trying to understand how we judged failure.

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

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

Bill, rest in peace. Yours was not failure.

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

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

TRIPLE PLAY OF AMERICAN CENTURY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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