

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

smartphone that is now an ultrasound. It is completely portable. We must, as a body—and this is at our State legislature, but particularly this body—we must break down these barriers to the technology disruption that could be a revolution in lowering healthcare costs.

You have got to be intellectually honest. The ACA, the Republican alternatives, in much of the discussion, we are not actually having a discussion about lowering healthcare costs. We are having discussions about who gets to pay.

It is time that we embrace and truly draw in the technology that can be that very disruption. We have a running joke in our office: Did you go to Blockbuster Video last weekend? We all live it. It is now time that we understand that our future healthcare costs are an Achilles' heel to this society because of our demographics and just where the costs are going.

There is another part of that. We are going to actually do a floor presentation, probably at the end of the month. There are incredible disrupters coming in the pharmaceutical world. We just had some information and we think, actually by the end of this year, there may be a single shot cure for hemophilia A. That is only about 8,000 of our brothers and sisters in the country, and it is going to be really expensive, but it cures.

What happens as we continue to see these biological, genomic pharmaceuticals rolling out that actually cure? Or the one that we were reading about today, that stabilizes our populations who have ALS?

What does that mean to the cost curve of the 50 percent of healthcare spending that is to the 5 percent of our population that have chronic conditions?

The last one I am going to give you is, it is time to rethink the incentives—and this one will always be tough—in Social Security, in Medicare. How do we encourage an individual to stay in the labor force? Are there things we can do to encourage waiting to take benefits? And these are math. It is just actuarial science.

So today we are going to talk about labor force participation. Isn't that exciting? The first slide I have already mentioned, this is from the CBO report 3 weeks ago, and I was shocked it didn't get much press or discussion in this body because it is math.

But if you look at this chart, what it is trying to say is, in functionally 9 years, half of the spending of this body—if you remove interest—half of the spending will be to those 65 and older.

It is just demographics. We got older as a society. In 9 years it is the end of the baby boomers, because they have moved into being 65 and older.

But if you had seen this chart and then matched it up to where you start to see the debt and spending curves move up, you understand they are in

sync: if you care about the debt, if you care about spending, if you care about opportunity in our society, understand the demographic headwinds and what we must do to face that.

So one of the reasons for this slide, and I know these are a little tough to watch, but what I want you to sort of see is this is 2000. At that time, actually over 67 percent of our population was in the labor force. It functionally collapsed after 2008 and never returned.

The blessing is this last year we have had a little bit of a blip. There were these really smart economists who said: Hey, you are never going to get back up to 62, 63 percent of labor force participation. I believe we are now around 61 or 62. We actually need to find a way to get back to that 67 percent of our brothers and sisters all up and down our society being in the labor force, having the honor, the elegance of working.

There were some amazing numbers last December, if you actually broke into what was in those statistics, of the number of organizations, the number of companies that were actually reaching out to the handicapped community and making accommodations and hiring.

There are actually—and we are going to touch on this—some parts of our society are moving into the labor force, particularly in the millennials, and we are seeing parts that are not. Countries like Japan that actually have faced this, are facing it, have actually been trying to design incentives and programs for even those who are older, who are healthy, who are capable, who are desirous to be welcomed to stay or enter back into the labor force.

It is a barbell. We have a problem with part of our younger population, and then, obviously, our older population—which we have so much talent—that are retiring. We are going to have to have an honest incentives discussion design to maintain this labor force philosophy.

If you actually look at what is going on in our society right now, if I had come to you 2 years ago and said: Hey, we are going to see all sorts of quartiles in our society have some of the lowest unemployment in modern history, I think I would have just gotten blank stares. But it is happening. And with that incredible, almost full-employment society, we are actually seeing—and particularly in markets like Arizona—we are actually now seeing wages really starting to move. This is wonderful. This is something we needed, functionally, for a decade or two.

We can do a much more complicated discussion of some of the incentives that were built in the tax reform last year that encouraged investment in plant and equipment to push up productivity. Productivity allows you to be able to pay people more. But those are the sorts of things you talk about. How do you maintain economic vitality?

When we actually look at some of the unemployment numbers, there is some-

thing missing. Understand, when we look at unemployment numbers, we are looking at people who are actively looking, actively searching for employment. We actually have a real problem in parts of millennial males and others, so how do we reach out and design incentives to stay in?

We are also going to go to some of the other tougher questions, and that is: Is it time to rethink things like Social Security disability and say, hey, if you earn \$24,000, or you hit this point, you hit a cliff. Your benefits disappear. If you are on other safety-net programs, if you earn a certain amount, you hit a cliff, and it disappears.

We need to have a brutally honest conversation of, is that incentive of that cliff an incentive not to enter the labor force? What would happen if we would work out the math so it was a much more gradual glide slope to draw those individuals into labor participation? Because if we are almost a full-employment society but we still had millions and millions of Americans who are choosing not to participate in the economy and we really need them in our economy, we have got to look to what are the disincentives.

□ 2030

It is about time that we actually start to have those social entitlement conversations. I know for both Republicans and Democrats, these are tough because it requires math. It requires us to work through certain ideological folklore. But if you want the wholistic solution to make it through the next 30 years, this labor force participation is one of those five pillars.

The reason I actually did this slide is—this one is a little geeky—but it is actually trying to walk through what has been happening. I am not going to walk through all the detail, but we recently had this wonderful pop of sort of in the population of 25 to 34 females entering the workforce. That was one of the great things that we actually saw last December. Great.

We need to understand why millennial women are entering the workforce in these sorts of numbers, what we learn from that, and what we do now for the millions of millennial males who are still dramatically underrepresented in the economy.

Data shows millennial women dominating the current job market. Look at this separation right here and why this is so important. Remember how I was just saying something has been happening in the last couple quarters where millennial females are entering, but millennial males is the lower line. This is a conceptual problem, but it is real math.

Remember we talked about our barbell? We have those who are older. How do we create incentives to enter and stay in the labor force? How do we reach out to our younger population, get them, incentivize them, and work with them to get them into the labor force? Functionally, we just do not have a choice.

Let me grab another slide. We will put these up in our office. Remember, this sort of presentation is for those who really care about digging in to the actual math of policy. So often, what we end up doing on the floor is political theater and folklore.

If you look at some of these lines—and I know this is a long time ago—but if you and I were to step back to 1967 and look at the data for males, we had 97 percent of working-age males in the labor force. Today, if we did that same thing, I think we are at about 88. It falls, 87, 88.

One of the big things that helped us grow the economy is female participation in the economy. But we need to find a way to get this back up. We are just talking a few points, but those few points of a few more million stepping back into the labor market have substantial economic impact.

I want to talk about a story from Arizona. I have had this discussion with a couple of my Democratic friends. Within that, we have talked about incarceration rates and some of the other things that end up becoming impairments for young males to be in the labor force.

In Arizona right now, we have such a shortage of skilled trades—electricians and carpenters—that a number of the businesses in Arizona—actually, I approached our Governor, Governor Ducey, and said: Help us. We are willing to take our own money and go into Arizona correctional facilities and do a training program that is, when someone is going to be on parole in just a few months, we will train them, and we will guarantee that we will hire them. It doesn't mean a guarantee that they will keep them.

So last year, we brought this young man out from Arizona. We brought him to the Ways and Means Committee. He sat down in this beautiful room. The Ways and Means Committee room, it is just very big and very ornate. He didn't look like our typical witness, with a number of piercings and a number of tattoos around the neck. He looked up when it was his turn to tell his story, and he hesitated for a moment and started with: I am a three-time convicted felon.

He went on to tell his story of how he was an addict and the other times he had gotten out of prison, he had relapsed. He had lost his family. He had lost everything. He had lost contact with his child.

He was a few months from his opportunity to go on probation and leave the correctional facility, and he saw this flyer that said: We are doing training for electricians. We guarantee we will hire you—it doesn't mean we are going to keep you—if you pass this very basic course.

He said: Why not?

He took this electrician course while in prison, while it was paid for by private industry because the job market is so tight they are willing to take risks on all sorts of populations to get them back into the work environment.

He graduated. He started at just a little over minimum wage. A year later, he was making, I think, \$23-something an hour. He said he hadn't relapsed because he is working too much. He said he is back with his family. He gets to see his child. There are these incredibly human stories.

If we are in a society right now that is almost at full employment for those looking for employment, how do we reach out to those whom our society gave up on or who gave up on themselves? How do we as policymakers design those incentives, design the social entitlement programs, and design our society where we want everyone to have this opportunity within our communities and our society?

It was one of the most touching and amazing hearings, because when you looked at those of us sitting up on the dais, there were actually tears hearing his story and realizing there is hope, that this economic vitality provides opportunity and hope.

We turn it into a political football because it is not our side that wants to get credit, or their side wants to get credit. We need to get beyond that, because if we don't get this math right, my 3-year-old little girl won't have the same type of future I have had.

There is a path to make this work and continue to have an economy, a nation, that grows and provides opportunities. Understand, when the United States grows, the world benefits.

But we have those five pillars. Is this body capable of stepping up and doing things that are complex without a simple solution?

Madam Speaker, I so desperately hope so. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of inclement weather.

Mr. KATKO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today until March 1, 2019 on account of a death in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

225. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and En-

ergy Efficiency, Office of Electricity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Updates to Personnel References (RIN: 1901-AB49) received February 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

226. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Waxes and Waxy Substances, Rice Bran, Oxidized; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0032; FRL-9987-83] received February 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

227. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final authorization — Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2018-0255; FRL-9989-93-Region 4] received February 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

228. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0735; FRL-9989-99-Region 3] received February 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

229. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0675; FRL-9989-61-Region 6] received February 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

230. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Approval of Revised Statutes; Error Correction [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0850; FRL-9989-09-Region 6] received February 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

231. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Abamectin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0037; FRL-9987-32] received February 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

232. A letter from the Director, Office of the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

233. A letter from the Director, Office of the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

234. A letter from the Director, Office of the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.