Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which

addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prevents

Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of

fuels unless their life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or

equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from

conventional petroleum sources.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stop the Defense

Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquid jet

fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some

environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more

greenhouse gas emissions than traditional, petroleum-derived fuels.

My amendment is a simple fix, and that fix is to not restrict our

fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, bad policies, and

misguided regulations like those in section 526.

Placing limits on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable

precedent to set in regard to America's petroleum independence and our

national security. Mr. Chair, section 526 restrictions make our Nation

more dependent on unstable Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of

section 526 will help us promote American energy, improve the American

economy, and create American jobs. In addition, and probably most

important, we must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources

and that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

With increasing competition for energy and fuel resources and with

the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now

more important than ever for our country to become more energy

independent and to further develop and produce all of our domestic

energy resources.

In some circles, there is a misconception that my amendment somehow

prevents the Federal Government and our military from being able to

produce and use alternative fuels. Mr. Chair, this viewpoint is

categorically false. All my amendment does is to allow Federal

purchasers, particularly our military, to be able to acquire the fuels

that best and most efficiently meet their needs.

I offered a similar amendment to the CJS appropriations bill for FY

2013, and it passed with strong bipartisan support. My identical

amendments to four other FY 2013 appropriations bills also each passed

by voice vote. My friend, Mr. Conaway, also had language added to the

defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this

burdensome regulation.

Let's remember the following problems with section 526: one, it

increases our reliance on unstable Middle Eastern oil; two, it hurts

our military readiness, our national security and our energy security;

three, it prevents the increased use of some sources of safe, clean and

efficient American oil and gas; four, it hurts American jobs and the

American economy; five, last and certainly not least, it costs our

taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

My amendment fixes those problems. I urge my colleagues to support

the passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

All my amendment does is remove any external restrictions

from the Department of Defense being able to acquire fuels. It doesn't

restrict their ability to acquire alternative fuels, such as the Green

Fleet.

Now, I have issues with paying $56 a gallon for fuel, but I'm willing

to battle that at a future date. I'm not endorsing the use of those

expensive fuels. I think they're irresponsible uses of taxpayer funds

when the purpose of the military is to defend our country, not to be

trying to promote alternative fuels.

The logic applies. But again, I think it's an order of

magnitude.

For instance, technology to do coal-to-liquids fuels was used by the

Germans in World War II. It's been tried in the past. It's still not

cost effective. I think there's an order of magnitude. For instance, if

the military can do it for, let's say, 50 percent more than it costs

for conventional fuel, that's one thing; but if it has to pay 10 times

more for biobase fuels, that's another issue.