

and take it under the umbrella of the United States of America and stop all of these problems. You're exactly right. If gas is \$4 a gallon this summer, we would be getting calls from our constituents, What are you doing? And you know what? If it wasn't for the recession, it probably would be. So next year, there will be \$4-a-gallon gas, and hopefully we're moving along to fix this problem.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. TONKO, why don't you take a minute and wrap it up.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you for bringing us together, and it's great to develop this colloquy with our colleagues here in the House, but I can't help but wonder which of us would have the opportunity to serve in this House if we pledged at election time to make certain that we develop jobs in competing nations for developing green energy innovation? Which of us would serve here? Which of us would serve here if we pledged to send dollars to some of the most troubled spots in the world that find us defending freedom-loving nations against some of these forces around the globe? We would be rejected resoundingly by that electorate.

Well, that's what's happening here. The agents of status quo are content to continue this effort to have other nations build the renewable resources out there. They would be content to have the American public send tons of their hard-earned dollars into the economies of the Mideast on which we rely for well over 60 percent of our oil supply. That is unacceptable.

And we can do it cleaner, we can do it greener, we can do it through American resources that develop American jobs to respond to the energy crises around the world. We can become that go-to Nation that will be the exporter of energy intellect, energy innovation, energy ideas. Just like we won the race in the 1960s for the space race.

We need to win this race. We don't have a choice to enter in. I think that choice has been made because there is a competitive edge already that's being developed with other nations out there. We need to go forward with an aggressive investment.

The investment here is to combat a huge deficit that was inherited by this administration, by the Obama administration. It was driven high and it started with a surplus. They spent away that surplus. They drove us into a deficit situation, and now it is necessary for us to invest in an innovation economy that creates jobs.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentlemen for joining us tonight. This has been a very intriguing dialogue, and I hope we garner a deeper appreciation for what it means to become energy independent. You all have the right vision. Now we have to find the courage in the Senate. We have to find 60 patriots in the Senate who will stand up and put America first and suggest that this is about producing and creating jobs here in our country, protecting our national security, and moving away from our dependence on foreign oil.

So with that, I will yield to my good friend from New York as we wrap it up.

Mr. MCMAHON. Thank you for convening the Freshmen Power Hour, and thank you also for having such a special guest in Congressman RYAN gracing us with his eloquence here, with his maturity and wisdom from so many years here in Congress.

You guys have said it all here tonight. This is, quite frankly, a no-brainer. Cap-and-trade was a Republican idea. It makes sense. It's market principles. It's about national security. It's about jobs, manufacturing good jobs for electricians and carpenters and plumbers and steamfitters and engineers and scientists. It is about our environment, too.

You know, Congressman RYAN, when you were talking about the people in China saying, Hey, we want clean air, in Staten Island in New York, we have the highest lung cancer rates in America. The people of Staten Island and Brooklyn and New York City, we want clean air, too. So it's about the environment as well.

But this is a bill that allows us to do all of those things in a uniquely American way, the right way. I'm glad we voted for it in the House. I'm disappointed at the Republicans that they keep lying about it, but I hope, as you said, 60 patriots in the Senate will find a way to get this done and we'll send this bill to the President's desk and get it signed.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, let's get this done for America.

We yield back.

□ 2230

CULTIVATING AMERICAN ENERGY RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINNICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate the time.

As frustrating as these times are, and as difficult as these times are for America, it never ceases to be an honor to serve in this body and to be serving, in my case, the constituents of east Texas. It does mean so much, and the more that you know about history and where we've come from—

Ms. FOXX. Would my colleague from Texas yield for a moment?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, I will yield.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. One of the gentlemen just speaking in the Special Order said, "Republicans keep lying about it." I thought there might be some concern about the use of that phrase, and I would like to ask the Speaker if that is an acceptable phrase to be used on the

floor when speaking about other Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the folks who said it are not here to hear you say that. But thank you very much.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointing that out. I was in the back, jotting down a few notes. But I have had some concerns about some of the things that I had heard. For example, it is inappropriate under the House rules for someone in this body to call another person in this body a liar. That violates the House rules clearly. It's inappropriate to call names in here and engage in personality destruction. That's not appropriate. I've had constituents wonder why those of us on the floor don't call each other names, like Gordon Brown was called in Parliament in England. I have explained to them, Well, we have rules in the House. We don't do that kind of thing here. It's entirely inappropriate, and you can be called down. You can be censured for inappropriate conduct here on the floor and name calling, engaging, as the Speaker said, in attacks on personality.

But there was a comment I did hear in the discussion amongst my colleagues across the aisle about energy; and what I noted when I wrote down the comment was, "If we do nothing like those on the other side say," and I attribute no ill motive or intent to that comment. But the trouble is, that is not accurate; and obviously, it indicates just an ignorance with regard to what has been proposed on this side.

For example, in the area of energy, we have proposed bill after bill that would provide this country more energy. For example, 80 percent or so of our coast is off-limits to drilling off that coast. You can drill off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi. There are some areas where drilling is going on. But we have found in Texas that despite all the naysayers who have said it would kill off fishing, when I was growing up in Texas, they allowed platforms off the coast. We ended up having platforms off the coast of Texas, drilling for oil and gas. Lo and behold, guess what happened—fish proliferated out there. They used the platforms as an artificial reef. So if you go out fishing in the Gulf with a guide, they're likely to take you to an oil and gas platform because the fishing abounds around there. Lo and behold, man and environment can work together for the good of both. Not only would we produce great amounts of energy and avoid this country going back to \$4 a gallon gasoline, which we are going to go to because of the policies of the current administration and the current Speaker who want to put more and more—not just want to—they are constantly putting more and more of our natural energy resources off-limits, just constantly.

Some of us have had bills, supported bills that have used the information available to say, If we allow drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf, it will do a number of things. For one thing, it will provide tremendous amounts of money for the Federal Treasury because of the royalties coming from that. Not only that, there are estimates that if we allow Outer Continental Shelf drilling, that it would produce at least 1.1 to 1.3 million jobs. Well, the President originally promised that he would create 3 million jobs, and he backed off of that and said, well, he may save that many, or 4 million, may save them. And obviously you can never document that you saved a job, only if you created them or didn't. So that's why it was important to inject the word "save" in there.

But with regard to drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, there would actually be real jobs created, not just on the platforms—there, of course—but it would create jobs in every single State. Then also if we allowed drilling up in ANWR—and it's not this beautiful mountaineous area up there. It's not. You go up there, and there's nothing there. Nothing lives there. The caribou may go through once a year, but they can't live there. There's nothing to live on. Birds may fly through every now and then, but there's nothing there for them to live on. That's the area that Jimmy Carter designated for drilling because it was an ideal place, and there was plenty of oil there. But if we allowed the oil to be pursued there, it would create a tiny footprint; and compared to the massive size—and it gets smaller constantly with technology—there would be another 1 million jobs created around the country, the United States, more Federal money, more jobs, which actually would create more Federal money. Then also there are some slopes in Alaska where drilling for natural gas has not been allowed, and that's estimated to create another 1.1 to 1.3 million jobs. We could have between 3 million and 4 million jobs without taxing an extra quarter of a penny. It would cost nothing extra if we just used the resources we've got.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I appreciate your helping to correct some of the things that they said. But I was very concerned with the fact that they said, We, on this side, want to do nothing. You know, I can challenge the veracity of their comments, particularly on that one. The gentleman, I know, is aware of the fact that Republicans have been trying for 2½ years to do something about the situation with energy. I know that you shared with 130 of us, I think, who came down last summer and spoke all during the month of August. But just for my sake and for anybody who's watching tonight, would you please verify that Republicans have offered

several bills to do the very kinds of things that these gentlemen were talking about tonight? The unfortunate thing is that we're in the minority. They're in the majority. So they can talk a lot about it, and they could do something about it when we could not at the time, except bring it to the attention of the American people. But please make a comment about the American Energy Act.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, sure. We had the American Energy Act. There are so many Republican bills that have been filed, and they encompass virtually everything. We want more solar. We want more wind. All these different sources. Nuclear power. I never thought I would end up indicating we ought to emulate France about anything, but they've done a terrific job in producing nuclear energy.

□ 2240

And so that is another area that we can utilize.

Natural gas from the horizontal drilling, the hydraulic fracking, when it's properly done, it has produced now, in recent years we find out, much more natural gas than we thought. And we have plans that encompass all of these things, every single source of energy.

What also our friends across the aisle have not realized, they made a comment about how their energy, their "crap and trade" bill would actually create jobs. And that does indicate to me that they didn't read their own bill. And that's rather unfortunate because there are things that contradict what they said.

But we've had many bills, and we call them "all of the above." And as my friend, Dr. Foxx, recalls, we were pushing an all of the above. We want to utilize all of the gifts with which this country has been blessed. We have more coal—now, coal burned improperly pollutes the atmosphere. We can demand better; coal-to-liquid that doesn't produce all the pollution that just burning coal does. We can require scrubbers, as we have over the years, to help clean up the environment.

We have more coal than any nation in the world. We have vast supplies of natural gas, now over 100 years worth. We've got vast amounts of oil. We had estimates in our Natural Resources Committee—and we've talked about so many of these issues there—in a 500-square-mile area that includes Utah, Wyoming, and part of Colorado, there is a very thick shale there that we would like to see oil produced. And some estimates are 1 trillion to 3 trillion barrels of oil could be produced. Well, we were told that there's only about 1 trillion barrels of oil left in the entire Middle East, and we may have one to three times that much in one 500-square-mile area if we allow the people to go after it. And our plans all include those things.

But one other thing about pursuing that energy ourselves would be, we have a plan. We have bills that would

actually take the money from the Outer Continental Shelf revenue, it would take money from ANWR production, it would take money from the gas production in Alaska and would actually use that to do research and find these other sources of energy.

I have a bill myself that they won't let come to the floor, and it's far-reaching. And some might say, well, it's kind of like the Star Wars idea that Reagan pushed—which ended up bringing down the Soviet Union and providing cover for so much of the world these days. But I really believe that someday solar energy will be our best source of energy and we'll be able to utilize it more so than ever. But we don't have a good way to store electricity. We can store energy. Energy can be stored, as it is in a place or two around the country, where during low-usage times they will maximize production of electricity to use it to pump water up into high reservoirs so that in peak times the water can flow down, turn turbines, and produce additional amounts of electricity. Now, that's storing energy, but it's not storing electricity.

So I had a bill that would say, for anyone who comes up with a way to store electricity in megawatt amounts for 30 days without losing more than 10 percent of the power, you get a \$300 million cash prize. Now, obviously if somebody comes up with a way to do that, they're going to make a lot of money off the process. Some say there is no way that could ever happen. Some scientists I've talked to said, Man, if we could do that, find a way to hold that electricity, we would never need any other source again. It would revolutionize everything. We might even be able to harness electricity. I mean, the lightning from electricity that would come down, we could just store that.

And so those things, I think they are out there. I don't know of a Democrat bill that addresses that; that's a Republican bill, that's my bill. That's far-reaching; it's not going to happen in the next 2 years. But we believe if you use the energy resources we've got, the carbon-based resources we've got, demand clean air, clean water, and be good stewards of the environment, but then use the proceeds to develop the next generation of energy, then we don't have to have people lose jobs.

Now, our friends across the aisle were talking about they were concerned about jobs going to China and places like that. The fact is, that crap-and-trade bill is going to run jobs to China, India, Brazil. And I don't see how anybody can say they're going to help the environment by closing down manufacturers in this country and driving them to countries who produce four to 10 times more pollution to do the same job that goes into the same atmosphere. That is ridiculous. That doesn't preserve our environment; it makes it worse.

And another thing, too, it's historical fact that when a country's economy is struggling, the country quits

worrying about the environment. They quit being good stewards of the environment. We don't have to do that. We can be good stewards, but you've got to have a vibrant economy to do that.

So why in the world would you want to put extra requirements on your industry in order to drive them to countries that would pollute 4 to 10 times as much? It makes no sense at all.

I yield to my friend, Dr. Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I think that this is a great segue to talk about the other subject that we wanted to talk about tonight, which is health care, and what is happening with the health care debate.

Mr. GOHMERT. Let me reclaim my time just briefly because that's where we want to get, but I do want to point out one other thing.

When I hear the talk about what this body is doing to create jobs, let me mention this. They didn't read the crap-and-trade bill because it says—and I pulled it out here on the floor, but I didn't have the full bill because there was only one bill in which both the 300-page amendment filed at 3:09 a.m. was being interfaced with the other bill, and that was right up there on the second level. And I finally got up there and found out where the one—and the Speaker ruled, consulting with the Parliamentarian, that even though there was no final bill that was put together with the amendments in the final bill, that that two stacks of documents that was not collated, didn't have all the lines deleted that it was supposed to, that that bill constituted the official copy that was supposed to be here on the floor.

But in that bill there was a climate—I believe it was called a Climate Adjustment Fund, something like that, and it created a fund. And in the face of people saying across the aisle that nobody's going to lose their jobs, we're going to create jobs—and I heard it again tonight—if you just read the bill—obviously these weren't the people that wrote it, but whichever staffers wrote it, they knew that somebody was going to lose their job. Maybe Members didn't know because they hadn't read it, but the staffers that put that bill together knew people were going to lose their jobs because the fund said it was to compensate people who lost their jobs because of the crap-and-trade bill.

And not only that, it created money in there to help people with relocation. But the problem is, it wasn't going to help them relocate to China, India, Brazil and these different places where those jobs were going to actually go. That was in the bill. So the people, whatever staffers drafted that bill, they knew people would lose their jobs, but unfortunately the Members that didn't read the bill didn't know that that was in there.

And not only that, as my friend, Dr. Foxx, knows, in the last month, what have we been doing? According to my friends, some of them across the aisle,

Oh, we've been concentrating on jobs, jobs, jobs. Last week, we passed a bill for \$770 million for wild horses and burros. I love horses, I grew up riding them, I love them. But the problem created after our friends across the aisle took the majority, they outlawed controlling the herds of these wild horses—even though they have an area bigger than New York State to run wild in.

Well, they have proliferated like crazy. And now, since we couldn't do anything for herd control, now they want to spend \$770 million, a big hunk of that, to buy a place bigger than West Virginia for the horses to continue to run around in. There was some money in there that I'm sure would have created a few jobs, that was going to help the wild stallions with their birth control, their contraception. So that was going to be interesting to see somebody apply for that job and do whatever was required to help the stallion with his contraception needs. But anyway, that was \$770 million.

Not only that, my friend knows that we just passed—and I know neither one of us voted for it—we passed a bill for \$25 million to help the otters. And as I pointed out here, when we passed the bill for \$25 million for the cranes—not the whooping cranes, but cranes, most of which are in other countries—and \$25 million for rare dogs and cats—none of which are in this country.

I was pointing out to my friends across the aisle, you know, you talk about wanting to save jobs and helping; we've got Americans with habitat problems right here. And you're sending money to China that we have to borrow from China in order to buy land to let these rare dogs and cats live on so somebody can move into that area that's starving and kill those rare dogs and cats. I mean, that's insane when we have Americans having habitat problems.

□ 2250

So when I hear people saying oh, no, we're all about jobs, jobs, jobs, I am very concerned. But I was able to point out to some of my friends that supported the crap-and-trade bill that actually there is good news in there for the people that supported that, like our friends across the aisle that did, that actually when the voters find out what all is in that bill that they didn't read, there's good news for them because they may be eligible for both relocation and that allowance because they'll lose their job as a result of that bill. So they may be able to get proceeds under the fund when they lose their jobs because they voted for that bill. I did want to point those things out.

The sea turtles, don't forget we sent sums because it may be necessary to protect sea turtles, and 80 percent of that is required to go to foreign countries and not stay here. I mean, people here have habitat problems, and we're spending money like it's just growing

on trees up here, and we are going to be in trouble.

Now I would like to get into the health care issue because there is money being spent, again, like it's growing on trees. The estimate of the President's plan, \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion. We had just gotten the data back, I think, in May for 2007 that showed all the spending for Medicare and Medicaid. It didn't even include SCHIP, Medicare and Medicaid. And we want to help people. We are a caring Nation, and that's what a caring Nation does. But you've got to spend your money wisely.

So we got the data, and you divide the number of households in America into the amount of money spent by the government on Medicare and Medicaid, and it's \$9,200 per household, for every household in America. The average is every household in America had to come up with \$9,200 in order to fund much less than one-third of the population on Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP. Well, that's insane. We can do better than that.

That's why I started putting together my own bill that basically would save tremendous amounts of money. And for the first time ever, senior citizens would have complete coverage. They wouldn't have to buy wraparound, supplemental coverage, anything like that. They would have complete coverage with a high deductible insurance, which is normally so much cheaper because you have the high deductible.

Then to cover that deductible, for any household where people were on Medicare, Medicaid, or SCHIP or any combination, we would give them cash money, \$3,500, in a health savings account that they access with a debit card, and it is theirs to access for health care. And for anybody that might try to spend it on anything else, it wouldn't work because the bill requires it to be coded in such a way that only health care items, whether it's prescription drugs, over-the-counter drugs, treatment at the doctor's office, all those kinds of things would be covered. And when you ran up \$3,500, if you did, then the insurance that we would purchase for you every year would kick in and you'd be covered.

And to provide \$3,500 in a household account of everyone on Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP, give them that cash money in the health savings account they completely control with that debit card, no gatekeeper insurance company or government telling them they can't if it's truly for real health care needs, and then above that the private insurance we would purchase with Federal money would cover them so well, they wouldn't need any kind of other supplemental.

Now, that is showing care for senior citizens, for those who are in poverty. For all of those who are in poverty, senior citizens, disabled that needed Medicare, Medicaid, or SCHIP, that is the kind of caring that I know Republicans care about; that you can do it

better without some government bureaucrat jumping in between people and their doctor.

Now, I have a health savings account right now and insurance coverage. Some people say Congress has got these gold-plated policies. I've got a \$3,000 deductible. I had better insurance when I was in private business. I had better insurance when I was a judge and chief justice than I do right now. I did. But I've a \$3,000 deductible policy, and I try to accumulate enough money each month into my health savings account, but it's going away at the end of the year.

Well, in the bill that I'm going to file, and I have about got it finished, it actually lets your health savings account amount roll over if you have excess in there each month. But for our seniors, all those on Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP, they would get a new \$3,500 in their health savings account every year. They would have new insurance purchased every year. And they couldn't be dropped because of a preexisting condition or anything like that. They'd just be covered and we'd take care of them. That's the kind of thing that shows when you really care about people.

I yield to my friend Dr. Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. I appreciate my friend leading the Special Order here tonight on health care.

I always like to start with setting the stage and getting the facts. I come from a background in education and in business, and I like to put the facts out so that people can see what they are and then make judgments themselves instead of just saying, like some of our colleagues do, what is happening. So I would like to show a chart that I have and I'd like to really talk about what is being talked about and what has driven this emphasis on doing something about health care.

Now, we hear that it's being called "health care reform," although I think some of our colleagues and the President have stopped using that term "health care reform." But I think it's really important that we put into perspective what it is we are talking about.

We hear all the time that there are 47 million Americans who do not have health care. That is not accurate. I have the numbers. I have the sources for them. If anybody wants to get these from me, they're from the Census Bureau. They are from the Congressional Research Service, the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute for Health Care Management, and the National Survey of American Families. So these are not numbers that I have made up or Republicans have made up; these are numbers that come from government sources.

So first of all, we don't have 47 million Americans who do not have health care. I've said it before. I have been criticized for saying it. But it is the truth. All Americans have health care. All they have to do is go to a doctor or

go to a hospital. They will get health care. We do not turn people away from health care providers in this country. So they have health care.

But what these people really should be saying is they want to talk about the number of people who do not have insurance. There is a big difference between saying a person doesn't have health care and doesn't have insurance. And even that number needs to be clarified. So the folks who are making a big issue out of 47 million Americans, which is an inaccurate figure, really should be saying there are 45.7 million people in this country who are uninsured. Now, let me break that down.

Of those, 9.5 million are not citizens. So when you hear it's Americans who do not have health insurance, that's not accurate either when you're using the 45.7 million because 9.5 million of them are noncitizens. Many of them are here illegally.

Then we have people who are eligible for public programs: Medicare, Medicaid, SCHIP. That's 12 million people. They have chosen not to participate in those programs.

You know, this is the freest, greatest country in the world. We are allowed in this country to make decisions, lots and lots of decisions. And I find it really interesting that our friends on the other side want to push choice that destroys unborn babies but when it comes to choice for school, when it comes to choice not to participate in a government program, they are not so keen on that. But we do have 12 million people who have chosen not to go into Medicare, not to go into Medicaid or SCHIP.

□ 2300

That's their choice. Then we have 9.1 million who are only temporarily uninsured. That means for maybe a month out of a year, in between jobs, or for other reasons, they might be uninsured. But they are not uninsured all the time. That is just for a brief period of time. So that's another 9.1 million. Then there are 7.3 million who make over \$84,000 a year. They are perfectly capable of purchasing health insurance. But most of them are young people who don't feel the need to do it.

I talked to a lady on the phone tonight who used to own a small business, and she said that it was all men, and they were between the ages of 20 and 35. And she said, we had the lowest rates for insurance of anybody because those people don't get sick very often and don't need a lot of insurance, and insurance obviously is calibrated on facts related to the age and the usage. And so she said it was very low rates at that time.

So a lot of people who are in that age range don't see the need to get insurance. So there's 7.3 million. That brings us down to 7.8 million who have lower income and long-term uninsured. These are people who probably would like to have insurance, but they feel they can't afford it. That's the number of people that we need to be serving in this country.

We do not need to turn our culture completely upside down, which is what the proposal from the Democrats is, in terms of health care, give government control of our lives, to take care of 7.8 million people. That would be a relatively inexpensive thing to do when you're talking about trillions of dollars.

Now, I believe, as my colleague has mentioned, that we need to reform Medicare and Medicaid. I believe in that. I think we should be doing better in those areas. We could make those programs better. We could have a higher quality of care, I believe, and again, more choices for our seniors and for those who need those programs. But we simply do not need to redo the entire health care system in this country to take care of 7.8 million people.

We know that American people are hurting. Republicans know that we need reform. And I want to go back to what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep saying. But saying it isn't going to make it true. They keep saying, Republicans don't want to do anything. They talk about our being the do-nothing group. That is simply not true. It was Republicans who instituted health savings accounts. And it's one of the things that the Democrats most hate because, again, it gives people choices. It allows people to build wealth. If they put that money into health savings accounts and they don't use it, they keep it. If you put money into insurance and you don't use it, it's gone.

We believe in building wealth and allowing individuals to do that. We believe in continuing the good habits that this country has fostered over the years, again, keeping the government out of our lives, keeping the government from running our lives from cradle to grave, and letting people make their own decisions and continuing to make this country the great country that it is, the only country I know of where people are struggling to get into. And I'd like to yield back to my colleague from Texas, because I know he has some great stories to tell about issues related to health care and some experiences, more experiences to talk about. And so I'd like to yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentle lady for yielding back. But I thank her even more for her insightful comments and explanations about those who are without insurance and what the real number is that we're talking about, and the real number that we really need to do something to assist. That is so immensely helpful.

But I was struck last week too that, during debate over the health care issue, and some on this side of the aisle were giving story after story, true stories, of just terrible things that had happened, and people died, suffered immensely under health care in England or Canada because of the long waiting list that people get put on to get, either diagnostics to find out if there's a problem, or what the problem is, and

then whatever the therapeutic need is, whether it's surgery, radiation, whatever, how long they waited, and some died while waiting for that.

And we had a friend across the aisle get up and say that, You know, gee, folks here are talking about Canada and England and their health care. No, no, we're not going to be like them. We're America. We always do things better.

And I was so struck by that comment because, for a couple of decades, we've been hearing people on the other side of the aisle talk about we need health care like England. We need health care like Canada. And that's been going on for a number of years, pointing to Canada. Look, we need to be like Canada. We heard that over and over. And then when we start getting into the nitty-gritty and just exactly how people are getting treated in Canada and England, the great examples we've heard for so many years, and we start pointing out these are not good systems that you've been telling us we need to imitate and emulate, then we get the response, Well, we're America. We'll certainly do it better than they did.

Well, the trouble is it doesn't matter what your country is. When you pursue socialism, and the United States government or any other government is trying to take over health care, and run health care, you're headed for trouble. It's socialized medicine. I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union back in 1973 for a summer. We went to hospitals, to medical schools. There were 8 of us allowed in on that program in the Soviet Union that year. And anyway, I don't want socialized medicine. I've seen it.

And now we have friends across the aisle who have admitted this week that, really, you know, the public option they've been pushing for, it's just a way to finally get to the single-payer health care where the government runs everything. And my friends, Mr. Speaker, should know that once the government pays for everybody's health care, then they will have every right to tell you how to live, tell you what you can eat, tell you where you can go, if it's too dangerous. Once they pay the health care, then freedom and liberty that has been known in this country will be so dramatically impeded.

We don't have to go there. And when you use common sense, which I'm told in Washington is not so common, you use common sense, you see that we're already, probably by now, spending \$10,000 from every household in America, on average, to just give 90 million people health care. And you realize, good grief, we could do better than that. If we just bought them the best sterling silver, golden health care in the world, gave them that kind of coverage, and there are some things that need to be done so the insurance company doesn't create problems and impede your freedom there, too. And you give them money for their own health savings account that they completely

control, and it ends up being cheaper—that's a real solution.

□ 2310

You give senior citizens complete control for the first time since Medicare came into existence, and then you give them complete coverage like they've never had, like they've never had. So that's a rather significant development.

There are a few other things I'd like to point out which are proposed in my bill, because I am sick of people across the aisle saying that we don't want to do anything about health care and that we like the status quo. Folks, we cannot stand to do the status quo. We have got to make some changes or it is going to bankrupt this country. We can do better, and this is one proposal that will.

One of the things we've got to have is complete transparency in health care costs because we sure don't have it now. We're not even close. You know, I've asked myself before: What is this going to cost? Well, it all depends; and it does. Which insurance have you got? If you don't have insurance, then that's another cost; but they may give you a little discount. Even if they give you a little discount, it's not going to be as cheap as you could get if you were an insurance company like Blue Cross.

Well, under my proposal, under this plan, you would have complete transparency because every health care provider would have to disclose to you exactly what the cost is. If they're proposing a cost that's different to you than what they've charged to some insurance company, then they have to tell you that, and they have to tell you how much they charge to these other entities. That's part of the bill. We've got to get away from this insane billing system where a hospital may bill \$1,000 to \$1,500 for a room for a night, hoping they'll get back \$100 to \$150.

I was involved in a situation. It wasn't my personal situation, but I was very familiar with it. There was a car wreck. A man ran a stop sign. The hospitalization was 2 days, the testing, all the doctors, the ambulance—everything—came to around \$10,000. That was the total of all the bills. As an attorney, you gather together all of those bills, and you provide them to the auto insurance company of whoever is at fault, and often they'll work out a settlement with you.

In that case, a settlement was reached. Money was put in escrow as required under State law, and then State law requires, before any of the proceeds of the settlement can be disbursed, that it has to first refund any money that any health care provider or insurance company has provided on behalf of the injured party. So, in accumulating the documentation, again, it was around \$10,000 total.

The documentation came back from all of the providers that everyone had been paid in full by the health insurance company of the injured driver. Ev-

erybody has been paid in full under their agreement with the health insurance company, so then you have to get documentation from the health insurance company.

Okay. Show us how much you paid to all of these different health care providers—hospital, ambulance, tests, doctors, all that stuff. Show us how much you paid to satisfy the \$10,000 in health care costs, and you'll be cut a check for that amount, and we'll send it right on out to you. The documentation came as to how much the insurance company paid in full satisfaction of \$10,000 in health care costs, and it was right at \$800 to satisfy \$10,000 in medical claims.

So, if you're the party and if you get these claims, you go, Oh, my word. This is \$10,000 of health care costs? Thank goodness I have insurance. I sure couldn't afford \$10,000. If you knew the real truth, that it was being paid in full with \$800, you might realize, gee, you don't need as much insurance as you thought you did. You could buy cheaper insurance; you could have a deductible, and your insurance would be cheaper.

With the proposal for everybody, it would cover everybody on Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP or any combination. We give them cash in their accounts that they control, and then buy insurance on top of that. It will save this government money, the State's money, and it will give dignity back to seniors who've had to beg the government, who've had to beg their supplemental carriers and who've had to get into arguments. That would have to cease. That would cease and it should. As the Federal Government, we should see to that and not create greater slaves to the Federal Government.

Another thing that this bill would do—and again, it's a Republican bill. There are numerous, wonderful plans that are being proposed on the Republican side of the aisle, but we're not in the majority. The majority can control and can keep every one of these great ideas from coming to the floor. In my proposal, it also addresses and provides great incentives for employers to pay money into individuals' health savings accounts, and that would be money that you, the individual, would have, would control, which would be yours. Again, it's a debit card—it's in the bill—that's coded to cover things that are health care related. Then you would have a high deductible insurance to cover things above the health savings account amount.

Yet since young people hardly cost anything, young people in their 20s and 30s, they would be accumulating vast amounts of money in their health savings accounts so that, by the time they would get to be seniors, the government wouldn't need to pay anything because they would already have so much in their health savings accounts that they could buy their own great insurance. They could pay for whatever they'd need, and they'd have a high deductible insurance.

There have been some statistics that have been put together that have shown that young people could pay for the best assisted living that they could ever need. Special needs would be addressed. That would be the way to get off this road to the \$22 trillion that has been estimated we're headed toward with the Medicare system we're on right now.

There are those who have been desensitized by President Bush's requesting \$700 billion last fall, by President Obama's asking for \$700 billion this year and by the \$400 billion land omnibus bill's actually getting, apparently, over \$400 billion of the original bailout money for Secretary Geithner to throw around at his friends as he sees fit. So people have kind of been desensitized as to how much \$1 trillion is.

So that it can be put in perspective, the total amount estimated to have been received by the U.S. Treasury for tax year 2008 is apparently going to be around \$2.5 trillion.

We have Medicare that is running through the roof, which will break this country. At the same time, seniors, relatives of mine whom I love and care about, are having to buy supplemental insurance because it really doesn't take care of what they need. They're fussing with their insurance companies; they're fussing with Medicare. That is ridiculous. You get toward your last days on Earth, and you've got to fuss over that kind of stuff? That's absurd. We don't have to do that.

Another issue, though, with regard to health care is not only the transparency of costs, but it is an issue with regard to migrants, both illegal and legal, getting free health care. We've seen very clearly health care costs will bankrupt this country if we don't do something to save this Nation, and we can. It's doable, but we have got to get back to reality.

It's estimated that there are over 1.5 billion people in the world who would like to immigrate, who would like to come into the United States. Legally or illegally, they would like to come into this country. Well, we've got over 300 million Americans right now. If 1.5 billion people came into this country, it would overwhelm everything, and we would be bankrupt overnight because we would not be able to absorb that kind of thing.

So, at some point, we have got to go back, as our forefathers did, and say: You know what? The rule of law means something. That's why we have such a top economy in the world, and that's why our friends to the south, Mexico, don't. They've got great workers, hard-working people. They've got incredible national resources, but they're not one of the top 10 economies because they've not been a nation of laws where the rule of law has mattered. They've been a country where graft and corruption all too often have been the rule of the day, not the rule of law. You can bribe your way out of things, and that is why they have not advanced.

Well, we don't need to forsake the rule of law. I am all for having all of the visas we need to supply the workers we need. Right now, we don't need a lot of workers, because there are a lot of out-of-work Americans.

So, as to all this talk about jobs Americans won't do, well, we had a hearing in the crime subcommittee in the last couple of weeks, and we found out that, out of just over 200,000 people incarcerated in Federal prison, 53,000 of them are migrants, immigrants in the country. We were told that most of them were illegal immigrants. We didn't get the exact number out of the 53,000.

□ 2320

But over 25 percent of the people in Federal prison are not American citizens and most of those 53,000 are illegally here. Well, people who are illegally here and are not paying for health care will bankrupt this country if we allow this to go unabated. And some of us care enough about our contribution as the greatest philanthropic country in the world's history and if we'd like to continue to do that, that we need this economy going and going forward in good measure.

And so part of this proposal and part of this bill is that if you are seeking a visa to come into this country, you will have to show proof that you have a health savings account, health insurance to cover your health needs while you're here. There's a provision where employers can set up migrant worker health care costs, or to cover health care costs while they're here and that will satisfy the requirement. You can show proof that the household you're going to be living in will allow you to be part of their household insurance and health savings account. But you're going to have to provide that or you don't get a visa or you don't get one renewed.

Not only that, the Supreme Court in this caring nation says if you present yourself while you're illegally in this country to a hospital, we'll provide your health care needs. That's the law. The Supreme Court says it is; we'll follow the law. But once we've got you well enough to travel, you will be deported and because a bankrupt nation is a matter of national security to avoid, then if you come back after you've been illegally here and required free treatment, free to you but at a huge cost to the American taxpayer, then that will be a crime, that you came in illegally, got free health care and then after deported you came back again, that will be a crime and you would have to be incarcerated. We have got to stop that, so that we continue to be the kind of nation that 1.5 billion people would like to come to and that people around the world can receive the great charity of this nation. Otherwise, a bankrupt nation can't help anybody around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, how many minutes do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to point out that under this health care plan, insurance whether purchased by the employer, purchased by the Federal Government, purchased by the individual, it will be totally owned by the individuals that have the insurance which means it's fully portable. There will be provisions that you can't be dropped because of preexisting conditions, things like that, because we have got to get things back on keel and that would be very helpful to do that.

I would just like to encourage, Mr. Speaker, those who are beginning to think, and I was on a telephone town hall conference tonight before I came over. We had thousands of people on that call. We asked the question, how many would like for the government to run health care? And we had right at 98 percent say they absolutely did not want the government running health care. They know too much about it themselves. We asked how many people were satisfied with their own health insurance or their health care situation and the vast majority were. We don't have to redo the entire system. We don't. But we can do better than we are, and my Republican friends I've talked to, especially the last couple of weeks, like this idea. We'll be getting that filed and we'll get it scored. There's an opportunity to show the caring heart of Americans. And in a different way from what my colleague across the aisle was intimating when he said, We're Americans, we can do—what he was talking about—socialized medicine better here than they've done it. Not if it's socialized medicine, but I would submit to you as Americans, we can do better.

I never seek to impose my religious beliefs on anyone else but I think it's important to know history and where we are and I'd just like to conclude, because it may be a word of encouragement to people, that when the Washington Monument was dedicated, there's a four-sided pyramid capstone that was put on there, there's writing on all four sides but on the side facing the Capitol, up here this way, are the Latin words, *laus Deo*, praise be to God. That's on the top of the Washington Monument. That is the tallest point in Washington, D.C. Those people back then put *laus Deo*, praise be to God, on the side facing the Capitol for this reason: This is east of the Washington Monument. This is the side from which the sun comes up. They wanted to make sure that when God's first rays of sun hit anything in this Nation's Capitol, it was the words—boom—praise be to God, and that is what I hope Americans will be able to say with our Founders for many centuries to come.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEWIS of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. TITUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YARMUTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PASCRELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 838. An act to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of land held by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, to facilitate the construction of a new educational facility that includes a secure parking area for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1513. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 31, 2009, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

2937. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Requirements Applicable to Undefined Contract

Actions (DFARS Case 2008-D029) (RIN: 0750-AG29) received July 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2938. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1055] received July 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting draft legislation entitled, "Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2009"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2940. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8081] received July 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2941. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of July 23, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2942. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-14, proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to section 36(d)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2943. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's letter in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2944. A letter from the Assistant Secretary and the Acting Assistant Secretary for Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 046-09, Transmittal No. DDTC 065-09, Transmittal No. DDTC 005-09, Transmittal No. DDTC 070-09, and Transmittal No. DDTC 052-09, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2945. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's letter in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2946. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the manufacture of military equipment (Transmittal No. DDTC 074-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2947. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed export defense articles or services (Transmittal No. DDTC 028-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2948. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 010-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles,

pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2949. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 063-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2950. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 057-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2951. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 073-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense services and defense articles, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2952. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the manufacture of military equipment to Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 051-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 067-09, certification of an application for a license for the export of defense articles of defense services to be sold under contract, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2954. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting the Office's report entitled "Letter Report: Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to the Revised Revenue Estimate Through the 4th Quarter of Fiscal Year 2008", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2955. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Letter Report: Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 7A for Fiscal Years 2005 through 2008, as of March 31, 2008", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2956. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Letter Report: Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6C for Fiscal Years 2005 through 2008, as of March 31, 2008", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2957. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-34; Introduction [Docket FAR: 2009-0001, Sequence 5], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2958. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2006-022, Contractor Performance Information [FAC 2005-34; FAR Case 2006-022; Item I; Docket 2008-0002; Sequence 2] (RIN: 9000-