

But we need leadership that is not here yet so that we will do that. By the way, big benefits. We could once again become a major exporter. We are the most creative, innovative society in the world. Properly challenged, we will figure ways to get this alternative energy. We could again be a major exporter. Today, we are a big, big importer, as you know, \$800 billion trade deficit this year.

We are a role model whether we like it or not. When you use 25 percent of the world's energy, you are a role model. Not a very good one today. We profligately use energy, way more energy than the average person in the world. It really is possible to be much more efficient.

This is a fascinating chart, such a simple one, but what it shows is the heat that you get out of an incandescent bulb and the light you get out of it. Ninety percent of it is heat which is why I use an electric bulb for brooding little chickens. I am not so much interested in the light as I am the heat from it. Now fluorescents are much better, and I saw there was a Time magazine cover page that had a pile of coal there. I think it was on the cover page, and they have one of these screw-in fluorescent bulbs beside it. Five hundred pounds of coal, that is the amount of coal you save in the life of that one fluorescent bulb, that is here.

But notice what you get out of light omitting diodes. I have a little light omitting diode flashlight that I carry. I put two little batteries in it, and I have forgotten when I put them in.

□ 2145

It just lasts so long. We have the same amount of light out of each one of these, but notice the enormous amount of heat you are getting out of the incandescent bulb and the tiny amount of heat that you are getting out of the light emitting diode.

There are lots of opportunities in our society to live well and comfortably using a lot less energy. I don't have the chart here, but the average Californian uses only about 65 percent as much electricity as the rest of America, and it would be hard to argue that Californians don't live well.

This next chart is a really interesting one, and what it shows here on the abscissa is the amount of energy that we are using per person and what it shows on the ordinate here is how good you feel about life. You couldn't feel any better than 100 percent, and notice where we are. We are the biggest users of energy in the whole world and we feel pretty good about it; but notice how many countries that use less energy than we feel even better than their quality of life. Let's go way back here to Colombia. They use a fifth as much energy as we; they feel almost as good about their quality of life as we feel.

If you drew a curve through this, you need some minimum energy to feel good about life, but once you go up

that steep part of the curve, the minimum energy is pretty flat. We can move way back here on the curve and feel just as good as we do now about life. You don't have to use the amount of energy that we use to feel as good about life as we do.

The average European, the countries are scattered through there, but the average European uses half the energy we use and, by the way, pays more than twice as much per gallon of gasoline and they have been doing that for a very long time.

We are shortly going to run out of our 60 minutes this evening and we will need to come back to finish this, but obviously we have got some finite resources here that we can use. When we come back, we are going to talk about the resources available to us to meet the challenge of transitioning from fossil fuels to renewables. And, by the way, we will transition either on a time scale that we have chosen or on a time scale chosen by geology.

As we run down the other side of Hubbard's Peak and the world has less and less supply of fossil fuels, we will transition. It can be a bumpy ride, or it can be a really bumpy ride. But Americans are up to it. We need leadership and knowledge. And we will be back again to talk about the finite resources available to us and all those fascinating opportunities in renewables.

CLEAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we come here to the well tonight to continue this discussion about energy. I have enjoyed listening to my colleagues Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GILCHREST, who have been talking about the need for changes in our energy policy to effectuate an energy efficiency policy for this country, to use our innovative talents to come up with new technologies to deal with our energy challenges, and to really bring our energy policy from the 19th century into the 21st century. And the good news is tomorrow, Thursday of this week, in just the third week of the 110th Congress, this new Congress is going to start with a big step out of the 19th century, which has been represented by the last Congress, and into the 21st century, which is represented by this Congress, and I am pleased to report to the House tonight and to the country, tomorrow the Democratic majority with some help from some of our friends across the aisle will pass a bill which will cause a major shift in the energy policy of this country.

In the last Congress there was a clear direction of the energy policy of this country, and under the last management of the U.S. Congress the basic operative rule was to give billions of dollars of taxpayer money to the oil and gas industry, the most profitable industry in the history of the solar sys-

tem, over \$10 billion in tax breaks to the oil and gas industry. Tomorrow, that money will be returned to the citizens of the United States for the use in developing a truly 21st century energy plan.

Tomorrow, the Democratic majority held Congress or House of Representatives will pass a bill which will reel back in \$14 billion of taxpayer money that was sent to the silk-lined pockets of the oil and gas industry, and that is a good thing for Republicans and Democrats and Independents and for our grandchildren for reasons we will talk about tonight. It is a good reason because when we reel that \$14 billion in giveaways to the oil and gas industry that happened in the last Congress, what we will do tomorrow is take that \$14 billion and create a fund of money belonging to the American people that will be used for the development of new technologies, creative new sources of energy, energy efficiencies, more efficient vehicles, more efficient appliances, and a way to beat global warming.

So we are going to convert the giveaways from the oil and gas industry that happened in the last Congress to an investment in the future of our country, to have a new energy technology, technologically based future for the energy source of this country. We are going to do it for three reasons. And perhaps those three reasons are obvious, but I want to state them.

Tomorrow when we pass this bill, we will create a fund called the Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve. Not really much of an acronym; I didn't get to name it. But the Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve will be a fund with \$14 billion that will be taken back from the oil and gas industry and be used for our inventors, our businessmen, our academicians, our people who are doing great work to develop new sources of energy, and we will do this for three reasons. I will go through them quickly.

Number one, we will use this fund to develop a domestic source of energy for this country. We will use this money to develop the new advanced biofuels, the second generation ethanol, the cellulosic ethanol, the advanced biodiesel systems so that we can start buying our fuel from Midwestern farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks. We know the trouble we are in in the Middle East due to our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, and we are going to break that oil addiction, not rhetorically, but in reality.

Second, we are going to use these funds to develop new clean energy sources that can stop global warming. We are going to have energy efficiency which can have efficient appliances rather than dirty appliances that waste energy. We are going to have energy efficient cars, plug-in hybrids, flex fuel vehicles that can use biofuels developed in the Midwest; energy created by wind turbine, solar energy and perhaps clean coal, wave power. You name it.

We have a thousand flowers that are going to bloom in energy if we use this money in a smart way to stop global warming.

And, third, we will use this money to create a new energy source of jobs in this country. It is about time to start building fuel efficient cars in this country, new technologies here. It is time to reel those jobs back in.

So I am very excited what will happen tomorrow. It is the first step in a long road of what we will talk about tonight, the new Apollo Energy Project. And we have a new Member of the U.S. House who has brought a new vision of energy, Mr. JOHN HALL of New York. And I will yield to Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am excited to be here at this time, at this point in history when our country will finally, beginning in this House of Representatives, begin to act on renewable energy and conservation in a meaningful way. And I also want to say that I hope Northeast farmers will also be able to contribute to the biofuels that will be developing.

I have a friend in New York State who is driving around in a stock diesel Jeep Liberty 4-by-4 that he is running on biodiesel made from wood waste at a renewable tree farm that makes furniture in New York, just north of my district in Representative GILLIBRAND's district, but it is minutes from where I live in Dover Plains, New York. There is no modification needed to the vehicle. The company that is making this fuel runs all their farm vehicles on it, they run their road vehicles on it. Every scrap of leaves and sawdust and little twigs and things that are parts of the tree that are too small to go into the furniture they make goes into making biodiesel fuel, and it is very successful.

The only thing that is lacking is the knowledge on the public's part that they can ask for it, and the law of supply and demand will work for renewables the same way it does for any other form of energy or any other commodity.

I called up my own local oil company in my hometown of Dover and asked if they had biodiesel to sell for me to burn in my home heating oil system, my furnace that heats our home, and they said yes. And I said, "What is it?" And they said, "20 percent soybean derivative." And I said, "Sign me up." And I asked the gentleman on the phone, "How is it?" And he said, "I am the owner of the company and I burn it in our house, and it burns cleaner than regular home heating oil."

So it is similar to the situation I ran into when I served in county government and we were dealing with markets constantly fluctuating in recyclables, for instance, where one month you might make money on recycling paper and the next month you might lose it. It depends on how many plants are built to recycle it and how many new communities start to do so in earnest.

If our country and our citizens know to ask for wind power, which we get in my home the first 1,500 kilowatt hours per month from a wind farm in Atlantic City. And that is only one of many wind installations that are being put up around the northeast. There is a big wind farm in the Tug Hill Plateau in the Adirondacks that is going to figure majorly in New York's energy supply, and in the Finger Lakes region also. Farmers are finding out that they can lease space on their property for wind turbines, make royalties on it or lease payments from the utilities on it that will pay their property taxes and enable them to stay in farming. The cows don't care. They graze under the wind turbines, and meanwhile they are turning overhead and cranking out the energy.

The Jersey Atlantic Wind Farm in Atlantic City that my wife and I are buying power from will be amortized in 5 years. It consists of five 380-foot-tall wind turbines. Each turbine is a greater surface area than a football field and taller than the Statue of Liberty and generates 7½ million watts of power when it is running at peak operation.

So if it is free in 5 years, the investment is paid off. After that, you have free energy, you have no pollution, zero emissions, and as you were saying it helps our balance of trade deficit, it cuts back on the money that we are sending to the Middle East oil potentates that are funding the madrasas that are training people that we then have to send our military to go fight. It cuts back on oil spills. It cuts back on asthma and emphysema in the inner cities, the particulate emissions. So it is a win-win-win situation with jobs being created here, with the dollars that we are spending on energy being kept here.

And I would just like to say once again that I am proud to be a part of this action of repealing and closing loopholes. It is not a raise of taxes as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were saying before, but it is actually closing tax loopholes, subsidies, and giveaways that they created in the last Congress and transferring those funds to these renewable energies.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield. Very much so, it is claiming what should be rightfully ours. We essentially gave away oil that belongs to the citizens of the United States, and gave it away with no royalties. It was a giant, giant giveaway program. And subsidies in certain circumstances are appropriate for nascent growing industries, but this is a mature industry. There was no reason to give a company that made \$20 billion profit last year more of our taxpayers. You are paying twice when that happens. You are paying at the pump, and then you are paying on April 15 when you are paying taxes that are given to these oil and gas companies.

I want to just touch on your wind sample. Today I had the Director of the Bonneville Power Administration that

runs the electrical grid in the Northwest today, and he was telling me that wind power today is cheaper, cheaper than essentially any other system that we have to generate electricity, at least in the Pacific Northwest, cheaper than coal even.

□ 2200

For those that say wind cannot be an integral part of the system, a study came down from a Minnesota group last week which evaluated how one can integrate wind because the wind does not always blow. It is not a totally reliable system, so you have to integrate it into your system.

They concluded it is so cheap you can integrate it by having backup gas turbines sometimes to kick in if the wind doesn't blow with minimal to no increases in prices.

This revolution that is happening in energy that we will start tomorrow, sort of the Concord Bridge moment for the energy revolution here, is all over the country. You mentioned in your neck of the woods, it is not just the Midwest, in Washington State we are going to have the biggest biodiesel plant in the Western hemisphere. It is going to be up and running next year.

Minnesota has huge growth in wind power. Wisconsin has a company that is building wind turbines so fast they cannot fulfill the orders. Missouri has just started three huge wind farms. This is something all over the country.

When I talk to businesses, what I find is there is not a State in the country that does not have some business that is going to benefit from what we will start tomorrow, which is new energy revolution. California in Silicon Valley is developing these new solar cells that could be 30-40 percent less expensive. A company called Fiber Forge in Colorado is starting to make composite bodies for cars that could be 40 percent stronger and half the weight. This is a national effort. All of us will get to brag about it some day.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN), a new Member of Congress. Thanks for joining us.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to be here with Mr. HALL, my good freshman friend from New York, and my good friend from the State of Washington. I know you have been leading the fight for a number of years and trying to get our focus, not only in your State, but throughout the country on the idea of renewable energy sources.

Many of us in the freshman class came to this year's campaign and this Congress with a view that this is an opportunity of historic proportion. This is an opportunity for us to recognize that this is a once-in-a-generation calling, no different than our predecessors had with the Manhattan Project. I know that many seniors in my district in south Florida have talked about that, the calling of their generation to make sure that World War II would end

with an atomic weapon. Of course we all know that when Sputnik went up in the early 1960s, a little before my time, but at a time when this country saw this little tin can up in space and thought this could be a threat of possibly bombs coming from outer space into our country, and John F. Kennedy saw this as a time and place for us to engage our private sector, our universities, our public, to create a new generation of scientists and mathematicians who would put a man on the Moon by the end of the 1960s. By 1969, they did that. And now the science and technology that came out of the space program has broad applications to our daily lives.

I view this, as do many Democrats and Republicans, as a time in our country's history when we need to make ourselves energy independent. I believe it. There is nobody in this room or in this country who doesn't believe that Americans, when they put their nose to the grindstone, can't accomplish anything. We can. We can and we will.

This has the unbelievable capacity of recognizing three great elements in this day. One is national security. We should never, ever have to make another foreign policy decision based on where the next drop of oil is coming from. That is a strategic mistake of unbelievable proportions. To have to import 60 percent of our oil from unstable countries around the world that in many cases are taking some of the dollars that we send over, the millions and billions of dollars, and financing both sides of the war on terror is wrong.

Recognizing that is something we need to do for our own national security, inside the United States, is crucial.

Secondly, we all understand the environmental impacts. I know my colleagues that are speaking tonight have led the fight on this, and many others. And recognizing whether it is global warming or any of the other environmental impacts of some of the technologies that are used today with oil and other things, these are issues that we need to take up.

I live in Florida. We have had a battle in Congress, and I was not in Congress last year, but many of us fought the fight back home: We don't want drilling off the coast of Florida, or in Alaska in the refuge. Those are false choices made by the administration.

The right choice is we don't have to have more oil drilling. Oil drilling will be a part of our energy solution, but we don't need drilling in places which will have a potential of having a tremendous long-term environmental impact. Off the coast of Florida, we have a very large tourist industry. We have wonderful reefs. We have a beautiful environment in our oceans and bays and the Gulf Coast. We can't afford to do that. It is not good for anybody in this country. There are choices that allow us to have alternative energy.

And of course the last thing is the new economy. Many have talked about

the fact that in this economy today we have lost jobs overseas. We don't have steel manufacturing like we used to. We don't produce a lot of the products. The science of alternative energy sources and the commercialization of that technology and those products can once again be our big technology boom like we had in the 1990s in this decade, and for decades to come. It will make us energy independent, and it will be exportable science to the rest of the world.

Mr. INSLEE. I was talking to a businessman the other day who wants to develop the Chinese market to sell China thin solar film technology to become the distributor in China of a technology developed in America. Talk about a great thing for our balance of payments.

You talked about the original Apollo project. We have named our bill, the first step we will talk about tomorrow, the New Apollo Energy Project because we believe, as John F. Kennedy did, that we have unlimited innovative capacity. But what we don't have at the moment are policies to put that innovative genius to work.

For instance, we are spending less than 16 percent on energy research in total in this country. We are only spending 16 percent of what we spent on the Apollo project. That is just abysmal. We had at least as much of a challenge as trying to get to the Moon.

I had a utility executive in my office today. He told me this factoid: We spend more on research about dog food than the utility industry does on new energy in this country. I don't want to belittle dog food, it is important, but we need to boost our research. Tomorrow we will put \$14 billion back into the pockets of Americans to use in part for research, the tremendous things that are going on. Every time I pick up the phone, I learn about a new technology being developed.

I yield to Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. I am just looking at the uses of the Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve, and I will get that out in one sentence, to accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, to promote the utilization of energy efficient products and practices and conservation, and to increase research development and deployment of clean, renewable energy and energy efficiencies and technologies.

The word "conservation" is in there, and it is one that has been sadly neglected. In fact, it was unfortunate a few years ago when our Vice President said conservation may be a personal virtue, but it is no way to build a national energy policy. I completely disagree. I think it is one of the most important ways to start building a national energy policy, and I was happy Mr. BARTLETT earlier was talking about energy efficiency. It is time all of us on both sides of the aisle did that and put our money where those words are.

I see these pet peeves of mine as I go through every day life. For instance, walking down the aisle of the supermarket, in the Northeast, I can walk through Hanford's A&P or Stop & Shop, and there are aisle after aisle of cold cases with yogurt or beer or cheese that is being kept cold by a refrigerator and a compressor running all of the time, and an open top so it is convenient. I can just reach in. But there is no door or plastic sheet to keep the cold air in and the warm air out. Meanwhile, because we live in the northern part of the country, half of the year there is a furnace going to keep the shoppers warm and the furnace and the compressor are working at cross purposes. That is the kind of blindness we have gotten used to, that energy is something we can throw away.

Mr. INSLEE. There is so much good work going in to stop those things that you are talking about. To mention two instances of success on energy efficiency, I was talking to the Vice President of Dow Chemical yesterday. Dow Chemical historically has not been looked at as a company on the forefront on environmental issues, but they got a star last year for their energy efficiency program.

They have saved 42 percent of their energy since 1990. They have reduced their energy since 2000 by 22 percent by just adopting commonsense measures, some of which you might have talked about, by having energy efficient appliances and lighting, by looking at how they monitor the energy in their building. So a 42 percent reduction of their energy usage, and they did that because it is good business, not because it is some granola-crunching idea. They did it because it is good business. And we will create a fund tomorrow to help businesses and individuals go down that road.

Second accomplishment, California. California has essentially, while the average American uses 50 percent more electricity than they did 10 years ago, 50 percent, California has been stable for the last 10 years. They have not gone up one kilowatt hour. And the way they did that was to help people invest in energy efficient light bulbs, energy efficient windows and appliances. As a result, they use 8,000 kilowatt hours per person per year, and the average person uses 14,000 kilowatts.

Does that mean people in California are living in the stone age? They are still taking hot tubs in Marin County and still putting out movies in Hollywood. They are living a good life there, and their economy is booming. But they are doing some commonsense things with energy. That is what we are going to start tomorrow.

Mr. HALL of New York. I wanted to mention something that should be another part of our energy mix and that is low head hydroelectric power. There are dams and waterfalls throughout this country where in some instances they used to generate power and no

longer do. But our own Idaho National Laboratory from the Department of Energy did a study a couple of years ago that showed, and it is on their Website, it shows how much State By State latent hydroelectric power is waiting to be harvested.

In New York State, there are some 4,000 dams and waterfalls that could, just by having turbines placed where the water is already falling, yield greater than 1,200 megawatts of power, which is about 60 percent of the peak output of the Indian Point Nuclear Plant in my district.

It is that kind of using everything. We have to leave no stone unturned and to try every opportunity for clean, renewable domestic sources of power for national security purposes, as Mr. KLEIN mentioned, for environmental purposes, as we all know, and for global warming. Anybody in my part of the country knows that the weather is not normal this year. And, indeed, the records for last year showed that it is the warmest year on record and there has been a string of years getting warmer.

We had a seminar at one of our freshman orientation sessions on global warming that shows as the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are rising, the temperature average is rising with it. It has risen out of what they call the background noise, where it is no longer something that can be written off to the normal ups and downs of climate. We are experiencing a change, a man-made change in our climate here on earth, and it is our duty to our children and grandchildren not to leave them that problem or to leave them mountains of debt because we refused to deal with this problem and keep borrowing money from one country so we can import oil from another country and lose our own sovereignty in the process.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. One of the beauties of what we are talking about, and what Americans are talking about, is there is a lot of technology and a lot of science and businesses that are already out there doing these things. That is a very exciting thing. If you listen to the national picture that 60 percent of our oil is imported, and that is a major source. And we obviously have lots of other fossil fuels being burned at this point, but there is solar power.

I am from Florida, and we call ourselves the Sunshine State. And we constantly hear in Florida you can't use solar effectively because the panels are too big and they can't store the energy.

My personal feeling, and I think you believe this, if we put our mind and science to this, we could probably have a solar panel the size of this 8½ by 11 piece of paper on every house that powers that house. Individual power plants, and it will happen. It is going to happen. There is wave power. There is wind power and corn-based ethanol and sugar-based ethanol like they use in Brazil.

Again, they may not be perfect in their present form. That is the point. Let's further them and use our innovation agenda that we are pushing in this Congress to get all of the economic incentives in place to encourage the businesses, to encourage our science and university academics as well as business leaders to come together.

□ 2215

Mr. INSLEE. We had a meeting with Hank Paulson today, Secretary of the Treasury in the Bush administration, and he had made an interesting comment. I am very impressed with him, though I have been pretty critical of the Bush administration, because he has been a pretty outspoken advocate that we need to do something about global warming.

He said everything he has learned since taking the job as Secretary of the Treasury, he comes from a very successful Wall Street career, has been worse than he thought. The deficit, the situation in Iraq, everything he has learned has been worse than he thought, except energy, because he has learned about the new innovations going on around the country.

What we want to do is help businesses, like the Iogen Corporation, which is ready to build the first commercial cellulosic plant in America in Idaho. They are ready to go, as long as they can get their loan guaranty. They have 300 farmers that are going to give them their straw left over after wheat. They are going to chop it up, put an enzyme in it, and then free the carbohydrates and distill that into ethanol, and, boom, you have a product that is three to four times more productive per acre than the current type of ethanol we get from our farms.

Ocean Wave Technologies has the first permit for wave power in the United States off the coast of Oregon, a 50 megawatt plant. They are using a technology now that is in the water in Hawaii, generating technology with this buoy that is anchored below the water. It goes up and down and creates a force thormatically that runs a generator. They are generating electricity today for the Navy. They are ready to make this a commercial operation. They need a little help to get started.

The Nanosolar Company, a company that was started, and the fellows who wrote the first two checks were the two guys who started Google. They have done pretty well for themselves, and they wrote a check to a couple of entrepreneurs in California, and now they are ready to do 450 megawatts of thin cell solar, where you use a solar panel that has one-fiftieth the width, using a selenium, iridium, gallium and caesium type of technology that they think can be 30 or 40 percent cheaper.

Another company trying something like this is called Miasole.

These are the companies that need help, not the big oil companies. And what we are doing tomorrow is shifting the subsidies that have been given

away to the oil industry, an 18th century technology, and helping these new-generation technologies come on.

By the way, in this debate we are the optimists. We should identify who is on what side of this. We are the optimists who believe global warming can be dealt with. The pessimists say we can't.

Now, they are giving up. The debate about global warming is over. And I know it is over because yesterday the Exxon Corporation, which has fought tooth and nail the science on global warming, basically withdrew their support from the political organization that has tried to create doubt about global warming.

So when the Exxon Corporation agrees it is time to start getting serious about global warming, I think the debate is over. And now the question is, how can we join on a bipartisan basis to find solutions, and we are starting this tomorrow. I hope we draw some votes from some of our colleagues across the aisle.

I yield to Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. INSLEE. I am pretty confident there will be votes from both sides of the aisle tomorrow. And it is interesting thinking about the history of ExxonMobil in terms of their corporate advertising, going back to the days of Herbert Schmertz and the op-ed in The New York Times, and how they have spent probably more money, and other oil companies as well have spent more money. Or I should say they have spent good money on advertising to try to stop people from changing the approach that they could have spent instead on research and development on these new forms of energy.

I wanted to mention one you had not mentioned yet, and that is tidal power. Wave power, of course, is obvious. My dad taught me to sail when I was a kid, and many is the time I have sailed by a buoy that had one of those wave-driven generators in it and keeping the light powered, and/or a solar panel on it keeping the light powered and a battery storing the energy.

But tidal power in my neck of the woods, in the Hudson River, which splits my district in half, is tidal all the way to Troy, all the way past Albany, and navigable all the way that far north. The current runs a couple knots and a half south on the ebb and about two knots north on the flood in New York Harbor. And in the East River and in Hellgate, what they call the juncture of the East River and the Harlem River, where it opens into Long Island Sound to the east, the tidal current there runs five to six knots, depending on the phase of the moon.

We have inlets, rivers, harbors, coastline all throughout this country where tide comes and goes, millions of tons, millions of tons of pressure of water moving in and out of these bodies of water twice a day every day. And that is, well, it is solar and lunar, because it is driven by, I guess primarily by the

moon, but nonetheless it is natural, free energy that can be harvested and should be explored. And, indeed, there have been experiments going on in the East River with tidal generators within the last year that I am looking forward to seeing the results of. But that is one more available source.

Mr. INSLEE. I want to comment that some people have argued this is sort of peripheral or tangential sources of energy, niche types of energy. I think it is important to realize the scale of energy that we have available domestically. It is enormous.

When you talk to the scientists about this, the wave power in a 10-mile-by-10-mile stretch of the California coastline, that is 100 square miles, if you can imagine 10-by-10, there is enough wave power using this existing technology to generate all of the electricity used in the State of California. That is not hypothetical. That is actual wave power that is available. That is not a niche technology.

In Montana, if we can find a way to burn coal cleanly, and I say if because we are a long ways from being able to do that, to segregate and store the carbon dioxide below ground, but there is enough coal in Montana, just Montana, if we can find a way to do that, to power the electricity needs of the entire Nation for decades.

Just to give people a sense of the scale of this, with solar energy, in a few hundred square miles, there is enough to light the entire Nation, if we get solar power down to a market-based price. It is more expensive than electricity right now from a coal plant or a gas-powered plant.

But what we are learning is that for all the technologies we have talked about today, solar, wind, wave, efficiencies, where some day plug-in hybrids, plug our cars in and run on clean electricity, every single one of those technologies has come down in price dramatically as the technologies have improved and as we have scales of economy.

Wind power has come down in price 80 percent in the last decade. Solar is coming down. There is a factor basically every time, if I get this right, every time it goes up, and I am going to have to check to make sure. In fact, I will not use it because I can't remember what it was, but there is a ratio that has been clear with solar power that has come down. Every time you ramp up production by a factor of X, you get a Y percentage decrease in price, and that has been a constant.

What we have learned is that we know there are two curves. Fossil fuels are going up because China is coming on gangbusters and demand is going to go up. We might reach peak oil. We don't know. But we know fossil fuels are going up long term, and these are coming down, and we want to be on the downward sloping path.

So one of the things we want to do eventually, in our new Apollo project,

is to have a renewable portfolio standard to say that a percentage of our electricity will be generated by clean energy sources by the year 2020. We just did this in Washington by popular vote.

I yield to Mr. KLINE.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman, and I think that is exactly the point. The point is, there is not necessarily one source of energy alternative that is going to be for everyone. We have a big country, with lots of existing resources that have been mentioned by the gentlemen on the floor this evening, and the choices and the competitive ways that we as a country can competitively grant resources to companies, to scientists to come together and say, listen, we think there is enough coal in this country to power the country for 300 years, but we have a high sulfur and carbon dioxide problem. Is there a solution? If there is a solution, that can be a wonderful thing. So there is coal in certain parts of the country and maybe that works there.

Wave power, wind power, all the things we are talking about, it is this competitive way of approaching this. Not one solution necessarily to fit all. There is still going to be oil out there to some extent, but the point of all this is, it is there. And the most exciting part about this is that there is a solution, and Americans need to engage this.

The Congress is way behind the American public, and the administration is even further behind. And the part where we, I think, are coming together tonight and tomorrow, as you and many others are going to be leading this fight for energy independence in the first step we are taking now, which will continue with additional steps, is, we want to ask the American public to come forward to their Members of Congress, to their business leaders, and to their Chambers of Commerce and start talking about the technologies that they have. What can we do to collaborate with each other to take some of these ideas and make them commercially viable? The more competition out there, the more resources in, the lower the price will be.

It is almost like the discussion we have had for so many years, public transportation versus road building. People have said, well, you have to subsidize public transportation. Well, absolutely you do. But guess what road building is? Who pays for the roads? It is your gas taxes in every State of the country and the Federal Government that pays for that. So it is a question of reordering our priorities.

In this case, it is the reordering of priorities from more oil drilling and giving those types of resources and support to putting that into places and with people that can create the new generation of energy alternatives, and it is very exciting.

Mr. INSLEE. I want to comment on two really exciting transportation al-

ternatives. One is public transportation.

The city of Portland, Oregon, has demonstrated the ability of America to reduce our CO₂ emissions to deal with global warming. They are the first city in the Nation to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions to 1990 levels, which would be consistent with the Kyoto Treaty, which may be a treaty we do or do not eventually adopt, but they have been the first city in the Nation to reach these 1990 levels, to roll back their carbon dioxide emissions.

One of the principal ways they did it was they embraced an incredibly popular light rail system to move people. Rather than sitting on freeways for hours at a time, you go down to Portland on a convenient, much-loved system that has now been voted on five times successfully in Portland because people love this system. It is convenient, it is safe, it is cheap, and it saves us from global warming.

So if we have a transportation policy in this country that helps communities work in that regard, we will make some strides.

The second thing I want to bring up is a technology called plug-in hybrids, which I think could be maybe the ultimate vision for us in the next decade, and that is to develop our cars so we go home at night and we plug them in. You take power off the grid, electricity generated by clean wind, clean solar, clean wave, clean coal, or a variety of technologies. These are cars that today are running, that can run 20 or 30 miles just on electricity. And then when you run out of juice, you start running on your motor.

If we have a flex-fuel hybrid plug-in car, we are going to be in really great shape in this country, because we can plug it in and get clean electricity. We have the pipes to deliver it, which is the electricity grid. You plug it in at night, you run your first 20 or 30 miles, then you use ethanol that you bought from our local farmer in the Northeast, or in Iowa, or eastern Washington. And if you don't like that, you can burn gasoline as well.

General Motors just announced their first sort of proposed car, called the Volt. They ran it out at their show just 2 weeks ago in Detroit at the auto show. Now, we have to improve the batteries to really make them commercialized, but that is where our money should be going, to improving the batteries so we can have plug-in vehicles, rather than going to the oil and gas industry.

So tomorrow we are going to make a decision to take money we gave to the oil and gas industry and give it to these companies, to the extent we can, to help develop these new technologies for batteries and a whole host of other things. These are lithium iod batteries, and they are close to being commercialized. There are a few security issues they have to work with to make sure they are stable and workable, but that is a good shift for the country.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield for a second, the next level of this, just like any start-up business in this country and the success of the capitalistic system that we have is, business entrepreneurs realize value. What we are talking about here is start-up capital for many of these businesses. We are not talking necessarily the United States taxpayer funding these things indefinitely.

The great part about this is that many of them are already in place. They just need a little additional push or a little additional resource, and then you will see venture capital and lots of business entrepreneurs, and probably even oil companies who will see a good opportunity, who will even invest. But whoever it is, we want to see the direction of this jump-started, and that is what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. INSLEE. Sure. And we can do things essentially at no cost to the Federal Government. For instance, loan guarantees. If we guarantee a company that wants to start a plant, like this Iogen cellulosic ethanol plant, if we do a loan guarantee for them, there is a high level of confidence it is going to work, and it never costs us a dime, assuming that it works. But it helps them get the capital to give security for the investors to do that.

That is a good investment for the country, if we choose wisely. But these companies will tell you they have to cross the valley of death, to get from development, where they have their prototype, until they can really commercialize it. And that is where Uncle Sam can happen.

And we will get a lot more bang for our buck helping a battery company that will help us drive plug-in hybrids a few years from now than we will just giving it to a company that made \$22 billion last year in the oil and gas markets.

□ 2230

That is a better deal for America. Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Yes, if the gentleman would yield for another minute. I wanted to mention a couple of other ways we can help, that the government can help jump start these industries. One of them is indemnification of risk. We have unbeknownst to most Americans been the underwriters for the nuclear industry since its beginning via the Price-Anderson Act. In fact, there would never have been a nuclear plant, electrical generating plant built in this country if the taxpayer didn't underwrite the possible cost of a catastrophic accident.

Now, if we took that same approach where we were willing to subsidize or underwrite alternative fuels or low head hydro plants, many of which are being held up, by the way, because of liability issues, that would be one way that we could help.

Another way would be preferential purchasing, because the government, at all levels, buys a lot of vehicles. And

if we put out a request for proposals saying that we want American companies to build vehicles that will either be plug-in hybrids or plug-in biodiesel hybrids, or just high efficiency vehicles that can be used in our fleets that the different departments of our government used, that would start the economy of scale working. The same way the wrist watches, digital wrist watches that used to cost \$200 when they first came out came down to the point where they are \$2 now, and computer chips that were bought in quantity by the Defense Department, or by the aerospace industry and NASA, drove down the cost to the point where now anybody can afford a laptop. It is that economy of scale that we can help get started.

And as you said, it is not going to be something that we will have to underwrite or subsidize forever. But when you look at the number of years that we have been subsidizing the old technologies that may be 19th or 20th century technology, we certainly now, in the 21st century can look at these renewables, domestic clean safe renewables and think about the same helping hand to get them off the ground.

Mr. INSLEE. And I think it is important to point out the tremendous payback to our economy of relatively small Federal investments. Look at the computer industry. It grew by leaps and bounds because of the Apollo project. There is more computing power now on a wrist watch than there was in the original Apollo space vehicle because we developed computer based software systems as part of the Apollo project.

Our medical device industry with these exotic materials largely came from the American space program, and these were relatively small investments.

By the way, we spend less today on research and energy than we do in a month in Iraq by a factor of about 10, just to put this in perspective. We are talking about for a family's budget a lot of money, but for the Federal budget fairly small amounts of money that can have absolutely tremendous payoffs.

I want to talk about one other thing that we think we need to help these companies too, though. If you want to start a company that will generate clean electricity with no carbon dioxide emissions today, you don't have a huge advantage because of a loophole in the law that a coal company has right now that is putting their carbon dioxide up the stack. That coal company that has what we call dirty coal, where you just burn it and you put your carbon dioxide, you dump it into the atmosphere, they have a huge loophole in the law because they can put as much CO₂ into the air as they want the tape. They can't put as much sulfur dioxide, they can't put as much nitrogen oxide, they can't put as much particulate matter, but they can put as much CO₂ into our atmosphere that you and

I own jointly, with no charge. And the company that is going to make a clean industry, they don't get any benefit like that. We have to close that loophole. There has to be a way that there is some charge imposed on polluters who use our atmosphere to dump their carbon dioxide. And that is a loophole that needs to be closed to help these innovators as well to level the playing field.

Now it is really interesting. We are getting some support for this idea from some unusual sources. Duke Energy, I think, the third or fourth largest electrical utility in the United States, they burn massive amounts of coal, I think 40 or 50 percent or more of their electricity is produced by coal. But they recognize the need to have what they call a cap and trade system that caps the amount of carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere. And in part they realize that, I think, because when you impose some cost on this pollution it inspires these new companies to be able to create new technologies that are clean. So we hope ultimately the U.S. Congress will adopt a measure that will level the playing field and not allow these dirty plants to continue to pollute our atmosphere for nothing. You know, when you and I go to the dump it costs us 25 bucks to dump our pickup load of junk at the dump. But a company that burns coal can put their carbon dioxide and just dump it into our atmosphere, gigatons for nothing. That needs to change.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well, exactly. And the incentive that is being used to encourage a company to make the investment in some type of scrubber or some type of way of reducing the amount of carbon dioxide should be just that. It should be an incentive to do that and make that capital investment in that technology, versus not having to pay for it. There is no economic incentive to change. Obviously there is a huge environmental impact for all of us who are breathing the air and the entire impact on the climate and the environment. But those companies that continue to burn coal don't have an incentive. So if we flip it around and say, all right, there is going to be a charge, in order for you to do this there is going to be an expense associated with it, whereas if you invest, if you are going to have to pay something in, if you are going to invest in something that is good, good for the environment, good for you. You get some type of benefit out of it then it is a good swap for the company, and it is a particularly, it is exactly what we need in terms of our encouraging private investment in technology that will clean our air.

Mr. INSLEE. And what we are finding is that more and more companies are actually accepting this idea, thinking it is a good idea because one, it will drive innovation. It will help us invent new technologies. But second, they realize this works. What we are talking about is a thing called a cap and trade

system. We cap the amount of carbon dioxide that can go into the air and we allow polluting companies to bid and trade for the right to put that pollution in. It is the most economically efficient way to do it. And what the companies have discovered is that when we do this, it works. When we did with sulfur dioxide in the 1980s it cleaned up the air and it actually ended up helping the economy.

Mr. HALL of New York. It created jobs.

Mr. INSLEE. It created jobs in creating these scrubbers. It helped our health and it actually, if anything, increased the gross domestic product. So what we are seeing is that some of these visionary companies are embracing this idea and it makes sense.

Today when I was talking to the Treasury Secretary, Mr. Paulson, I said, you know if we don't do this we are going to be wasting a lot of money. The Bush administration has supported a program, basically, it is a combined cycle way of using coal that you can make into hydrogen and sequester the carbon dioxide. It is called "future gen." We are going to have a future way of generating coal based electricity. And I think it is a good idea to invest in that type of research to see if we can burn coal, take the carbon dioxide, stick it in the ground forever and we will have clean electricity. But the Bush administration is spending \$750 million of taxpayer money to do that. But the plant will never, ever, ever be used or built if the Bush administration's policies succeed because they don't want to have any charge for carbon dioxide, any regulation on the amount of carbon dioxide going into the air. Well, if you are a coal company and you have got to invest money in this future gen program but you can put your carbon dioxide in the air for free, are you ever going to build this kind of machine that President Bush wants to build? It doesn't make any sense. So if we are going to do research in this new technology, it only makes sense also to have some regulation in the amount of carbon dioxide that goes into the atmosphere. Otherwise these technologies will be developed and never used. And that is not our goal, Mr. HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. I wanted to say that you prompted this thought. I am not against big corporations. I am not against corporations making a profit. In fact, a couple of the companies that are making the most innovation and putting the most investment into wind energy in our country right now are GE and Siemens. General Electric built the wind turbines that are in the Atlantic City wind farm that I mentioned earlier. Whether it is small start up companies working on alternative energy or whether it is existing oil companies or other utilities or big energy companies, the important thing to say, and this is the important thing, I think, to say to individuals also, and it is what I believe leadership should be

doing, whether it is our President, whether it is Senators or whether it is us here on the floor of the House of Representatives, we need to tell our corporations and our citizens that it is patriotic to save energy, that it is patriotic, when you have a choice, to use the most domestic, clean, renewable form of energy that you can. It is patriotic to try to support, if you have a choice on the back of your utility bill, as I do in New York State, to check off that I want wind power, or to check off that I want hydro electric. You could choose the source of where your power comes from if you can afford to do it. And not everybody can, but those of us who are able to spend a couple of cents more per gallon for home heating fuel can get biodiesel. Well, right now it is no difference where I live. It is the same price for bio as it is for oil. But we need to think of this in terms of patriotism and national security and our national interest, and that you can't separate it from our foreign policy. You can't separate it from our economic well-being. You certainly can't separate it from our health. And I don't think you can separate it from our job future either. We need to have these industries start up and be developed here so we can compete. We can't afford to be in a situation we are in right now with hybrids, where I, who want to support, I got elected with union support, I am proud to say. Now I want to buy an American hybrid car that gets top mileage, and right now, the best mileage cars being sold in the United States are made in Japan. I don't believe, for a minute, that we can't compete and make a car that will get as good mileage or better as any other country in the world as their companies can. I think it is the choices that have been made, and the incentives that have been offered or the direction that has been given by government has been lacking. And I am proud to be a part of this 110th Congress, when we, tomorrow, will start down that road where we transfer the emphasis from the old to the new in terms of energy.

Mr. INSLEE. I really appreciate your comment. A couple of comments, first off, about the value of business, big, little, medium, small, all sizes. There are so many companies today that are leading this revolution that we want to assist them. DuPont has done tremendous work on energy efficiency. 3M has done tremendous work on energy efficiency. British Petroleum, an oil and gas company, internally, because of their great leadership, reduced their own carbon dioxide emissions down to 1990 levels. They thought it was going to take them 5 years. It took them 3 years. And they saved \$300 million in energy because of doing just exactly what Mr. HALL is talking about of energy conservation. This is a green policy in two ways. Green environmentally and green for profit, and red, white and blue for America. So we have a lot of colors working for this policy.

I want to mention one other thing about our auto industry. We need our auto industry to give consumers cars that we can drive to use multiple fuels. Right now we are all kind of slaves to gasoline. We don't really have a choice. We need cars that will burn gasoline or ethanol, like they have in Brazil. The cars in Brazil drive, almost all of them burn either gasoline or ethanol. And because of that Brazil is energy independent today because they are growing their own ethanol, which we can do in this country. But we need the auto industry to give us this choice, to give us cars that can burn gasoline or ethanol. Now you can make a car for about \$85 that does that. That is all it costs. Almost nothing. That is what it costs to put tint in your glass. But we need the industry to do that. And you know, Congress may need to act, and I think it does need to act to get the industry to agree to do that rapidly. The second thing we need is these oil and gas companies to agree to put pumps in that will be ethanol pumps or biodiesel pumps.

□ 2245

That is not happening, because, unfortunately, those companies kind of only are selling gas right now, not biofuels. So we need to act to give consumers that ability to have at least a small percentage in the number of service stations that are going to give us that choice.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. To follow up, if, the whole idea of gas, miles per gallon, which people have a tendency to look at cars today and look at the miles per gallon, there have been a lot of games that have been played with that over the years, sport utility vehicles being viewed as trucks, therefore, not having the same limitations that most automobiles in the United States have.

As the gentleman from New York mentioned, there are many cars made in other places around the world that have figured out how to make 40, 50 miles per gallon, base car and some hybrids as well. I don't believe there is any inhibiting factor in the United States for our car companies to do the same.

Now, do we need to give a little incentive? Maybe. I think we have all seen the statistics. For every couple of miles per gallon you increase in efficiency, we are dropping some amount of oils per barrel, gas that has to be imported from the Middle East or wherever every day. So there is a trade-off here.

There is also this issue of importing, which is a current issue which we need to reduce. The technology is going to take a little bit of time. We need to do exactly what we are doing tomorrow and over the next number of weeks and months. But there are some immediate things we can do.

I certainly would suggest to Americans on a patriotism basis, on a smart basis on the thinking of your children

and your grandchildren and what's right, we will sacrifice. We are all in this together here. Let's make the right decisions, do what you can. It's not the right thing for everybody. But to the extent that you can buy a car that gets better gas mileage and focus on that cars that maybe use regular instead of premium. Those are all choices that people make. Everybody is in this together. Let us make some smart decisions.

Mr. INSLEE. We know this can be done because in the 1970s and early 1980s we increased our gas mileage by 60 percent in 8 years. If we had simply continued on that path with the same rate of improvement, we would be free of Saudi Arabian oil today. We need to get back on that path of energy efficiency. We can do that. We can start tomorrow. It will be a good day for energy revolution tomorrow. I am looking forward to it.

Mr. HALL do you have any closing comments here? We are about ready to wrap it up.

Mr. HALL of New York. I think you have said it all, Congressman. I am happy to be here and proud to be here as part of this 110th. This is part of our taking our own future back, we as a country, I am talking about all the citizens of this country.

I think the same way Congressman KLEIN mentioned the moon shot, I do remember that, I am a couple years older than you are, and there was a huge lift in the psyche of this country, because even though President Kennedy didn't live to see the day that we landed a man on the moon, it was done in 9 years when he said we could do it in 10.

So our ingenuity and our industry and our creativity took hold, and we accomplished the goal. You could just sense this palpable lifting of the weight off the shoulders of Americans on the street. I mean, people you knew, that we had done this.

The day that we harness all these alternatives, and harness the power of conservation and efficiency so that we can say no thanks, turn that tanker around, send it back to the Middle East, we don't need that oil, that day, when that day arrives, you will see the same feeling of weight lifting off the shoulders of the American people and a feeling of self-sufficiency and of pride and of being in control of our own destiny again. That is really something to look forward to.

Mr. INSLEE. When that day arrives they will write a sequel to Tom Wolfe's book about the Mercury 7 program, and he called it "The Right Stuff." Tomorrow Congress is going to have the right stuff. We are going to do a good energy policy.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, January 18.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

275. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live Fire Gun Exercise, Lake Erie [CGD09-06-153] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

276. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Coast Guard Live Fire Exercise, Gulf of Mexico, Clearwater, FL [COTP Sector St. Petersburg, FL 06-199] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

277. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine-Neches Canal, Sabine River, Orange, TX [COTP Port Arthur-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

278. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Algoma Shanty Days, Algoma, Wisconsin [CGD09-06-143] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

279. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: St. Peter's Fiesta Fireworks display, Gloucester, Massachusetts [CGD01-06-071] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

280. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine-Neches Canal, Miles 284 — 285, Port Arthur, TX [COTP Port Arthur-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

281. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine-Neches Canal, Port Arthur, TX [COTP Port Arthur-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

282. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine-Neches Canal, Port Arthur, TX [COTP Port Arthur-06-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

283. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live Fire Gun Exercise, Lake Superior [CGD09-06-158] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

284. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live Fire Gun Exercise, Lake Superior [CGD09-06-162] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

285. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live Fire Gun Exercise, Lake Ontario [CGD09-06-155] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

286. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercise, Southeast of Ocean City, MD, Atlantic Ocean [COTP Hampton Roads-06-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Live-Fire Gun Exercises; Bodega Bay, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.