

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

taxes on businesses. Businesses, as they normally do, will send that tax on down to the consumer, and the consumer will have to pay for that tax.

How much are we talking about? Individuals will have to pay an additional \$1,800 a year for this new energy tax, this new cap-and-tax that will be placed on Americans.

Madam Speaker, Americans don't need or want any more taxes for any reason. Supposedly, this money's going to be used to subsidize green energy products. Now we're learning that so-called renewable energy may be more expensive than the use of nuclear power and fossil energy.

Madam Speaker, remember how we were all told that ethanol was going to save us all; how it's not going to pollute like crude oil; how it's going to be cheap renewable energy? Now we're learning something opposite.

We learned that it costs too much to produce ethanol without a Federal subsidy. It caused a food shortage not only in the United States but throughout the world, because we had the idea that we should burn corn for energy.

And we also learned that ethanol was, in fact, a pollutant. Now people don't talk so much about the benefits of ethanol, although the Federal Government has spent millions and millions of dollars with the ethanol program.

Madam Speaker, no question about it. We need to explore all types of energy, solar, hydrogen, wind and nuclear. But we should also use the resources we have, like clean coal and crude. We need them to provide energy for Americans.

Madam Speaker, America's the only country that doesn't use its own natural resources for its energy, and that includes the fact that we should drill offshore because that will bring jobs to America. It will keep money in America, instead of going overseas. And that lease revenue that the oil companies pay will go to the Federal Treasury. We need to do all of the above until we can move to alternative energy.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 2000

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.)

H.R. 1701: PTSD/TBI GUARANTEED REVIEW FOR HEROES ACT

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, almost 2 million American servicemembers have served our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Unfortunately, many of these men and women are returning

home with symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and other mental health challenges.

In April of 2008, a study by the RAND Corporation found that nearly 20 percent of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans have symptoms of PTSD or major depression. The study also found that many servicemembers do not seek treatment for psychological illnesses because they fear it will harm their careers. Of those who do seek help for PTSD or for major depression, the study found that only about half receive treatment that research has considered minimally adequate for their illnesses. If our government and the military fail to address problems associated with PTSD, the situation will only grow worse in future years.

A sad reality is that, in many cases, these servicemembers self-medicate with drugs or alcohol, and they get into trouble. One marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, in my district, has unfortunately fallen victim to this problem, and he is pending involuntary administrative separation due to misconduct. The fitness reports for this lance corporal prove that he was an outstanding marine prior to his deployments—two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan.

His medical board report states, "His service in the Marine Corps caused his PTSD and, indirectly, his incidents/legal problems. The Marine Corps' failure to treat him in the past and treat him appropriately . . . has done nothing but worsen the problem." That is a quote from the medical review board.

Madam Speaker, it will be difficult for this marine to succeed in life if he is administratively separated from service. One, he will not be eligible for TRICARE benefits. Two, he will have difficulties obtaining a job. Thirdly, it is unlikely that a university will accept him as a student. This is a story of one marine, but this is not an isolated problem.

As part of addressing this problem associated with PTSD, I have introduced H.R. 1701, the PTSD/TBI Guaranteed Review for Heroes Act. The legislation creates a special review board at the Department of Defense level for servicemembers who were less than honorably discharged. Separated servicemembers would be permitted to seek a review of their discharge if their PTSD/TBI were not taken into consideration. The board would then have the authority to change the characterization of their discharge to "honorable."

For active duty servicemembers, the legislation would mandate a physical examination board before an administrative separation proceeding if the servicemember has been diagnosed with PTSD or TBI by a medical authority. If the servicemember is found unfit for duty, then the servicemember would be retired and given a disability rating. Otherwise, the separation board must consider the effects of PTSD and TBI on the servicemember's conduct.

Madam Speaker, too many times, the same men and women who left this

country as good soldiers and marines return with serious wounds, both physical and mental, and their lives are not the same. The culture within our branches of Service must change to recognize that PTSD is a real concern that must be addressed.

I am grateful to have Representative GENE TAYLOR as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1701, and I hope that many of my colleagues will join us in supporting this bill and this legislation.

Madam Speaker, before I close, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families. I ask God to please bless the wounded and their families and to bless the families who have given a child who has died for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, and three times, God, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

HONORING THE GALBUT FAMILY AND THE HEBREW ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand here tonight in honor of Bessie, Ronalee and Russell Galbut, an institution in South Florida. I want to recognize them for their work on behalf of the Hebrew Academy of Miami Beach and for all that they have done to promote the Jewish heritage in my area of South Florida.

The Hebrew Academy of Miami Beach is among the finest institutions, both academically and in terms of philanthropy as well. It is dedicated to educating children regardless of their financial means and to instilling in them the timeless values of Judaism so that they may remain steadfast in their faith.

The Hebrew Academy and the Galbut family have been intertwined for many years. At the young age of 17, Bessie met Hymie, a 19-year-old student at Tulane. Hymie had enlisted in the Navy and would not return for 7 years.

The newly wed Galbuts then moved to Miami Beach, and immediately became active in the Jewish community in our area. They devoted their time to the Jewish Learning Center and to the Jewish Community Center, and played integral roles in the building of the mikvah in the community. Hymie checked the lighting and planted the trees and the flowers with his own hands.

Their home quickly filled with four beautiful children—Robert, David, Aib, and Russell—challenging Bessie to keep the family's roots firmly planted in the principles of the Torah. She and Hymie worked tirelessly to send their four children to the Hebrew Academy.

Years later at the Hebrew Academy, the youngest Galbut, Russell, was educated alongside a young lady named Ronalee Eisenberg. During and after