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, we don’t 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? Who would be content to send tons of their hard-earned dollars into the economies of the Mideast on which we rely for energy? They would be content to have these problems. You’re exactly right. If gas is $4 a gallon this summer, 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. Mr. Tonko, why don’t you help me 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? Who would be content to send tons of their hard-earned dollars into the economies of the Mideast on which we rely for energy? They would be content to have these problems. You’re exactly right. If gas is $4 a gallon this summer, 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 gentleman for joining us tonight. This has been a very intriguing dialogue, and I hope we garner a deeper appreciation for why our industry is incredibly innovative. 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 say, 60 patriots in the Senate who will stand up and say, "Republicans keep lying about it." I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for his maturity and wisdom from so many years here in Congress. We can find the courage in the Senate. We have to find 60 patriots in the Senate who will stand up and say, 60 patriots in the Senate who will stand up and say, "Republicans keep lying about it." I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for his maturity and wisdom from so many years here in Congress.

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

We yield back.

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 I think 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 gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, if I may, 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 gentleman 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 does in Parliament. 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 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 oil is off-shore 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 off there. They used the platforms as artificial reefs. So off-shore 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 said he wants to put people out of work and we don’t 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, federal Treasury revenue 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—it would work in every single State. Then also if we allowed drilling up in ANWR—and it’s not this beautiful mountainous 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—the Outer Continental Shelf would create, I think, 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 raised a lot of questions. I think it was 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. I am grateful 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. Then we should not at the same time 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 things that have been said, 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.

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 people 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 “crack 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 that.

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 the 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 paid for 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 pro-lightning from electricity that we 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, 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 thought of lightning coming from the earth 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 be 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 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 more requirements on your industry in order to drive the industries 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. GOMERT. 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 they weren’t here 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 it 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 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 said 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 question is, 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.

So I was pointing out to my friends across the aisle that if 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 those 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 right here. And you’re sending money to China that we have to borrow from China in order to buy land to let those 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.

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-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 relocation, the funds 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 in 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. They would have complete coverage, anything like that. They would have complete coverage with a high deductible insurance, normal deductibles normal copays 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 used 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, they give them that cash money, in the health savings account that 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. And I don’t think you’ve ever heard 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 tax breaks. 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 got 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, it is true 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 these, and they don’t just want 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 the big issue of Americans, that 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 what 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.

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 this year. That’s another 12 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 have the lowest rates of any population 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 the bipartisan group that is 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. 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 allow people to make their own decisions, the choice is theirs to make. And that 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 gentlelady for yielding back. But I thank her even more for her insightful comments and her clarifications 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 and 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, and we spent time in 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 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 single-payer 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, 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, the insurance company, and the doctors could create problems that pede 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.

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 that’s what they’ve done 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 30 percent 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, 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 $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 who- ever is at fault, and you don’t have them 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 same settlement came back from all of the providers that everyone had been paid in full by the health insurance company of the injured driver. Ev-
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 foreseen. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased with the Medicare system we're on right now.

There are those who have been desensitized by President Bush's requesting $700 billion in October, and by President Obama's asking for $700 billion this year, and by the $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 $3.5 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 fund 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 that point, we have got to get 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 are losing because 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. And most of them were illegal immigrants. We didn't get the exact number out of the 53,000.

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 is something we need this is 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 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 you with 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, that you know it 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?
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. Tittus, 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. Sánchez 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. Loraine 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 Miami Dade County, Florida, to facilitate the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in Miami Dade County, Florida, to construct a new educational facility that includes a secure parking area for the Bureau of Prisons, 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:

2947. 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.


2949. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting draft legislation extending temporary authorization under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2950. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Defense, 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.

2951. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, 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.

2952. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 028-09 (RIN: 0750-AG11) received July 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 057-09, 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.

2954. 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.

2955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 079-09, certification of an application for a license to export dual-use items to dietetic and health-related products to Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 051-09); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2956. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 067-09, certification of an application for a license to export 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.

2957. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 067-09, certification of an application for a license to export 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.