

collect mortgage insurance premiums for mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) made available under any multifamily housing mortgage insurance program affected by the interim rule issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on July 2, 2001 (66 Federal Register 35070; Docket No. FR 4679-1-01), in an amount greater than the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of such program, by \$5,000,000.

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just do so in order to allow the gentleman to make clear to the membership what this will mean for all of them for the rest of the day, and what it will mean for the further consideration of this bill.

It is my understanding that this will mean that after we take up the Menendez amendment, we will then vote on the accumulated amendments, and that there will be no further votes today; that the committee will rise, and that we will resume consideration of this bill Monday after 7, and proceed to completion of the bill Monday evening.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely our understanding of this agreement.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERREUTER). Would the gentleman from New York specify the Traficant amendment that he intends?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, one Traficant amendment is printed and the other is not printed yet. It is at the desk. It is his Buy American amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Traficant).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be made available to any person or entity convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York to dispense

with the readings of the three unprinted amendments?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 210 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2620.

□ 1233

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 45 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) had been postponed and the bill was open for amendment from page 33, line 5, through page 37, line 9.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate.

The amendment printed in House Report 107-164.

The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5, 6, 7, 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 46.

Two amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and one amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) that have been placed at the desk.

One amendment en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) consisting of amendments numbered 31, 33, 34, and 35.

Such amendments shall be debatable as follows:

Except as specified, each amendment shall be debatable only for 10 minutes each.

The amendments numbered 6, 12, 24, 39, and 42 shall be debatable only for 20 minutes each;

The amendments numbered 5 and 37 and one amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) shall be debatable for only 30 minutes each.

The amendment numbered 46 shall be debatable only for 40 minutes.

Such debate shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the request, the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or a designee, each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The amendment printed in House Report 107-164, may amend portions of the bill not yet read.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 46 offered by Mr. MENENDEZ:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

“SEC. . Funding made available under this Act for salaries and expenses, excluding those made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Environmental Protection Agency, are reduced by \$25,000,000 and funds made available for “Environmental Programs and Management” at the Environmental Protection Agency are increased by \$25,000,000 for activities authorized by law: Provided, none of the funds in this Act shall be available by reason of the next to last specific dollar earmark under the heading “State and Tribal Assistance Grants.”

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the outset, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the subcommittee ranking member, for all their hard work and cooperation on this amendment.

This amendment which I am sponsoring with my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) would restore critically needed funding to the Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Compliance and Enforcement, which is responsible for enforcing America’s most important and effective environmental laws.

To do so, we cut \$25 million from nonpersonnel administrative costs from other parts of the bill except EPA and veterans' programs. Spread out over this bill, this will require very modest cuts in administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I stand before the House today because I believe America's environment is under attack. Not too long ago, as a Presidential candidate, George Bush spoke strong words about protecting the environment, but today his promises to the American people ring hollow. In only a few short months, the Bush administration made its priorities clear to all of us, and environmental protection is apparently very low on the list.

While I am not surprised at the actions of President Bush or of EPA administrator Whitman, given her shoddy record of environmental enforcement in my home State of New Jersey, I am surprised that the committee went along with this dangerous course of action.

The bill before us today, at the direction of the administration, irresponsibly cuts \$25 million from the EPA's enforcement budget, specifically targeting compliance, monitoring, civil and criminal enforcement, and Superfund enforcement.

If this bill passes in its present form, 270 positions would be eliminated from the Office of Compliance and Enforcement, which will result in 2,000 fewer inspections, an 11 percent reduction in criminal actions, and a 20 percent reduction in civil actions. These reductions would be devastating to EPA's ability to enforce clean air, clean water, and hazardous waste laws.

These are not just numbers we are talking about here. This is the water our children drink, the air they breathe, and the legacy we leave to the next generation. It is because of Federal enforcement officers that we have made so much progress in cleaning up our air and water.

Experience tells us the difference a strong EPA can make. Civil enforcement activities have resulted in real improvements in environmental quality. In fiscal year 1999, EPA's civil enforcement actions achieved over 6.8 billion pounds of pollutant reductions, but the bill before us would cut 6 percent of the staff positions from the Superfund hazardous waste cost recovery efforts, this from a program that in fiscal year 2000 recovered \$231 million from responsible parties at Superfund sites.

This is pennywise and pound foolish because the cut in Superfund enforcement would reduce cost recoveries by over \$50 million in fiscal year 2002, a reduction in revenue that greatly exceeds the funding necessary to fully restore the enforcement efforts.

The administration's budget also proposes to transfer \$25 million to the States for environmental enforcement. While States could use additional help in ensuring compliance with environ-

mental laws, that help should not come at the expense of EPA's successful enforcement programs.

Federal and State resources combined are not enough to fully enforce our Federal environmental laws as it is. Transferring scarce Federal resources to State programs when both compliance programs are underfunded is like robbing Peter to pay Paul. The fact is, the air and water quality in one State impacts the air and water in another State. There are no borders when the goal is a clean environment. That is why a clean environment should be a national priority.

Big polluters would like nothing more than to see a major reduction in Federal, civil, and criminal enforcement by the EPA, so cutting EPA's enforcement budget is sending the wrong message at a time when over 60 million Americans live in areas of the country that still fail to meet air quality standards.

We can do better, but this bill takes us in the wrong direction. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment because it is the right thing for the environment and it is right for America. Let us leave a legacy of clean lakes, clean rivers, fresh air. Let us leave a clean environment for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized to control the time in opposition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no one in this Congress who cares more about the environment than I do. I had the good fortune as a young boy of growing up in the Finger Lakes region of New York State, and my experience showed me that the people that I saw on the streams where I fished, in the woods where I hunted, in the woods where I skied, are State officials, State employees. The States are the ones who do the enforcement work for the Environmental Protection Agency. The State folks know those streams. They know those lakes. They know the conditions and industry surrounding our watersheds. They enforce the laws.

I want to make it very clear, there are no cuts in the EPA budget. There are no cuts. The amendment that the gentleman proposes, however, is a cut. It is a cut to HUD, it is a cut to NASA, it is a cut to FEMA, it is a cut to the National Science Foundation.

If Members want to cut HUD or NASA, FEMA, the National Science Foundation, support the gentleman's amendment. But what I submit is that the people who do the enforcement day-to-day, who know the conditions, who know the watersheds, who know the lakes and rivers, we are providing them with the additional funds.

States conduct more than 95 percent of the environmental inspections and

more than 90 percent of the environmental enforcement actions. It is the States that do the lion's share of the work, and it is the States that get the lion's share of this increase. This is an increase in the EPA enforcement budget.

As a fact, the fiscal year 2001 enacted budget for enforcement is \$465 million. In this budget, according to the President's budget request and what we have committed to, the subcommittee has committed to, the level of funding is \$475 million. How Members can arrive at a cut from that, it just defies logic.

What we do is we put the money where it is needed and where it is used. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the Federal Government. I work in the Federal Government. I have the greatest respect for the employees who work within the Federal Government. But I want to make sure that the people who have the responsibility to protect my watershed, my drinking water, my neighbor's good health, I want to make sure those people know the system, the environmental systems. I want to make sure that they know the businesses and the business owners. I want to make sure that they know that their neighbors are the ones who are going to benefit from their vigor and activity in enforcing the laws of the land.

So let us put the money in the hands of the people who are going to do the enforcement work, and that is the State employees who have traditionally done the lion's share of this work. There is not a cut. I will just restate that, there is no cut in enforcement. This is an increase in enforcement. But if Members want to cut Federal agencies, cut HUD, cut NASA, cut FEMA, cut NSF, support the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1245

I would strongly urge that my colleagues not do that. These funds are needed by those agencies, and let us keep the enforcement in the hands of the State.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Two points on the gentleman's comments. Number one, we simply cut nonpersonnel administrative expenses. Number one. And, number two, even EPA's own justification to Congress shows that there will be dramatic reductions in their staffing, in their ability for enforcement, in their civil and criminal penalties that they will be able to pursue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, but the reality is that if we do not provide enough money to keep these Federal enforcement officers in place and they have to be laid

off, then, in effect, this is a cut and it means we cannot enforce the law. That is what we face here today.

We saw the same thing in New Jersey. The current EPA administrator used to be our governor in New Jersey. When she was governor, she cut back on the amount of money for the personnel, for the people that go out and do the inspections, for the people that conduct the criminal investigations against the polluters; and the consequence was that in New Jersey the environmental laws were not enforced. That is what is going to happen here again with this budget unless the Menendez amendment passes today.

It is a very insidious thing. People do not pay a lot of attention to enforcement. They pay attention to when the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act is weakened. But when an attempt is made to weaken the enforcement by not providing the personnel, the public does not notice. But it is more damaging, and I would suggest what is happening in this budget and the laying off of these enforcement personnel will be more damaging to the environment than almost anything else the Republican leadership or the President has proposed since he came to office. So we must speak out against it.

I want to give an example how it also impacts the taxpayer. New Jersey has more Superfund sites than any other State. My district has more than any other district in New Jersey. When we cut back on the inspections for Superfund and we do not go after the polluters, then we do not get the money from the polluters to clean up the Superfund sites and then we have to spend the money out of the Superfund, which is taxpayers' money.

And my colleagues on the other side know that, in the case of the Superfund, we do not even have the tax in place on the chemical and oil polluting companies to pay for the Superfund. The money increasingly is coming out of the general funds, which means income taxes.

So the consequence of this is not only that we weaken the environmental laws but also that we put more of a burden on the taxpayer rather than on the polluters these inspectors go out and find and go out and enforce to clean up their act.

What is happening here is very insidious. I am sure this is only going to be the beginning. We will see the same thing next year with the President's budget. We have to put a stop to it. Pass the Menendez amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MENENDEZ. May I inquire if the gentleman from New York has any speakers at all?

Mr. WALSH. I have not identified that yet. But as soon as I have a better figure on it, I will provide the gentleman with that.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support this amendment. This amendment, very simply, restores 270 positions that are being cut by the Bush administration, positions that are needed to enforce our environmental laws.

I think the cutbacks that the administration is providing are consistent with what I regard as its generally misguided policy on environmental cleanup. I think the cutbacks they are trying to achieve in EPA enforcement are similar to the weakening of our attack on environmental problems that we see by their walking away from our obligation to try to work out an international treaty on global warming, for instance.

I think that their efforts to cut back on EPA enforcement are consistent with the White House efforts to reverse the new, more stringent standards for air-conditioning efficiency, a standard which the Clinton administration tried to implement and which would have saved us billions of dollars in energy costs if the White House had not walked away from those new standards.

If we take a look generally across the board at what the administration tried to do to shred the New Lands Legacy Agreement, which we reached in the Subcommittee on Interior last year, which over the next 6 years essentially doubles our ability to purchase key parcels of lands for future generations, all of those initiatives that the administration has taken have operated to reduce rather than strengthen our support for environmental cleanup. This is just one more instance.

It may seem like a small thing, but in my view it is not. The amendment is consistent with our efforts, for instance, to strengthen standards on arsenic in drinking water, which we just completed. So I would urge the House to support this amendment. I congratulate the gentleman for offering it, and I am happy to cosponsor it with him, and I would urge that the House adopt this amendment unanimously. I cannot think of a single constructive argument against the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time and thank all those who have worked on this amendment.

I think we should just get rid of the mirrors and the smoke on this, Mr.

Chairman, and cut straight to the heart of the matter. This administration is simply attempting to undercut the authority and the effectiveness of the EPA by reducing its funding by 25 million people and putting 270 people out to pasture.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I would just remind the gentleman this year's budget is \$10 million higher for enforcement in EPA.

Mr. TIERNEY. Reclaiming my time, I have respect for that, but the short part of the matter is that people are being put out of work at the EPA and enforcement will not proceed as it should on this.

This is nothing new. This majority and this administration have had a hostile attitude toward environmental protection for several years. In 1995, the House majority attacked an astounding 17 riders to eviscerate the EPA. And over several years running, the EPA was forbidden to spend any funds to implement or even prepare to implement the Kyoto Protocol that combatted global climate change. Frankly, without the efforts of colleagues in the Senate, without vetoes of then President Clinton, and without substantial public outcry, the EPA simply would have been crippled.

Further, it seems this administration has not learned anything from the last several months. Nearly every public indicator signals there is no issue on which the public and the administration disagree more strongly than on the environment. From clean air to water quality, the public is acutely aware that the majority and the White House are not protecting the people's interest or their needs.

Now they seek to attempt to undercut the EPA by shifting enforcement responsibility entirely to the States. We all support assisting the States in their efforts to ensure environmental law compliance, but that will not take care of problems across borders, that will not take care of the problem that this administration, in transferring that responsibility to the States, is risking an erosion of the standards that this legislative body has passed and calls upon the States to enforce.

This administration will almost certainly permit States to issue proposals that include incentives for voluntary compliance. And while some States are good stewards of environmental issues, others have a history of diluting enforcement of provisions that protect the public.

In such States, we have seen what happens to violators who simply choose not to voluntarily comply. Nothing. No penalties, no deadlines by which the standards must be enacted, nothing at all, Mr. Chairman. Voluntary compliance too often simply means "never having to say you're sorry."

Findings by the General Accounting Office also echo this sentiment. It finds

serious cuts would result in 15 to 25 States receiving no funding at all. In those States the cutbacks would result in the absence of effective enforcement of protective safety measures. The EPA knows that there would be serious staff reductions that would result in this proposal; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the administration is intending.

The facts are that the EPA enforcement resources are already stretched thin. The Washington Post recently outlined a case where a State seriously neglected its responsibilities and violated numerous environmental laws. The State had also shifted the burden to the residents to prove violations.

One case involved a power plant illegally emitting the hazardous gas styrene, which harms the nervous and respiratory systems. Without the efforts of the EPA, Mr. Chairman, which requires States to enforce the code, who knows how long those violations would have continued.

It is crucial that the EPA have the resources to enforce environmental laws. Enforcement of those laws is often the only thing that stands between polluters and justice. The Senate has already restored this funding in their version of the bill, Mr. Chairman, and I strongly encourage Members to do the same in this body.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to reiterate that the budget for enforcement is not cut, it is increased. And since the States do the lion's share of the enforcement, they receive the lion's share of the increase.

I think the idea is that we want to make sure that the money that is being spent on environmental protection is spent wisely, and we would like to have it in the hands of the individuals and in the hands of the States that are going to do the enforcement.

So this is obviously an increase in enforcement. I think if my colleagues support increasing enforcement, they would oppose this amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has more time than I do.

Mr. MENENDEZ. No, at this point, the gentleman has more time than I do.

Mr. WALSH. Then, in that case, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just two points. As I understand it, \$10 million of this goes to COLA, and the rest gets out of Federal enforcement. So to say Federal enforcement is in fact increased is not the reality. Federal enforcement is not increased.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, in fact, the EPA budget for enforcement is increased by \$10 million over last year. The gentleman can define it any way he wants to, but this is an increase in funding for enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds simply to say that all the EPA COLA does is take those employees and give them an increase. It does not increase the manpower at EPA to do something about the environment. It takes the environmental cop off the beat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would like to thank the many friends who are in support of this amendment that has been offered, the Menendez-Waxman-Pallone-Tierney amendment.

This amendment simply restores EPA's enforcement budget to current levels. Without these funds, the EPA's ability to enforce the Nation's environmental laws will be greatly reduced.

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this appropriation without adopting this amendment, we will be doing a grave disservice to America's environmental health. The cut in the EPA's enforcement budget will result in a further degradation and destruction of environmental resources. As a result of this cut, there will be fewer than 2,000 inspectors, 50 fewer criminal actions and 50 fewer civil actions and the loss of millions of dollars in cost recovery.

This administration would like to rely on the States for enforcement action and, as a result, will cut some 270 enforcement positions. The EPA Inspector General said in a September, 1998, audit that six States have failed to report numerous serious violations of the Clean Air Act, as they are required to do. While performing more than 3,300 inspections, six States reported only 18 significant violations. In reviewing a small portion of those 3,300 inspections, the EPA turned up an additional 103 serious violations.

Other States have failed to report serious violations of Federal pollution laws, allowed major industrial polluters to operate without proper permits, and failed to conduct basic emissions tests of industry smokestacks, according to the studies.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, the EPA and the Justice Department can step up if we conclude a State is not doing an adequate job. But with limited resources only 3,537 lawyers, investigators, and staff will be involved in enforcement. I urge this amendment to be adopted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask two questions. First, what is the time on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the second question I have is who has the right to close in this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. MENENDEZ. He has the right to close on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would ask of the gentleman then, since the time is lopsided, what does the gentleman intend to do in terms of speakers? It would be unfair to have a long list of speakers come at the very end.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure how to help the gentleman out. He has had more speakers than I have. He has expended his time less frugally than I have. I do not intend to use all my time to close.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I do not know if the gentleman should characterize it as "less frugally." We have Members who feel very passionately about this.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate that. Many of our Members are very passionate about this also. But the fact of the matter is, I do not have any additional speakers right now so I will continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for this amendment and rise in support of it.

President Bush has proposed cutting EPA's enforcement budget by \$25 million and giving these funds to the States. I do not oppose giving the States money for enhanced enforcement of environmental laws, however, our laws cannot be adequately enforced if EPA's budget is slashed.

This amendment restores critically needed funding for enforcement of our environmental laws. I urge all my colleagues to support this. If we have these cuts we are talking about 2,000 fewer inspections, a 20 percent reduction in civil actions, an 11 percent reduction in criminal actions. There are many environmental programs that the States are simply not in a position to enforce. For example, States cannot ensure that pollution from one State does not affect neighboring States. This is a job only the Federal Government can do. So I support the gentleman's amendment. I commend him for his leadership. I urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his amendment. I thank him for yielding the time because I think it is important to clarify what we are doing here. It is to suggest to the American public that we do not want them to be denied of enforcement protection that the EPA provides them in clean water protection and clean air protection.

It is interesting that my colleague would cite the cuts coming from across the board and he cited FEMA. Obviously, coming from Texas, I am particularly interested in making sure

FEMA is funded fully. But we well know that OMB can make the decision as to where those cuts would come. This is simply an inclusion of \$25 million to allow for 2,000 more inspections, to allow for 20 percent more civil actions to protect Americans in the issues of clean air and clean water, and to allow 11 percent more in criminal prosecutions when individuals ignore the environmental protection laws to enhance the quality of life for Americans.

So I think this is a simple process and a simple proposition and a good proposition. Let us do the right thing and provide the Environmental Protection Agency with the kind of enforcement they need to enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I intend to use 2 minutes of our remaining time to close. As soon as the gentleman completes, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, could I ask how much time I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are not taking money from the States, just a particular earmark. Nothing can stop the EPA administrator from using those monies for State programs if that is where they are most needed.

What we are doing is what I hear my colleague from the other side suggest that they want, which is more flexibility. We have greater flexibility here. But it is foolish to suggest that, in fact, we are not robbing Peter to pay Paul. And, secondly, it is also from the EPA's own estimate submitted to the Congress, not my words, the Republican-appointed administrator submits to the Congress this information, that, in fact, this is 270 or so full-time employees less than compared to the actual number of inspections done in fiscal year 2000 to the one under this request, we would have 5,000 less inspections, that we would have about 70 some-odd less criminal investigations, that we would have a serious number of decline in civil investigations, over 400 from fiscal year 2000.

That is not in any sense justified by saying that there is an increase. There cannot be an increase when we dramatically drop the number of people in the department, when we dramatically drop the number of civil and criminal actions, when we dramatically drop the number of inspections by EPA's own words. So this simply cannot be categorized anywhere, in fact, as an increase. Again, we are taking our monies for this purpose from nonpersonnel administrative functions and not out of veterans and not out of EPA.

Lastly, EPA remains the only enforcement authority for many Federal laws. Under the existing program as it is, 15 to 25 States would not get any-

thing under the provisions that the chairman continues to seek to have.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question is simple. Do we want to leave a legacy of clean air and water for our children and grandchildren or do we want to take the environmental cop off the street?

A vote in favor of the amendment is a vote to keep the environmental cop on the street. It is a vote to ensure that the number one agency for all Americans in terms of their quality of their air, their water, their rivers, their streams, their lakes being protected is the EPA.

If we do not pass this amendment, we will have degraded the ability to enforce. This is a real cut to the EPA. That is why we need to restore the enforcement capacity the EPA must have for all Americans in all States across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would end this debate by suggesting that there is no cut in enforcement. In fact, there is an increase in enforcement. This amendment is a fiction.

The funding level for last year was \$465 million. This year it is \$475 million. The fact of the matter is that the lion's share of the increase will go to the States where the lion's share of the work is done. Mr. Chairman, 95 percent of the environmental inspections are done at the State level; 90 percent of the enforcement actions are taken at the State level.

We need to empower the States to do the work. We need to get the money into the hands of the individuals who know our watersheds, our industries, and the sensitive areas of the country that need to be protected.

If my colleagues want to cut Federal agencies, HUD, NASA, FEMA, National Science Foundation, this is the amendment to do it. I do not advise that. Those agencies need these funds. This budget for this bill has been developed on a bipartisan basis. We have tried to provide assets where they are needed. We do not need to cut NASA any more. We certainly do not need to cut FEMA any more. We are trying to increase the National Science Foundation budget.

We have a terrific administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency. She is a tiger for the defense of our national environment. She has shown that through her experience as Governor. I think she will do a marvelous job. She believes that the lion's share of the enforcement belongs at the State level. At the end of the day when this bill is passed, the Environmental Protection Agency will have virtually the same number of people working in enforcement in 2002 as they have in 2001.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that we reject this amendment and re-

tain this level of funding; this increase in funding over last year.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Menendez-Waxman-Pallone-Tierney amendment to restore funding for EPA's efforts to protect human health and the environment. Without the amendment, this bill will significantly reduce the protection our Nation's environmental laws provide to the daily lives of our constituents.

Increasing resources for the states to enforce environmental laws is fine, but it must not come at the expense of Federal efforts. The Nation's advancements in environmental protection are as a direct result of Federal laws put in place where states simply could not or would not do the job.

The reason we have Federal environmental laws is because there is a need for Federal action. Taking money away from EPA to give it to the States does not result in a benefit to the environment, but only a benefit to the polluter. States and EPA work best when they work in partnership, not in competition. The Menendez-Waxman-Pallone-Tierney amendment restores this partnership.

Proponents of taking money from EPA and giving it to the States argue that the States are better equipped to handle local issues. Pollution is not a uniquely local blight. Pollution discharged from one State into a river affects the residents of other cities within a State or of other States. While many States are the primary enforcer of some portions of environmental laws, the State and Federal programs are not duplicative.

For example, States are not the enforcement authority for many environmental laws such as Clean Air Act mobile source standards affecting cars and trucks; right-to-know and emergency planning; the Toxic Substances and Control Act; the wetlands program under the Clean Water Act in 48 States; and the Oil Pollution Act. Even where States have primary implementing responsibilities, in areas such as the Great Lakes, the States have relied on EPA to ensure uniform and effective progress toward water quality improvement.

Shifting resources from the Federal Government to the States is not as simple as which entity will spend the money. Besides the diminution in enforcement of Federal laws where States are not coenforcement authorities, the Bush budget indicated that the funds would not be provided to all the States. EPA expects that 15 to 25 States will receive no funding under this new program. Therefore, in those States, EPA enforcement capabilities will be reduced with no additional resources available for the States to make up the shortcoming.

There will be no inspections, no enforcement, and public health will suffer, the environment will suffer. While States do conduct the largest amount of inspections and institute the greater number of enforcement actions, the Federal programs are the ones that take on the difficult cases where States are unwilling or unable to act.

The Federal Government has the unique role of addressing multistate issues where large corporations operate in several States; dealing with pollution that crosses State boundaries, like acid rain or downstream pollution of rivers or lakes; interstate hazardous waste; and global warming.

EPA enforcement is of direct benefit to the taxpayer and the environment. Every \$1 spent

on Superfund enforcement results on average in about \$1.60 in direct cost recovery of government cleanup costs, and it creates another \$6 in private party spending for cleanup of the Nation's most dangerous hazardous waste sites. A \$5 million cut in Superfund enforcement activity could cost the Federal Government \$8 million in recovery of money already spent, and preclude \$30 million in additional cleanup.

Every \$1 spent on enforcement of Federal clean air, clean water, and hazardous waste laws results in an average of \$10 to \$20 spent directly on pollution control equipment and other improvements. Without these non-Federal investments, continued progress in cleaning up the air, water and land cannot be achieved.

Providing additional resources to States to enforce their environmental laws can benefit human health and the environment. However, where these additional resources are provided at the expense of the Federal programs, environmental protection will suffer and human health will be compromised.

Support the Menendez-Waxman-Pallone-Tierney amendment to protect human health and the environment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 43 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); the amendment No. 44 offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR); the amendment No. 45, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR); and the amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment No. 43 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 247, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—163

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Green (WI)	Lucas (KY)	Schrock
Ackerman	Hinchey	Napolitano	Greenwood	Lucas (OK)	Sensenbrenner
Allen	Hinojosa	Neal	Grucci	Manzullo	Sessions
Baca	Hoeffel	Oberstar	Gutknecht	Mascara	Shadegg
Baird	Holt	Obe	Hall (TX)	McCrary	Shaw
Baldacci	Honda	Olver	Harman	McHugh	Shays
Baldwin	Hooley	Owens	Hart	McKeon	Sherwood
Barcia	Hoyer	Pallone	Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shimkus
Barrett	Inslee	Pascrill	Hayes	Miller, Gary	Shows
Becerra	Israel	Pastor	Hayworth	Mollohan	Shuster
Bentsen	Jackson (IL)	Payne	Hefley	Moran (KS)	Simmons
Berkley	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi	Herger	Morella	Simpson
Berman	(TX)	Pomeroy	Hill	Murtha	Skeen
Blagojevich	Jefferson	Price (NC)	Hilleary	Myrick	Smith (MI)
Bonior	Jones (OH)	Rahall	Hilliard	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Borski	Kaptur	Rangel	Hobson	Ney	Snyder
Boyd	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes	Hoekstra	Northup	Souder
Brady (PA)	Kildee	Rivers	Holden	Norwood	Spratt
Brown (FL)	Kilpatrick	Roemer	Horn	Nussle	Stearns
Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Ross	Hostettler	Ortiz	Stenholm
Capps	Kucinich	Rothman	Houghton	Osborne	Stump
Capuano	LaFalce	Royal-Allard	Hulshof	Ose	Stupak
Cardin	Lampson	Rush	Hunter	Otter	Sweeney
Carson (IN)	Langevin	Sabo	Hutchinson	Oxley	Tancredo
Clay	Lantos	Sanchez	Hyde	Paul	Tauzin
Condit	Larson (CT)	Sanders	Isakson	Pence	Taylor (MS)
Conyers	Lee	Sandlin	Issa	Peterson (MN)	Terry
Costello	Levin	Sawyer	Istook	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	Jenkins	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Crowley	Lofgren	Schiff	John	Phelps	Thornberry
Cummings	Lowey	Scott	Johnson (CT)	Pickering	Thune
Davis (CA)	Luther	Serrano	Johnson (IL)	Pitts	Tiahrt
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)	Sherman	Johnson, E. B.	Platts	Tiberi
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Skelton	Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Toomey
DeFazio	Markey	Smith (WA)	Jones (NC)	Portman	Traficant
Delahunt	Matheson	Solis	Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)	Turner
DeLauro	Matsui	Stark	Kelly	Putnam	Upton
Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland	Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich	Vitter
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner	Kerns	Ramstad	Walden
Dingell	McCullom	Tauscher	King (NY)	Regula	Walsh
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (CA)	Kingston	Rehberg	Wamp
Eshoo	McGovern	Thurman	Kirk	Reynolds	Watkins (OK)
Etheridge	McIntyre	Tierney	Kleczka	Riley	Watts (OK)
Evans	McKinney	Towns	Knollenberg	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Farr	McNulty	Udall (CO)	Kolbe	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (PA)
Fattah	Meehan	Udall (NM)	LaHood	Rogers (MI)	Weller
Filner	Meek (FL)	Velazquez	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky	Latham	Roukema	Wicker
Frank	Menendez	Waters	LaTourette	Royce	Wilson
Gephardt	Millender-	Watson (CA)	Leach	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
Gonzalez	McDonald	Watson	Lewis (CA)	Ryun (KS)	Young (FL)
Gordon	Miller, George	Waxman	Lewis (KY)	Saxton	
Green (TX)	Mink	Weiner	Keller	Scarborough	
Gutierrez	Moore	Wexler	Largent	Slaughter	
Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)	Woolsey			
		Wu			

NOES—247

Aderholt	Camp	Doyle	
Akin	Cannon	Dreier	
Andrews	Cantor	Duncan	
Armey	Capito	Edwards	
Bachus	Carson (OK)	Ehlers	
Baker	Castle	Ehrlich	
Ballenger	Chabot	Emerson	
Barr	Chambliss	Engel	
Bartlett	Clayton	English	
Barton	Clement	Everett	
Bass	Clyburn	Ferguson	
Bereuter	Coble	Flake	
Berry	Collins	Fletcher	
Biggert	Combest	Foley	
Bilirakis	Cooksey	Forbes	
Bishop	Cox	Fossella	
Blunt	Cramer	Frelinghuysen	
Boehlert	Crane	Gallegly	
Boehner	Crenshaw	Ganske	
Bonilla	Culberson	Gekas	
Bono	Cunningham	Gibbons	
Boswell	Davis, Jo Ann	Gilchrest	
Boucher	Davis, Tom	Gillmor	
Brady (TX)	Deal	Gilman	
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Goode	
Bryant	DeLay	Goodlatte	
Burr	DeMint	Goss	
Burton	Diaz-Balart	Graham	
Buyer	Dooley	Granger	
Calvert	Doolittle	Graves	

NOT VOTING—23

Mr. BERRY and Mrs. CLAYTON

changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. RANGEL, UDALL of Colorado, and BOYD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional amendments on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 BY MS. KAPTUR

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

Calvert	Hilleary	Pryce (OH)	A recorded vote was ordered.	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Camp	Hobson	Putnam	The vote was taken by electronic de-	Hayes	Mollohan	Shadegg
Cannon	Hoekstra	Radanovich	vice, and there were—ayes 182, noes 214,	Haworth	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Cantor	Horn	Regula	not voting 37, as follows:	Hefley	Murtha	Shays
Capito	Hostettler	Rehberg	[Roll No. 289]	Herger	Myrick	Sherwood
Chabot	Houghton	Reynolds	AYES—182	Hobson	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Chambliss	Hulshof	Riley		Hoekstra	Ney	Shuster
Coble	Hunter	Rogers (KY)		Horn	Northup	Simmons
Combest	Hutchinson	Rogers (MI)		Hostettler	Norwood	Simpson
Cooksey	Hyde	Rohrabacher	Abercrombie	Hall (OH)	Houghton	Skeen
Cox	Isakson	Roukema	Ackerman	Harman	Nussle	Skelton
Crane	Issa	Royce	Allen	Hastings (FL)	Osborne	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Istook	Ryan (WI)	Andrews	Neal	Hunter	Ose
Culberson	Jenkins	Ryun (KS)	Hill	Oberstar	Hutchinson	Outer
Cunningham	Johnson (IL)	Schaffer	Hilliard	Obey	Hyde	Oxley
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Schrock	Baldacci	Hinchey	Isakson	Paul
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Baldwin	Holden	Issa	Pence
Deal	Kennedy (MN)	Sessions	Barcia	Owens	Istook	Peterson (MN)
DeLay	Kerns	Barrett	Holt	Pallone	Jenkins	Peterson (PA)
DeMint	King (NY)	Shadegg	Honda	Pascarell	John	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Shaw	Hooley	Pastor	Johnson (CT)	Phelps
Dooley	Knollenberg	Sherwood	Barton	Payne	Johnson (IL)	Pickering
Doolittle	Kolbe	Berkley	Becerra	Rivers	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Dreier	LaHood	Shows	Bishop	Israel	Jones (NC)	Platts
Duncan	Latham	Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)	Jones (NC)	Thornberry
Ehlers	LaTourette	Boehlert	Jackson-Lee	Rahall	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Skeen	(TX)	Ramstad	Kerns	Portman
Emerson	Smith (MI)	Bonior	Jefferson	Rangel	King (NY)	Tiabrt
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Rexes	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
Flake	Lucas (KY)	Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rivers	Kingston	Toomey
Fletcher	Lucas (OK)	Boyd	Carson (IN)	Kirk	Putnam	Thomas
Foley	Manzullo	Brady (PA)	Clay	Rodriguez	Radanovich	Traficant
Forbes	McHugh	Brown (FL)	Clayton	Knollenberg	Regula	Turner
Fossella	McKeon	Brown (OH)	Clement	Koermer	Kolbe	Rehberg
Galleghy	Mica	Capps	LaFave	Rothman	LaHood	Upton
Gekas	Miller, Gary	Tauzin	Langevin	Royal-Allard	Reynolds	Vitter
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Terry	Markay	Rush	Lampson	Walden
Gilchrest	Thornberry	Carson (IN)	Markowitz	Sabo	Rogers (KY)	Walsh
Gillmor	Thune	Clay	Kind (WI)	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	Wamp
Goode	Ney	Clayton	Klein	Leach	Rohrabacher	Watkins (OK)
Goodlatte	Northup	Clement	LaFave	Sanders	Watkins (OK)	Weller
Goss	Norwood	Condit	Langevin	Sawyer	Lewis (CA)	Watts (OK)
Graham	Otterson	Lantos	Markay	LoBiondo	Ross	Weldon (FL)
Granger	Ose	Larson (WA)	Markowitz	Lucas (KY)	Royce	Weldon (PA)
Graves	Otter	Conyers	McCormick	Lucas (KS)	Matheson	Wicks
Green (WI)	Oxley	Lee	McCormick	Manzullo	Scarborough	Wilson
Greenwood	Paul	Coyne	McCollum	Matheson	Schaffer	Young (FL)
Grucci	Pence	Crowley	Dodgett	McDermott	Schrocks	Sensenbrenner
Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)	Davis (GA)	Doolley	McGovern	Mica	
Hall (TX)	Petri	Davis (IL)	Edwards	McIntyre		
Hastings (WA)	Pickering	Davis (FL)	Engel	McKinney		
Hayes	Pitts	Davis (IL)	Eshoo	McNulty		
Hayworth	Platts	DeGette	Etheridge	Mascara		
Hefley	Pombo	DeLahunt	Farr	Markay		
Herger	Portman	DeLauro	Fattah	Markowitz		
NOT VOTING—26						
Blumenauer	Largent	DeLay	Fazio	McCormick		
Callahan	Linder	DeLauer	Fitzgerald	McNulty		
Collins	Lipinski	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
Cubin	McCrary	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McNulty		
Dunn	McInnis	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
Frost	Miller (FL)	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
Hansen	Quinn	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
Hinojosa	Ros-Lehtinen	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
Keller	Slaughter	DeLay	Fitzgerald	McCormick		
□ 1350						
Mr. ENGLISH and Ms. HART changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”						
So the amendment was agreed to.						
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.						
Stated against:						
Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall No. 288. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”						
AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ						
The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.						
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.						
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.						
RECORDED VOTE						
The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.						
A recorded vote was ordered.						
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 214, not voting 37, as follows:						
[Roll No. 289]						
AYES—182						
Hastings (WA)						
Miller, Gary						
Sessions						
Hastings (WA)						
Haworth						
Moran (KS)						
Shaw						
Regula						
Shays						
Hefley						
Myrick						
Sherwood						
Hobson						
Nethercutt						
Shimkus						
Horn						
Northup						
Sessions						
Hastings (WA)						
Hefley						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						
Hobson						
Horn						

Economic Development program of HUD is a direct affront on my constituencies in North Carolina and on Rural America as a whole. I wish to discuss Rural Housing needs in this statement.

I applaud my colleague, MARCY KAPTUR, a champion of rural America, for her efforts by amendment to reinstate \$25 million (\$25,000,000) to maintain this program, but unfortunately, to no avail. I would like to also recognize my colleague Mr. HASTINGS, of Florida, who spoke passionately to restore this funding in the Rules committee, although, he represents an urban district, Mr. Chairman.

I can not stress enough the importance of the housing problems facing rural communities. In the richest country on earth, we still have close to 1 million occupied homes without adequate indoor plumbing; and 30 percent of all rural homes have coliform bacteria contamination in their water supplies. This is a disgrace, especially when it is apparent that this HUD program can help.

Consider these facts, Colleagues:

Over 2.1 million rural households are so severely cost-burdened that they pay more than half of their incomes for their dwellings. In addition, despite housing quality improvements in recent decades, many still continue to live in substandard housing, encompassing an astonishing 8.2 percent, or 1.8 million rural households.

There are approximately 36 million homes in rural America. Nearly half of them are actually located near larger cities within metropolitan areas.

Over 9 million rural households experience major housing problems, including cost burdens, moderate or serious physical problems, and overcrowding, with more than one person occupying a room. Many rural households have more than one of these problems, generally both high costs and substandard quality.

The most significant disgrace, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that more than a quarter of the rural households living in poor housing are required to pay more than 30 percent of their incomes for their substandard units.

Consider also that there are 200 counties in America that have poverty rates of 30 percent or higher. Almost all are rural counties. Only one is a big city county, and only 8 have populations of 60,000 or more.

Six of ten poor people in this country live outside the central cities, that is not to say that there are not great needs in our cities, but there is also a rural need. Those figures in a nutshell show why this program is so important.

There is also a tremendous housing need among certain populations such as migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

Mr. Chairman, we should remember that rural concerns and issues are nationwide. In fact, the largest rural states in terms of population are in this particular order: Pennsylvania, Texas, North Carolina, Ohio, New York and Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, there is no duplication of the ORHED programs; services provided by ORHED have unique qualities. Eventhough USDA Rural Housing Service (RHS) programs have been known to cater to rural residents RHS has suffered substantial funding cuts in recent years, and none of the RHS programs duplicate ORHED.

The HUD (ORHED) program is very useful to local groups because of its flexibility. Many

groups of varying levels of experience and capacity have successfully applied to this popular program. This program provides flexible, innovative housing production and capacity building funds and constitutes a very small portion of the HUD budget. The program allows local communities to define their own needs and projects. The very high demand for this program attests to its need.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of a little known, but important program in the federal government—the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Inspection Board (CSB). Many Americans are familiar with the work of the National Transportation Safety Board, which investigates airplane accidents. The CSB performs a similar role by investigating chemical accidents.

The CSB suddenly became important to Delaware nine days ago when a major chemical fire ignited at the Motiva Enterprises refinery in Delaware City, Delaware on July 17, 2001. This accident left eight people injured and one man missing. What makes this accident most troubling is that the sulfuric acid storage tank that caught fire had been declared unsafe by company inspectors a month earlier. The inspectors further recommended that it be taken out of service. In fact, the same tank had a previous record of vapor and liquid emission leaks.

I strongly believe that the time has come for a thorough investigation of the operations and practices at the Motiva Enterprises refinery at Delaware City. CSB's specialty in investigating such accidents and making recommendations for safety improvements are sorely needed in Delaware.

Currently, the CSB is conducting a preliminary investigation to determine if a more extensive investigation is warranted. My suspicion is that a full investigation will be required and I will be meeting with the CSB shortly to discuss this issue further.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the additional funding provided in this bill for the CSB. The bill increases funding for the CSB by \$500,000 to \$8 million. Because the accident at Motiva is just another in a long series of accidents at that plant, I want to make sure CSB has the resources to conduct a thorough investigation and make solid recommendations on how changes can be made at Motiva to keep Delawareans safe in the future. Last year, the CSB completed three investigations. So far this year, it has already initiated investigations of two incidents in Georgia and Indiana. Should the need for additional funding arise, I hope I can count on support from the VA-HUD Appropriations Committee to provide the necessary resources for the CSB.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, we are fortunate in Ohio to have one of the most outstanding federal installations that exists in the United States—NASA Glenn Research Center.

I wish to thank Chairman WALSH and Representative HOBSON for their hard work of the VA, HUD, Appropriations Committee, and for recognizing the importance of the work done at NASA Glenn.

This VA-HUD appropriations legislation goes a far way in restoring many of the dollars that have been cut over the years to NASA Glenn Research Center, and the Subcommittee should be applauded for its recognition of the importance of this Center.

Yet, there is still work to be done. There are advances in biotechnology to improve our

health care; Quiet Aircraft Technology to improve our quality of life, and other important energy saving research—all conducted right at NASA Glenn Research Center.

This Center has an annual economic impact of more than \$1 billion to the State of Ohio and provides in excess of 12,000 jobs.

And these are high tech jobs. Scientists and engineers in areas such as aerospace engineering, electrical engineering, chemistry, and physics account for more than half of the jobs at the Center . . . 25 percent of these employees have Ph.Ds.

NASA Glenn grants more than \$10 million a year to Ohio's universities and pumps more than \$243 million into Ohio industry through contracts.

Because NASA Glenn is the only NASA installation north of the Mason Dixon Line, its impact is felt far and wide across our Nation.

The accomplishments of NASA over the years are nothing short of amazing and many times we overlook the impact the NASA Glenn Center has on our everyday lives. NASA Glenn has been a leader among other NASA centers by winning more R&D 100 Awards than all other NASA Centers combined.

Historically, NASA Glenn's value to the Agency has been its strength in aeronautics and space. In response to the Agency's changing priorities NASA Glenn has endeavored to redirect its core competencies toward biotechnology (fluids and sensors), nanotechnology (advanced materials), and information technology (communications). NASA Glenn remains a leader in the areas of propulsion, power and communications.

Several of the testing facilities at NASA Glenn are unequaled, from the largest icing tunnel in the world, to the zero gravity research facility where most space shuttle and International Space Station experiments are tested before being launched.

The Agency encourages its centers to share knowledge and research with area academic institutions and research facilities. Northeast Ohio has an unbelievable wealth of knowledge when it comes to biotechnology. We have world-class health care facilities like the Cleveland Clinic and University hospitals. We also have some of the finest educational institutions like Case Western Reserve University.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this Congress continues to realize the impact of NASA Glenn, and I urge the President and my colleagues to support NASA and the work at NASA Glenn to continue the fundamental research so vital to our future.

□ 1400

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROCEDURES
AND DEADLINE FOR PRINTING
OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify Members that this morning the Committee on Rules sent out a Dear Colleague letter announcing that it intends to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 4, the Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001. The consolidated bill was introduced this morning and the text is available on the Committee on Rules Web site at www.house.gov/rules.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment must submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a very brief explanation, very brief explanation, of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol no later than 6 p.m. on Monday. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, that is no later than 6 p.m. this coming Monday.

Members should draft their amendments to the bill that was introduced this morning. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 770

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 770, the Morris K. Udall Arctic Wilderness Act of 2001.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1745

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1745. My name is mistakenly added as a cosponsor.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire from the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has now completed its legislative business for the week. On behalf of all of us in the House, I would like to thank the Committee on Appropriations for its hard work on the VA-HUD appropriations bill that has been under consideration yesterday and today.

I would like to thank them in particular for the unanimous consent agreement reached earlier today. We will now be able to complete the consideration of that bill on Monday, once again due to their willingness to work on that night for that purpose and in that manner, Mr. Speaker, so it will become no longer necessary for us to worry about our weekend.

Mr. Speaker, the House will next meet for legislative business on Monday, July 30, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later today.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 o'clock p.m. Following suspension votes, the House will complete consideration of H.R. 2620, the VA-HUD Appropriations Act.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures:

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act;

H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act;

The Jordan Free Trade Agreement; and

H.R. 4, the Secure America's Future Energy Act of 2001.

Members should also be prepared to consider HMO reform legislation and trade promotion authority next week as they become available. Obviously, Members should expect another busy and productive week in the House with the possibility of several late nights.

Mr. Speaker, as is the tradition of this House, we must advise Members that we can give no firm guarantee for 2 o'clock getaway on Friday, the day we break for such a long work period. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, given the cooperative nature of this body, I have every confidence if we are willing to work late evenings, we will be able to get away for our district work period at the designated time next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for informing us of the schedule for next week.

If I might inquire of him a couple of questions. Is it his anticipation to finish up this bill we have just completed today, or at least finished working on today, on Monday evening?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes. In accordance

with our unanimous consent request propounded earlier by the bill managers, we believe we can finish it Monday night after we take the suspension votes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we expect a late night on Monday, then. Would the gentleman care to venture how late we might be going Monday, and then the other evenings during the week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, my impression is that there is little work remaining on the bill, so we should not be extraordinarily late on Monday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the HMO bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights, do we have a time when that might be coming to the floor next week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his interest.

We are continuing to work with several Members on that bill. At this point, I can only say that we would expect it sometime from Wednesday through Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. The energy bill, can the gentleman give us a day when that may, in fact, reach the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, we would expect that probably on Wednesday, but in that time frame, from Wednesday to Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. On the energy bill, can the distinguished majority leader give us an idea what kind of rule we are going to have on that? Are we going to have an open rule? Is it going to be closed? What are the feelings at this point with respect to the ability to bring that bill to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. I am informed that the Committee on Rules is meeting next week. They have just announced a filing deadline for Monday. I understand that there are a great many Members with some very, what should I say, controversial amendments over which they are concerned; but I can only say that every conversation I have had leads me to believe that the Members should expect the Committee on Rules to be very understanding and generous with the rule.

Mr. BONIOR. And the fast track legislation? The gentleman is suggesting we will definitely see that, we might see that, or is it 50/50 we could see that? Where are we with fast track?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am confident we will see it before we retire from work for our recess on Friday. I am just sorry I cannot give a more specific time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague. I wish him a good weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 30, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.