

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Liberian community in Minnesota and throughout the United States, as they celebrate passage of the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act. This act provides a lifeline to certainty for Liberians around the country, bringing relief and clarity to so many families and communities throughout my district and home State.

Adoption of this important legislation is credited to the hard work of the many advocates who lived in a constant state of limbo and under the threat of the unknown for many years. Thank you to all our community members who banded together to advocate for our Liberian American friends and neighbors.

I am pleased that Congress, the administration, and President Trump have finally provided our Liberian Americans, our neighbors, and our friends, the clarity and protection they deserve.

ATROCITIES IN IDLIB, SYRIA

(Mr. RASKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, there is another unfolding humanitarian crisis in Syria, this time in Idlib province. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad has launched an all-out assault on the province, aided by Vladimir Putin's Russian forces.

More than a quarter of a million people, 80 percent of them women and children, have fled their homes to the northern part of Idlib into freezing desert and refugee camps, without adequate food, shelter, or medical care.

With the current death toll of the Syrian civil war estimated to exceed 500,000, along with six million people internally displaced, humanitarian groups are concerned that the siege of Idlib will result in the largest humanitarian disaster yet seen in the country.

This assault is a replay of the siege of Aleppo as the government again bombs civilian targets like hospitals, schools, markets and people's homes.

This disaster will only be compounded as a result of Russia vetoing a U.N. Security Council resolution allowing cross-border aid to Syrian refugees. Although a modified resolution was adopted, cross-border aid has been restricted and may come to an end this summer if Russia and Syria continue to push for its elimination.

As U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Kelly Craft said: "Syrians will suffer needlessly as a result of this resolution."

□ 1315

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for National School Choice Week.

Every American enjoys choices, and, indeed, it is the American way; yet, when it comes to educating our children, one size fits all seems to be the norm—and is even forced upon families.

Every family, regardless of their background, should be able to choose an educational option that is right for the needs of their children, whether that is traditional public schools, charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, or other alternatives.

There is plenty of evidence to suggest that, when a family can choose a school based on their own children's needs, there is an increase in college readiness and success in life after graduation.

If we expect today's students to become tomorrow's world leaders, we should give them every opportunity to learn and grow and thrive, to have choices that work for them, not for the government and not for special interests.

Expanding school choice is the most viable option to prepare students for success.

COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF DEATH CAMPS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, last week, I went with Speaker PELOSI and some other Members of Congress to Jerusalem, where we had the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the end of the death camps. Many of our colleagues went to Auschwitz-Birkenau to look at the concentration camps.

Some of my colleagues have said this, but I think it is important that each one of us says it: We have to raise our voices loudly and clearly and monitor the situation so these types of things don't happen again to any people.

First of all, anti-Semitism is rearing its ugly head, and certainly we need to do everything we can to stop the scourge of anti-Semitism. We cannot treat people the way the Jewish population was treated during the Second World War, and America must always be in the forefront of equal rights and standing up against injustice.

I wanted to take the time to say that participating in that conference was really emotional for me, and I think that we should always say: Never again will we stand idly by and allow anti-Semitism to rear its ugly head. Never again will we stand idly by and allow any group of people to be killed and slaughtered.

So, never again.

DISCUSSING ECONOMIC DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

HONORING THE LIFE OF LORILEE WARD

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, over the last few weeks, we have lost two Americans about whom I want to, here, speak.

Earlier this month, we lost a valued member of our southern Indiana community. Lorilee Ward from Clarksville died of cancer. All of us, her friends, her family, are devastated by her loss, and the outpouring of support from fellow Hoosiers shows just how large a legacy Lorilee leaves behind in her wake created by that strong dedication she always had to her community and the values she so fervently believed in.

Lorilee's warmth and enthusiasm was a staple of our Clark County community. Lorilee served on the board of southern Indiana's Clark-Floyd Counties Convention Tourism Bureau, a group dedicated to bettering our neighbors. She furiously believed in the prosperity and future of our towns all the way across southern Indiana, and she gave liberally of her time and of her energy to make sure that we are all the best we can be.

For Lorilee, the future of our communities of Indiana and of our country rests in preserving and promoting our conservative values in principles like the value of all life; supporting our troops and veterans, which she did so passionately through her involvement in Wreaths Across America; economic opportunity and job creation; and putting America and Americans first.

Lorilee always fought to make sure our voices and values were heard. She served adamantly as the president of the Clark County Republican Women, a reliable and relentless volunteer for her President, and a member of our Indiana GOP. She did it all on behalf of others, knowing that she was fighting for bettering the lives of future generations.

Southern Indiana will not be the same, both because of her work and because of our loss.

Lorilee's mighty spirit shown through in all she did. Lorilee has always been a fighter. At the age of 18, Lorilee was diagnosed with stage 4 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and she was told by her doctors that the end was near, that she should expect the worst. But Lorilee did not expect the worst. She fought for the best. She fought for her future and lived another 37 years.

Despite the challenges she faced, Lorilee had a smile on her face every day and went through life with a positive energy that inspired everyone around her. Lorilee was truly a force of nature, and her death is a great loss.

It was once said that success in old age is having a crowded table, knowing that your friends, your family want to gather with you on special occasions

and spend time with you. This was especially true for Lorilee.

Lorilee, survived by her incredible family, was loved dearly by them. Lorilee put her family above everything else, and I know her husband of 25 years, Donald; her two daughters, Chantelle and Darci; her father; her siblings; and her 14 grandchildren will miss her dearly. That, to me, sounds like a crowded table. That, to me, sounds like a great legacy.

Madam Speaker, may Lorilee rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS LAVELL
SECRET

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, Thomas Lavell Secrest passed away this week after a life full of service to his country.

Tom was born in Corpus Christi, Texas, and attended the U.S. Military Academy at West Point from 1966 to 1970. After graduation, Tom served in Germany and Fort Knox, achieving the rank of captain, as a tanker. Tom is remembered by his West Point classmates as a smart and kind guy.

After his service in the Army, Tom returned to Texas to attend law school at the University of Texas and then went on to a very successful legal career in New York City. Over his career, Tom represented Polaroid, AT&T, Lucent, and Hunter Douglas in defending their intellectual property. Tom's demand for uncompromised performance was evident in every pursuit of his life: academic, military, professional, and personal.

Tom spent the last few years of his life in South Carolina with his beloved wife, Liz, where they enjoyed their mutual passion for golf. Throughout their marriage, they also ensured that their friends, their family could participate in their love for golf, including Golf Magazine's editor-in-chief, George Peper.

In 2002, George highlighted his friend Tom's spirit both on and off the golf course in an article that tells you exactly who he was: an ardent believer in hard work, a fiercely loyal friend, husband, and father. He was someone who never missed an opportunity to hit the links. And while always staying humble, Tom's golf game was legendary.

A golfer once said that many golfers argue very frequently, very vigorously about where they played or which course was the best; but, at the end of their lives, what they will remember is with whom they played. Tom truly embodied this by always remembering it was with whom you played that mattered most. He played with his favorite friends, his family.

He is survived by his wife, his son, his daughter-in-law, his brothers, his nieces, his nephews, and his grandchildren. I know each of them will miss him dearly but will carry on the legacy of earnestness and humor that he instilled in each of them.

Tom is someone whom those around him could always rely on, but he was taken from us far too soon. Our country

and his family are better off because of his life, because of his service, and because of his spirit.

Madam Speaker, may Tom rest in peace.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I am going to come down to the lower microphone because we are going to be using a number of slides, and I want to apologize right now, this one is going to be a little thick. We are actually going to do some information in regard to what CBO put out this week and some other economic data and try to put it in perspective. So let me come on down.

I get teased all the time about the charts and the fact that I can't even get my wife to now watch me do these because she says I am boring, but it is important.

Madam Speaker, what I am going to try to do today—and let's see if I can do it as well as possible. I want to walk through what is a little bit of sort of the political folklore that we engage in here about the math when we talk about the deficits and the debt and the economic future and when you hear people say things like the debt as compared to the size of the economy and what is driving it, because, if we don't actually sort of get our act together here and start to become honest about just the math and what is driving it, we can't put together policy.

I am incredibly optimistic that there is a path where we can digest the realities of these costs that happen from our demographics, because we are a society that is getting old really fast, but we do politics now.

The other day, I am home and I am watching a little bit of one of the Presidential forums. It is a candidate on the Democrat side running for President from the Midwest, and his first comment was: These deficits, this trillion-dollar deficit we are going to have next year, that is because of tax reform.

It just breaks your heart because you know these individuals are smart, and have we hit this world where, as Republicans—and please understand, I beat up both sides—as Republicans, we had this history of saying: Well, the debt and deficit comes from waste and fraud.

The left often said: We don't tax rich people enough.

All that is lunacy, and the investment in a calculator here would really go a long way.

First, I brought a number of boards because, heaven knows, I am incapable of speaking without my charts.

This, right here, is the change in receipts to the Federal Government. Revenues are up, and they are up fairly substantially since tax reform.

Do you understand last fiscal year revenues were up over 4 percent? With the size of our economy, that is actually a big deal. Our problem is we increased spending just shy of 8 percent.

Does anyone see a small math problem there?

Our projection is we will take in over \$3.6 trillion in the fiscal year we are in right now. Last year, revenues were about \$3.462 trillion. That is a fairly substantial increase in these revenues, but how can we keep running these massive deficits?

Well, it turns out it is spending, but it is spending on what we call the mandatory side, the formulas that we don't get to vote on and we are terrified as elected officials to talk about.

I am going to walk us through part of this math. First, let's do some of the positive stuff, and then let's get to the really difficult policy issues.

So, revenues are up, and they are going up fairly substantially. A lot of this economic growth and receipts is payroll taxes. It is because we are having a remarkable period here of employment.

When you look at what we call the U-6 data put out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of our brothers and sisters who weren't even looking for work that are moving into the labor force and all the sudden now are paying payroll taxes, Social Security, Medicare, these things, is remarkable.

We should actually, as a society, be joyful, both those on the left and those on the right. We should be joyful because, if I had come into this room 3 years ago and said we are living in a time where we have more jobs than people, we are going to live in a time where it actually turns out to be our brothers and sisters who are functionally defined as the working poor have the fastest growing wages, double what the mean is—this has been our goal around here for years, and it is not a Democratic goal or a Republican goal. It just should be a goal of lifting people up, and it is happening. So let's take some joy in that. And it turns out it is also helping the receipts here to the Federal Government.

There are other things that we should be joyful about.

When you actually look at this enhanced period of economic stability, what happens when what we call the real net worth—the value of your homes, the value of your savings, the value of your investments, the value of things you hold—well, it turns out the bottom 50 percent, their real net worth has gone up fairly substantially, over 15 percent in these last 3 years. That is a big deal.

But then I will get folks who will just make up stuff. Well, the rich are the ones. Well, it turns out that is not true.

□ 1330

The top 1 percent aren't having most of that growth in their personal wealth. It is the bottom 50 percent is where most of the growth is.

Can we take some joy in that? This is one of the most unique economic cycles because it has been so stable for so long. You also have the GDP numbers that came out today basically saying:

Hey, looks like we are just going to be in a steady, healthy environment.

We really need this because you get really positive math when you hit this type of economic stability.

All right, last one on this. When you look at what we call real wage growth, who are seeing their incomes go up? I know this is thick, but the politics—and I accept that we are in an election year, but we have to stop—what do you call that? Oh, yeah—lying.

The fact of the matter is it isn't the top income earners who are seeing the most actual movement in their wages.

Take a look at this red line. That is what is really going on right now. The blue is what we thought was going to happen. You see that inflection point.

I have been on the Joint Economic Committee for years now, and it was only about 3 years ago we were having some of the smartest economists, the experts, coming in and saying: Well, you have to understand, Joint Economic Committee, those who don't have a high school education, those who have moderate skill sets, you need to prepare, because they will be part of the permanently poor, the permanent underclass of your country forever.

Then, all of a sudden, something has happened the last couple of years where their labor now has some of the most value in this economy. Look at the wage growth for our brothers and sisters who didn't graduate high school, who have moderate skill sets. That is where the substantial, almost double the growth of the mean is.

We should be joyful about this because all of those fancy economists who were in front of us just a couple of years ago said that it couldn't happen, that we should be planning for this to be a population that will have to live in a subsidized world for the rest of their lives. It turns out they were wrong.

We have sort of a family saying: Figure out what you do right and do more of it; figure out what you have done wrong and do less of it.

Maybe we should stop inviting those particular economists to come to testify in front of us.

Where is the trillion-dollar deficit coming from? Well, it is a combination of a bunch of things. This is one of the things that will frustrate you, particularly about Congress. We seem incapable of dealing with complexity because the solution to this is also really complex. We will sort of close on that.

This chart, it is almost impossible to read this chart, so I stole some notes from myself.

The point I am trying to make here is this is 2017, before tax reform, and where we are at today. The top one is net interest. It looks like our projection of what we are going to spend in interest costs has gone down and gone down fairly substantially.

The argument here is one of the things that happened in tax reform that we didn't expect is that savings rates are much better than we expected

and what they call repatriation, cash that has been coming in from overseas—remember, we had that cycle for almost 20 years where businesses would move their headquarters out of the country and then keep their profits there because if they brought them in, they were substantially taxed in the United States. We made a deal with sort of the world and those businesses saying: Here will be the new tax rates. Bring your money in.

That money, I think, in our reports we had last summer, we were seeing about \$400 billion more than we had modeled for. I have not seen a more recent number, but there is an argument that we are afloat with cash in North America, in the United States, and that drives interest rates down.

Is that a first- or second-degree effect? Let's not geek out too much on that.

But take a look here. Let's use, like, 72 percent of the budget, of our spending here. It is what we call mandatory. It is on autopilot.

The other portion is what we call discretionary. About half of that is defense, and about half of that is everything else you think of as government, from the Park Service to the FDA to this and that. That is the other, let's call it 14, 15 percent of government. That is what we vote on, the discretionary side.

Take a look at this. Where you see that little orange bar, you see that big piece of growth. Those are things we have voted on in just the last 2 years, and it is up substantially.

We have some other charts I am going to show you that if you look at the growth in deficit—not debt, the deficits from this year, even the next couple of years—a big driver of it is our own votes. It is the discretionary side.

This here is the growth in mandatory, and there is something wonderful about this. Do you notice that it is getting smaller? I know these look like tiny, little increments, but when you are talking about a trillion dollars, that is a lot of money.

It turns out, because of the economic expansion, we are seeing a reduction in some of the demands for entitlements.

We always have to be careful when we talk about this because this is sort of the—what is the term?—third rail for a lot of us who are elected officials to explain this.

There are earned entitlements. You earned your Social Security; you earned your Medicare; you earned your military pension. Those are earned entitlements. You paid for those. You earned them with your service and your contributions.

There are other types of entitlements that are part of this mandatory formula. It is a treaty obligation. You are part of a certain Native American population, other things. They are obligations we took on. Or you fell under a certain income. You know, you are having really rough times in your life, so there is certain income support or

access to certain healthcare or housing allowances and those things.

We haven't done all the analysis yet, but we think that is where part of this drop all of a sudden in mandatory spending has come from. As the economy is growing and we are seeing our brothers and sisters who were—the term is often marginally detached or detached from the workforce—are coming back in, all of a sudden, they are leaving certain programs. So that is another benefit we are seeing mathematically and budgetarily in the growth of the economy.

Is that a first-degree effect or second-degree effect from tax reform? Okay, fine.

Other spending, these are other types of programs that may have their own individual trust funds or those things, and you will take a look and notice that their spending is up just a little bit.

Here is where, when we talk about the tax reform, we see lower corporate taxes; we see substantially higher payroll taxes because people are working; and we see lower individual taxes.

When you have someone walk up behind one of these microphones and say, "Well, it was the tax reform. That is why we are"—no, it is not. Tax reform is part of it. I mean, we always modeled that tax reform was going to cost about \$1.4 trillion over 10 years.

If we could get the economic expansion and employment statistics, that number would come down. You all saw now—because I know everyone immediately grabbed their CBO update report—that from August to the report this week, there is a \$705 billion reduction in the deficit projection over the 10 years.

A lot of that, I think, are these first- and second-degree effects. Some of that was interest rates are lower, like you see up here in this top line, because people are saving more, and payroll taxes, which you see down over here, because more people are working.

I don't want to sound whiny up here and frustrated, but these numbers are complex. I will go through this three or four times with a highlighter to get my head around the numbers, and then I will turn to the freaky smart staff of the Joint Economic Committee and others to make sure we are understanding it correctly.

But I beg of my brothers and sisters who are elected or policymakers, stop spouting off in political terms, because if we can start to get an honest understanding of the math, maybe we can come up with some honest approaches on how to deal with the crushing level of debt that is coming at us.

Let's start walking through what is driving the deficits and the debt. One of the comments I heard the other day from an economist on I think it was CNBC—now, it was ideological. It was a politically liberal economist from a university: Well, if we could have some substantial cuts in defense, we would see all these changes in these deficits.

That is lunacy. Look, the model on defense is pretty flat and stable.

Here is a number I am going to give you two or three times, and I beg of you, I know a number of people don't want to hear this, but it is math: Just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, and healthcare entitlements over the next 5 years equals the entire Defense Department.

Is that Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is demographics.

There are—what?—74 million of us who are baby boomers. We are about halfway moving into our retirement cycle, turning 65, qualifying for certain benefits. It is like Congress only just recently discovered there were baby boomers. But when you hear someone start to say something like, "Well, if we would just cut defense, all of a sudden the numbers are better," it is lunacy.

You could get rid of all of defense tomorrow, and it only gives you 5 years of the growth in Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements. Why is it so hard to tell the truth?

Here is another one. This is sort of building a chart right out of CBO, Congressional Budget Office. CBO projects budget deficit rise is entirely—this is CBO—driven by soaring Social Security and Medicare shortfalls.

I know it is the third rail. I know we are not supposed to talk about it. But if you believe like I do, I believe it is a moral obligation to protect Social Security and Medicare. How can you step up to that ethical obligation and then not tell the truth about the math? You know, you can't fix a problem unless you are willing to accept it.

Look, the chart is the chart is the chart. This is from the nonpartisan arbiters of what is going on. It is demographics. And the sizes of these numbers are just devastatingly large.

Let's take a look at another one. There is a bunch of the tax reform that expires in the next couple of years, and we go back to other sort of tax rates and those things, but this one, we just pretend everything is permanent, that those revenue gains that are coming in a couple of years don't happen, assuming they would create multipliers in the economy, which they won't. They probably won't pay for themselves, but that is a completely different chart and models. This also misses a bunch of the expanded spending that happened late last year when we lifted some of the budgetary restriction caps.

But once again, 90 percent of the budgetary shortfall is Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, but mostly Medicare, yet this body is terrified to talk about that. It is the math.

One more on this, just to sort of get our head around it because I am frustrated, because for those of us who do believe there is a policy set, and I have been behind this microphone—and the poor folks who have to try to keep up with me. Tell me if I am starting to speak too quickly. I have had a lot of coffee today.

There is a way to get there. Now, when I say "get there," that means to sort of stay about 95 percent of debt to GDP and hold it as we wait for those of us who are baby boomers to meet our reward and go back to more normal population demographic numbers. This is hard, but it is the reality. Then we put this together.

And, I am sorry, we don't typically try to do something that is this blatant, but it is. This is one of the things that comes into our office, saying: "Well, if you would tax rich people more, you would be fine." It is lunacy. It only covers about 4.7 percent of—8.3 percent of GDP. It doesn't even cover close to half of the total shortfall when you put everything together.

□ 1345

The entire defense budget, if you get rid of that, we have already talked about that, it only covers 5 years of the growth in spending.

We actually have an entire chart list if anyone ever wants it. You are welcome to call our office where we actually have been laying out all of these proposals.

If we tax this bunch more, or Republicans, if we do this in waste and fraud, or this and that, and you start to see, we are talking about slivers that functionally have almost no impact. Because if you do them solo and not tie it in with lots of other economic growth dynamics, you don't get anywhere.

The last column is just things that are being proposed in the Presidential race. So we are talking about trillion-dollar deficits, and then you look at that last bar on this chart and those trillion-dollar deficits don't even have these things in it. That is about another 25.6 percent of GDP going to debt.

You can't get there. The fact of the matter is, the economy blows up a long time before that.

So, can we move back a little bit from the lunacy and actually sort of say: Okay, how do you get there? SCHWEIKERT, you keep coming to the microphone. You keep begging your Democrat colleagues and Republican colleagues to open up their minds and think more creatively—think with a calculator—actually, in some way optimistically. We joke in my office that I am 57 with a 4-year old. I am optimistic.

But first off, you have to grow. We have to grow like crazy. You do tax policy that maximizes economic growth. And we saw that in some of the earlier boards here when you see what is happening in the labor force participation and payroll taxes.

You will have to fix the immigration system. The economic modelers keep coming to us saying: A talent-based immigration system will give you much more economic lift.

We are going to have to also come up with policies that encourage family formation. Birth rates are collapsing in our country. And it turns out that that

has a really devastating effect over the coming decades in what happens in economic growth and we just need to be honest about that. But there are other things. So that is population stability.

There are other things you can do in economic growth. I am not happy with the term "deregulating." I argue that you need to move to a type of smart regulation. We all walk around with these super computers in our pocket, and we don't stop for a second to think what would happen if we actually started to use technology as part of our regulations.

There are arguments, like in financial markets, the ability to use technology to find bad actors, instead of the lunacy of the model used today, which is almost like a 1938 model where people fill out pieces of paper. They may email them in, but they are still filling out pieces of paper instead of using technology to watch the markets.

It turns out you could crowdsource data for water, for air, and so many of these things, and have instantaneous information if there is a bad actor in your environment. And it turns out it is dramatically less expensive because you don't have to be crushing each little business with regulations. If one of them screws up, you catch them immediately because you are using technology.

There are lots of ideas like this. They are not Republican. They are not Democrat. They are technology. But, yet, you have to be willing to take on the bureaucracy. And as a lot of us are learning around here, it is the bureaucracy now that basically runs Washington, D.C.

Technology disruptions. We need to have an honest discussion. You saw in the charts; Medicare is the primary driver of our debt. You have to be honest with it. How do you have a disruption in healthcare prices? And there are lots and lots of ideas that you are going to have to put together.

We had a meeting in our office earlier today. We were walking through the math on pharmaceuticals. Did you know the misuse or lack of use—which is misuse—of pharmaceuticals is over half a trillion dollars a year? Sixteen percent of all healthcare spending is because of the fact that people didn't take, or took too much, or screwed up taking their hypertension medicine, or other things.

But there is a simple technology solution. It turns out it is not in the pharmaceutical pricing. It is actually in the cap of the pharmaceutical bottle that says: "Hey, Bob, we calculate you did not take your hypertension medicine," and you ping the phone. You can do that for a couple of dollars. Or the thing that distributes pills to grandma who has to take two in the morning and one in the afternoon—this and that—and when she screws up, she ends up in the hospital. It is efficacy of when you take your pharmaceuticals.

What would happen if I could walk up and say, just changing this technology

platform is 16 percent of all U.S. healthcare spending? We have to be willing to think creatively and disruptively.

There is the thing you can blow into. It looks like a large kazoo and instantly tells you you have the flu; instantly can bang off your medical records; and instantly order your antivirals.

Would that make us healthier, more productive, less time getting sick? Of course, it would. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is just technology, except it is illegal. That type of technology today, the way our laws are set up, is illegal.

How do we actually drag in the willingness to engage in those disruptions? It is one of my running arguments. Should we have protected Blockbuster Video from Netflix? We love it when it comes into our home and makes our lives easier. But what happens when it makes many of our constituencies that are filling up the halls here lobbying us really nervous?

There are technology disruptions out there that could crash the price of healthcare and raise productivity and raise GDP. We know what they are. But the arrogance of this place often thinks we know what the future is, and we keep getting it wrong. So we need to legalize technology.

Employment. We still have a problem with millennial men. We have lots and lots of people who have gotten older who want to stay in the workforce. What do you do in programs to incentivize as many people as possible to be in the labor force?

It turns out to be simple ideas that I can't believe we can't come to an agreement on and we have been working on it for years; things like Social Security disability. Should someone say: "Oh, I got a job," boom, they hit the cliff and their benefits, and that sort of safety net goes away.

How do you actually smooth the off-ramp on these programs so it incentivizes people getting attached into the labor force? Because labor force attachment is one of the most powerful things you can ever do for someone's future and for the economy. That is true for lots of programs, even the earned entitlement.

Should we give you a spiff on Social Security and Medicare if you will stay in the labor force? Because as it turns out, you lower our costs. You lower society's costs.

So we really, really need to think about that. And that ties into the earned and unearned benefits of how do you build incentives in there to be part of the labor force to actually use the technologies that make your healthcare much less expensive but keep you healthier. How do we do those things? We know the policy, but this place seems to think about them in silos of: "Well, I have this piece of legislation that does this," instead of understanding it will be dozens of pieces of legislation that are complex. They

are politically difficult and have to be put together.

And the reason those are so important—I have been working on this model now for years saying, if we do everything here and do it right, the future is actually really bright. If we don't do it, we are crushing my little girl. We are crushing our country to just a time of anemic growth and crushing debt. At some point, Members of Congress and the armies of lobbyists in these hallways will have to step up and admit that we squandered the opportunity when we were in this time of just almost a miracle Goldilocks economy where things are stable.

If we are going to do this, this is the time to step up and make it work. But, yet, this has been a couple of years that I have come behind this microphone, and I will get one or two offices that will reach out and want some of the slides and some of the backup information.

I will have—probably next week—certain associations, lobbyists come marching into my office and saying: "David, you can't talk about technology that way. Don't you understand, you are going to screw up our business model?"

We have got to get honest. We know the math. We know how devastating it gets. And just to make a point, before tax reform, CBO was still predicting in these next couple of years we are going to have trillion-dollar deficits. We have known this is coming. The game here is to find someone or something to blame.

How about actually starting to expect us to start offering solutions? That is why I am behind this microphone. There is a path. It will be hard. It will be complex, but there is a path where it works.

Let's try it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 3, 2020, at 1:30 p.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

[Omitted from the Record of January 29, 2020]

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of September 13, 2019, through January 3, 2020, shall be treated as though received on January 29, 2020. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3678. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval of Laboratories To Conduct Official Testing; Consolidation of Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0054] (RIN: 0579-AE46) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2016 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities — Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs, pursuant to Sec. 680(c) of Public Law 97-35, and Public Law 105-285; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3680. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a renewed determination that a public health emergency exists nationwide as a result of the consequences of the opioid crisis, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3682. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Johnson County, Indiana, to a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AN93) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3683. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN87) received January 28, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments (NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-29542; PPWOVPADU0/PPMPRL1Y.Y00000) (RIN: 1024-AE60) received January 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 5715. A bill to improve honesty in pet sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the