Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's

amendment. It's been argued that section 526 harms our military

readiness. This is simply not the case, particularly according to the

Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has stated this month, very clearly, the

provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we

need today worldwide to support the military missions. But it also sets

an important baseline in developing the fuels that we need for our

future.

DOD, the Department of Defense, supports this section and recognizes

that tomorrow's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are going to

need a greater range of energy sources. In fact, the Department says

that repealing this section could, and I'm quoting the Department,

``complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy

solutions to our warfighters and to take advantage of the promising

developments in homegrown biofuels.'' I would also emphasize the impact

it would have on our economy and the creation of new jobs in our

economy.

I believe the amendment would damage the development of biofuels,

given the fact that the Department of Defense is such a huge procurer

of energy, at the worst possible time for our economy. It could send a

negative signal to America's advanced biofuel industry and could result

in adverse impacts to the U.S. job creation efforts, rural development

efforts, and the export of world-leading technology.

I would also emphasize to my colleagues the section does not prevent

the sale of fuels that emit more carbon, nor does it prevent the

Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need to.

Government policies should help drive the development of alternative

fuels that cut carbon emission, not increase it. I think that's a

commonsense approach.

Again, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment and, I yield back

the balance of my time.