the price.

How about doing things to actually make it so the co-ops, like Civica RX down the street that makes insulin cheaper, why would we have promoted crashing the price instead of subsidizing Big Pharma?

It is actually insane. The left basically wants industrial policy to control you.

We want markets to crash the price and make people healthier. Let's legalize the technology. It is moral.

People have the right to take care of themselves. They have the right to be healthy. They have the right to use this technology, and this place substantially keeps it illegal.

Let's do some other things. What would happen if I could adopt artificial intelligence to make your life of having to deal with government better, faster, cheaper, and a lot more accurate?

We are working on an experiment with the IRS, and it is still crap. There

was a report that came out just a couple days ago saying only about 80 percent of the calls are getting answered, which is dramatically better than 4 or 5 years ago when it was 5 percent of the calls.

We have a level of AI chat—because you build a stack and it is just an expert on this; it is not terminator; it is not a generative AI—that says, I just need help on this form. How do I fill it out? If you use technology, the voice will stay on the phone with you. It will help you fill out your form. It will even email or text you the form you need. Maybe even send you the video so you know how to do it.

You could crash the cost of government by adopting technology. The IRS has already hired 6,000 more people to answer the phone. What is the pension cost on that? I am not being mean, but at some point I have got to figure out how to finance these things when technology would have been faster, better, more accurate, and you could have called in the middle of the night.

I have gotten some of this. To my brothers and sisters here, they have actually helped me. For the VA, for the IRS, for the Pentagon, we have actually been able to get a number of our AI amendments to do things like this.

We actually got attached to the NDAA something called the AUDIT Act. Turns out, I think we are in our eighth year where the audit of the Pentagon has been incapable of knowing the assets. The audit of the Pentagon is a failure. They can't audit it. It is unauditible.

Turns out, we were able to get the amendments attached saying just use technology. Let the technology crawl through the data: Every invoice, every receipt, every this, every that, and find where all the assets are. We think there is \$4 trillion of assets we can't identify in the Pentagon. It is absurd, and a technology package solves that.

I have offered this for years. All I've heard is: David, we can't do that. Turns out, this year—maybe I am making some progress because this got attached. We are finally going in the right direction.

Let's actually walk through a couple of other things.

AI's integration could add trillions of dollars to the global economy. There is a point out there that in the high end if we allowed technology to make governments more efficient, society more efficient, you could add a few trillion dollars in global expansion.

Remember before how I was talking about what happens if the world is flat population growthwise? Where do you get the productivity?

Remember your high school economics class? What are the two ways you are paid more? Inflation; well, that is crap because you basically tread water. The other is productivity. Your salary goes up because of productivity.

Help the productivity enter our country and the world and let's have a more prosperous country.

How many of you hear complaints over and over from patients, from doctors, from hospitals, from clinics, from insurance companies, everyone is mad at each other. They don't pay my claim. They don't do the claim right.

We have a piece of legislation called Clean Claims. Just use technology to do it. We estimate for many medical clinics and doctors, we can cut their costs in half. What would happen to your price of getting healthcare if the doctor, the clinic, the surgery center you go to its overall cost is half? You want to change the price of healthcare. Do you do it by just changing the financing? That is all ObamaCare was.

Remember, ObamaCare was a financing bill. It moved from who pays here to who gets subsidized. It just moved it to these folks get subsidized, so these people get to pay. In reality we just borrow the money now. Those are financing bills; they don't change what we pay. The technology changes what we pay.

We have had multiple amendments we put together to actually study how we can do things better, faster, cheaper, and healthier. Instead of just putting a roomful of people together, it turns out AI can do the study in days and tell us how we can help our veterans have better, healthier outcomes and crash the price.

We were able to get this attached. We are starting to make some progress. We did the same thing in other parts. We were able to move a million dollars around to actually administer veterans' benefits better, faster, cheaper, and you don't need an army of people to do it.

Madam Speaker, in a moment, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas because he needed a couple minutes to share some things.

I will make the point that the Joint Economic Committee Republicans didn't just do the typical sniping at the Democrats or the President. We worked through the math and the scale of the actual problems ahead of us, and then we actually laid out ways we could make it a better, healthier, more productive, more prosperous society.

Is this body actually capable of reading a couple chapters, working with us, and saying, okay, maybe we could adopt some policies that crash borrowing, grow the economy, and make everyone's lives better? There is a path.

□ 1245

The other dystopian part, though, is I think we only have 3 to 5 years, and then at that part, the bond market runs your country because everything we do will be to keep the bond market from ever getting nervous.

As we calculate this year a single basis point—one point of interest is 100 basis points. A single basis point is \$800 million, meaning sometimes when the clowns show up—excuse me. The Members of Congress here do dumb things. We can actually see the market stressing out.

Sometimes just because someone here says something outrageous, the next day, it costs you a few billion dollars in additional interest. Remember, we are still borrowing \$80,000 to \$100,000 a second every day.

To those of us who are baby boomers, do I have a moral obligation to keep your retirement solid but also not destroy the future of the younger generation?

We can do it. You are just going to have to sort of realize the solution is complex. There is a way to get there.

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

DISAPPOINTING DEBATE

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

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, like millions of Americans last night, I watched the Presidential debate, and much of what I heard from President Biden was disappointing.

One statement in particular made me angry, and I know it angered our veterans, it angered the American people, and especially it angered the Gold Star families.

President Biden said last night: "Truth is, I am the only President this century that doesn't have any—this decade—that didn't have any troops dying anywhere in the world like he did."

That is a lie, Mr. President. I remind President Biden of the 13 servicemembers that died on his watch during a terrorist attack at Abbey Gate on August 26, 2021, during his deadly and chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Their names are: Marine Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza; Marine Sergeant Nicole Gee; Marine Staff Sergeant D. Taylor Hoover; Army Staff Sergeant Ryan Knauss; Marine Corporal Hunter Lopez; Marine Lance Corporal Rylee McCollum; Marine Lance Corporal Dylan R. Merola; Marine Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui; Marine Sergeant Johanny Rosario Pichardo; Marine Corporal Humberto Sanchez; Marine Lance Corporal Jared Schmitz; Navy Hospital Corpsman Maxton "Max" Soviak; and Marine Corps Corporal Daegan William-Tyler Page.

There they are, the fallen who were killed, blown up by a suicide bomber who, by the way, escaped from Bagram Air Base as thousands of other ISIS-K terrorists did that day. God knows where they are now, threatening the security of the United States.

It was a deadliest day for the United States in Afghanistan in over a decade, Mr. President, and it will remain a stain on America and American foreign policy for generations.

It happened under Joe Biden's watch. Shame on him. Shame on him for his heartless comments that disregard the ultimate sacrifice of so many Ameri-

cans under his tenure as Commander in Chief.

To the fallen heroes, I say: Well done, good and faithful servants, and may God hold you in the palm of his hand.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

CRISES FACING AMERICA TODAY

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, we had a debate last night, and, obviously, a lot of Americans are discussing public policy. I want to address what I consider the three greatest crises facing America today, only one of which was brought up by the press last night.

The one brought up by the press last night, which cannot be overstated, is the crisis at the border. I was disappointed that last night, people did not talk about the size of the crisis.

We are in a situation right now in which we have about a quarter of a million people crossing our border every month. Under President Trump, that number, depending on the month, was between 5,000 and 10,000 people.

We have gone from 10,000 to over 200,000 people coming here last month, and I think the press should be doing a better job of describing the size of that crisis.

I think they also have to do a better job of questioning the amount of legal immigrants that are coming here.

Some people are under the impression or seem to be under the impression that people coming to this country, and as a result, changing this country is only on the southern border.

Actually, we have almost a million people a year, depending on the year, 850 to 950,000 people coming here legally.

It is not impossible for people to come here, and I think there ought to be more focus on the 900,000 or 950,000 people who are sworn in every year as Americans.

I also think there ought to be more focus, depending on the month, on the 7,000 to 9,000 unaccompanied minors coming in this country.

For those of us who watched the debate last night, President Biden tried to weigh in on supposedly people kept apart from their parents. That was for a short period of time because their parents committed crimes.

Here we have between 7,000 and 9,000 people coming in every month who are unaccompanied by either parent. As a result, I think it is possible that they will never see their parents again, but the press does not emphasize or talk about what should absolutely be dis-

cussed in this country, that being, should we continue to allow children in this country without either of their parents present.

If we are going to do it, what is going to become of those children because we do know that, depending upon your source, tens of thousands of these children are not only in this country without their parents, but we don't even know where they are.

I think we have to talk a lot more about what is going on at our southern border and talk a lot more in specifics as to do we continue to allow unaccompanied minors in this country, and exactly how many people coming into this country described as illegally should be allowed.

We should talk about the fact that we have a new program under President Biden in which 30,000 people a month, or 360,000 people a year, are being let in through the parole program if you are Haitian, if you are Cuban, or if you are from some Central American countries. Another significant way America is changing is not being addressed.

The next issue that I would like to talk about, we had a hearing yesterday touching upon the idea of racial preferences or racial breaks in employment, be it government employment or be it employment in businesses that do business with contractors.

It seems strange that in America we have programs based on the theory that we have a huge amount of racism in America.

We live at a time in which the wealthiest Americans or the wealthiest group is people from India; the second wealthiest group, in the sources that I find, Philippines; third wealthiest group, Chinese. People from Cuba are doing very well. People from other countries in the Caribbean are doing well. There is this drumbeat that America has a horrible racist past or a horrible racist present, which I just think is not true all.

We have to ask about the motivation of people who keep these programs coming in which we identify people by where their great-great-grandparents come from.

There recently was a book that came out called "America's Cultural Revolution" by a guy by the name of Christopher Rufo, which kind of confirmed my worst suspicions.

The reason why we are taking almost all of these immigrant groups and trying to give them preferences is that the goal is to divide America.

There is a small but determined number of progressives in America who would like to permanently change America, have a different form of government.

These people have been around in America in the thirties and the forties and the fifties. They have certainly been around in the sixties.

During most of this time, they felt the way to overthrow America or permanently change America was through