

are with the family and the friends of these brave young men and women during this very solemn time.

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

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

TAX THEM TO DEATH

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. Mr. Speaker, the government answer to government-created problems is to tax people and businesses that are producing. The economic philosophy is simple: Punish success by the power of the tax.

The latest government tax plan is the energy tax. The idea is, tax anything that uses energy. And it contains several philosophies. The first one is raise the gasoline tax 10 cents. I guess the government bureaucrats don't think gasoline prices are high enough already. Americans pay 18 cents in Federal gasoline tax, about 20 cents in State tax; and gasoline is approaching \$2 a gallon, so they are going to raise taxes and make it harder for us to drive.

But that is not all. The idea also is to tax mileage of cars. It is called the car user tax. In other words, for every mile an American citizen drives, they are going to get taxed for that mile. Of course, that hurts people in rural areas, it hurts people who don't have mass transit and don't have a choochoo train to ride to work. But it is the car user tax, and we don't know yet how much that is going to be.

But we have more. The idea also is to tax the use of energy in your home. In other words, when you turn on the lights, you are using electricity and you are going to get taxed for using that energy. If you have hot water in your home and you use a hot water heater that is run by natural gas and you turn on the hot water, since you are using natural gas you are going to get taxed again for the use of energy. And of course in the winter in some places in the United States they use home heating oil to keep warm in the winter. And since they are using energy, they are going to get taxed for that. It is the home use energy tax on all Americans. And of course the same is going to be applied to businesses. But businesses, they are going to pass their taxes on down to the consumer

who has to pay all of those taxes as well.

There is more. There is the cap-and-trade tax, or the cap tax as I call it. What that is, it is based on the unproven mythical theory of global warming and the use of CO₂; so if you use any CO₂, you are going to get taxed for that.

There are other taxes. Those include taxes on energy production. What that is, is those businesses—we call them oil companies—that produce energy for the rest of us to use, they are going to be taxed with so many different taxes I don't have time to go through it; but what it amounts to, it will cost the American consumer another 41 cents per gallon of gasoline to pay for that tax on energy production that is being passed from the oil companies down to the American consumer. And, of course, the effect of that, whether intended or unintended, will be to send those energy-producing companies, those oil companies, somewhere else. We already find out that some of them are moving to Switzerland.

When that happens, we will get less tax revenue to begin with. You see, we already have the second highest corporate income tax in the world. And why would we fault oil companies for moving overseas when they are already paying so much taxes? And these energy taxes will increase and encourage people to move offshore and to other places.

Mr. Speaker, whether people know it or not, we do not have alternatives for the use of crude oil or gasoline yet. Some day we might have one of those electric cars that we all get to drive around in, but we don't have it now. So if we keep sending energy companies overseas, make it harder for them to produce, tax the energy consumption, it is going to be more difficult for us to exist in this world.

So why don't we do something a little novel. Why don't we allow more energy exploration, instead of continuing to subsidize the Middle Eastern oil countries who don't like us anyway.

If we explore more, that will create jobs that stay in America. It will bring revenue to the American Treasury, because those oil companies have to pay for those leases. We can then get more tax revenue from those oil companies, and money will stay here, instead of shipping it overseas to foreign countries. A novel idea. And there is not a tax included in any of that.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the current bureaucrats never saw a tax they didn't like. So we will all just get to ride bicycles and freeze in the cold dark of winter, and for light we will have to use candles since we can't afford to pay the electricity tax on our homes.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

ENERGY AND ECONOMICS

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. Mr. Speaker, following up on the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) in talking about energy, I have got a different take on that, and the different take is this: It is all about economics.

Actually, technologies exist right now to be the alternatives. The problem is, they don't compete real well against the incumbent technology, because the incumbent technology doesn't have all of its negative externalities attached to it. If you attach those externalities to those incumbent technologies, all of a sudden new things would happen. And rather than being driven by government and grant programs for this or that, it would be driven by free enterprise, with people making money selling the competing technology.

What do you have to do to get there? You have got to figure out a way to, what economists call, internalize the externals. You have got to figure out a way to attach to the incumbent technologies, which in this case with transportation is gasoline, attach the negative externalities to the price. In other words, demand accountability. Insist on accountability. Say we are going to attach the national security risk, for example, to gasoline, and we are going to say, what is it really costing us for a gallon of gasoline? Is it the \$1.90 that I paid recently in my car, or is it a lot more than that? The answer is, it is a lot more than that.

If you consider just the supply chain that we have to protect the assets that we have forward deployed to protect the supply chain, and attribute some percentage, it doesn't have to be 100 percent, but some percentage of the cost, for example, of protecting the shipping lanes that carry this stuff that we are addicted to, to us, if you just attach the cost of a percentage of that, maybe 50 percent of it, give 50 percent cost accounting to somebody else, somebody else's account. But let's account to gasoline at least 50 percent of the cost of the operations in protecting the shipping lines. If you do, it is not \$1.90 a gallon. It is a lot more.

□ 1945

But as long as there is an unrecognized externality, then what happens? There is a market distortion. And as long as that market distortion exists, nothing happens in free enterprise. Because what free enterprise is about is a wonderful thing called "making a profit." And the people generally on this side of the aisle understand very well that we are in business to make money, to make a profit. But when

your competitor gets a freebie in the national security realm or a freebie when it comes to climate change impact, or a freebie when it comes to, say small particulates, when it comes to coal, nuclear doesn't develop, and alternative energies don't develop because you have got this freebie.

Why not continue on with the cheap old technology, the one that really doesn't take a lot of rocket science? You stick pipe in the ground, out comes some crude, you refine it, stick it in a car and you run it. Not real rocket science. But how about some rocket science of hydrogen, for example? Well, you have to internalize some externals in order to make that work for a profit-making venture.

Until then, we will be talking science projects. I'm on the Science Committee. I'm happy to do science projects. But what I really want to have happen is to have people making money selling the competing technology. Here is a way to do it. We are just hearing about how we don't want more taxes. So let's start with a tax reduction. What if you reduce taxes on something, say payroll or income, and then in an equal amount, apply a tax to carbon-based fuels? Then we will see what happens. What would happen then is all kinds of exciting things. The new entrepreneurs in the energy field, the Bill Gates of the world in energy would suddenly do for energy what Bill Gates at Microsoft and Steve Jobs at Apple did for the PC and the Internet. America would break free. It would be no additional intake to the government, and Mr. Speaker, we would be on our way to energy independence.

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

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

SUPPORT H.R. 1245, HOMEBUYER TAX CREDIT ACT OF 2009

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. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to do something novel tonight. I am going to reach out to my Democrat colleagues. And I'm glad to see some of them, like DON, over there tonight to listen to my exhortations.

Mr. Speaker, the \$8,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers was one of the reasons why home sales went up by about 5.1 percent last month. That was an indication that we are probably moving in the right direction as far as stimulating some economic growth in the housing industry. But the housing industry is in a depression right now. And we need more than just the \$8,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers.

Now, back in 1975, Congress passed the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, which

included a tax credit not just for first-time homebuyers, but for all homebuyers, up to \$2,000 in a tax credit. As a result, they increased within the next year by 400,000 the number of houses that were sold, and in 2 years they were back up to the 2 million house level.

So we need to stimulate economic growth in the housing industry across the board, not just for first-time homebuyers. Now KEN CALVERT of California, our colleague, has introduced a bill, H.R. 1245. I'm a cosponsor of it. And it will give a 10 percent credit, 10 percent of the home price, up to \$15,000 for all homebuyers for 1 year. Now if we did that like they did back in 1975—and this was sponsored mainly by Democrats back in 1975—if we did that across the board for homebuyers up to \$15,000, we would stimulate a huge movement towards home purchasing. Twenty-five percent of the people in this country say they want to buy a home within the next 10 years. We can move that up pretty rapidly if we extend the tax credit to \$15,000 and allow everybody to get it for 1 year. And if we did that, I think that would go a long way toward solving the economic problems we are facing right now. Right now, what we are doing is we are throwing money at the problem, and we are hoping that that will solve it. It is probably going to help a little bit in the short run. But in the long run, if we really want to stimulate economic growth and activity, we have to get the free market working again. And the best way to do that in my opinion, and I'm saying this to my Democrat colleagues as well as my Republican colleagues, is to give an incentive for people to buy homes, not just first-time homebuyers, but everyone who would like to buy a home or move into a better one.

So if we allow, say, a 10 percent tax credit up to an amount of \$15,000 for just 1 year, I think you would see a huge movement in the purchase of homes in this country, and it will really help the economy.

Now the realtors of this country and the homebuilders of this country really need help. They want this bill. They think it is extremely important. They are out here this week and they are going to be talking about it. So I would like to say to you, DON, and all my Democrat colleagues and my Republican colleagues, let's get together on this one. We can fight on something else. But right now we have an opportunity to really stimulate home purchases in this country and get this economy moving more rapidly in the right direction.

So I hope you will join with me in cosponsoring KEN's bill, H.R. 1245, and I'll be glad to sign any of you up tonight.

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

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

JORGE LUIS GARCIA PEREZ
"ANTUNEZ," CUBAN FREEDOM
FIGHTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. This last Friday, I had the honor of being able to speak by telephone with five brave human rights activists, pro-democracy leaders, inside the totalitarian nightmare that is Castro's Cuba.

One of the great heroes of the pro-democracy movement inside the Cuban totalitarian nightmare is Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez. A black man now in his 40s, Antunez was first imprisoned while he was in high school because of his support for democracy and his opposition to totalitarianism. For 17 years, Antunez was regularly beaten as a political prisoner in Castro's gulag. He never gave in. He was released from the gulag last year, but since he never surrenders, he doesn't stop denouncing the thugs and pirates who have destroyed, impoverished and oppressed the Cuban people for 50 years. Antunez has been routinely detained, dozens of times, thrown into a dungeon and subsequently released, since his release from the gulag.

Some days ago, Antunez began a hunger strike in his city of Placetas, in Sancti Spiritus province, Cuba, calling for the end of the death threats being leveled against Cuban political prisoner Mario Alberto Perez Aguilera; an end to the physical and psychological torture of all Cuban political prisoners; and the cruel and cynical prohibition by the dictatorship against Antunez's sister, Caridad Garcia Perez, being able to rebuild her own house. They don't allow her to rebuild her own house, which was destroyed by one of the devastating hurricanes that passed by Cuba.

Accompanying the hero Antunez when I was able to contact him by telephone on Friday, March 19, was his wife, the pro-democracy leader, Iris Perez Aguilera, whose brother, Mario Alberto Perez Aguilera, is a political prisoner receiving death threats. I'm sure one of many, but the one specified by Antunez, receiving death threats by his jailers. And I also spoke to pro-democracy leaders, Carlos Michael Morales Rodriguez, Alejandro Tur Valladares and Ernesto Mederos. It was my honor to speak with all of them.

Antunez's house was surrounded by state security thugs while we spoke. And he and his colleagues knew very well that our telephone conversation was being monitored by the thug-regime. The courage of these pro-democracy leaders is simply awe-inspiring. They all explained their human rights work and reiterated their commitment to freedom. I told Antunez that I would be speaking in the U.S. Congress this week about him, about his hunger strike, about his heroic struggle for