

questions about where the money was allocated and who got it and what they did with it. And we found out some very interesting things. Eight billion dollars was loaned from the TARP money to Citigroup—they got a lot more than that, I think they got about \$35 or \$40 billion—but Citigroup loaned \$8 billion from the TARP funds to Dubai. Dubai is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, and their public sector borrowed \$8 billion from Citigroup, here in the United States, that had just gotten about \$30 or \$40 billion from the taxpayers in the TARP funds. And that just made my hair stand on end. Why would the taxpayers in this country want to give money to Citigroup and then have them turn right around and loan it to Dubai, halfway around the world, which is a very wealthy country? One billion dollars was invested by the J.P. Morgan Treasury Services in development of cash management and trade finance solutions in India. There's another billion, another thousand million dollars, that J.P. Morgan took from the American taxpayer in the TARP funds and then loaned it to an organization called Trade Finance Solutions in India.

And then \$7 billion was invested by the Bank of America in the China Construction Bank Corporation. Now, China has quite a bit of our money already and quite a bit of our business, and I don't know why in the world American taxpayers should be having their money that is given to the Bank of America to keep them afloat to be given or loaned to the China Construction Bank Corporation. It just doesn't make any sense to me.

□ 1600

We had \$700 billion that was put into the TARP fund. Of the \$700 billion, there are only about eight or nine places that we know where the money went. There are another 297 places that are unaccounted for. We had a hearing today to try to find out where the money went and what it went for, and we couldn't find it, but we know that there are 297 areas where we don't have any idea what the money was used for or where it went.

In addition to that, we had other expenses or places where we put our money. We put \$14 billion into the auto bailout, and there's going to be another \$30 billion in that before this is over; \$780 billion, I believe it was, that went into the account that was supposed to stimulate the economy, the stimulus bill, and that is almost another trillion dollars. We passed a \$410 billion supplemental yesterday, and we're going to pass a \$3.6 trillion budget before too long that's going to include 660 some billion dollars for a new socialized national health care program.

The reason I bring all this up, my colleagues, is because I think the American people and my colleagues ought to know that we are spending trillions of dollars of taxpayers' money, and in many, many cases we

don't have a clue where it went. And I think that this government and this administration and the Congress should demand, demand, that the TARP funds and all the other funds that are being expended by the taxpayer to take care of these financial institutions to keep our economy above water and to help bail out homeowners who are losing their homes ought to be accounted for. Most of that money so far, as far as I can tell, isn't doing anything to stimulate economic growth or to help the homeowners or the financial institutions to solve this problem.

And in addition to that, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Geithner, said that they're going to have to put another \$2 to \$3 trillion into the financial institutions to keep them buoyed up and survivable.

Now, just add all that together in your mind and you're looking at \$5 or \$6 or \$7 trillion, and that money is not there. We're going to have to print it. It's going to be passed on to our kids in the form of tax increases or inflation. We need to have an accounting.

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

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

#### OUR HEALTH CARE FINANCING SYSTEM

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our health care financing system in America is broken. We have the best health care system in the world, but the financing system is going to degrade, and it's going to wreck the quality of health care if we don't do something about it.

I come before you this evening and talk about this issue that is of vital importance to everyone in this body and every American, and that is health care.

The new administration has stated that health care reform is going to be their main priority for the rest of the year, and I applaud the administration for undertaking this ambitious endeavor to finally reform this broken system of health care financing.

Our current health care system, with a reliance on third-party, or employer-provided, insurance, is a relic of World War II. As time marches on, we are finding that individual patients, which should be the primary concern of any health care system, are being relegated to the back seat in the decision-making process, leaving it up to their physicians to try to obtain payment from insurance providers, with varying degrees of success. In fact, insurance bu-

reaucrats, both government and private, are currently making health care decisions and are already rationing health care, and these folks are not even medically trained.

Instead, if true health care reform is to be at all successful, we must refocus our efforts on putting patients front and center in all decisions that relate to their health. The patient and the physician should be deciding the best course of action as it relates to the patient, just as the patient should be the main arbiter with their insurance provider. Once people are finally allowed to assume responsibility for their own medical well-being, they will be able to demand upfront an explanation of charges for potential tests and procedures. Only in a fully patient-centered system can we bring the market forces of accountability and transparency into the health care system that exists in other areas of our economy.

I envision a way in which we can build a vibrant health care system in our country, where physicians are free to practice medicine without the massive government burdens that our current health care system weighs them down with. Our new system will still have a vital place for a third-party payment structure to cover extraordinary or even catastrophic procedures. But the basic tenet must be simple and straightforward: The patient must always come first, and the patient must ultimately be responsible for their own health care well-being.

The task set before us is enormous, but it is attainable. Failure is not an option, but a fate worse than failure for the future of our country and its people is absolutely making the wrong choice.

I cannot stress this enough. Our country's health care system must not follow the ill-advised example of other western countries, specifically France, England, and Sweden, with an utter reliance on the government to provide health care for every individual. This is socialism in its most basic form and is directly responsible for burdening these countries with such massive financial obligations that the only remedies are radical changes and cuts or bankruptcy. Not to mention that the standard of care that these countries provide is an inferior one.

True, our current health care system is rapidly going bankrupt and bankrupting every American in the process. But we spend 2½ times more money than any other country in the world right now. Just imagine how much we'll spend if we follow Europe's lead and totally socialize our health care system.

So we must not follow their reckless example as we work to change our own health care financing. But we must not waver either in the face of this enormous task set before us. And make no mistake about its enormity.

I have never encountered a problem, except for national defense, where a solution from the government has turned

out better than a solution from the private sector. That said, we should not stand for trading in government bureaucrats for insurance company bureaucrats. I cannot stress this enough: The ultimate decisions must be in the hands of every individual patient. Physicians should be in charge of explaining the benefits and risks of each and every test and procedure to the patients, and the patient will decide how to proceed. When necessary, the patient will consult with their insurance provider, seeking guidance about extraordinary procedures or hospital stays or whatever is required.

We must take steps to change our health care system, but socialism is not the answer. Let's work together to find solutions that are patient-focused and not government-focused.

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

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

#### THE \$10 BILLION LANDS BILL: ANOTHER BIG GOVERNMENT BOON-DOGGLE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House, unfortunately, voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Senate lands bill, a \$10 billion bill that we simply cannot afford. Fortunately, it did not pass with the required two-thirds vote necessary for passage under suspension of the rules. However, all this really means is that it will now be taken up under regular order, where it should have been in the first place and which requires only a majority vote. Thus there is no question this bill will pass the next time it's taken up.

But I hope more people across this land will start thinking about what we are doing to ourselves. I realize that since we are now throwing around trillions, spending money like never before, that maybe people don't really think that \$10 billion sounds like that much anymore. But to anyone who stops to think about it, \$10 billion is still an awful lot of money, and it becomes even more when you realize that we are having to borrow all this money we're spending since we surely don't have surplus cash, and we are now 12 trillion 104 billion dollars in debt at the Federal level. I realize that 12 trillion 104 billion is an incomprehensible figure. But what it really means is that we will soon not be able to pay all of our Social Security and veterans' pensions and all the other things we promised our own people with money that will buy anything.

I used to say what we were doing to our children and grandchildren was ter-

rible. But now I believe that tough economic times, already here for many, are going to come for almost everyone in the next 10 or 15 years, if not sooner.

When a family gets deeply, head-over-heels in debt, it gets in even worse trouble if it goes out and greatly increases its spending even more. That is exactly the situation our Federal Government is in today, living way beyond its means.

This lands bill is a combination of 170 bills, which cost \$10 billion in total. In addition to that, it is a luxury that we do not need and which will be very harmful in the long run. We already are having trouble funding and taking care of the Federal lands we have now. The National Park Service claims it has a \$9 billion backlog on things it needs to do in our 379 national park units. It sounds great for a politician to create a park, but we now have so many parks at the Federal, State, and local levels that we cannot even come close to getting adequate use of them unless all of our people suddenly find a way to go on permanent vacations.

Another problem that few people think about is that we keep creating so many local and State parks, and expanding others, especially at the Federal level, that we are taking way too much land off the tax rolls. We keep decreasing private property at the same time the schools and all the other government agencies keep coming to us telling us they need more money.

These 170 bills, combined into one bill, create 2 million acres of new wilderness, 330,000 acres of national conservation areas, and restrict energy development on millions of acres.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce says this bill "substantially hampers energy development and private property rights by withdrawing millions of acres of land from oil and gas exploration . . . shackling U.S. energy exploration and development at this critical time would substantially jeopardize America's already fragile economy."

It's going to drive up prices, utility bills, Mr. Speaker, and it's going to destroy jobs.

The Federal Government today owns about 30 percent of the land of this Nation. It has 84 million acres in the National Park System. It has 150 million acres in the Wildlife Refuge System. It has 193 million acres in the National Forest System. I could go on and on with other Federal lands, but it's not necessary.

Then State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies control another 20 percent of the land. Half the land is now already in some type of public ownership now.

On top of all this, there are now 1,667 land trusts and 1,400 conservancy groups at least. These are figures from 2 years ago; so there may be more now. USA Today, which published these figures, said that these private trusts and conservancy groups control about 40 million acres and that they're taking over an average of more than 2½ mil-

lion more each year. These lands are eventually sold or turned over to the government at great cost to the taxpayer and causing further increases in taxes on the property that remains in private hands. Then we're putting more and more restrictions or limitations on the private property that can be developed, thus driving up the cost of homes to astronomical levels in many areas.

Mr. Speaker, we are slowly but surely doing away with private property in this country. If we don't wake up and realize that private property is one of the keys to both our prosperity and our freedom, we are going to really cause serious problems for everyone except for the very wealthy.

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

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

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1937 NATURAL GAS TRAGEDY OF NEW LONDON, TEXAS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, March 18 will mark the 72nd anniversary of what freshly graduated newscaster Walter Cronkite called the "worst school disaster in American history." I stand before the House today to commemorate those students and educators who so tragically lost their lives that afternoon as well as to encourage the survivors.

The 1930s saw many families in East Texas with hope as they fought to regain what had been lost in so many parts of the country during the Great Depression.

□ 1615

With the discovery of oil in northern Rusk County, the City of New London, Texas, boasted one of the richest rural school districts in America. They had just built a state-of-the-art school that would make any school district envious.

But at approximately 3:18 p.m. on March 18, 1937, many of those same families would lose forever the promise of youth while east Texans and people around the world would bear the pain of losing a community's entire generation.

It was on that date, at that time, the New London school did become the site of the worst school disaster in American history. In those days, natural gas had no odor. That odorless gas started leaking from a tap line and accumulated in the massive crawl space beneath the school building.

In an instant, a spark from a sanding machine in the basement ignited the gas, creating an explosion heard miles