

migratory habitat. U.S. geological reports are inconclusive as to how much oil will actually be available within the coastal plains, and even if drilling were to begin today, it will be more than a decade before useable oil will be produced. H.R. 4 does not address the fact that oil produced right now on Alaska's North Slope is currently being exported to Japan and Asia. If we are trying to increase supply, why not ban exports on all our oil currently produced in America?

H.R. 4 includes a provision to artificially enhance competitiveness of western federal coal to give lessees the ability to control market prices. Instead of requiring coal prospectors to "diligently develop" coal, H.R. 4 allows federal coal lessees to withhold production at any time without penalty. I wrote this provision that H.R. 4 is striking. Federal coal lessees already produce 33 percent of U.S. coal consumption, this "produce or withhold" option would allow them to drive out competition and spike prices. They could flood the market with coal when they wanted and eliminate their competition or they could withhold production in order to raise prices. This provision gives an unfair advantage to current federal coal lessees and is bad for consumers.

H.R. 4 provides an insufficient amount in grants to develop alternative fuels, including fuel cells, natural gas, hydrogen, propane and ethanol. Ethanol should be a cornerstone of America's energy future. It is a clean burning, renewable, biodegradable fuel that reduces harmful greenhouse gasses when added to gasoline as oxygenate. Ethanol is good for the environment and production is vitally important economic stimulus to our nation's farmers. Ethanol is also critical to American energy security, adding volume to a tight fuel supply and will reduce consumer cost.

There were 5 amendments offered on renewable fuels, but the Rules Committee made every single one of them out of order. This is not the way to help our farmers, our environment, and will not enhance our energy security.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy (SAFE) Act of 2001. I regret having to take this position because I support the Energy and Commerce Committee provisions of this bill, which were crafted in a bipartisan manner under the leadership of Chairman TAUZIN and Ranking Member DINGELL, as well as the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee Chairman BARTON and Ranking

Member BOUCHER. Working together, the members of the committee created a balanced energy policy that recognizes the importance of conservation and efficiency as well as increased production from traditional sources of energy, while improving our nation's commitment to alternative and renewable energy resources. These efforts produced an excellent first step toward addressing critical national energy supply issues in an environmentally sensitive manner, improving efficiency so as to reduce waste, and ensuring our nation's energy security for future generations.

The product of our committee's bipartisan work was combined with the sections reported by other committees. Instead of having conservation and efficiency as its center, the legislation added millions of dollars of tax benefits for corporations involved with exploration and production and distribution of energy supplies with no guarantees that the savings will be passed on to the American consumer. Several provisions were added which threaten sensitive environmental areas such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and allow the private sector to short circuit important environmental regulations. These provisions fundamentally alter the balance that was needed to increase energy supply and protect the environment.

The process by which the bill was pieced together for floor consideration was also seriously flawed. I worked with my colleagues in the Energy and Commerce Committee, on both sides of the aisle, to include important provisions that will improve the energy efficiency of the federal government through a streamlining of the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP), saving taxpayers millions of dollars for years to come.

We created an innovative funding mechanism called the Federal Energy Bank to establish a fund that would help federal agencies invest in more efficient technologies and renewable resources, recouping the savings for reinvestment later on. We also included incentives for production from renewable energy facilities through revisions to the Renewable Energy Production Incentive (REPI).

When H.R. 4 was presented for floor consideration the Energy Bank provision, which was unanimously approved by committee, was missing, with no explanation of why other than that the Office of Management and Budget had concerns about the provision that had not been raised during the three previous versions of the legislation as it was developed in committee. After learning that those concerns could be addressed with minor revisions, I offered an amendment to clarify the language for the floor, but it was not made in order by the rule. As the details of the legislation came to light, it was determined that other important provisions contained in the Energy and Commerce Committee bill were removed without consultation with committee members. Mr. Speaker, legislation of this magnitude deserves complete and thorough review and the rush to get the measure to the floor should not supersede the good bipartisan work that was performed in committee and thwart the public policy gains that were made.

Increasing the fuel efficiency of passenger vehicles and light trucks holds the greatest potential to reduce consumption of fossil fuels

and emissions of harmful global greenhouse gases, but the implications on the industry and jobs requires a delicate balance on how we best approach this problem. The Energy and Commerce Committee took a first step toward addressing improved fuel efficiency through the requirement that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) take steps to decrease petroleum fuel consumption of new vehicles manufactured between 2004 and 2010 by five billion gallons than otherwise would have occurred. Because the rulemaking process under existing law has been stalled for the past six years we have lost the opportunity to approach increasing fuel efficiency at a reasonable pace. We should continue to work to increase the fuel efficiency of all vehicles. The automakers have indicated repeatedly that they have the existing technology to increase the fuel economy of their products and plan to implement those improvements in the near future. Making these changes to improve automotive fuel efficiency and actually affecting the number of these vehicles sold is a different matter. Whether for safety, convenience or performance reasons, Americans' buying habits have trended strongly toward larger sport utility vehicles (SUVs) and light trucks. The public supports improved fuel economy, but balanced with the desire to have vehicles that meet their transportation needs.

The Energy and Commerce Committee provisions also call for a report that will examine alternatives to the current CAFÉ standard policy and requirements for each manufacturer to comply with these standards for vehicles it makes. The National Research Council report suggests alternative means by which we could achieve greater success at improving fuel efficiency such as a system of tradeable credits to augment the current CAFÉ requirement and eliminating the differentiation between foreign and domestic fleets. We should continue the effort to examine how best to accomplish this over the next several months and come back to this issue once we have learned more about the economic effects of the suggestions that have been included in the report. Mr. Speaker, we must follow through on our commitment to make the provisions of this bill the first step to increase the fuel efficiency of all vehicles, not the last.

When considered as a whole, H.R. 4, is an incomplete solution to our nation's energy needs which will harm the environment we are charged with protecting. I cannot support such an unbalanced and shortsighted energy strategy, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE
ENERGY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.