

other idiots are going to be like me and get behind the microphone and be willing to talk about this and get ready for the television ads? He was willing to talk about this.

And here is some of the punch line. I believe this number is dramatically too low, but we are coming up with math that says, look, just the use of the GLP-1s for some of the highest BMI segments, potentially hundreds of billions of dollars in savings, and that is without the economic effect, and that is also without the long-term health effects that are outside that 10-year window.

Madam Speaker pro tem, I appreciate you sitting there letting me go through this. I am trying to make a point. Instead of coming to this mike every week after week after week saying there is something horribly wrong in the debt data, it is getting worse dramatically faster. People don't understand how fragile we are becoming as a society because of the threats that debt means.

I am going to try to be better. I am going to try to demonstrate there is hope. There is a path.

This is only one of about four key things I believe we could do to become a much more prosperous society with dramatically—we are not going to pay off the debt, but we could stabilize it. There is hope, Madam Speaker pro tem, but is anyone listening?

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 423. An act to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4004. An act to approve and implement the Agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States regarding Trade between the United States of America and Taiwan, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 70. An act to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to process and complete all mortgage packages associated with residential and business mortgages on Indian land by certain deadlines, and for other purposes.

S. 460. An act to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to establish an urban Indian organization confer policy for the Department of Health and Human Services.

S. 794. An act to require a pilot program on the participation of non-asset-based third-party logistics providers in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism.

S. 1308. An act to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend the deadline for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations implementing title IV of that Act, and for other purposes.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I am going to address a topic I have addressed before this time earlier in the week, but it was brought up again yesterday in the Oversight Committee, entirely inappropriately. It is something that is brought up with each authorization bill or appropriation bill, and it is apparent that the other side of the aisle desperately wants a new bureaucracy dealing with what I will call preferences.

It has been in the news lately because there was a Supreme Court decision saying that, for the first time in 50 years, in the United States, we could not discriminate or use—I guess they were primarily focusing on race but they could have used sex as well—in university admissions. It put an end to 50 years of discrimination at universities.

It has also been in the paper because we have a Secretary of Labor appointed, not yet confirmed, that believes that this country was built on white supremacy, and we have a proposed new head of the Joint Chiefs who believes that we should cap the number of White male officers at 42 percent.

Of course, this gets into other areas as well that the Court did not touch. It gets involved in the area of government hiring. It gets into the area of hiring by businesses that do business with the government.

I think a lot of Americans are not aware that if you have at least 50 employees and do business with the government, you are required to submit a statement every year to the government called the EEO-1, listing the race and sex and the amount of money all your employees make.

It also goes into play with government contracting. Frequently, government contracts are reserved for certain people.

It will continue to be an issue as even after this decision, individual universities have gone down the path of not using tests for admissions. Historically, for example, to get into medical school you had to pass a test called the MCAT test. I had always felt when I was in my teens and twenties that we had the smartest kids go on to become doctors.

But the medical schools are shifting away from tests, which are an objective measure of intelligence, and using things like essays to determine who the next doctor is.

I want to make several comments about this preference idea and why it is so important, as we work through our authorizing bills and our appropriation bills, that we do not slide into this.

First of all, for people who claim, like our Secretary of Labor, that we are a racist country, or a Eurocentric country, I want to point out that the

most successful ethnic group in America today are people from India. The second most successful are people from the Philippines. Other groups like Chinese, Japanese, if you look at Latin America, Cubans are all more successful than the average American, at least judged by income earned.

According to Thomas Sowell, the children of immigrants from the West Indies, the children of immigrants from, say, Jamaica or the Bahamas are more successful than the native-born.

If all these people come here and are successful, why in the world would we want the government sticking their nose in and establishing a whole new bureaucracy?

I also had an experience over the weekend with regard to the Hmong. The Hmong are perhaps the most—the largest number of so-called minorities in my district. I talk to a lot of the Hmong at their festivals. It is always enjoyable to be at their festivals. And, it gives me a chance to eat Hmong food, which allows me to become more used to very hot food.

It is always enjoyable to see such happy people as the Hmong are in their festivals. They had a festival in Sheboygan last week.

One of the things I like to ask the Hmong, since if there was ever a group that would have felt like a minority when they came here it would be the Hmong; obviously not European. When they came here they didn't know the language.

I ask either the older generation how many children plus nieces or nephews they have and they all smile. When they get done adding it up, it seems like it is 30 or 40.

I ask, have any of them had any trouble with the law? No. Do all of them graduate from high school? Yes. Do all of them have jobs? Do all those that have children, were the children all with the mother and father at home? The answer is yes.

□ 1230

I find the same thing when I ask the younger generation, and I ask them about their siblings or their cousins. They have to add up in their mind how many there are. There could be 30, 35, 40.

All of them have had no problem with the law. All of them, when they have children, there is a father in the house. All of them are living the American Dream. Again, it drives home the idea that in America we do not have a problem in which we have a European class that is preventing other people from succeeding. Indeed, the new people who come here do better than the people who have been here all along.

That would be one indication that we do not need these new bureaucrats running around labeling people by their racial background.

The next thing I will point out that inevitably all of these programs have is what I will refer to as, "stupid rules."

Let us determine, for example, who is Hispanic and in need of help. If my ancestors were in Spain, came to Cuba for

a couple generations, and then moved to the United States, they would be considered Hispanic in need of help. If my ancestors lived in Spain and came to the United States, they would not need help. They would not be considered a group in need of preferences.

If you are, for example, one-quarter Native American and one-quarter Hispanic and the rest, say, English or German, you would, again, be considered a minority.

A minority that needs help, even though nobody in your life even knew what your ancestry was, but according to the diversity bureaucrats, you get to check off a box and are in need of special help.

There are a variety of reasons they claim we need affirmative action, one of them is to make up for past injustices, but all of these ethnic programs or whatever we want to call them, apply to people who just moved to the United States. Does it make any sense to say someone who moved here directly from Morocco or Nigeria or Haiti gets preferences when they had nothing bad happen to them in America?

As a matter of fact, it is even more ridiculous than that. They get preferences over the native born. For the purposes of filling out the form, if I move here from Peru and I am not even a citizen, but I have a green card, I get preferences over a person who has lived in America all along. That is, obviously, a potential for a lot of divisiveness.

Along these lines, there are two rationales. One rationale is, we have to make up for past injustices, which makes no sense when you are giving preferences to people who just moved here. The other one is supposedly to show diversity.

Now, let's look at our examples again. If I moved here or my ancestors moved here from Cuba, I don't know any Spanish, I have never been to a Spanish-speaking country, and I have grown up in a northern suburb in the United States. What diversity do I bring to any company? What diversity do I bring to any school? I bring no diversity at all. I don't know why that is not talked about by people who want to push these programs.

As I mentioned, these programs also affect grants given or who gets government contracts. The government sticks their nose in, and if a husband owns a business, he is penalized. If a wife owns the business, that may be considered good in creating diversity. Is that fair? They both have similar backgrounds.

It does encourage lying and crookedness in America as you run across people who put their business in the wife's name so they can get the government contract, but is that something we want to do? I don't think so. Nevertheless, that is an inevitable result of this diversity.

The next question that has to be brought up is for a lot of jobs, probably for the vast majority of jobs, is ethnic

diversity really something that matters?

If we are hiring a new engineer, if we are hiring a new brain surgeon, does it matter whether you are from China or Cuba or Morocco or Poland? You want the best person, the one who has done best in school, the one who has demonstrated just an innate intelligence to do these jobs. Diversity or where your ancestors came from does not help as well.

Now, let's look at another big reason why it is important that the Republican Party fight these diversity bureaucrats every step of the way. These diversity bureaucrats have to justify their job, and to justify their job, they will do things like have little classes in diversity in their businesses or colleges or governmental areas.

These diversity bureaucrats, to justify their existence, will tell young people, or older people, that there is a huge amount of racism in America, and they need the diversity bureaucrats to even things out.

This is one way to destroy America.

You are going to cause people to walk around with a chip on their shoulder who should not be walking around with a chip on their shoulder.

Worse, you are going to be dividing America. One of the things that has made America so great is, out of many, one—E Pluribus Unum.

The diversity bureaucrats want to go the other way. They do not want people from all around the world considering themselves one united group. The diversity bureaucrats want to take what was one united group, tear it apart, and have people angry at each other or fighting with each other. This does not work anywhere else in the world.

When I read about elections in other parts of the world, one thing that makes them so contentious, sometimes violent, is that the elections become a contest between two different groups.

Look at what has happened in Sri Lanka over a period of years between the two big groups there. What has happened in Nigeria between the different tribes there. Of course, in the 1970s, it wound up there were tens of thousands of people dying as the ethnic groups or the tribes in Nigeria separated and wound up fighting.

Why in the world would we want elections in America to be a contest between groups? That is sadly what these bureaucracies are going to want.

I will close with a couple anecdotes, so people back home know what is going on in America.

I know somebody who worked for a manufacturing firm and that manufacturing firm had four engineers. They all were men. They had to hire a fifth engineer and they were told by the diversity firm they contracted with that their fifth hire had to be a woman.

It didn't matter if they had found a perfectly good candidate for the job. They were afraid that the government would come in and penalize them in some fashion or audit them if the next

person was not a woman. It clearly is not right.

The same company was going to hire a new person in management and their first four or five members of management were all of European descent. They were told they had to go out of the way to hire somebody who wasn't European in management rather than just taking the best person that they could.

I don't think most Americans would agree with that sort of thing, but that is what has been going on in America for the last 50 years. I strongly encourage the Republican Party to draw a line in the sand.

Joe Biden wants to insert these diversity bureaucrats in all government agencies, and they will stick their nose in hiring decisions, in promoting decisions. They will stick their nose in who gets grants around the country.

This is a way to divide America. America has become the greatest country in the world by viewing people as individuals. We should keep viewing people as individuals. We do not need diversity bureaucrats throughout our government.

I encourage all Members of this body to treat everybody equally and look at everybody as an individual, not as a representative of where their ancestors came from years and years ago.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 2023, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-1420. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0420; FRL-9970-02-R9] received June 29, 2023, 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.

EC-1421. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Limited Approval-Limited Disapproval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits; New Source Review [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0427; FRL-10165-02-R9] received June 29, 2023, 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.

EC-1422. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting