And if folks have suggestions, Mr. Speaker, if you would encourage folks, if it's about the FairTax, if they know how we can get this country back on track, they can send an email to fairtax@mail.house.gov and you will be able to see it. If it's about energy independence and how we can change national security in this country, how we can reclaim all of the bounty with which God has bestowed this country, energyindependence@mail.house.gov, Mr. Speaker, is an email address that folks can send their ideas to about how we can get this going forward, because I am certain as I am that the sky is blue that the best ideas for saving America in this time of crisis, Mr. Speaker, they are more likely to come from the family dinner table back home than the committee hearing room here.

That's who we are here. We're just folks who used to be at the family dinner table back home, and we've taken 2 years out of our lives to come up here and be a part of a larger discussion, but the good ideas still come from back home. Mr. Speaker, if folks would send in those ideas, we can begin to change this Chamber one seat at a time. We can begin to effect this process one Member of Congress at a time. Members of Congress don't change their minds or change their votes because of lobbyists on Capitol Hill. No, they change their minds and change their votes because of lobbyists back home, and that lobbyist is named Sally the pharmacist, and that lobbyist is named Steve who works at the foundry. Those lobbyists are the individual voters back home. That's what effects change in this place. That's what causes change to happen in Washington, DC.

The American people still run this Republic. I see it every day, and Mr. Speaker, if the American people would reclaim this House, reclaim this House by reclaiming their Representatives, by pushing forward those commonsense ideas—we don't need an economist to tell us, we know it to be true—we can reclaim this country.

□ 1410

I'm not telling you it can happen overnight. I'm not telling you it's going to be easy. But if there is one thing I am certain about America, Mr. Speaker, is in times of crisis we get the job done. If there's one thing I know about the American family, it's if you tell the American family they can't, then they will. We can do it, Mr. Speaker. 300 million Americans together can do this, but their ideas have to be heard.

This big freshman class, I would argue, is doing a better job of making the families' hopes and dreams heard on Capitol Hill than we've seen in my lifetime. But we can still do better. Fairtax@mail.house.gov and energyindependence@mail.house.gov. We will get those ideas heard.

Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful to you for providing me the time this afternoon. I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2192. An act to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days.

ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on the 8th day of March, 1956, a scientist, geologist by the name of M. King Hubbert spoke to an audience in San Antonio, Texas. The audience was a bunch of oil people. He gave what I think is going to be recognized as the most important speech of the last century. It was really a very audacious speech. At that time, the United States was King of Oil. We produced more oil, we sold more oil, and we consumed more oil than any nation in the world.

M. King Hubbert told that group of oil geologists and company executives that in just 14 short years the United States would reach its maximum oil production, that no matter what they did after that their oil production would decline. This was an incredible speech. Essentially no one believed it because, as I say, at that time the United States was the King of Oil, producing more, shipping more, consuming more than any other nation in the world.

For a number of years, M. King Hubbert was a pariah. Nobody believed him. He was kind of relegated to the lunatic fringe. In 1980, 10 years after his prediction that the United States would reach its maximum oil production, you could look back, and what you saw is shown on this chart. This, of course, goes out beyond that year. What you see is what happened then.

The United States did reach its maximum oil production in 1970. After that, the production fell off no matter what we did. Now, there was a little blip on the downside because we found a lot of oil in Alaska. You can see it there on the chart. And we found a lot of oil in the Gulf of Mexico, the yellow that you see there. There was a little blip on the down slope, and M. King Hubbert had not included in his predictions the oil that we would find in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. He included only the lower 48.

This chart shows where that oil came from. A lot of it came from Texas, the biggest single source of oil. The first oil, of course, was found in Pennsylvania and part of the rest of the USA. Then you have natural gas liquids on the top. As we found and used more and more natural gas, the natural gas liquids increased. That's not gas in your gas tank. That's propane and butane and things like that.

This is something that could have hardly been believed. How could a country as creative and innovative as the United States possibly not be able to continue to produce more and more oil when they needed more and more oil?

What M. King Hubbert did was a pretty simple thing. Oil had been pumped for long enough—50 years or so—by that time that they had some idea of what went on in a field, and the production in an individual oil field followed kind of a bell-shaped curve. As you pumped the field, you got more and more; and then when you reached the top, it became harder and harder to get the oil, and so it fell off as you went down the other side of the bell curve.

And so what he reasoned was, if I can make some estimate of how many oil fields there will be in the United States and I add up all those little oil fields, all those little bell curves, I'll get a big bell curve, and that will tell me when we're going to reach our maximum production in the United States.

Just about a year later, another speech was given. I don't know if these two gentlemen knew each other at all. But this other speech was given by the father of our nuclear submarine, Hyman Rickover. Hyman Rickover spoke to a group of physicians. The audience is irrelevant. He spoke to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota, and he said something that should have been self-evident, but obviously they weren't because nobody else was saying them and nobody has said them much since then.

What he said in this speech was that in the 8,000-year recorded history of man, the age of oil would be but a blip, and he referred to it as this ''golden age.'' Here are a few quotes from that speech.

By the way, you can find it on the Internet. If you simply Google for Rickover and energy speech, it will come up. It was lost for a number of years, and a few years ago it was found and put on the Internet. And what he says here seems to be axiomatic.

''There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves. They were created by solar energy,'' he says, ''500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume.

''In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuels are finite''—they will run out—''the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: the longer they last, the more time do we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes which we can expect from such a shift.''

Now, this would seem to be, as I said, axiomatic. Obviously, the Moon isn't

made out of green cheese and the Earth isn't made out of oil. It is finite. One day it will run out. And so it is obvious that one day one will have to come to grips with this. You will have to find alternative energy sources. Just when is that time for the world?

When we ran out of our ability to produce more oil when we wanted more oil was in 1970. But the United States was the first great industrialized Nation and so we would expect that we would reach that point before the rest of the world. Just when would the rest of the world reach that point?

I love this statement: ''Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank. A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly in order to pass on to his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will squander it in riotous living and care not one whit about how his offspring will fare.''

□ 1420

I have 10 children, 17 grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. Particularly my great-grandchildren and some of my grandchildren will look back and they will ask themselves, how could they have done it? How could they have gone on feverishly looking for and drilling for oil when it was obvious that it was finite, when it was obvious that there would come a time when we would have to transition from oil to alternative sources of energy?

Now, this is a warning from the past, but that wasn't the only warning that we were going to have because your government has paid for four separate studies of this problem. And the phenomenon is called ''peak oil.'' That's the time at which you reach your maximum production capability; and after that, no matter what you do, production will fall off. As we saw earlier, that happened in the United States in 1970. By the way, by 1980 it was painfully obvious that M. King Hubbert was right, because looking back those 10 years, we say, gee, we really did peak in 1970, didn't we? And we're tipped over and starting down the other side now.

Your government paid for four studies. Why four? Because they didn't like what the first one said, and so they ordered another one and didn't like what that one said, so a third and then a fourth. I have quotes here from two of those studies.

The first of those studies was a study by SAIC, and the primary author of that study was Robert Hirsch, and it's usually referred to as the ''Hirsch Report.'' It was issued in 2005. These are just a couple of quotes from that: World production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak. A number of confident forecasters project peaking within a decade. Others contend it will occur later. Prediction of the peaking is very difficult because of geological complexities, measurement problems, pricing variations, demand elasticity, and political influences. Peaking will happen, but the timing is uncertain.

The world, they said, has never faced a problem like this. Without massive mitigation, more than a decade before the fact, before peaking occurs, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. We had a temporary problem with the Arab oil embargo in the seventies. This will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions—wood to coal and coal to oil—were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary, the report said.

We were very comfortable living in this ''golden age''—as it is referred to by the father of our nuclear submarine, Hyman Rickover. He noted that the incredible amount of energy and oil permitted us to live a very high-quality life, as compared to our ancestors who had not yet found how to tap into the enormous riches of fossil fuels. When I first heard this statistic I was stunned. I said to myself, it can't be true. One barrel of oil—that's 42 gallons—one barrel of oil has the energy equivalent of 25,000 man-hours of effort. That's 12 people working all year. A barrel of oil has the energy equivalent of 12 people working all year long. Wow, that seems incredible, doesn't it?

And then I thought, I drive a Prius and it takes me about 50 miles on a gallon of gasoline, not very big, a gallon of gasoline. Now, I could pull my Prius that 50 miles, but it would take me a long time. With the come-alongs and the chains and hooking to the guardrail and trees, I could get the Prius that 50 miles. Wow, I said, maybe there are 25,000 man-hours of work in one barrel of oil.

Now, it wasn't very long ago that oil was worth $12 a barrel. That means that you could buy the life-enhancing effects of having a full-time servant work for you all year long, and you could buy it at the well head for $1. If you look around the world and see the quality of life that most of the world's people live, it is really quite incredible compared to the quality of life that our ancestors lived before they found how to tap into the enormous potential of fossil fuels.

There was another report which issued in 2005, and that was a report by the Corps of Engineers. And here is a quote from that report: ''In general, all nonrenewable resources follow a natural, simple curve—production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak, and then declines at a rapid pace similar to its initial increase.'' This is the bell curve, the curve that M. King Hubbert had noted that permitted him to make his prediction as to when the United States would reach its maximum oil production.

The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak, but when it will peak. There are many estimates of recoverable petroleum reserves giving rise to many estimates of when peak oil will occur and how high the peak will be. A careful review of all the estimates leads to the conclusion that world oil production may peak within a few short years, after which it will decline.

Your government didn't like what these two studies said, and so there were two more studies ordered, one from the Government Accountability Office and the fourth one from the National Petroleum Council. I do not have quotes from these two; but they say essentially the same thing, that the peaking of oil is inevitable with potentially catastrophic consequences. Since your government didn't want to hear what these reports said, it didn't pay any attention to what the reports said, and we have gone on with policies of Drill, Baby, Drill.

Just recently, there have been two more reports that tell us where we are—they also look at where we have been—and they make their prediction of where we are going. The first of these reports is the one on top that issued in '08. And the people who issued it were the IEA, the International Energy Agency. They are a creature of the OECD, a consortium of major industrial countries. There is a similar organization, the Energy Information Administration, which is a part of our Department of Energy. And they do similar things and have published similar curves; but this is the IEA, the International Energy Agency.

The blue part of the chart here represents conventional oil. Now, if they had a long enough chart, it would go back here about 100 or more years. We started pumping way back here when we didn't need much, and so we didn't pump much. And every time we needed more oil, we could find more oil and we could pump more oil. And we've been doing that now for right at 150 years.

And so here we are now. And what they show in this chart is the total liquid fuels—that's the line up here—has been plateaued. You can see it's flat there at 84 million barrels a day. We've been stuck there for 5 years now.

□ 1430

We're in a recession worldwide. We aren't using as much oil as we might use. And still oil hovers near $100 a barrel. A couple, 3 years ago when the world's economy, including ours, kind of had a momentary collapse, the oil prices dropped down to $40 a barrel. But the reality of the supply compared to the demand, the prices steadily rose until oil is right at $100 a barrel now.

What this chart showed was a fairly significant drop-off in the production of oil from our conventional oil field. This is following the same curve, you note, that was followed by the United States after 1970. So our 1970 plateau is the world's plateau that occurred—what?—'05 to '09, something like that, was roughly when their curve occurred.

The chart here has several other contributions to our liquid fuels. The top on here is natural gas liquids, and you saw that in the previous chart. That's

propane and butane and liquids like that. The green one under it is nonconventional oil. That is growing, and that will grow. That's oil from places like the oil sands of Alberta, Canada, where they have a lift there, a shovel that can lift 100 tons at a time. It dumps it into a truck that hauls 400 tons, and then they haul it to a big cooker, and they heat it up so that the oil will flow. It won't flow otherwise.

They have a large amount of what we call stranded natural gas. Stranded natural gas is natural gas that is where you don't have very many people. And since it can't be moved—it's not a liquid. It's a gas, and it's difficult to move long distances, so it's cheaper when it's stranded, and so they're using this stranded natural gas as an energy source to warm this oil up so that it will flow.

The next little wedge there, a dark red wedge, really is a part of the dark blue one down here. It's enhanced oil recovery. It's the additional oil we get by pumping live steam down there or pumping seawater down there, or pushing CO_2 down there to push it out. Enhanced oil recovery, that is growing. That will grow because we're finding more ways of doing that.

Then they show two wedges to keep this production line going up, because they think it should go up, and so we'll just find some oil so that it will go up. The light blue here is oil from the fields that we've found but are too difficult to develop, like the field in the Gulf of Mexico that is under 7,000 feet of water and—what?—30,000 feet of rock. It's way down there. As the price of oil goes up, why, more and more of these fields will be feasibly economically developed.

The bright red wedge there is a wedge of fields yet to be discovered because they, predictably, cannot get enough oil from the fields that we have discovered. They're too difficult to develop now, so we'll need to find some new fields.

Notice that by 2030 they have predicted that we would rise from our current 84 million barrels of oil a day to about 106 million barrels of oil a day.

Now, this same organization, the IEA, issued another chart 2 years later, in '10, and this chart is pretty different. It shows, of course, the same plateau. Actually, they show a little dip here. Is it starting down or is that simply an undulation at the plateau?

They have reversed the top two contributions and given them different colors, but they're the same thing. This is natural gas liquids, the purple one, and the yellow one is nonconventional oil production.

Notice that they don't show the little wedge here for enhanced oil recovery. They have included it where it ought to be, simply as a part of the production from the current oil fields. And notice, they go out to '35 rather than '30 in this chart. They go out 5 years further, and they show a really precipitous reduction in the amount of oil that we're going to get from the fields that we're presently pumping.

And so, to keep this curve going up, because it must go up if the world is going to have any opportunity for a growing economy, to keep the curve going up, they are predicting two huge wedges that will come from the fields that we have now discovered: the too difficult to develop and fields yet to be discovered.

There is little confidence that these prognostications will occur. The United States could not do this. We are the most creative, innovative society in the world, and we could not reverse the decline of oil production in our country. And most of those who are serious students in this area do not believe that these two wedges will occur. So it is very probable that what the world is going to do is what the United States has done, and that is that it will tip over and there will be ever less and less oil, harder and harder to get, and more and more expensive.

The next chart kind of puts this in a global perspective. This is a chart which shows what the size of the countries of the world would look like if their size were relevant to the amount of oil reserves that they have. And you notice here that Saudi Arabia dominates the world. That's because Saudi Arabia may—we aren't really sure because they won't open their books. Saudi Arabia may have 22 percent of all the reserves in the world.

You may remember, oh, 6 weeks or a couple months ago, there was a WikiLeaks expose that said that maybe the Saudis had overestimated their oil reserves by as much as 40 percent. So the map might not look quite like this, but relatively like this.

Now, why would they overestimate their reserves?

When OPEC couldn't produce more oil than they were producing and they were all anxious for more revenues, OPEC decided that they would limit their production so as to keep the price of oil up. And so they permitted each of the countries to pump a percentage of their reserves.

And so if you look back at the history of this, you will see that, without finding any new fields, their reserves could go up 50 percent, sometimes their reserves doubled. It was kind of a contest amongst liars, because the more you said you had, the more you could pump because you could pump a percentage of what your reserves were. So we really aren't sure what these reserves are because they will not open their books, but it's roughly like this. Certainly, the largest reserves of all the oil are in Saudi Arabia.

Look at those countries around them, Iran and Iraq and Kuwait. Little Kuwait, that looks like a province down there in the corner of Iraq, and look how much oil they have. The United Arab Emirates, you can hardly find them on a map.

Now, I want you to look for the countries on the map that have the largest economic activity, and that's the United States. We represent a fourth of all the economic activity in the world. We're one person out of 22, and we have a fourth of all the good things in the world.

It's really interesting to ask yourself: How come? What is so different about the United States that this one person out of 22 has a fourth of all the good things in the world?

That is a subject for another time, and we will come and talk about that, but it's an interesting challenge: Why?

Look at the United States here. We have only 2 percent of the reserves of oil in the world, and we use 25 percent of the oil in the world.

Now look at Europe. It's hard to find them on this map, isn't it? Europe, collectively, is economically a bit bigger than the United States, and they're even in worse shape than we are as far as having oil reserves. They are almost totally dependent on oil which is shipped in.

□ 1440

And now look to find the two countries that have between them better than 2½ billion people out of our 7 billion people in the world, China and India. See them over here? Tiny, tiny. They have very small reserves of oil.

Last year the Chinese bought 13 million cars. We struggled to sell 12 million cars. China is now the world's largest polluter. They just passed us. We're number two in that category. China's economy is growing very rapidly. Their demands for oil are increasing rapidly. I do not have the chart here, but China is buying up oil all over the world.

I asked the State Department why would China buy oil. We have only 2 percent. We use 25 percent. We're not buying oil anywhere. I said why would China buy oil. You see, you get your oil today by going to the global oil auction and if you have the money—it's dollars today; let's hope it stays that. If it turns to yen or euros, we're going to be in a heap of trouble. And if you have the money, you get the oil. So you're not benefited at all by owning oil today.

The State Department's answer was, I'm not sure China understands the marketplace. Wow. A country at that time growing at 14 percent, I think China understands the marketplace. I think they understand that there is such a thing as peak oil. Well, do they understand that?

Five years ago, I led a codel to China, this holiday season. I was in Shanghai on New Year's Eve. Nine of us went to talk about energy. China began their discussion of energy by talking about post-oil. Of course there will be a post-oil world. It's not today.

We're not running out of oil. That's not what we're running out of. There is a lot of oil left. There is more oil left than all of the oil we have used in all of the world's history up to now. What we're running out of is our ability to

produce that oil at the increasing rate to meet increasing demands. We're not running out. There will be oil for another 150 years. Ever less and less, more and more expensive, harder and harder to get.

Our time is running out.

If you have only one chart to look at, this would be the chart.

This is when we discovered oil way back there. Huge amounts of oil. This dark, heavy line here is our consumption of oil. You need to kind of thank the Arabs or their Arab oil embargo. If they hadn't had that in the seventies, look where this curve would be. It would have gone off the top of the chart. That woke us up. Your air conditioner now is probably three times as efficient as your air conditioner was then.

Well, we will return to talk about what can we do about this. Today, we talked only about the problem. It's a huge problem. We're equal to that problem. We'll be back and talk about how we respond to the problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BUDGETARY AND OTHER CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're in a time of massive overspending, a time when some want to raise taxes, creating more of an economic problem. But it's been shocking that after the biggest wave election since the 1930s, 80-plus brand-new Republican conservative Members coming into this House, it's been nearly a year, and we really haven't cut much of anything. There's plenty of places to do it. It should be done. It can be done.

We ought to just say we're going back to the last Speaker PELOSI budget before the big bailouts and stimulus all started occurring. I don't remember governmental entities around the country, Federal Government entities, in 2007 and 2008 with Speaker PELOSI at the helm of things, complaining that they weren't getting enough Federal money. Yet, if we went back there and just said, you know what, forget the stimuluses and the bailouts, obviously those haven't worked. Let's just go back to the '07 or '08 budget. They didn't pass a budget; they passed appropriations—but let's go back to those numbers. Instantly, a trillion dollars trimmed off.

What we've had is a President of the United States coming into office jumping up the Federal spending by a trillion to a trillion and a half dollars and then saying we're not cutting any of that extra trillion dollars we've added on. We just need now to raise taxes to get up to all of this giveaway spending that we've done.

There are many good examples of that, but none better than in the solar energy area—a place like Solyndra getting between five and $600 million that's been completely wasted.

We've been told by Secretary Napolitano that the country just can't afford to build a fence on our southern border where our problems now are not Latin American citizens coming up here. We have what are sometimes labeled OTMs, ''other than Mexicans,'' coming in; and many of them are coming in and they're not coming in to do us any favors, and they're not coming here to get jobs.

We have an obligation to provide for the common defense. Our oath requires us to do that, and we're not doing it.

But good grief, if you took the money that this administration squandered giving away to Solyndra, take the $700 million or so that was squandered, given away to a solar plant in Nevada—actually they had about $35 billion to give away, they literally have been doing—and according to the information from this administration—some of us think it shouldn't cost nearly this much—but if you took just $1 billion to $2 billion of that $35 billion that had been squandered by this Energy Department and said we're committed to providing for the common defense, and in providing for the common defense we're going to build a fence, it would cost a fraction of what this administration has squandered on solar energy giveaway programs. What a waste.

Then we have ObamaCare. You want to save a trillion dollars? Just stop it. Repeal ObamaCare. The vast majority of American people sent a new majority into the House to try to get that done. Turns out, we've got to have help in the Senate we don't have down there so that we can do the will of the majority of the American public and repeal ObamaCare. There's a trillion dollars in savings, actually more than that.

We've got $105 billion being spent right now, in the process of being spent, to make sure that the mechanisms are in place so that by 2013, 2014, ObamaCare is going to be the law of the land whether the Supreme Court strikes it down or not, because all of these mechanisms will be in place. It's time to repeal it. It's time to get rid of it and have serious health care reform.

And you can't have serious health care reform until you know what the cost of health care is. You can't go into any doctor's office or any hospital, any health care provider's office and say how much does it cost for this procedure, that procedure if it is something that's covered by insurance or Medicare or Medicaid because they can't tell you. It depends, they'll tell you. What kind of insurance you got? Are you on Medicare? Medicaid? Are you paying cash?

Ironically, in a society where paying cash should normally get you the lesser price, in health care, because of some of the insurance agreements, they are not allowed contractually to charge as little to the cash-paying people as those who have insurance get charged to their insurance companies.

□ 1450

Well, that's not the free market. That's not competition. So that's something that has to be dealt with. We need transparency there.

When we look at the figures, for example, on Medicare for the calendar year of 2010, it has been estimated that $522.8 billion was spent on Medicare. When you divide the number of households in the United States that have been estimated to have one or more people on Medicare, you'll find out we're apparently spending between $20,000 and $30,000 a household for Medicare. You can buy some really great private health insurance, especially if you have a high deductible, for a lot less than $20,000 a year.

That's why the proposal I had—some have called it bipartisan—has clearly become a partisan entity. After being called to the woodshed by this current President, they were able to strike about $200 billion or $300 billion from their estimated costs of ObamaCare only to find, once it passed, it got put back in. Well, if CBO has a margin of error of $300 billion out of every $1 trillion they estimate, then it's probably not something we ought to keep. It's kind of like the Energy Department. When they're that bad at what they do, it's time to get rid of them and do something new.

But you can't blame the folks who are there. Their hands were tied with rules that were put in place in 1974 up until the last 5 or 6 years with the most liberal Congress in our history, the same Congress that said we weren't going to stay with our commitments to allies in Southeast Asia. We left, some estimate, 2 million people to be killed when we fled Southeast Asia. Now this President seems to be following the same trends that we saw with Jimmy Carter: turning on our allies, hurting our friends, helping our enemies—and there's always a price to be paid for that.

So we've got ObamaCare put in place. Over $1 trillion could be saved. Just repeal the thing, and let's start with real reform.

Even though CBO refused to score it, Newt Gingrich told me, if I could get that bill scored, it might revolutionize the discussion on health care. So, naturally, CBO wouldn't score something like that even after they were requested by the ranking Republican on Energy and Commerce—the committee of jurisdiction—and by the ranking Republican on the Joint Committee on Taxation. They both requested it be scored, but CBO didn't score it. It might have interfered with ObamaCare being passed. The bottom line was it would have given seniors a choice.

Do you want to keep being on Medicare and have the Federal Government tell you what you can or can't have, and have to go out and, with the precious few dollars you have from Social