

trying to understand how we judged failure.

One sentence summed it up for many of us: At 15, I could define failure in Minnesota by dying here and going nowhere.

What Bill Holm understood was this Nation had a way to make itself great, reinvent itself and move to the future.

Bill, rest in peace. Yours was not failure.

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

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

### TRIPLE PLAY OF AMERICAN CENTURY

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, it is interesting to see and troubling to see gas prices rising again. I have talked to several colleagues here tonight in fact about gas prices going up. I noticed today on the Wal-Mart sign in Travelers Rest, South Carolina, that the price has gone up here recently. But I am here to say, Madam Speaker, that gas at \$2 a gallon or so is a sleeper cell waiting to detonate in the United States. I am also here to predict for you that within 2 years, I will make the bold prediction, within 2 years gas will once again be \$4 a gallon. So the question is: What do we do about that? Do we wait for it to happen and just sit here and assume that we have to absorb that kind of hit, gas at \$4 a gallon, or do we start taking action now to prepare for the energy security of the United States?

Madam Speaker, I hear a lot of our colleagues saying we need to do other things. We need to, for example, in the case of electricity generation, we need to do nuclear. I think it is a great way to make electricity. But the problem is there are some economic challenges there. Others say let's move away from gasoline and move towards alternatives. But there is a problem there. There are economic barriers, and the economic barriers are in both of those cases the liquid transportation fuel; and in electricity generation, the challenge is that the incumbent technologies have some freebies that they get. And as long as those freebies continue to distort the marketplace, the free market system, as long as those distortions are there, we won't move to alternatives for gasoline. We won't move to alternatives to coal. What we will do is just stick with the incumbent technologies. As long as the incumbent technologies get these freebies, and economists call them negative externalities. They are basically bad

things that come with those products that aren't recognized by the market, and as a result the market doesn't respond.

So, for example, take the national security risk that we run by being dependent on gasoline, on oil. Right now on the Straits of Hormuz we have some very heavy metal going up and down the Straits of Hormuz protecting a supply line of a product that we must have because we are dependent, we are addicts, addicted to oil.

If you attributed some of those costs to the price per gallon of gasoline, it wouldn't be the \$2.09 that I saw on the marquee in Travelers Rest, South Carolina, today; it would be a lot higher than that. If there were proper cost accounting, if you will, and that were really attributed to the price of gasoline, right now we would be moving more rapidly toward alternatives.

We would be having plug-in hybrids coming very quickly to the market. We would be having the Chevy Volt make its way to the market. We would be having hydrogen coming much closer and faster than it is coming now.

Madam Speaker, we have to figure out a way to change the underlying economics because I believe the solution here is not us in Washington coming up with grant programs and maybe doling out some money here and there, but rather in harnessing the power of American free enterprise, entrepreneurship, to deliver these solutions. The way that they are delivered is if we come together as a Nation and say listen, no more freebies, no more of these negative externalities that are unrecognized because as long as they are unrecognized, there is a market distortion. We attach those to the prices of the products, and I think the way to do that, by the way, is a revenue-neutral carbon tax where you reduce taxes elsewhere, say on payroll, and in an equal amount impose a transparent tax on carbon.

The result would be no additional take of tax revenue to the government; but rather, a price signal to the marketplace that says the incumbent technologies aren't going to get their freebies any more. If they are not going to have their freebies, then those of us who have alternatives can make a buck selling them.

When that happens, Madam Speaker, we will change American energy dependence on the Middle East and we will be able to say to them we just don't need you like we used to. We can improve the national security of the United States, we can create jobs with those new technologies, and we can clean up the air. It is the triple play of this American century. Madam Speaker, I say let's get about it.

### HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, those of us who came to Washington to pass comprehensive and revolutionary, potentially transformational health care reform are emboldened by the realization that we now, for the first time in almost a decade, have a President and an administration who are as committed as any advocate in this country to the premise that this country must reform its health care system. We are reminded almost weekly of President Obama's commitment to health care reform that happens this year.

This week we saw the President bring together varying and diverse groups that over the course of the history of health care have normally been at each other's throats, coming together to say that the first premise of health care reform has to be lowering of cost in the system. The health insurance community, the hospital association, the medical association, PhRMA and SCIU, one of the Nation's biggest unions, all coming together and saying, listen, let's take cost out of this system. And it is the right way to first approach health care reform. We can talk all we want about coverage, but if we don't start to dramatically slow the growth of health care at a pace now that stands at 7 or 8 percent a year, if we don't bring it down to something that more resembles the general inflationary rate in this country, there will be no room, never mind to expand coverage, there will be no room to just cover the people with health care now. We have gone over the numbers over and over again: \$7,400 per person that we spend on health care in this country, \$2.2 trillion across the spectrum of our health care system. Twice as much of our GDP is spent on health care as we spent in 1970, and twice as much of our GDP is spent on health care than many other similarly situated industrialized nations.

Health insurance premiums over the last 10 years have gone up 119 percent, while earnings have risen only 34 percent. We know there are savings because we look out across the country and we see dramatically diverse experiences with regard to cost.

In my home market of Hartford, Connecticut, we are spending on average about \$8,000 a person to treat a Medicare patient. Well, you go down the eastern seaboard to Miami, and they are spending twice that amount, \$16,000 to treat a similar Medicare patient.

Now, I am sure we can come up with a list of reasons why that care is going to be marginally more expensive given the client base and the provider costs, but not twice as expensive.

As we saw in some recent work at Dartmouth University, there is no correlation between what you spend and the quality you get. In fact, it tends to be the reverse: the better you are at coordinating care and keeping costs down, the healthier your patients are. So there is an enormous amount of savings that we can achieve just by better

coordinating care and learning from the areas of the country and the health care communities that have figured out that you can reduce costs and preserve quality.

But ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can really take a whack at costs until we understand the important role that a public insurance model can play in our health reform system. I want to talk about this for 1 minute.

We have looked at comparative models, for instance on the purchase of prescription drugs via a government program like the veterans health care system and private models like the Medicare prescription drug benefit programs, and we see example after example on how the ability of the United States Government or entities acting on its behalf can bring down the cost of health care. We have seen examples of how a government-sponsored health care initiative that has no interest in returning value to shareholders, that has no interest in paying its CEOs massive salaries, that does not have a profit motivation can get more humane and less expensive care to its recipients. That is the theory behind those that want a government-run single payer system, and I think we all acknowledge we are not going to get there.

But we are not going to achieve the savings that we hope to achieve unless we can have a robust, completely competitive market where individuals and businesses that are purchasing insurance get to choose not only between private insurance companies that might offer them the best deal, but also from a public option as well.

This is fundamentally about creating real market-based choice for consumers. If we have a diverse array of private insurance products and a public option, that more than anything we do with regard to changing reimbursement from volume to outcomes, can bring down the cost of health care.

#### IN MEMORY OF SPECIALIST RYAN CHARLES KING

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today the residents of northwest Georgia are saying good-bye to a native son who died while bravely serving his Nation in Afghanistan. Specialist Ryan Charles King was killed in action on May 1, 2009, in Afghanistan when his unit came under enemy fire while on a night mission.

Last evening, Mr. Speaker, I joined Specialist King's family, his friends and supporters at his visitation to honor the life of this brave soldier. In speaking with Specialist King's parents, I found out that he and I have a history together. When I was an obstetrician-gynecologist, I delivered Ryan King a little over 22 years ago on Veteran's Day in 1986. How fitting that

this brave soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice for his country was born on such a special day.

We remember Ryan as a man of the highest character whose receipt of the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and NATO Medal are testament to the supreme sense of duty he felt to his country and to his comrades.

Born in Marietta, Georgia, at WellStar Kennestone Hospital, Ryan attended Faith Lutheran Church for many years.

□ 2015

He was a talented and a spirited baseball player, leaving his mark on the diamonds throughout Canton, Powder Springs, and Dallas, Georgia.

A few months after graduating from East Paulding County High School, Ryan King fulfilled a lifelong dream and he enlisted in the United States Army. He went to basic training at Fort Sill in Oklahoma, followed by advanced individual training at Fort Huachuca in Arizona. After completing his training, Specialist King was stationed in Korea for 1 year, and it was there that he met his wife, Sergeant Rachel Nicole Smith King.

As a member of the Special Troops Battalion, 3rd Brigade, 1st Infantry, he left for deployment in eastern Afghanistan in July of 2008 and, sadly, was scheduled to return to Fort Hood in Texas in June, 2009, just 1 month from now.

Specialist King leaves behind his wife, Sergeant King, his father, Charles King of Temple, Georgia, his mom, Candice R. King of Decatur, Georgia, younger brothers Tyler King of Temple and Dante Moore of Decatur, grandparents, Dorothea King of Temple and Tommy and Nancy Roberts of Dallas, Georgia, as well as many aunts, uncles and cousins.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers go out to his family. And my deepest gratitude goes out to Specialist King for his selfless sacrifice for our Nation. I ask all Members to join me in honoring the distinguished memory of Specialist Ryan Charles King.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, 111TH CON- GRESS

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules for the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the 111th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Committee adopted the following rules in open session by a voice vote, a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on January 14, 2009:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ADOPTED JANUARY 14, 2009, 111TH CONGRESS

Rule 1. General Provisions. (a) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (hereinafter the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as is applicable.

(b) Rules of the Subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

Rule 2. Meetings. (a) Regular Meeting Days. The Committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The chairman of the Committee may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the ranking minority member.

(b) Additional Meetings. The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) Notice. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting of the Committee or its subcommittees scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House will be in session shall be announced at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting. The date, time, place, and subject matter of other meetings shall be announced at least 72 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(d) Agenda. The agenda for each Committee or subcommittee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

(e) Availability of Texts. No bill, recommendation, or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee unless the text of the matter reported, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the Committee for at least 36 hours. Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.