of legislation that the Energy Subcommittee held hearings on earlier this week, a bill offered by the gentlelady, STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN, which is bipartisan, and it expands the definition of renewable fuel and biomass to include wood removed as byproducts from National Forest System land or any organic matter that is available on a renewable basis from non-Federal land, including renewable plant material which includes feed grain, other agricultural commodities, other plants and trees, waste material, including crop residue, et cetera, food and yard waste. And it would instruct the conferees to include this on the farm bill.

Of course, the farm bill is a bill that is moving along. The farm legislation is a bill that is going to be on the President's desk we hope in the not too distant future. So this is a bill that is going to move.

Why not take a piece of bipartisan legislation that deals with alternative fuels like ethanol, expand that, and actually get it to the President's desk so we can do it right away rather than wait for more hearings, markups and dealing with the Senate? Who knows what happens over there. We can actually get this thing done and then address part of the needs that we have in this country to expand our alternative fuel base.

So I would like to think that we could adopt this. I know that there is quite a bit of support on it based on the hearing that we held earlier this week.

Madam Speaker, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it appears that my friend from Michigan's motion is to instruct the House to recede to the Senate's definition of renewable biomass. The House conferees have receded to the Senate on their definition of renewable biomass. That definition of renewable biomass that is included in the farm bill applies only to farm bill programs. This definition does not apply to H.R. 6.

The farm bill conferees report does not amend H.R. 6, that despite the fact that several members of the Agriculture Committee, including myself, are supporting efforts to amend the shortcomings we see in that bill. And I say to my friend from Michigan that I am going to have to oppose this motion to instruct at this time. And I agree with your position on this. But yet you know there are multijurisdictional concerns that have to be addressed with the Energy and Commerce Committee. And we are trying to work through all of these.

The farm bill conference is all but done. Over the last few weeks, I have been saying we need to dot our I's and cross our T's. The I's are dotted and we are crossing our T's. So even though I agree that the argument that my friend is making on the problems of H.R. 6 are correct and on target, we cannot do it on this farm bill. The hour is too late. So I would oppose my good friend's amendment at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close if the gentleman yields back his time.

Mr. HOLDEN. Again, the argument that my friend makes is credible. But at this time, we just cannot accept it. The conference is all but over. And I would oppose my friend's motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I just might say in closing as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, we had what I thought was a very favorable hearing earlier this week. I would like to think this is a vehicle we can move this legislation on very quickly rather than resort to the normal process, particularly as we look long term. We can do this in the short term. It makes a lot of sense.

I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the motion to instruct the conferees to include this in the farm bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shimkus moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012) be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in section 9021 of the Senate amendment (relating to the E 85 Fuel Program).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, as many people who have observed the House floor over the past month, I have continuously come down to address the high cost of energy and the importance of bringing the supply issue to this debate.

One of the things that we have been successful with, which is now under attack, it was once a success story, was E–85, ethanol and the entire debate of bringing more supply to this debate.

This motion to instruct highlights the importance of E–85 fueling stations and developing that. For example, in my home State of Illinois, I am very fortunate. We have 171 E–85 fueling stations. In my congressional district, I can go all throughout my 30 counties and fuel up with my flex-fuel vehicle E–85.

□ 1715

There are States in the Union that cannot. An example, Maine, we couldn't get any information on. Rhode Island has zero, Vermont has zero, Delaware has one, where other States, like Minnesota, has 346.

One of the issues of more supply is also more supply locations. When we move to new fuels, as other people talk about, if we move to a hydrogen economy, we are going to need hydrogen-fueling stations, and that's all part of the importance.

This motion to instruct says let's do what the Senate did on the farm bill, and let's talk about developing an E–85 infrastructure around this country so we can help decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. Why? Because everything we talk about on this floor revolves around energy and the high cost of energy, especially for the producers of our food.

For example, manufacturer inputs have increased 14 percent in 2008 on top of a 12 percent increase last year. That's inputs to grow our food. Corn fertilizer costs $140 per acre for 2008, compared to $115 price in 2007, contrasted to $63 per acre from 2001–2005.

What is driving up high farmers' input costs? No additional supply. A lot of fertilizers are affected, all buy natural gas. As we continue to restrict our ability to go after more supply, we push up the input costs, which drives up the price for food and this whole debate.

I can go through all the huge increases that our farmers have had to do. DAP, prices rose from $252 per ton in January, 2007, to $752 gulf price. Urea rose from $272 to $415, muriate of potash rose from $173 to $252. We can just go on. It's a huge, huge increase.

Now we don't want to come down to the floor without bringing alternatives and solutions. What's the solution? The solution is more supply.

Look at what's happened. It's not disputable. Under this majority, crude oil has gone from $58 a barrel to $123. I come down almost every day. This price has not gone down. This price continues to go up.

We have had promises made by Democrat leadership. In 2006, I quoted them before, Speaker PELOSI saying, ''We have a plan to drive down energy costs.'' Majority Leader HOYER who just spoke: ''We have a plan to bring down energy costs.'' JIM CLYBURN: ''We have a plan to drive down energy costs.''

The reality is, energy costs have gone up, not down, $58 a barrel to $123. What has that done for us at the pump? When the Democrat majority took over, the price for a gallon of gasoline was $2.33 on average. What is it today, on average, $3.66.

Put in climate change tax, 50 cents, $4.16 is what we would be paying today with climate change. That's not a plan. In fact, it's a plan to fail. If you don't have a plan, you plan to fail, and that's the difficulty of our farmers getting into the field. Diesel costs have doubled, rising the price. Ethanol gets blamed. Ethanol gets blamed because energy costs to get the corn out of the fields has gone up. You want corn prices down? We have got to lower this.

We have got to get back to the day of $58 a barrel crude oil. We can't get there with no plan. We can't get there by every week saying we have got a plan, and there is no plan.

There is a plan. We have brought them onto the floor numerous times. What can we do? One is use our great natural resources on coal in this country, 250 years worth of coal to be used using coal-to-liquid technology. Get coal from our underground, build a coal-to-liquid refinery, pipe it, in this case, to an Air Force base, pipe it to a commercial airline. We have lost all these airline jobs because of high costs. This is what we do.

Guess what you can make: Diesel fuel. Diesel fuel. What is the farmers' major input? Diesel fuel, because that's what goes in the tractors when you have got to plant the corn. That's what goes in the tractor when you have got to harvest the corn or the beans, and diesel fuel has cost. Truckers are going on strike. Independent truckers are going on strike.

A lot of these independent truckers are hauling the beans, hauling the corn to the elevator. Without a plan to lower cost of energy, you plan to fail. Coal-to-liquid is a solution.

What is another solution? See all this red area? We don't have Alaska on there. Off-limits. Off-limits for natural gas. Off-limits for crude oil. Let's open up these areas. The environmentalists will say, oh, no, we can't do that. One of our major areas for crude oil and natural gas is the gulf.

Guess what happened here? Katrina, big storm, devastated New Orleans. A major oil spill in the gulf? No, no major oil spill.

We can do it cleanly, we can do it efficiently, we can bring more supply to the market. You want to know how to lower prices for the farmers? Lower energy prices.

But what's our policy here? Can we drill in ANWR?

''Forget it.''

What about offshore?

''Are you crazy?''

Clean coal?

''Out of the question.''

Nuclear power?

''You're just joking.''

Well, what are we going to do about the high price of energy? When you have no plan, you plan to fail. My farmers, who are getting accused for high prices, have high prices because we have high energy costs, and we have high energy costs because we won't get to supply.

That's why we want ethanol to succeed. That's the only thing we have done to bring more supply to this debate.

If we don't address the high input cost, what's going to happen is this fuel-food debate is going to go crazy. I was at the hearing. Guess what, there is a call to roll back the ethanol renewable fuel standard.

Now, that really helps our energy independence, doesn't it?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, well, it appears that the gentleman's motion to instruct will direct the House conferees to accept the provision of the Senate version of the farm bill.

The Senate farm bill contains a provision, section 9021, that would have created a grant program to install E–85 pumps. The Energy and Commerce Committee, who are also conferees in the farm bill energy title, indicate that had this plan is duplicative of section 244 that was included in H.R. 6, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. We tried to avoid this duplication of programs between the farm bill and the energy bill that was passed last year.

While I agree with the gentleman that ethanol is a very vital part of our energy independence program, we still have to make sure that we continue to move forward and that we do not derail this current farm bill that we are presently working on. It is my understanding that my colleagues in the conference committee for the food conservation and energy act have already come to an agreement that is already to be reported.

Nonetheless the chairman reminds us, all Members, that all motions to instruct are really out of order because the conference committee report is ready to be filed. I know that adopting this motion would obviously delay passage of the farm bill.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize my colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this is such a critical issue. You know, there are so many important things facing this country, whether it's the war on terror, the importance of FISA. But when you talk to people at home, it's getting desperate. It is getting very desperate, and they need help on the price of gasoline. They need help on the price of diesel fuel.

What are we doing? We are hearing people say, oh, we couldn't possibly drill ANWR. I am from Texas. Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, we have got States where we are doing everything we can to pump up all the energy we can to help the rest of the country.

We need some help. We have got all of these other resources, and they are being put off-limits. They are being kept off-limits, and we have heard from some on the other side, well, drilling doesn't really bring down the price of fuel.

You know what? We are told from some of the experts, 20, 30 percent is speculation. These speculators are smart. They see that every bill that's come out of this House for the last 16 months does not provide any answers to getting us more energy any time soon.

Talk about ANWR. Now, it was pointed out yesterday in our Resources Committee that really this area that is proposed for drilling is not part of ANWR. It was a section set aside by Jimmy Carter to make sure that we had an area that we could develop.

Now we are told that perhaps once a year caribou may come through this area of ANWR, and, oh, my goodness, if we put a drilling rig out there, it may destroy our caribou. We heard the same thing back some years back, that if we put a pipeline through some of this area up north it was going to kill off the last 27 head of caribou.

You know what happened? The pipeline went in, that oil is warm going through that pipeline, and what happened is it makes the caribou amorous. Now when caribou want to go on a date, they invite each other to go over to the pipeline. We are up to 30,000 head of caribou now because of what the warm pipe has done for the good of the caribou community, so it's going well.

We are told we can't drill the Outer Continental Shelf. About 97 of our coastlines are unavailable. We heard the same thing in Texas years back. Oh, please, don't put a drilling rig, not a platform out in the water. Oh, my goodness, you get beyond 30 miles, nobody can see it from the beach.

But what we found in the Texas coast is, despite all the naysayers saying it was going to kill off the fish, what's happened, if you want to go fishing and really go where the fish are, they go around the platforms because they have become wonderful artificial reefs. Man and environment can work together to help each other. The Outer Continental Shelf, we may have the highest second supply of natural gas in the world, some think we might even have the most, but we have put it off-limits and won't go after it.

We have lost so many wonderful union jobs because of the price of natural gas. I lost several hundred jobs out of my district when a paper mill closed

because it ran on natural gas, and we were paying the highest price in the world because we wouldn't utilize what we have.

My friend has pointed out coal. We are the Saudi Arabia of coal, according to a lot of experts, and yet we put it off-limits. President Carter put a huge amount of our coal off-limits. We are the only advanced nation that takes our greatest resources of energy and puts them off-limits.

Nuclear. Now I am not one to advocate mimicking France over anything, but they have about got it down on nuclear. We could follow their example and provide so much energy. Refineries, the bills we keep passing out of this Congress, out of this committee I am on, it makes it harder to open refineries. That makes the price go up. Speculators see that.

If we had an announcement today, tomorrow, from Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID that, by golly, next week we're going to drill ANWR, we're going to drill Outer Continental Shelf, we're going to start supplying more of our energy needs until we can bring all these alternatives on line, that 20 to 30 percent would go down.

I would be willing to bet you that we would lose a dollar off the price of gasoline within a week's time because the speculators would say, whoa, they are really serious about providing their own energy needs.

We had a report last week, that it turns out a lot of the experts believe that we may be able to get three to five times the amount of oil left in the entire Middle East from our shale in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, three to five times. They are saying there are maybe 900 billion barrels of oil left in the Middle East, maybe a trillion, and we may get 3 to 5 trillion barrels recoverable from shale in areas so much of which is off-limits.

□ 1730

In some cases they say, well, we'll give you an 8-year lease, but it will take over 7 years to get the permits. Folks, we have to help our people. They are crying out, and we need to do something now.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to remind the members on the other side of the aisle that the Future Gen project which was actually on track to be built in Illinois was actually pulled from being built because of its costly forecast.

So I would remind our Members on the other side of the aisle that coal is a very large part of our energy independent America formula; however, we have to do it in a clean way to make sure that we use clean coal-burning technology. However, that technology has not been perfected yet.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Would the gentleman yield since you mentioned Future Gen which is in central Illinois?

Mr. SALAZAR. I will yield.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate your yielding.

I was one of the few Members who actually talked to the President registering my disgust, frustration and anger. I will say it is now up to my friends on your side of the aisle, both in the House and on the other side of the Capitol to help move on a strategy to keep Future Gen on track.

We have a strategy. We are working in a bipartisan manner. Coal is critical to our national security, low cost fuel. I am begging the legislative leaders on your side, which they can do by putting Future Gen legislation on must-pass legislation, funding it, and Future Gen can stay alive. But I am not in the majority now. I am glad you mentioned it, and I call upon your side to make it so.

Mr. SALAZAR. I agree with the gentleman. I agree this is something that we have to move forward on, and it can be done in a bipartisan fashion, making sure our environment is taken care of.

We also have to employ other nations as well. In China, they are building a coal-fired plant once a week, that's what I hear. Maybe even more. So we have to do it in a worldwide fashion type of legislation that would actually create that clean coal burning technology.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 16 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) 10 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, the reality of 2008 is that the nexus between national security, energy, and the environment is the most important public policy issue that we face in this country. The nexus has a lot of different angles to it, but these three issues together is the greatest policy challenge that we face.

The farm bill is now in a sense an energy bill. The national security challenges that we face are indeed tied to the cost of oil. Unfortunately, these are the realities of what we face today.

Tomorrow in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory which is one of the lead laboratories in our country on alternative fuels, biofuels, research, mostly looking at cellulosic ethanol research and how to best bring that about, tomorrow at that laboratory my senior Senator, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, will lay out a Manhattan Project style approach to energy.

I don't want to preempt what he is saying there tomorrow, but he is joined tomorrow by Congressman BART GORDON, a Democrat from our State who happens to be the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee here in the House on a Manhattan-style approach because of this nexus, because there is a lot of clamor about global warming and because people are looking to our country to take some leadership, and the President of the United States has said we do need to lead. I believe this is an opportunity for us.

But I will tell you what my position is on energy, and this is after 8 years as the Republican co-chairman of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus in the House of Representatives, which is over half of the House, it is about 60 percent Democratic members and 40 percent Republican members. I have chaired it for 8 years with MARK UDALL. I am the chairman of that, but my position on energy is an all-of-the-above position. It has to be an all-of-the-above position. We cannot pick winners and losers. They did that in California and the lights went out. You can't pick winners and losers, not when we have the capacity challenges that we have today. And we do have capacity challenges everywhere.

At $122 a barrel, this is a supply-and-demand problem. If the people who don't like us around the world that produce oil would increase the supply, the price would go down. Or if the demand would reduce by conservation and not so much growth in India and China, the price would go down. But this is a supply-and-demand problem. We have to have an all-of-the-above solution.

Let me talk about a few things because transportation is the big driver, and gasoline is the most painful thing for the average consumer. I would suggest to you today, and Members say this a lot, but I know a lot about this, alternative fuels are only a bridge to the future. They are not the end all. That is not where we are going to end up in terms of transportation.

We have such quick development in ion lithium batteries that the people in the auto industry will tell you that we will be plugging in our automobiles very, very soon at a cost-competitive price point, not like the hydrogen fuel cell which is a 25-year proposal because the cost is prohibitive today, we can't pay $300,000 for a car, so we can't have hydrogen fuel cell cars yet, but that technology is out there. And maybe it will work.

But I will tell you what will work right now in the marketplace is electric cars, and they are coming quick. Plug-in hybrids, GM and Toyota, the year after next, will be commercially viable at a price point such that consumers will use them. So fuels are important, but technology is going to develop. Transportation is two-thirds of our oil consumption, and we have to move quickly there because this is very, very painful.

But here is the technology opportunity for the United States of America, and I call this the in-tech agenda. How did the budget get balanced for 4 years here? I was here. I think SHIMKUS was here. Four years ago, LEE TERRY was here. For 4 years in a row it got balanced, not by cutting spending. We did slow the growth of spending below inflation for 4 years which was very admirable because that hadn't been done in 40 years. But what we did do is we

had such a robust, export-driven U.S. economy that revenues surpassed expenses. That's how the budget got balanced.

Now what drove the revenues up? Well, guess what, we led in an area of the economy, and it boomed with our leadership, called the information world. Bill Gates and people like him so led the world that if you wanted the best in software and computers, for a long period of time they were from this country. I grew up when you didn't want to drive an American-made car. You didn't want to have an American-made television; for a while it had to be Japanese. Cars had to be German. Things changed. We led in the information world, and revenues surpassed expenses.

Guess what can happen early in the 21st century if we get off our tails: we can lead in energy technologies. We can solve the world's problem by being proactive and not even beat a retreat on climate change. I don't want to argue about how much man contributes to climate change because, frankly, the science is not clear on that. But it is an opportunity for us because if we provide these technology solutions to the world, the budget will get balanced again with a robust manufacturing-driven U.S. economy. Part of an all of the above.

We should provide the nuclear solutions to the world and not be afraid of it because, like the speaker said, in France and Great Britain and the Netherlands and other countries, nuclear is very much a part of their portfolio because they have a balanced portfolio, because they know they need to do these things in order to reduce their emissions.

While we are going to vigorously debate next year this issue of global warming, anybody in this place who says they are for cleaning up the air globally and making progress on zero emissions and carbon sequestration and reducing the carbon footprint and they are not for nuclear, they are kidding themselves because it has got to be a part of the portfolio given the capacity demands of today and tomorrow.

And if we are going to plug our cars in, capacity has to increase on energy. It is an all-of-the-above strategy.

Just today in the House, Congressman STEVE BUYER, with me as an original co-sponsor, introduced the Main Street U.S.A. Energy Security Act. It opens the Outer Continental Shelf to responsible energy production. It allows energy development within the ANWR. It streamlines the refinery permitting process assisting new refineries to be built in the United States for the first time in 30 years. It supports the development of coal-to-liquid plants. It supports the building of more nuclear plants. It provides a 3-year production tax credit extension for wind, biomass, geothermal, and many of the renewable investments. It invests in research and development programs for the energy needs of tomorrow.

You say, What are you doing introducing that today? Well, that is just a package of things that we are reintroducing again that we voted on in this House over and over and over and over again in the last 14 years because I counted, and it is dozens and dozens of times that we have had these votes, and the people who were for more capacity lost. On the floor of this House, on the floor of the Senate, we lost.

Bill Clinton vetoed the bill to open up oil production in Alaska. I'm not picking on him. Maybe that is what people wanted then, but they sure don't now. Why are we not responding? Why is our head buried in the sand? We have to have an all-of-the-above policy to compete. And we can balance the budget again. It is good for us. The world sees us reducing our carbon footprint, leading with new energy technologies and solving the world's problems.

We sat on the couch from 1973 to 2008. Since the oil embargoes of 1973, we sat on the couch as Americans and didn't make the changes we needed to make. And now we are in a mess. A $122 a barrel mess. But we sat on the couch. Guess what happens when you sit on the couch and you don't exercise and you don't get ready; that's where we are. We have to change.

You cannot vote against energy capacity in any segment of our economy or energy production without ending up either the lights go out or the price is too high, access is not there, and people are hurting. That's where we are today. It is an all-of-the-above strategy.

Let me close on this note. I am a conservative, and conservation is a good thing. People can begin to reduce demand by conserving, and consumers can join us. We need to do better, and so does the consumer in this country. Use less, be sensitive to lights, drive less, move to smaller vehicles; demand goes down and price goes down. We need to do that, and it is not wimpish to propose that. It is a good, solid, pro-American thing. Let's be more efficient, let's move to alternatives. But I'm saying an all-of-the-above strategy. Don't say we can do all of this with renewables. It is not there to meet tomorrow's demand. We have to have all of the above. Some things are long term and I know that, but right now we have to respond. This takes a balanced approach.

I thank Members from both sides who have that attitude, and I look forward to tomorrow at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his leadership in the Renewable Energy Caucus and his efforts to try and develop future products that come from renewable energies.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I thank my friend from across the aisle for his comments on conservation and the sharing of the same root between conservatism and conservation. Perhaps he would be willing to tell our Vice President who said a few years ago that conservation may be a personal virtue, but it is no way to build a national energy policy, that he is wrong. I am pleased to hear Members of this body on both sides of the aisle voicing that opinion, that conservation efficiency in effect has to be part of our national energy policy.

I also was happy to hear his comments on electric cars. In Israel, which I visited last August, and which I would like to wish a happy 60th birthday to, Israel is leading the way on not just solar energy in which they are collaborating with a California company on a huge solar photovoltaic project which will provide today, this is not some distant time in the future, today will provide enough electricity for 400,000 homes. Solel, Inc., is the Israeli company and Pacific Gas and Electric is the partner here in the United States. Not only are they a leader in photovoltaic solar electric power, but they are pioneering in Israel, as we could be in this country, electric cars that travel from one station to another and instead of charging the battery, they just switch it. They are working on a battery that will be interchangeable between all cars. So one can drive up to the gas station which will now be an electric station or whatever fuel one moves toward, remove the old battery that is run down, immediately get a new one installed and drive away in a matter of minutes rather than waiting for it to be charged up.

□ 1745

All these options are available, and I'm here to say they're available today.

I would also dispute, however, the assertion that nuclear power is non-emitting, that nuclear power is clean. First of all, nuclear power does give off greenhouse gas emissions because, in the process of mining and milling and transporting nuclear fuel, there are fossil fuels burned.

There are, in my very district, in fact, strontium, nydium, tritium, among other cancer-causing radioactive particles being released into the groundwater and even under normal operations, into the air.

And lastly, of course, the spent fuel has to be transported, again using fossil fuels, to a repository, which may be Yucca Mountain whenever that happens to be opened.

In the meanwhile, every nuclear plant and every nuclear shipment is a potential terrorist target. We know that Mohammad Atta wrote, for instance, in the papers that were found after 9/11, about canvassing New York City, flying on commercial airliners, and that he took notes about a nuclear plant that he flew over as a potential target that we believe to be Indian Point.

So I would remind those on both sides of the aisle that our diplomatic stance around the world has been one of trying to stop other countries from taking a ''peaceful nuclear program and turning it into a military nuclear program.'' It's a very gray area and a blurry line once one learns how to enrich fuel. It's only a matter of how far one enriches that fuel.

So there are some things that we agree about. I totally agree that we need a moon shot technology revolution. We need to put all the resources of this country that we can behind this, and that American ingenuity can solve these problems.

But speaking as one who's burning 20 percent biodiesel in my home heating oil, who's getting 1,500 kilowatt hours a month from wind power, who's driving an American-made hybrid today that gets 33 miles per gallon, and an SUV with 4-wheel drive, not a little tin can, but actually a pretty sizeable vehicle, I think these technologies are available if they're given the proper incentives, tax breaks and subsidies today, and if we lead the way in government with preferential purchasing and the decision-making that we make as the powerful government that we are.

So I'm happy to be a part of this exciting time in our energy history.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I would like to save my time to close, so I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for many of his comments. I understand that this is a very important issue here in America today moving America forward towards an energy independent America.

Madam Speaker, however, it is my understanding that my colleagues on the conference committee for the Food Conservation and Energy Act have already come to an agreement that is ready to be reported. We have a title, which is the energy title of the farm bill, which directly deals with agricultural issues and renewable energy and cellulosic-based ethanol.

As a matter of fact, the energy title creates a $1.01 per gallon cellulosic ethanol tax credit to 2010. It also has in $1.01 per gallon is based on a 56 cents per gallon tax credit, producers credit, and it has a 45 cents per gallon blenders credit. The total tax benefit is $400 million.

And as the gentleman knows, we are currently in a budgetary strain. We have PAYGO rules which we must abide by. I think that adopting this motion would delay the passage of the farm bill. And the chairman reminds all Members that motions to instruct are basically out of order at this time, being that my colleagues in the conference committee have come up with an agreement and they are ready to report this.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Colorado. I'm an aggie. I don't serve on the committee. And the agricultural sector is one of the few sectors that we have increased supply. So I do this with all due respect.

My concern is that when we disincentivize the E85 fuel stations, the cellulosic debate, which is the next bridge to get us to the RFS standard that we passed in December, we can't get there without RFS, without cellulosic. And we're sending a bad signal when we have States without any fueling stations and we have States that do. And so that's what brings me down.

And I'm glad my colleague from New York talked about nuclear power. The former head of Greenpeace now supports nuclear power. The former head of Greenpeace now supports nuclear power.

Coal generating electricity is 50 percent of our electricity generation in this country. 50 percent. Nuclear's 20. Our demand's going to increase 30 percent in the next 20 years.

Texas tried wind power. They had brownouts. ZACK WAMP is right. We need more supply. This is what China's doing. China is building 40 nuclear plants in the next 15 years, not one. We haven't done one in 30. China's going to build 40.

China's invested $24 billion in large scale coal liquification technology. China is rapidly expanding its refining capacity. One of the reasons we compete is because we had low cost power. We don't have low cost power anymore. Those days aren't here. Renewable fuels aren't going to fill the gap that we have.

So we have to do, as Zach said, all of the above. In a column, Robert Samuelson said, what to do about oil? The first thing, start drilling. It's the easiest, quickest thing we can do. Unless you want to put up with this. Unless you want more, and, you know, you're a rural farm boy in Colorado.

I try to remind people here that in rural America we like big trucks. We have to have working trucks. We can't haul a horse trailer with an electric engine, with a four-cylinder engine. It won't go anywhere. We need powerful trucks. We need trailers. We need working trucks.

That's fossil fuels. That's diesel. We can't pay these gas prices anymore. And we're going to. Don't get me on climate change. All I want is transparency.

If we're going to tax the American public they need to know they're going to pay 50 cents more a gallon. And my charts are way over.

Why can't we go here? Why? Why can't we access these areas to get natural gas? Anhydrous ammonia, the Number 1 commodity input, natural gas.

And what has your majority done? You put areas off-limits. We've got areas in your State in the last year we put off-limits. We didn't bring on more supply.

Great solution. China's doing it, taking coal, gasifying it. When you gasify it you can burn electricity. You can capture the carbon. It's a clean way to do it. We can't do it.

For every dollar increase in a barrel of crude oil, do you know how much the taxpayers have to pay to fund the Air Force? 60 million additional dollars. Our Air Force is the number one jet fuel user in the world. They're begging for help. It's crazy.

We are relying on imported crude oil. Our national security depends on aviation fuel, and we are constrained by imported crude oil. Don't you think it'd be better to use our known natural resources to help our Air Force to fly our planes?

Coast Guard authorization bill, $1 increase. $1 dollar increase in Coast Guard authorization diesel added $24 million to the cost of the Coast Guard to protect our border.

Mr. SALAZAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SALAZAR. I just wanted to ask the gentleman, what does this have to do with the farm bill?

Mr. SHIMKUS. These are input costs. You know the diesel price has doubled. I mean, my farmers, when they plant the corn, they're in a tractor. When they harvest the corn or the beans, they're in a tractor. It's run by diesel fuel.

There's an attack on ethanol today. I was in committee today, I mean, 2 days ago, let's stop the RFS. It's the only thing that we have. And why is it under attack? Because input cost to production of commodity grain has gone up because we can't get low price diesel fuel.

When we harvest the corn we take it to a grain elevator. We do that with a big diesel truck, a big tractor trailer. We have independent truckers striking. They drove around here a couple of weeks ago, big signs. We can't afford the high cost of diesel.

And we know costs get passed on. What's some Democrats' response? Oh, we've got a great idea. Let's tax the energy companies more.

My challenge is, when have we ever raised a tax that's lowered the price to a consumer? And I've challenged people; give me one example where we raised the tax and costs went down. No one's challenged me. And I'm sure people will look at that.

Another thing is let's demand that the people we're reliant on, pump more crude oil. Oh, that helps us not become reliant on imported cried oil. Let's demand that the people who are providing us oil pump more. That's why I'm so frustrated with this. I hope you understand. We need to lower prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Terry moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012) be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in section 12312 subtitle C of title XII of the Senate amendment (relating to a cellulosic biofuel production tax credit).

Mr. TERRY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) will be recognized for 30 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today with my motion to instruct to make sure that we keep a tax credit that the Senate has in its version of the farm bill for cellulosic energy and the blending. It's a dollar tax credit, and that's important that we have the higher number because cellulosic energy or cellulosic ethanol, I think, is where we are going to move to for our midterm energy strategy in this country, and that we really are at the very embryonic stages of its development, as I'm going to show here in a few minutes, and that because we are at the beginning stages of cellulosic energy, taking it literally from the research laboratories to the experimental market, trying to produce it more than at 1 gallon at a time, that we will need to, more heavily subsidize these beginning processes.

□ 1800

Now, I'm going to build our argument here of why I feel that cellulosic energy or cellulosic ethanol is important and why we need the $1 credit versus the lower number that was in the House version to get to our ultimate goal here, which is energy independence.

And by the way, I define ''energy independence'' as not relying on OPEC countries. We will need to use the natural gas and oil from Canada, and we will need to, for a variety of reasons, use the oil from Mexico; but wouldn't it be great if we were in a position that we didn't have to use the oil that's produced by countries that don't like us, that really hinders, as the gentleman from Tennessee, ZACH WAMP, mentioned. Our foreign policy, we have to counsel, we have to do things for countries that really are trying to harm us economically, like Venezuela is right now.

Now, the bottom line here, the bottom line here is that every citizen of the United States is paying higher prices at the pump. They are paying more of their family budget to get to and from work, to and from the grocery store, and they're upset and rightfully so. So I am asked frequently, what is the plan. Well, the problem is there really isn't a cohesive plan. We do know that it is an issue of supply and demand.

Now, we've nibbled at the edges in an earlier bill this year that was signed by the President in December on the demand part. We did things to help incent electric cars, hybrids, battery technology; and probably the key component or foundation of that demand bill or lowering demand of oil was increasing the fuel efficiency of cars and light trucks. That was called the Hill-Terry bill. So I was one of the co-authors of that bill, and we got that in there. And that will increase fuel efficiency by 40 percent, in stages, to 2020, where I really see that we're going to end up earlier meeting those goals because of battery technology and ethanol.

We already have some vehicles out on the road today using ethanol blends as high as 85 percent that are hybrid. So you're combining ethanol, lowering the amount of oil that we have to use and refine, and battery technologies at lower speeds: for example, the Ford Escape.

Now, let me broach into an area here that I think is important for people to understand because our midterm strategy, at least as I envision it, is going to involve ethanol. And for some reason, ethanol has been blamed for every ill that has occurred globally. There has been severe droughts that have affected rice crops, and yet I read in U.S. papers that that's caused by ethanol. It's baffling how they make this connection, and it's wrong; but yet it seems like ethanol is causing more problems, as related by the media, than President Bush is. Maybe President Bush is happy that ethanol is pushing him off the front page. I don't know.

All I know is most of what you're reading about ethanol is completely bogus. And even people in the Corn Husker State are now starting to tell me, We can't rely on ethanol. We're learning that this is bad, because I am paying more at the grocery store. My eggs are more expensive because of ethanol. Huh? Well, okay. Maybe some of the grain-related foods have been impacted by ethanol.

I want to show you a few charts here. And by the way, these studies are done by the government. They've been reported in The Wall Street Journal and other major business magazines.

First of all, the problem with the higher prices at the grocery store in total is because of increased energy costs. The price per barrel of oil closed short of a $124 today. It's grown dramatically, and ethanol is actually helping with those energy costs. Every report that I have seen, and we will use this chart, has shown that we would be paying much more at the pump today if it were not for the ethanol that we're blending.

Here is a chart that shows today's average price at the pump of $3.65. That would be $4.20 at the pump today if we didn't have the ethanol to blend.

Now, you're saying, well, that's great but, you know, it's driving up the food costs so I'm actually paying more. Well, that's not true, but we're not hearing about it in our media.

The reality is that today, because of ethanol being blended into gasoline and that major difference of what you would pay at the pump, it would be as much as 40 cents more, maybe 60 cents more, according to that information. So actually the consumer is saving around $305 to as much as $420 a year because of ethanol.

Now, every study that I have seen has shown that the direct impact of ethanol, that part of the corn crop that's diverted from feed or shipped to be manufactured into food, impacts about 5 cents on a box of cereal. Every study that I have seen from Texas A&M, the government, University of Nebraska has said it is about 3 percent on grain-related foods. 3 percent. But yet you're saving 15 to 20 percent at the pump, and it is helping you in today's world.

Now, let's talk about cellulosic. Cellulosic is where you take a biofeed stock, it can be just about any living, growing thing, and you use an extra step in the process to take this and break down the gluten, kind of the glue that holds the cells together, that holds the sugars; and when we are able to dissolve those, then you can extract that and create ethanol.

Now this type of ethanol, by the way, has a higher Btu rating and has more energy involved in it. So actually this ethanol goes further for us.

What type of products can we use? Well, you can use things like switchgrass. You can use wood pulp. You can use sweet sorghum. You can use anything as long as it's a living, growing organism. You don't have to use food. So that's why it's important.

Now, I'm going to say that ethanol is here to stay, but I do believe ethanol, based on corn, is going to hit a ceiling; and so cellulosic, if we can then use these types of bioproducts and create more energy or liquid fuel, then that is more that we can displace. And we will need a complete national energy strategy, and that's why I was curious when ZACH WAMP came up here and talked about LAMAR ALEXANDER announcing