

havoc Katrina played not only on the 90,000 square miles of the gulf coast, but when it comes to energy and gasoline supply, indeed all of America. In fact there was a world disruption because of that.

In the United States, we consume over 20 million barrels of crude oil a day, nearly 25 percent of the consumption for the entire globe; and yet the United States only has about 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. Worse than that, we import from countries about 60 percent, and these countries are not always our friends. A lot of it comes from the Middle East: Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait. We have got some from South America, Venezuela. We all remember last week what Hugo Chavez of Venezuela did to the President when he was down there to give him a warm welcome.

Because energy is a national security risk, I have introduced today, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a number of Republicans and a number of Democrats, the Fuel Choice American Security Act of 2005. And what this bill does is it seeks to get us off Middle East oil by the year 2015. We will not be free from importing oil from around the world; but when it comes to the Middle East, we will be able to say, We can buy from you, but we do not have to buy from you.

Our bill does a number of things. Number one, it sets a goal. It says that by the year 2015 we will have reduced our oil consumption 2.5 million barrels a day. That is a 10 percent reduction and that would get us free from the Middle East.

It also requires that the General Accounting Office scores energy-related bills that we consider on the floor of Congress, and it gives Members of Congress a clear idea does this bill make you more dependent on foreign oil or less dependent; and does it move you closer to that goal of energy or fuel independence by 2015, or does it move it further away.

Secondly, what this bill does is it provides incentives to automobile manufacturers and to consumers to buy more and produce more energy-efficient automobiles. We double the tax credit for the purchasing of hybrids. We encourage automobile manufacturers to use light materials in the manufacturing of their cars. We put money, or incentives into municipalities to move towards the plug-in flexible fuel fleets when it comes to automobile taxicabs and so forth.

We give incentives to gasoline companies so that they will switch pumps so that when a consumer pulls in, they can have their choice of fuels for their automobiles. We also say that when you purchase tires you ought to know how many miles per gallon those tires should help you get. People do not even realize it, but if you inflate your tires right, you get more miles per gallon. And our consumers do not know that.

The third thing our bill does is it increases energy choice by investing

more money into biomass, and that could be any kind of biomass there is. It also takes the import tax off of ethanol from other countries. In Brazil today, 40 percent of the cars run on ethanol. In America, only 3 percent do. Brazil actually has surplus ethanol. We have a goal, we call it E 10 by 10. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is one of the champions of it. It says 10 percent of the gasoline will have ethanol in it by the year 2010. We are in agreement with that.

But the domestic production of ethanol through the corn supply alone will not get us there. We need to have corn, we need to have sugar, we need to have pine needles. We need to have whatever can get us that ethanol supply. But in the mean time, why are we taxing a source of energy from a country like Brazil? What we need to do is take that export tax off there, and that is what our bill does.

And finally, we ask the Federal Government to audit their agencies to figure out what can you do to save gasoline. One example, I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. Think about Saturday mail delivery. We pay 100 percent of the fuel cost to deliver 30 percent of the mail that we do on Monday through Friday. In this day of e-mail, do we really need Saturday mail delivery anymore?

Those are just some of the things the bill does, Mr. Speaker. It does move us towards energy independence by the year 2015, which is what we need. And I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for letting me get in front of him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KING of Iowa addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHO IS IN CHARGE, MEXICO CITY OR WASHINGTON, D.C.?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to U.S. immigration policy, who is really in charge? Is it Mexico City or Washington, D.C.?

On almost a daily basis, Mexican officials seem to interfere with the immigration matters and U.S. laws. Mexican officials on both sides of the border are righteously indignant about American policies pertaining to the security of our border. Many American officials are oblivious to the problem as well. There is a continuous moaning and groaning rhetoric complaining we should not prevent illegals from entering the sovereign United States.

I want to make it clear again that I fully support immigration, legal immigration. It is not fair to America, nor is it fair to those who are trying to

enter our country lawfully that every year thousands of people enter our country illegally. We must stop sending the wrong message to the world that we will wink at illegal immigration. It appears to me that the leaders of Mexico give lip service to our immigration and border security laws. Mexico must stop encouraging illegal entry to the United States and the disrespect for the dignity and sovereignty of this country. So I ask, When it comes to U.S. immigration policy, who is in charge? Is it Mexico City or is it Washington, D.C.?

Let me give you some examples. I will start with our open borders. You know, our government does not acknowledge the term open borders or porous borders, but that is exactly what we have. I have recently visited the United States-Mexico border and witnessed firsthand the lax security in place there. It takes very little effort for illegals to cross or hire someone to cross them into the United States and enter this country illegally.

Some estimate that 5,000 people a day cross illegally into our country. Some of them even do it with the help of the Mexican Government. The Foreign Ministry of Mexico distributes a pamphlet called "Guide to Crossing the Border." I have shown this on the floor before. It is produced in English and Spanish, and it is essentially a book of sneaking into the United States. The Mexican consulates encourage this illegal conduct as well. Their purpose is not to help their citizens break American law, but that is what occurs. Passing out these guides is a disgrace to our laws and encourages illegal behavior. This lone act of a document showing people illegally how to come into the United States is a disrespect for America's borders and encourages the daily invasion of illegals into the United States.

So once again I will ask the question, When it comes to United States immigration policy, who is in charge? Mexico City or Washington, D.C.?

Consulates also hand out matricula consular cards which illegals use for identification purposes. This card resembles a driver's license and has become widely accepted as a form of identification to get services at U.S. banks, car dealerships, and American insurance companies. Even in some States they are allowing individuals to purchase or get a driver's license based on this document. The consulate issues these cards to people who are illegally in the United States. This is an absurd policy because these people are in our country illegally, yet we are helping them set up a residence in our country.

The Mexican Government has heavily lobbied the Federal Government of the United States to use these cards as identification cards, but so far the Federal Government does not do so. So Mexican consulates are going to local communities and local governments and trying to get them to accept this document. And some do, unfortunately.

This is just one more example of blatant disrespect for American law, yet we do nothing about it. We give illegals and the Mexican Government another pass. When it comes to the United States immigration policy, who is in charge? Is it Mexico City or Washington, D.C.? The answer is becoming more and more blurred.

Let me give you another serious example. In Los Angeles during the past year, the Mexican Government has provided over 100,000 Mexican text books to 1,500 schools. In fact, according to a recent Houston Chronicle editorial written by Heather McDonald, the sixth-grade Mexican history book celebrates the Mexican troops who fought against Americans during the Mexican-American War. The book refers to the enemy flag as the flag of the United States and says that the war's consequences were disastrous for Mexico.

So is this what we are going to teach American school children? Has political correctness gone so far that we now refer to Old Glory as the enemy flag? And why do we allow the Mexican Government to inundate our kids with Mexican text books anyway? This is very disturbing. The Mexican Government should spend more time enforcing their own rule of law and fighting corruption in Mexico and less time undermining our rule of law. Mexico has many advantages and natural resources. Perhaps they should take advantage of these to improve their own country so residents will quit leaving. They need to address their problems at home instead of sending them north to us.

Mr. Speaker, the lawlessness of the border will promote more lawlessness. We welcome people who want to make a better life for themselves and come to America for the American Dream, but they must do so legally. Our government cannot afford to continue to ignore the invasion from the south of our borders. The Mexican-American War started because Mexicans did not recognize the Texas-Mexico border at the time. They ignored the treaty that their dictator, Santa Anna signed, and they invaded the United States in 1846.

Sound familiar? It seems to me that a second attempt at invasion and colonization has already begun. Is Mexico trying to retake the Southwest? It is said that Caesar fiddled while Rome burned. I ask, Is Washington fiddling while the border burns with the lawlessness of an illegal invasion? Who is in charge of the U.S. immigration policy? Washington, D.C. or Mexico City? Only history will reveal the answers to that.

That is just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BABY BOOMER GENERATION

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to go out of order and address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at a breakfast, Chairman Alan Greenspan was talking to a group of us, and he made mention of the fact that one of his concerns about those of us who were members of the baby boomer generation, despite the fact that we may have lavish pensions or Medicare, Social Security awaiting us upon retirement, that we may suffer because there are not enough of those in the generation coming after us to provide the things that we may want; and of course one of those things we may want will be physicians to take care of us in our old age on Medicare and Social Security.

Well, there is an event happening at the end of this year that I think is particularly pernicious to the upcoming crop of young medical students and physicians, and that is a planned 4.4 percent negative update, that is, a pay cut for doctors who provide care for Medicare patients. As a Member of Congress, and as a physician, I can strongly empathize with the medical community, particularly the younger medical community as they face an impending 26 percent cut in reimbursement over the next 6 years, law already in place, cuts already programmed to happen unless this Congress takes action.

Medicare payments are already lower than the cost of delivering the care. Medicare payments do not pay the freight for overhead in a doctor's office. According to a survey conducted by the American Medical Association, a tremendous number of physicians, 38 percent, responded that they would be forced to reduce the number of Medicare patients that they accept, based on the 4.4 percent reduction that they face just for this coming year.

□ 1845

This data is reflective of the first installment of a series of cuts. This is of great concern to me, as access to health care is crucial for the Medicare population. We have seen the roll-out yesterday of the availability to the part D Medicare prescription drug benefit; and many of us, myself included, have argued on the floor of this House that the Medicare prescription drug benefit is crucial to providing 21st-century medicine to our seniors. But if we have no doctors present to write the prescriptions, then all of the prescription drug benefit in the world will be of no benefit to tomorrow's seniors.

It is not just that we have doctors dropping out. We have doctors restrict-

ing the types of services that they might offer to Medicare patients, and we have doctors restricting where they might go into practice.

Well, in addition, based on these reduced reimbursement rates, doctors will be less able to invest in things that we are asking them to do, things like information technology and necessary and up-to-date medical equipment. All of these combined factors will negatively impact the quality of care that our seniors receive. Simply put, we are driving doctors out of the Medicare system, and we can no longer afford to do that.

Now, one of the proposed solutions deals with what is called Pay For Performance; and true, we should explore the concept of Pay For Performance by addressing whether this system is an improvement over the current one. It is important to establish the true quality indicators, and this is best done in conjunction with the specialty societies themselves, with the doctors themselves who will be delivering the care.

What are the goals of Pay For Performance? Well, the number one goal is better clinical outcomes. In partnership with that, we want improved patient satisfaction, and that goes hand in hand with improved physician satisfaction.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that doctors will support a concept like Pay For Performance if they believe in what it is trying to accomplish; but if it is just simply empty rhetoric, doctors will be among the first to recognize that and will abandon any attempts by Congress to drive a concept like Pay For Performance.

Ultimately, if Pay For Performance is structured appropriately and the cost of delivering care comes down, well, that is good. We save some dollars in the Medicare part B system, but that money cannot be used to offset other debt. It has to be put back into the system and reward those doctors who have improved quality and lowered costs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, fortunately, in my committee, in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, we are going to hold a hearing on physician reimbursement tomorrow, and it is timely. I am grateful to the chairmen, both the full committee chairman (Mr. BARTON) and the subcommittee chairman (Mr. DEAL of Georgia), for having this hearing. We are going to have good panels of witnesses present to receive our questions, and I think it is timely that my committee be involved in that discussion because, after all, that is the jurisdiction where this particular argument resides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)