



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2003

No. 58—Part II

House of Representatives

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003—

(Continued)

□ 1630

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, 39,700 of these people are directly employed by the industry.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment. Let us defeat it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The National Academy of Sciences identified 13 readily-available technologies, each one of which would improve fuel economy from .5 percent to 12 percent. Three major automakers, GM, Ford and Toyota, have already announced plans to introduce vehicles that would get 35 to 40 miles per gallon within the next 2 years.

New technologies can improve fuel economy without reducing weight and size. It is irresponsible to pass a national energy policy that does not reduce the use of gasoline because 70 percent of the oil we use is to power our cars.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The answer to better fuel mileage is probably in a different fueled vehicle. It is called hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

This morning I met GM officials who gave me their new brochures on these cars that they are going to be manufacturing. They have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to develop and finance the new hydrogen fuel cell vehicle.

Now, what this amendment would do you cannot create with just magic. You cannot say just "Poof, here it is. There you go." It would be nice to have a vehicle that delivered 40 or 50 miles per gallon. But to do that would take all of the engineering gusto away from developing what I think is the real answer, hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. It would take hundreds of millions of dollars out of that engineering cycle today and invest it into something else.

This is the answer. Let science prevail. Let science and the experts decide that this is the vehicle. Let them develop these types of vehicles, knowing that we are there, that we are going to have these cars in the showroom before too long. Let us not get off that track. Let us defeat this amendment. Let the research and development continue so that all of us will be able to drive one of these vehicles in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1584. An act to implement effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, two facts are on a collision course:

Fact one, the concentrations of carbon dioxide, a pollutant that causes global warming, is skyrocketing and will continue to do so as this graph indicates.

Fact two, to date, the U.S. Congress apparently believes that since the mid-1980s American technological genius has disappeared by its willful failure to use our smarts and our can-do efforts to improve fuel-technology efficiency. If we had simply continued on the path of improving the efficiency of our vehicles from the mid-1980s until now, we would have eliminated our need for 70 percent of the imported oil from the Mideast.

How can the U.S. Congress be so pessimistic to think that the people that gave us Microsoft, that gave us biotechnology, cannot improve the efficiency of our vehicles?

John Kennedy said we could go to the Moon in 10 years. We ought to be able to improve our fuel efficiency in the 10 months in this session.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of our committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, we come from a big State that wants big trucks and big cars, and my concern about the Markey amendment, not that we would not like to have more fuel efficiency, but it actually treats our trucks even harsher than what the National Academy of Sciences says is reasonable. That is why I think we need to have more study on it. Let us make sure we have a plan that works, not only for some parts of our country, but the whole country.

The Markey amendment will restrict consumer choice, particularly for folks where I come from, who like to drive

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3231