

fiscal house in order, this Nation will not be the Nation it is.

So, again, I don't think it will balance in 10 years. It won't balance in 20 years unless we change the dynamics, and they need to change now.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Florida, when we look at that and the promises constantly, this is getting to my point: The process needs to get back to regular order. It needs to get back to 12 individual bills—this is what we talked about—12 individual bills that go through a process where there is debate; there are amendments; there is discussion; and there is accountability.

Nothing provides more accountability than bills that have single subjects; nothing provides more transparency than bills that have single subjects; and nothing allows the American people to see what we are doing in Congress like single subjects.

So when you take 12 subjects, which are your budget bills, and you combine 3 or 4 of them into a minibus and 6 or 7 into an omnibus, and you say vote on these things—usually we are given just a short period of time to read those things and analyze them anyway; usually they come in under some closed rule or some highly structured rule—well, you are preventing a couple of things:

Number one, we are not going to get to a balanced budget because, ultimately, what you are also preventing is accountability, because when the American people can see how you voted in a single area on a single issue, they know whether they agree with you or not. They know whether you should be doing that, and they will let you know. They give you the feedback. That is the accountability that we need if we are going to balance this budget over time and correct our course.

Now, there is an economic theory called path dependence. Sometimes it is called increasing returns. Kenneth Arrow wrote a lot about this, and what it boils down to is this: It is an analysis, really, of why decisionmakers make suboptimum decisions and then persist on the course even after they know it is a suboptimum decision.

Well, what typically happens is regimes and institutions are built up. There is feedback, and people will persist on that because they are building up regimes and institutions; and, ultimately, they have propelled themselves so far down, they are what we call locked in. To exit that path, the cost is so high that they don't want to exit that suboptimal path and move to a more optimal path.

But I am here to tell you tonight that as long as we stay on this suboptimal path where we don't have these 12 budget bills, we don't get back to regular order in budgeting, as long as we do CRs and then claim that we have done a normal budgeting path when we have created cromnibus bills

or omnibus bills or minibus bills, we are not going to be able to exit the path that we are on.

If we are going to sustain this Nation, we are going to need to exit the path that we are on and move to a more optimal path.

□ 1945

That is really what this resolution is about. It is encouraging people from both sides of the aisle. I am not blaming one side or the other. I am just saying that if we are going to get this done, everybody in this House has to look internally. Everybody in this House needs to say: What are we doing with our process? Everybody needs to recognize that if we continue on this path, at some point there is no more path to run down.

We just heard from a series of speakers that the numbers go up and, at some point, you reach a tipping point, and that tipping point says you cannot go forward. I would rather we move over to a suboptimal path now and pay that price, which is typically a short-term, corrective price. In the scheme of things, it may take longer than just a short-term, but we have to move over because, if we don't, our choices are taken away from us.

I will tell you that if we would have gotten on the path 2 years ago, we would have had more choices and more options. Every day we go further down this path, the fewer options we have until the end. Mr. YOHO is correct, and all of my friends who have spoken tonight were correct, and the more than 50 cosponsors here, they are all correct: If we don't do something, it will be imposed upon us.

If it is imposed upon us, we won't have control. We will not be able to handle this in a way where we hurt the fewest people, where we can feather the landing as much as possible, where we can maintain our economic status, where people can still find jobs, and where people can achieve the American Dream that they perceive that they want to achieve. Those things get taken away from us because, ultimately, this country is built on individual freedom and individual accountability.

If we have to take that horrible measure of receiving something like our debts being called in, or we can't find lenders, or the cost of our loans—imagine if the cost of our debt today would just move up a couple of points—imagine what that would look like. If we can't do this of our own volition, we will be subject to someone else's will and the very essence of the American Dream—individual freedom and individual accountability—will go away. And why? Because that accountability will be foisted upon us by coercive forces.

Madam Speaker, I conclude tonight with gratitude to the 50-some-odd men and women who have signed on to this resolution. I implore all in this body to join myself, to join me, to join Senator

PERDUE and those who have signed on and sponsored a companion resolution in the Senate, and let's make the hard choices today so that we might preserve the freedoms for our children and grandchildren.

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

AMERICAN VOTING SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I rise today in opposition of H.R. 1. This bill is nothing more than a thinly veiled attack on the American voting system designed to allow Democrats to keep the majority in the House of Representatives, and I will explain and illustrate.

As a Member of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure that every American vote is counted and protected, especially because our democratic society relies on participation in the democratic process through free and fair elections. While I support efforts to involve all Americans in our electoral process, I cannot support this unconstitutional legislation.

Madam Speaker, let me lay out for you some of the most absurd provisions in this legislation.

H.R. 1 creates Federal Government subsidized elections. For the people watching on C-SPAN, if they don't have insomnia, I want them to hear that again. H.R. 1 creates Federal Government subsidized elections through a 6-1 ratio for government matches to small donor contributions for congressional or Presidential campaigns.

For the government to give matches—subsidized elections—that means they are taking money from you to go to candidates, hopefully of your choice, but not necessarily. So the donor contributions for congressional or Presidential campaigns, which means for every \$200 an individual donates, the Federal Government will take \$1,200 of the American taxpayers' money and distribute it.

Additionally, H.R. 1 removes the checks our current voting system has in place to ensure eligible voters are casting ballots by forcing States to accept online and same-day voter registration. I don't think that has ever happened before, where H.R. 1 removes the checks our current voting system has in place to ensure only eligible voters are casting vote ballots by forcing States to accept online and same-day voter registration with no penalties for ineligible voters.

That means somebody could show up, an individual, and cast multiple ballots or votes, or vote without meeting the current requirements, and they will not be reprimanded. There is no recourse. Who is going to go after somebody after they have already cast their vote and they weren't an eligible

voter? Nobody will go after these people, so it can sway elections. That is what H.R. 1 does.

By removing the consequences of illegal voting, this bill is, in turn, encouraging it. It should be doing the opposite. The right and privilege of us as American citizens to vote is something we should all garner and protect as American citizens. And, again, this is not a partisan issue, it is not Democrats or Republicans, this is an American issue, and I think people would be incensed on all parties.

Additionally, this bill allows Federal employees to take 6 days of paid leave to be poll workers. So the American taxpayers are going to pay Federal workers to be poll watchers. This is something that has always been done voluntarily by our precinct captains, both Republican and Democrat, in our districts, where politics is always best locally.

But the Federal Government wants to intervene here and say: No, we are going to give you guys 6 days off. How many people do you think, that are Federal employees, will take 6 days off of paid leave? Probably a lot, wouldn't you expect?

Madam Speaker, we pay our Federal employees to do the job they were hired to do, not to be poll workers for our districts. That is something that the American voting process has done for over 200 years by volunteers that are passionate and care about this country.

In fact, Federal employees already receive paid leave that they can take for any purpose they choose, including being poll workers. Why should the Federal Government pay? And I want to reword that, because it is not the Federal Government paying them. It is the American taxpayers paying money out of their paycheck that goes to the Federal Government that the Federal Government thinks they know better how to spend that money than they do. So why should the Federal Government pay to give them additional leave that can only be used for this purpose?

Madam Speaker, there are just three provisions outlined in this almost 600-page bill, and I would venture most people will not read this when it comes up for a vote. And while I can further elaborate, I will let my colleagues share their thoughts with you.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for leading this Special Order.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak to two specific aspects of this.

First of all, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the sweeping unconstitutional attack on the electoral system that it represents. It would federalize our electoral system and usurp the authority of States and their citizens to manage their own elections by imposing unnecessary and unconstitutional restrictions that interfere with their fundamental democratic rights.

H.R. 1 would restrict freedom of speech and undermine Americans' constitutional rights under the First Amendment by increasing the power of the Federal Government to regulate and control political speech.

It would criminalize a vast range of legal activities, increase government censorship, and impose an enormous administrative compliance burden on candidates that would make it harder for everyday Americans to participate in our political system and even run for office.

It would also weaken important safeguards to ensure the integrity of our electoral system and guarantee that every American vote is counted and protected. This could expose future elections to greater risk of cyber manipulation and mass voter fraud.

It could limit the ability of election officials to ensure that only eligible voter votes are counted and cripple the effectiveness of State voter ID laws.

Now, I have to speak to an issue that particularly impacts those of us who live in States that have independent redistricting commissions. I live in Arizona. Many years ago, our voters said: We don't want the legislature designing the congressional districts and the State legislative districts anymore; we want an independent redistricting commission, so they voted for it. So we have a five-member commission: two Republicans, two Democrats, and an Independent. They design the congressional districts.

This bill would take that away from them. It would bring it back to Washington, D.C., after creating an unelected board that would then design these districts for States. Now, I ask you, why would that be better than the independent redistricting commission in Arizona that was approved by the Arizona voters? It doesn't make sense to me, and it doesn't make sense to my constituents, I can tell you that.

We struggle enough. We struggle enough with the independent redistricting commission with Arizona appointees. Imagine if we have no connection to the appointees.

I am also always amazed at people who don't get to Arizona and don't realize the vastness of that State. It is a unique State: 7 million people—5 million of them in one county, one metropolitan area; 1 million in another county; and then another 1 million sprinkled throughout this vast State. That takes local knowledge and it takes local experience to create those districts, there is no doubt about it. The Arizona Constitution is filled with the criterion on how to redistrict in Arizona. This would usurp the Arizona Constitution.

H.R. 1 is fraught with many, many problems. I have just gone through a couple of them for you tonight.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for his leadership on this, his fight, and I appreciate him sharing time with me tonight.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS. I appreciate his help.

I have got a top 10 list here—actually, it has turned into a top 11 list—of the 10 most egregious provisions of H.R. 1.

Again, I want to remind you that the Democrats took over at the beginning of the year. We are \$22 trillion in debt. And they will say: Well, it is President Trump's fault. Well, we can say: It is President Obama's fault. And they will say: Well, it is President Bush's fault. And it can go all the way back to George Washington, I expect.

But the fact is it is a bipartisan issue that needs to be dealt with. So the top 11 most egregious provisions of H.R. 1: It creates, again, a 6-1 government match to any small donor contribution of \$200 or less in a congressional or Presidential campaign, meaning for every \$200 the government will match \$1,200.

So let's look at the facts. Where does that \$1,200 come from? You go to work, you get a paycheck at the end of the week, at the end of the week you notice that you don't get paid your gross pay, you get paid your net pay. The rest of the money comes to the government and the government is going to use that money, when we are \$22 trillion in debt, and give out subsidies to support, hopefully, your candidate. This has never happened before in our government, and we are at \$22 trillion in debt. It does nothing to solve our national debt.

□ 2000

Number two on the list: Creates a new voucher pilot program—a pilot program.

And I have to hand it to the Dems. They love programs that give out monies and grants, this voucher pilot program that grants eligible voters a \$25 voucher of hard-earned taxpayer dollars to donate to any campaign of their choosing.

The Federal Government has no need to do this. Again, they are taking money from people and using it for that which the government is not mandated by our Constitution to do.

Number three: Authorizes an inappropriate use of Federal workers and taxpayer dollars by granting Federal employees 6 days of paid vacation to serve as poll watchers.

I would venture that come election day, the largest majority of Federal employees for 6 days will be poll watchers and not running the government. This is just bad policy.

Number four: Weakens the voting system of the American people by increasing the election system's vulnerability and failing to implement the necessary checks and balances regarding who is registering to vote. H.R. 1 will force States to allow online voter registration, automatic voter registration, and, I think the most dangerous and egregious, same-day voter registration.

So that means I can show up in Florida, my home State, and I can register to vote that day. I can drive to Georgia

and register to vote that day. I can go to Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and I can possibly vote in every one of those States, because the driving distance, I could make that.

So I could vote in possibly seven or eight States as a single person on the day of voting. Nobody could validate that. Yet the election gets calculated and determined on those kinds of voting, and I don't think that is what anybody wants.

I would hope, regardless of your political affiliation, you would stand up to say this is wrong. We need to make sure these safeguards are in place to protect that one very, I think, sacred, precious right of all voters, of all American citizens, the right to vote.

Number five: Diminishes the process of election day voting by expanding "no excuse" absentee voting and allowing for eligible voters to be able to cast their ballot by mail with no additional safeguards to this process.

That means provisional ballots that get sent in, their signature can't be questioned. It doesn't need to be questioned. It doesn't have to be the correct signature, but it will be counted as a vote.

I would think a party that put that in place would be afraid of that, because it really weakens the democratic process we go through as a constitutional republic.

Number six: Disregards State voter identification laws by allowing sworn statements to be used in place of identification and allowing for signature verification, which can be submitted through a photo if the voter registers online.

Let me read that again.

Disregards State voter identification laws by allowing sworn statements to be used in place of identification and allowing for signature verification, which can be submitted through a photo if the voter registers online.

Now, think about that. I can't get on an airplane without a picture ID. I can't purchase medication, over-the-counter cold medication with phenylephrine in it, without a picture ID, but we are going to allow people to vote without a picture ID just by signing an affidavit saying I am who I say I am. And, again, that won't be verified until after the election.

It has fraud written all over it, and I think it is unconscionable that the Democrats would even consider such a thing on something that we hold so sacred in this Nation, that we brag about and we boast about in the world as being the longest serving democracy in the world using a democratic process in a constitutional republic, that we are going to allow such shoddy type of verification.

Again, it is unconscionable that they would even consider bringing this up.

Number seven: Fails to criminalize fraudulent registrations.

Fails to criminalize fraudulent registrations. We have people going to jail

because they have lied to the FBI. We have George Papadopoulos who lied to the FBI, and he went to prison for 14 days. But I can lie and not be who I say I am, and I can vote on this Democratic bill, H.R. 1, and I have no recourse against me. There is no consequence for me being a liar.

And I just think a party that wants to have those kinds of policies in place as a whole needs to look in the mirror and say: What are we trying to do?

Number eight: Impedes States' ability to determine their registration and voting practices as protected under Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution and violates separation of powers by Congress mandating ethics standards for the Supreme Court. H.R. 1 is a constitutional overreach.

Number eight: Impedes States' ability to determine their registration voting practices as protected, as I said, under Article I, Section 4.

Number nine: Violates constitutional rights under the First Amendment by prohibiting any false statements relating to Federal elections, including time, manner, place, qualifications of candidates, or endorsements of candidates enforced by a partisan FEC, which is the Federal Elections Committee.

Number 10: Empowers trial attorneys by establishing private rights of action by allowing candidates to litigate their way to victory.

We saw this in the last Presidential election. We saw this in the last gubernatorial election in my State of Florida. We saw this in the senatorial race in Florida, where people were going to sue, and they didn't have the legality of doing that, but this bill would allow that.

And I think one of the largest grievances for H.R. 1 that all people ought to be upset with is that it mandates voter registration—mandates voter registration. What that means is the Federal Government says you must register to vote.

I agree, we should all register to vote, but can the government mandate you?

We tried this with the Affordable Care Act that the Democrats ran through in a partisan manner in this Chamber, no Republican support, mandated that people had to buy a product even if they didn't want that.

Madam Speaker, that is wrong, and that is why that part got struck down, the individual mandate got struck down, as it should have, because the Federal Government was saying: If you don't do what we say, we are going to fine you.

You know, that sounds like China. China does that. They have their good citizen score, the Orwellian good citizen score that they monitor what you do, and if you don't do it, you don't get the prizes of the Chinese Government. Are we turning into that, mandating voters to register?

Last Congress, I chaired the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Sub-

committee on Foreign Affairs. And it was amazing because I got to travel to countries around the world that have just started free and open elections in a Western, democratic style. It pains me to see these countries with a new democracy where 95 percent to 98 percent of the people show up.

If you look at Iraq or Afghanistan, they are walking around with the purple finger at risk of their lives, because for once in their life they had an opportunity to vote, to vote for somebody that they wanted in power—a foreign concept to them. Yet in this country, we want to take that away from people.

As we continue on, there are some myths on H.R. 1.

It has been designed to fund, elect, and maintain Democratic majority, and I want the American people to know that. The Democrats introduced this 571-page package of Democratic priorities without allowing for input from Republican Members or going through the standard House Committee.

This is something that they railed against us. All the 6 years I have been in Congress, they have railed against us about no open process, yet they come out with a 571-page package of Democratic priorities without allowing for input from one Republican Member.

H.R. 1 will waste taxpayers' money, federalize the election system, weaken safeguards surrounding voter registration, and violate Americans' constitutional right to free speech under the First Amendment.

The estimated cost of this that we got for H.R. 1, because of all the subsidies and the other garbage that is in this, is over \$10 billion to the American taxpayers—\$10 billion—when we are already at \$22 trillion in debt.

I would like to go through a few myths.

Democrats are empowering citizens. That is the myth. The facts are Democrats are using citizens' hard-earned taxpayer dollars to fund their candidates:

Voucher from the government to the campaign: Through this bill, eligible voters would receive a \$25 voucher from the Federal Government that they can use to donate to the campaign of their choice, meaning hard-earned taxpayer dollars are going to be going to the government, to their campaign of choice;

Government matching campaign donations in congressional races: Under H.R. 1, the Federal Government will be required to match small contributions under \$200 at 6 to 1. Taxpayer dollars will be going to the government to fund candidates;

Government matching campaign donations in Presidential races: Also, under H.R. 1, there is a 6-to-1 government match of small contributions in a Presidential campaign, up to \$250 million. A quarter of \$1 billion would be going towards the Presidential campaign, and there is no limit to contributions.

Another Democrat myth: Democrats are promoting integrity. The facts are Democrats are promoting the interests of Washington, D.C., swamp, not yours:

Federal paid vacations: Federal workers would get a 6-day paid vacation to serve as poll watchers;

16-year-old voters: H.R. 1 will open the door to 16-year-old voters by requiring States to allow them to register and vote;

Free speech violation: Prohibits any false statements related to Federal elections, including time, manner, place, qualifications, candidates, or endorsement.

And I want to go back over this one other myth. Democrats are creating vulnerabilities in the voting system:

Automatic voter registration—automatic voter registration, mandates from the Federal Government, boy, how the Dems like that—requires all States to adopt an automatic voter registration system that would be relying on the Federal Government for records. There would be no criminal punishment for an ineligible voter who is registered in error.

Madam Speaker, as you have heard, my colleagues and I have severe concerns about H.R. 1. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are marketing it as a fix to the American voting system, what it really does is degrade the standards we have had in place for over 200 years to protect American voters and the voting process.

As Members in Congress, we have the responsibility to ensure that every American has the right to vote and the access to vote and that that vote is guaranteed and protected. H.R. 1 does not do this, and I encourage my colleagues to consider this implication and not support this bill.

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

FIVE PILLARS OF WHAT WE BELIEVE SAVES US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, many of us really appreciate when you stay here and listen to us because we know a lot of folks out there don't appreciate it. It is sort of a gift of your time to be with us. When we were in the majority, I spent much of my freshman term sitting in that chair.

What we are going to do tonight is this sort of a continuation of a theme. We have already heard tonight, and over the last couple weeks, discussions of debt, discussions of what is happening in Medicare, and, actually, I want to come here behind this microphone and talk about what I believe is a solution.

□ 2015

I genuinely believe over the last few years, we have put together at least

the backbone of enough math to talk about the reality. But let's first sort of set up the discussion if you haven't watched some of our other floor presentations since the beginning of this session.

Every week, every other week, we try to take a half an hour and walk through our five pillars of what we believe saves us. Understand, in 9 years, 50 percent of all of the noninterest spending that this Congress will do will be to those 65 and over.

Understand, in 9 years, the 74 million baby boomers will actually be in their benefit cycle. They will be 65 and up.

In 9 years, two workers for one retiree. And when you start to look at the future of our debt, understand—and this is hard because so many don't want to hear it, and it is not Republican or Democrat, it is demographics. If you look at our society, we are getting older very fast; our birth rates have substantially collapsed. Family formation, we have some real issues out there.

So what do you do as a society? We have promises that have been made, earned entitlements out there, your Social Security, your Medicare, and you have earned those. That is part of your societal contract with this government, but we don't have the cash to pay over the next 30 years.

How do we get there? I am going to tell you. I am still optimistic there is a path. I see some of these slides and these boards through the eyes of my daughter. I have a 3-year-old daughter. Best little girl ever. We actually have a coffee mug at home that says that.

Doesn't she have the right to live as well as the generations that have gone before her? Doesn't she have the right to have that sort of optimistic opportunity? I actually believe that is not lost in our society. But as you even saw on the floor today, we do political theater here because complex policy is hard. It actually requires math, and Congress is substantially a math-free zone.

So we always start with this chart. Understand, I believe there are five pillars, and you can mix them up any way you want to.

Immigration. How do you design an immigration system in the future that maximizes talent importation to the Nation? Because you need to maximize economic philosophy as soon as possible. That is what the rest of the world has done. Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand, and Canada have moved to talent-based systems because they figured out that there is something elegant about that model.

Now, let's be honest. I don't care what gender you are. I don't care your religion. I don't care your race. I don't care who you cuddle with. I don't care about those things. We care about the talent you bring to our society to maximize economic growth. I actually think it is a much more elegant model than we use today in immigration.

Economic growth. We must hunker down and embrace tax policy, regu-

latory policy, and trade policy that maximizes economic vitality. The velocity of the size of this economy must continue to grow, and grow at a fairly substantial rate. If you look at the data, 91 percent of the spending increases from this government from 2008 to 2028 are functionally three things: interest, Social Security, and healthcare entitlements.

So we are all going to talk about debt. It is a threat to our society. When we are going to have the honest conversation, it is substantially driven by our demographics and our healthcare costs.

The next one we are going to talk about is labor force participation. We are going to spend time tonight on that. I know it is a dry subject, but this is actually trying to be intellectually honest. This is a moment where if you are going to call our office and say we want solutions, we are working through it. But it is not trite.

My father used to have a saying. We were just talking about it over in the corner. For every complex problem, there is a simple solution that is absolutely wrong. It turns out, complex problems require complex solutions.

We are going to talk tonight about labor force participation. How do we get as many Americans across the board to participate in the economic vitality? It turns out that has an amazing effect; everything from our healthcare costs, to tax collections, to just the economic growth.

The next two, there is a technology revolution about to happen in healthcare. It is also happening in environment. In the next couple of weeks we are going to come here and show some of the amazing technologies that are out there that actually make some of the environmental discussion seem sort of passe when you understand the technology that is on the cusp of rolling out.

Let's talk about healthcare right now. I have come here to the floor over the last couple of weeks and shown things like—we nicknamed it in our office the flu kazoo—something a material science professor has developed; you blow into it, and it instantly tells you if you have a viral infection, and in the backbone, it could automatically order your antivirals. Start thinking about the revolution that would happen in the cost curve of healthcare if we had substantial change in autonomous healthcare.

In the Phoenix area, we have an organization that now, I believe, has seven of these autonomous healthcare clinics where you go in, you sign up on an iPad, you take a picture of your insurance card, your driver's license, you go in and you put your arm in, you pick this up, you shine it in your throat, your ear, and your nose, and the algorithm is able to do amazingly accurate calculations of your health.

Think about that type of technology when it is in your pocket. You have all seen the pocket size, the size of your