

Res. 296) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1388) to reauthorize and reform the national service laws, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOPE FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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, today I read another one of these hopeful statements. It's the hope from some folks that say we want energy independence with increased development of all of our natural resources, including renewable energy sources such as wind and solar.

What I trust my colleagues here are beginning to notice is that hope is not a strategy. And when you hear somebody, or a group of us, or outside group saying that we hope we can get to renewable energy resources, what we really need to say to them is, so how do you get there? What is the strategy? What is the strategy beyond just hope?

Well, for me, the path is laid out in sound economic principles. If you have a price signal that causes entrepreneurs and investors to see how they might get married along some point of a projection of cost, such that they could see where it is that they could take out the incumbent technology, then you have a strategy. Up until then, you just have some hope.

So, Madam Speaker, the thing that I hope we see is that, if we take the incumbent technology, in the case of transportation, which is gasoline, and start attaching its externalities to it, basically internalizing the externals and saying, okay, gasoline, bear the full weight of your cost; in other words, bear the weight of the national security risks that we're running by being dependent on a region of the world that doesn't like us very much. Bear the environmental consequences, and then let's compare to some other possibilities.

Today I had the opportunity to meet with some folks that are looking at electric vehicles. Those are fairly attractive in today's market, but not as attractive as they were at \$4 a gallon. Today gas is somewhere around two. But I'm here to predict for my colleagues that we will be dealing with \$4 a gallon gasoline before too much longer. Within the next couple of years, as the economy takes off, I think we can expect to be back at \$4 a gallon. At that point, of course, this electric car company will be far more competitive.

So we could just wait and be jerked around, essentially, by OPEC and the problems of a constrained supply and an increasing demand, which means that the price may gyrate very rapidly. Or we can plan our way toward energy security with a solid plan that's an actual strategy rather than just a hope.

And that hope, that strategy that I hope we will pursue to basically say, get something better than cap-and-trade. Cap-and-trade, by itself, is an enormous tax increase in the midst of a recession. It's also trusting Wall Street to do maybe derivatives in carbon credits when they didn't do so well with derivatives in home mortgages.

So, rather than doing that, what if we reduce taxes somewhere else, say, in payroll, and then increase taxes or, for the first time, placed a tax on carbon dioxide?

The result would be no net increase to government, no increase in taxation but, rather, a swap of taxation, moving from one source of taxes, payroll, to another, carbon dioxide. If we do that, and lay it out on a curve where entrepreneurs and investors can see the price signals that are being sent, then we can have a real strategy, one that's not based on hope, but one that's based on sound economics.

Madam Speaker, I hope that's what we get to in this debate.

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

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

INCIDENT IN THE WEST BANK INVOLVING TRISTAN ANDERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my sympathies, first of all, for one of my constituents, Tristan Anderson of Oakland, California who lies gravely injured in a Tel Aviv hospital, and to express my concern regarding the incident that put him there.

On Friday, March 13, Mr. Tristan Anderson, an American citizen and resident of the 9th Congressional District of California, was critically injured when he was hit in the head by a tear gas canister fired by Israeli troops during a rally protesting the extension of Israel's separation barrier in the West bank village of Ni'ilin. Media accounts indicate that Israeli troops may have intentionally fired tear gas canisters at the protesters like the one that struck Mr. Anderson, who was apparently engaging in nonviolent, peaceful protest and was an innocent victim.

Clearly, something went horribly wrong in the village of Ni'ilin, and I am determined to get to the bottom of it. To this end, I have asked the State Department to report back to me on the status of any investigations into this tragic incident, and to advise me as to when the investigation will be completed, and also, that the report be made public.

The report should also document the actions that were taken to determine

culpability, if any, and to take appropriate corrective actions against those responsible for Mr. Anderson's injuries. Those responsible for this tragedy, whether through negligence or intentional misconduct, must be held accountable.

Lastly, I have asked the State Department to advise me of the actions, if any, which it has taken to ensure that Mr. Anderson is provided relief for the injuries that he has sustained.

But most of all, Madam Speaker, I wish Tristan Anderson a speedy and full recovery, and for his family and loved ones to know that he is in the thoughts and prayers of the people of the 9th Congressional District of California.

CAP-AND-TAX ON AMERICANS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, even though the alarmist global warming crowd claim humans are the evil CO₂ pollutants of earth, the jury is still out on the theory of global warming.

At a recent meeting of the International Conference on Climate Change, as reported by the Heritage Foundation, 31,072 American scientists subscribe to this statement: "There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the earth's atmosphere and disruption of the earth's climate."

Madam Speaker, how can this be? We're all told that global warming is a fact, and don't even argue this issue.

Even though global warming is still a theory, it hasn't stopped the Federal Government from presuming it to be an absolute fact, and it now has an energy policy based upon the global warming theory. It proposes an energy consumption tax called the cap-and-trade, or the cap and tax on all Americans and all businesses that use any form of energy.

Here's the plan. Every person and business that uses energy will be taxed for the use of that energy. For example, if a homeowner turns on the lights in their home, they will be taxed for the use of the electricity in that house.

If a person wants hot water in their house and they turn on the hot water, coming from the hot water heater that's usually heated by natural gas, they'll be taxed for that use of that hot water because they're using the energy of natural gas.

If you turn on the furnace in the winter in the Northeast, you'll be taxed because you're using home heating oil. All of these taxes are called the cap-and-trade, or cap-and-tax, as I call them.

What this means is that it will increase the taxes of individual homeowners in this country, about 50 percent a year. And of course, it will raise