present, and solemnly binds herself to be false to the future.

Standing with God and the crushed and bleeding slave on this occasion, I will, in the name of humanity which is outraged, in the name of liberty which is fettered, in the name of the Constitution and the Bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon, dare to call in question and to denounce, with all the emphasis I can command, everything that serves to perpetuate slavery—the great sin and shame of America! ''I will not equivocate; I will not excuse;'' I will use the severest language I can command; and yet not one word shall escape me that any man, whose judgment is not blinded by prejudice, or who is not at heart a slaveholder, shall not confess to be right and just.

I fancy I hear some one of my audience say, it is just in this circumstance that you and your brother abolitionists fail to make a favorable impression on the public mind. Would you argue more, and denounce less, would you persuade more, and rebuke less, your cause would be much more likely to succeed. But, I submit, where all is plain there is nothing to be argued. What point in the anti-slavery creed would you have me argue?

Must I undertake to prove that the slave is a man? The slaveholders themselves acknowledge it in the enactment of laws for their government. They acknowledge it when they punish disobedience on the part of the slave. There are 72 crimes in the State of Virginia, which, if committed by a black man, subject him to the punishment of death; while only two of the same crimes will subject a white man to the like punishment. What is this but the acknowledgement that the slave is a moral, intellectual and responsible being?

Southern statute books are covered with enactments forbidding, under severe fines and penalties, the teaching of the slave to read or to write. When you can point to any such laws, in reference to the beasts of the field, then I may consent to argue the manhood of the slave. When the dogs in your streets, when the fowls of the air, when the cattle on your hills, when the fish of the sea, and the reptiles that crawl, shall be unable to distinguish the slave from a brute, then will I argue with you that the slave is a man!

For the present, it is enough to affirm the equal manhood of the Negro race. Is it not astonishing that, while we are ploughing, planting and reaping, using all kinds of mechanical tools, erecting houses, constructing bridges, building ships, working in metals of brass, iron, copper, silver and gold; that, while we are reading, writing and cyphering, acting as clerks, merchants and secretaries, having among us lawyers, doctors, ministers, poets, authors, editors, orators and teachers; that, while we are engaged in all manner of enterprises common to other men, digging gold in California, capturing the whale in the Pacific, feeding sheep and cattle on the hillside, living, moving, acting, thinking, planning, living in families as husbands, wives and children, and, above all, confessing and worshipping the Christian's God, and looking hopefully for life and immortality beyond the grave, we are called upon to prove that we are men!

Would you have me argue that man is entitled to liberty? That he is the rightful owner of his own body? You have already declared it. Must I argue the wrongfulness of slavery? Is that a question for Republicans? Is it to be settled by the rules of logic and argumentation, as a matter beset with great difficulty, involving a doubtful application of the principle of justice, hard to be understood? How should I look today, in the presence of Americans, to show that men have a natural right to freedom? To do so, would be to make myself ridiculous, and to offer an insult to your understanding. There is not a man beneath the canopy of Heaven that does not know that slavery is wrong for him.

□ 1900

What, am I to argue that it is wrong to make men brutes, to rob them of their liberty, to work them without wages, to keep them ignorant of their relations to their fellow men, to beat them with sticks, to flay their flesh with the lash, to load their limbs with irons, to hunt them with dogs, to sell them at auction, to sunder their families, to knock out their teeth, to burn their flesh, to starve them into obedience and submission to their masters? Must I argue that a system thus marked with blood, and stained with pollution, is wrong? No, I will not. I have better employments for my time and strength than such arguments would imply.

What, then, remains to be argued? Is it that slavery is not divine; that God did not establish it; that our doctors of divinity are mistaken? There is blasphemy in the thought. That which is inhuman, cannot be divine! Who can reason on such a proposition? I cannot. The time for such argument is past.

At a time like this, scorching irony, not convincing argument, is needed. O! Had I the ability, and could I reach the Nation's ear, I would, today, pour out a fiery stream of biting ridicule, blasting reproach, withering sarcasm, and stern rebuke. For it is not light that is needed, but fire; it is not the gentle shower, but thunder. We need the storm, the whirlwind, and the earthquake. The feeling of the Nation must be quickened; the conscience of the Nation must be roused; the propriety of the Nation must be startled; the hypocrisy of the Nation must be exposed; and its crimes against God and man must be proclaimed and denounced.

What, to the American slave, is your Fourth of July? I answer: A day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade, and solemnity, are, to him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages.

There is not a nation on the Earth guilty of practices, more shocking and bloody, than are the people of these United States, at this very hour. Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despotisms of the old world, search out every abuse, and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the everyday practices of this Nation, and you will say with me, that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival.

You declare, before the world, and are understood by the world to declare, that you ''hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; and that, among these are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;'' and yet, you hold securely, in a bondage which, according to your own Thomas Jefferson, ''is worse than ages of that which your fathers rose in rebellion to oppose,'' a seventh part of the inhabitants of your country.

Fellow citizens! I will not enlarge further on your national inconsistencies. The existence of slavery in this country brands your republicanism as a sham, your humanity as a base pretense, and your Christianity as a lie. It destroys your moral power abroad; it corrupts your politicians at home. It saps the foundation of religion; it makes your name a hissing, and a byword to a mocking Earth. Be warned! A horrible reptile is coiled up in your Nation's bosom; the venomous creature is nursing at the tender breast of your youthful Republic; for the love of God, tear away, and fling from you the hideous monster, and let the weight of twenty millions, crush and destroy it forever!

Allow me to say, in conclusion, notwithstanding the dark picture I have this day presented of the state of the Nation, I do not despair of this country. There are forces in operation, which must inevitably work the downfall of slavery. I, therefore, leave off where I began, with hope. While drawing encouragement from the Declaration of Independence, the great principles it contains, and the genius of American Institutions, my spirit is cheered by the obvious tendencies of the age. Nations do not now stand in the same relation to each other that they did ages ago. No nation can now shut itself up from the surrounding world, and trot round in the same old path of its fathers without interference.

The time was when such could be done. But a change has now come over the affairs of mankind. Walled cities and empires have become unfashionable. The arm of commerce has borne away the gates of the strong city. Intelligence is penetrating the darkest corners of the globe. It makes its pathway over and under the sea, as well as on the Earth. Wind, steam, and lightning are its chartered agents. Oceans no longer divide, but link nations together. From Boston to London is now a holiday excursion. Space is comparatively annihilated. Thoughts expressed on one side of the Atlantic, are distinctly heard on the other. In the fervent aspirations of William Lloyd Garrison, I say, and let every heart join in saying it:

God speed the day when human blood shall cease to flow!
In every clime be understood, the claims of human brotherhood,
And each return for evil, good,
Not blow for blow;
That day will come all feuds to end,
And change into a faithful friend each foe.

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

MATH DOESN'T LIE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be another presentation of basically budget, debt, my frustration with this place, and my frustration with telling the truth.

Look, we are a remarkable country, no matter what you hear often from our brothers and sisters, particularly from the left, a quarter millennium of a remarkable experiment. We have brought more freedom to the world, more prosperity to the world, more ingenuity to the world, more health to the world.

I think sometimes our dourness, if that is a word, our frustration—and Heaven knows I am a sinner on this. I am terrified of our unwillingness to tell the truth about basic math. So we are going to walk behind these mikes over and over and over and desperately try to find whatever the dopamine hit is of the day, and yet, we will borrow another $6 billion, $7 billion today.

Last week, when I did this, I had my little boy, who had just turned 4 years old that day, running behind us. It was so much fun. Yet, the comments we received from the folks who are unique enough to watch something like this commented on the little boy, not necessarily the math.

I was trying to make the point at one moment saying: Here is my 4-year-old we have adopted. It is the greatest gift God has ever given someone, and he is healthy. We were terrified he would never be healthy. He was born with rather severe drugs. This government has made a decision we will need 104 percent of that little boy's lifetime earnings just to pay the Federal Government pensions, to cover Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, our retirement, 104 percent of the generation of young people today, we are so upside-down mathematically.

□ 1910

I also tried—and I am going to do it again because apparently I didn't do it very well. We passed a housing bill. I voted ''no'' because there were too many gimmicks and it made government too big. Fine, personal opinion. I actually have a background in housing economics.

However, not once did someone come behind these microphones and say that one of the primary problems in affordability of you being able to purchase a home, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that if we had a normal debt load, then you would be paying 5.5 percent on today's 30-year loan. Instead you are paying 6.5 percent.

Why?

It is because the United States is going to borrow probably $2.3 trillion this year. We are crowding you out, Mr. Speaker. We are raising the price of money.

I have given presentation after presentation saying that if we keep this up for much longer, then the bond market is going to run this country. We will exist in a fear of the weekly and monthly debt auctions.

We actually brought some data just trying to show the difference between 2011, and right now the interest rate movement. This is interest rates. We are paying 1 point higher because of the scale of U.S. sovereign debt borrowing that when you buy that 30-year mortgage, Mr. Speaker, on an average priced home—and I think we used an average priced home in Arizona, not here in D.C.—you are going to pay about $2,500 more, and over the life of that loan, $76,000 more.

That is just the cost of money because we, as a government, borrowed so much. We are responsible for that higher expense in the interest rates.

Except for the problem here is the hallways here are full of armies of people coming into our office demanding more money.

What happens when, Mr. Speaker, you and I go home?

We tell the truth.

Now, we make people angry because I am starting to worry: Voters, do you want us to lie to you?

Is that actually what you are asking for?

Do you want us to tell you things that set off a good dopamine hit, that make you feel this, but don't tell you the truth about the demographics, debt, and deficit?

That is because at that point, it is not a conversation of what else we can give you. It is going to be a conversation of how we are going to fix it.

The data is actually pretty darn clear. Our borrowing raises your car loan, Mr. Speaker, and raises the cost of you financing your small business. Heaven knows, it is going to cost on an average home in Tempe, Phoenix—not Scottsdale—about $76,000 more in interest. That is a knockoff effect.

Let us actually start. I am going to produce a whole bunch of boards here. My rule used to be that I am going to give you the problem, Mr. Speaker, and then I am going to give you a series of solutions. I am tired of coming here with solutions and then realizing there is not a chance in hell—I can't even get cosponsors because it would mean telling the truth.

When I have come here and shown the MedPAC reports, there is $1 trillion, $2 trillion of misalignment because some of it is legal on the edge. We introduced a bill. The preliminary score was $1.84 trillion of savings over 10 years just to fix some of the things in Medicare Advantage that wouldn't cut a single service, and I got told this morning in conference: DAVID, you don't understand. It has the word Medicare. We are not allowed to talk about that in an election year, but we will fix it next year.

I have been here 16 years, and it is always next year.

Let us take a look at this chart. I often start with this one because so few people understand.

Mr. Speaker, do you see the blue area?

That is all you, as a Member of Congress, get to vote on, unless it is a reconciliation budget, except we now use reconciliation budgets to pass things, not save money. Here is your math problem: As of today, just this little net interest sliver for this fiscal year will be 20 percent of all tax receipts. So when you pay $1, 20 cents of that is just covering interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show you some charts here that in 9 years how big that math actually gets. But understand, your government is functionally an insurance company with an army. I love that line. Think about it. It will make sense.

Nondefense and defense, that is all we vote on, and we are about to make this much bigger. People go to war with us when we are trying to cut down nondefense.

Mr. Speaker, a moment of truth. Let's have some fun here. DOGE identified $0.25 trillion in potential savings modeling. What has made it through the legislative process is about $7 billion, basically what we will borrow today.

I know folks aren't really good at math with lots of zeros. Our government borrows about $1 million every 13 seconds or so. In 13, 13.5 seconds, we borrow $1 million, and then $1 million. So often we will have debates here and say that this will save $3 million. I try to explain that it barely covered 30-some seconds of borrowing.

We are now borrowing about 90—if you do just this fiscal year so far, so just this fiscal year, about $73,000 a second.

If you do the last 12 months—understand there is a blip in there because we had the extraordinary measures where we didn't have a debt ceiling and we had to refund it. But if you do the last 12 months, we are borrowing about $98,000 per second.

I know everyone is going to talk about that, right?

All right, let's get to the math. Let's do some speed dating on math.

Do you see this chart, Mr. Speaker?

This is basically to make a point. We are in the OECD, basically the organization of developed economies.

Do you notice the red one down here, Mr. Speaker?

If you add up everything, Mr. Speaker, we are borrowing 7.9 percent of our entire economy. We are the worst in the entire industrialized world.

Mr. Speaker, if you actually start to take a look, you start seeing countries like Greece—and those are much healthier than we are. Do you realize today Greece can sell a 10-year bond substantially cheaper than the United States?

Of course, we are going to work on that and talk about it next year.

Let us actually walk through some of what is going on.

Remember, Mr. Speaker—I am going to try to make this point a couple of times through the presentation in some of the last slides—the primary driver of the debt is not a tax cut over here. It is our demographics. Next year the data looks like we are going to have fewer under 18 than we had 20 years ago and double the number 65 and up.

Are we allowed to actually say that?

It is not personal. It is not actually Democrat or Republican, it is just math.

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed to hold the chairmanship for the Joint Economic Committee, so I have a handful of guys who all have Ph.D.'s, and we geek out on this. We are trying to find ways, and they are terrified with me.

I have done presentation after presentation here of my chairmanship from

Ways and Means over the Oversight Subcommittee, where the fraud we found in so many programs—can I get a piece of legislation? Can we actually have an honest discussion of fixing it?

Well, we would have to take on the lobbyists. We would actually have to tell the truth. We would actually have to redesign the programs. We would actually have to have an honest conversation of some of the fraud we found in things like Medicaid and Medicare. Even then, understand, we have worked on this over and over.

It is still 7 to 12 percent of the spending we can figure out is missed payments, fraud. The majority of it isn't some international syndicate coming and stealing money from us. It is things we, as Members of Congress, have allowed to happen because when we find it, we don't go back and fix the law because that would be hard because we will have to take on advertising. They will say mean things about us.

''Raising spending, not falling revenues, have driven long-term deficits.''

Here is a point: Revenues. Go back to 2015 all the way through what we have modeled. You will notice it is consistent. It is basically that the long-term projection sits about 18.8 percent of the entire economy we are collecting. Back down here was slightly below, 17.8, 17.9. It is not tax cuts. It is demographics.

Here is the problem: Our spending, when we get 30 years from now, almost 28 percent of the entire economy, but I need to make a point. When you actually look at some of these charts, you are going to actually see—and I am bouncing around—if we do current policy—let me explain for those who are not budget geeks.

Here is the law. In our laws, we have: Oh, taxes are going to go back up in 4 years. Oh, that program is going to get cut in 4 years. We used to have this thing called paygo, pay as you go, except in the law, there was a scam. It says if it goes beyond 5 years, we have to find offsets to pay for it, but if you write the law that it ends in 5 years, even though they never end in 5 years because we always extend it, then you don't have to score it. You don't have to score it as more long-term debt. We lie in our budget documents.

Here is the current law. So last summer, 1 year ago, we had a whole fight about this. Do you use current law or current policy, even though this current law had all these things ending? So we couldn't win that so we used current policy, which actually gave it—extending of the current spending.

Now, when you start to take a look, you start realizing that revenue has basically stayed the same, but now you are borrowing about or spending about 32 percent of the entire economy. Then, you take another look at it: Budget deficits under current policy will exceed 14 percent of the entire GDP.

That is in 30 years. How many of you plan to be around in 30 years? If you plan to be around in 30 years, think about this: Treasury tomorrow wants to sell a 30-year bond. There is still a remarkably liquid market buying our bonds. When will the folks buying that 30-year bond start to realize: I have a problem.

Thirty years from now, if we stayed with the current both law and our policy baseline, you have about 14 percent of the country's GDP just in borrowing, not spending. It is not in building things. It is just paying interest.

Let's get back on track here. This is one of the things I have railed about over and over because I get frustrated with it. CBO keeps having to readjust its baseline. Why does it have to readjust its baseline? It readjusts because things happen: COVID happens; a war happens; 2008 happens; and Congress happens. Understand, if you and I take a look at what were our projections, we functionally have added just about—I think this all adds up to $1.39 trillion in additional spending in the baseline.

It is geeky, but what it means is, when CBO puts out a report, it is of what they have, but they are constantly having to update it because things happen in the economy; interest rates go up; and we spend money and don't pay for it.

Let's actually walk through another famous chart. Ever since the pandemic legislation—during the pandemic, we were spending about $63,000 per American citizen. Guess what. Today, that is way down. We are spending about $55,000 per American citizen, but over the next 9 years, it goes up to $66,000. If you add up all the spending, add up all the residents of the United States, citizens, $66,000 is our spend. Right now, it was $55,000. Anyone see a math problem? If you don't see the math problem—I am going to bite my tongue.

Budget deficits under current law will reach $3.1 trillion by 2036, so that is 9 budget years from now, because we are working on right now—hopefully, we are finishing and passing the 2027 stuff. This is under current law. I need you to understand how devastatingly ugly this number is, and when I show you under current policy, it is even worse.

This is 9 budget years from now. CBO last February said, hey, we are going to be borrowing $3.1 trillion that year, 2.1 of it will be just interest. So, the structural deficit will be only a trillion dollars, but on top of that, we owe $2.1 trillion in interest. Okay.

What does that actually mean to us if we just—this is under current law. That means, in 9 budget years, 31 percent of every tax dollar that is paid, meaning income tax, payroll tax, and tariffs, everything coming in, in 9 budget years, 31 percent of all those tax collections will be just interest. It will be just interest, and this is on current law, assuming no wars, no pandemics, no market crashes, and no additional spending from Congress.

If you come back over here, my math says 20 percent. The chart says 19 percent. Depending what revenues are, it could be 21. That is this year. Let's just use 20 percent. This year, when you write $100, $20 of that just went to pay interest. Anyone see a problem?

Let's see. ''Budget deficits under current policy will reach $4.4 trillion.'' See what I am doing here. This one said the deficit—and I am sorry; this is a little awkward—in 9 budget years is $3.1 trillion under current law, but if we keep doing what we have been doing, which is we just extend current policy.

I am sorry this is geeky, but it is math. This is going to destroy the Republic. We have made it a quarter millennium, I would like this to be another American century. I would like it to be the place my 10-year-old and my now 4-year-old prosper. Hell, I would like to have a nice, quiet retirement, but in 9 budget years, it is no longer $3.1 trillion of borrowing. It is $4.4 trillion if we follow current spending policy, current baseline spending, not current baseline law. Anyone see a problem?

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, are we even allowed to talk about this? Because I know the armies of folks, often both at home and in our hallways here, demanding more money, telling us they are going to say mean things about us on social media unless we hand them more checks or we do things to regulate their competition. This is what this place has become. I am terrified we have hit the point where, on Twitter and X, someone saying something mean about me is now a policy override over a calculator.

Here is one of the drivers of this, one of the things that is really uncomfortable to talk about: We have a shortage of young people in the country. It is a math problem. Look, we are only a couple ticks over zero population growth right now. There are a couple datasets out there—depending on what continues with immigration policy and a couple of other things—sometime in the next 5 years, we may actually, as a country, go slightly negative. You go, oh, good.

Remember, Medicare and Social Security are pay-as-you-go programs. I did the presentation a couple weeks ago on the Social Security actuary report. I am sure every Member of Congress pulled it out, read it, highlighted it, and noticed you had about 6 years and 3 months before the trust funds are empty.

If we followed the law—I think the Social Security actuary report is wrong on their math, but they said in 6 years, 3 months, you get a 22 percent cut. I think it is 24 percent. If you extend that out, that is doubling senior poverty in the following year. Yay, we are going to double the number of homelessness living on the street of baby boomers. Is that moral?

Are we allowed to talk about it? Allowed to fix it? Are we allowed to do the really hard things? Guess what, Mr. Speaker. At that same time, the Medicare trust fund is also empty.

From last year to 2032, Medicare doubles in spending. It goes from 1 trillion to 2 trillion. The Medicare Part A trust fund, if you are a hospital, you take a 12-percent cut. That is the law.

How many of you on Medicare are going to be able to see your doctor in that hospital?

Start to take a look at this. In 2025, people 0 to 18, we had 76 million people but 63 million over 65. In 9 years, we will have 70 million, so we will actually have fewer people under 18, and we will have 76 million, 65 and up. I am one of them. I am 64—yes, I am 64 with a 4-year-old. Yes, I am really optimistic about the future. I am just cranky about the math.

All right. Let's continue on this. Workers per Social Security beneficiary. We have got a problem. In 2011 we had 2.9. In 2025, last year, we had 2.7. It continues to do this. It is a little hard to do as a pay-as-you-go program.

That is why every month when Social Security checks go out the door, the Social Security administrator reaches over to their special Treasury bills and say, Treasury, we are short because the payroll taxes don't cover all the checks going out the door. Give us some of our money back. That goes on and on for about another 6 years and 3 months, and then they don't have any more to cash in.

Seniors per 100 working-age adults. 2011, we had 21.9 seniors per 100 people in the labor force. Last year, it is now 32. I am just trying to pound this point in. We prefer it to be: Oh, it is horrible Democrat policy. And they say: Oh, it is a tax policy. I have already shown you the percentage of the economy that we take in in taxes has stayed remarkably stable. The economy grows so you may have a lower tax rate but, because the economy is bigger, you are still taking in the same percentages of the GDP.

U.S. population age 65 and up. 2011, we had 41 million. 2026—this is a projection for this year—we have 63 million.

Estimated share of outlays by group. I know there are a lot of bars on this chart. The punch line here is actually very simple. In about 25, maybe 26 months, over half of the Federal Government spending will go to those 65 and up.

Now, why is this important? Now, remember, think of baby boomers as large demographic quartiles. When I was a kid in the 1970s, for every dollar for seniors, there was $7 spent for those functioning under 18. That is almost reverse now. It is not really about a change in policy. It is actually a change in demographic populations.

This is really important. National defense in 9 years will take 12 percent of our spending. Seniors over 65 will take 52 percent in 9 budget years. It is just math. We know it. Hell, we knew people were going to turn 65—we knew we had a baby boom 65 years ago—actually 70-some years ago.

Why are we so terrified to go in front of our voters and tell the truth about math? Why are we afraid to tell them that often the crap that they see on this thing is fake? It is meant for you to click, get a nice dopamine hit, but it is not budget policy.

I had a woman the other day at an event—beautiful event, wonderful people—I think it was up in Prescott, talking about this. She was absolutely positive, if we just cut this one benefit off, we could balance the budget.

We spent a couple moments. We walked on the internet using our phones, and she saw it was like $9 billion was the total value of the benefit over a year. It did cover about a day and a quarter of borrowing—not spending, borrowing. She was devastated. It was as if I said something horrible to her.

Is that why politicians are terrified? Is that why we are terrified to actually tell the truth to our brothers and sisters? Remember, you have a country that is borrowing about $6 billion to $7 billion every day.

I started to talk about DOGE before. My economists, we helped them. I am a believer we have to have a revolution in how we provide government services: the adoption of technology, the elimination of excess positions, those things. All that has passed so far is about $7 billion in actual spending cuts that have made it through Congress, Senate, and to the President's desk for his signature.

Functionally, it barely covers one day of borrowing. How many of our folks back home get a text message every other week saying: Are you ready for your DOGE check? Just send us a couple thousand dollars, and we will send you a DOGE check. Those text messages are fraud.

The point of this is: It is just demographics. I am one of them. I am at the tail end, but I am a baby boomer. It basically means, in 9 budget years, 21.4 percent of our population will be 65 and up. We will have moved into our earned benefit years: Medicare, Social Security, military or public service retirement, whatever it is. Then you take other calculations that I am not going to geek out too much on: labor force participation, the number of our population that is actually in the labor force, and then we have a math problem.

□ 1940

What is the moral obligation of those of us who are elected to actually know what—sorry, I can't curse on the floor—know what the hell we are talking about, know the math, stop trying to sell shiny objects and things that basically are enraging but don't take down the republic?

I will argue this debt, unless we find a way to start stabilizing it, we are not going to make it another 250 years.

Is this miracle of a self-governing republic worth saving? Then it is worth telling our voters and the public the truth about our demographics, the cost of financing it, and how much trouble we are actually in.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will go back and look at all of the angry comments I am going to get because, once again, telling the truth means you get the crap kicked out of you around here. I am perfectly happy to do it.

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

DEFENSE INNOVATION WITH UKRAINE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to spotlight the urgent need for deepened cooperation between the United States and Ukraine in defense innovation. This follows yesterday's important announcement of $18.4 million of investment through our Department of Defense in our Northwest Ohio region.

After over 10 years of Russia's brutal, unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, Ukraine has given the world a master class in the future of warfare. Ukraine has pioneered drone tactics and technology. It has developed cost-effective air defense systems, all under the most difficult of circumstances.

Imagine Russia, a nation of 11 time zones. Ukraine has but one. Russia has 3.5 times as many people as Ukraine, but Ukraine fights on nobly.

Ukraine's ecosystem of innovation is a model that the free world can't afford to ignore.

No matter where I travel as a member of our Defense Subcommittee and meet with U.S. troops who are close or in theater, do you know what they say to me? Congresswoman, please help us advance drone technology.

I have heard many things from troops, but that has been one of their most constant clarion calls to Members of Congress, and we intend to deliver to them.

That is why today, I introduced the bipartisan Strategic Unmanned Systems Partnership Act—I underline bipartisan—along with Representatives FITZPATRICK, QUIGLEY, MCCAUL, COSTA, and BACON. These are Members with experience, both military and civilian.

This companion legislation to its Senate counterpart introduced by Senators ROSEN and ROUNDS would establish a landmark strategic defense innovation working group with Ukraine and NATO. This working group would accelerate joint production of innovative systems to defend our nations at a time when liberty needs it most and it is being challenged in many, many ways globally.

Remember, Iran just killed American troops with the same weapons it tested with Russia. Iran and Russia have a relationship, and then they used the technologies against Ukraine. But it was Ukraine that came to our defense with its innovation in the Middle East. It was Ukraine. That is the mark of a true ally and friend under very difficult circumstances.