

from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) tomorrow night and many of us try to help the President through this, remind him of the mistakes that he has made, we also have an obligation to talk about what we should do. And what we should do with this economy, we can talk about these mistakes, but what we should do is we should first of all extend unemployment compensation, second we should pass the Crane-Rangel bill, which gives incentives for those corporations that actually produce manufacturing jobs in the United States instead of rewarding those companies that ship jobs overseas.

The President's mistakes can be fixed. We need to fix them by doing some of the things I just talked about.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S MISTAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if and when the President has another prime time press conference, and if the President is asked again to consider the mistakes that he has made, I have a suggestion: he might mention the thousands of soldiers in Iraq who have and are now risking their lives without appropriate body armor and other life-saving equipment.

We are finding out now that the President and his advisers and Cabinet were thinking about this war in Iraq for a very long time. And yet here is an AP story from March 26 of this year. It says soldiers headed for Iraq are still buying their own body armor. In many cases their families are buying it for them despite assurances from the military that the gear will be in hand before they are in harm's way.

Last October, last October, that is 8 months after the war started, it was reported that nearly one quarter of American troops serving in Iraq did not have ceramic-plated body armor which can stop bullets fired from assault rifles and shrapnel.

□ 2000

The military says the shortfall is over and soldiers who do not yet have the armor soon will.

"Nancy Durst," I am still quoting from the AP story, "recently learned that her husband, a soldier with an Army Reserve unit from Maine serving in Iraq, spent 4 months without body armor. She said she would have bought armor for her husband had vests not been cycled into his unit. Even if her husband now has body armor, Durst says she is angry he was without it at any time." Her husband also told her that reservists have not been given the same equipment as Active Duty soldiers. "They are so sick and tired of being treated as second-class soldiers," she said.

That is from the AP story. No wonder she is mad about it. This armor costs about \$1,500. And I hope the President

will support legislation that will reimburse the soldiers and families for this expense. Clearly this was a mistake. And so if asked about a mistake, the President could not only say that it was a mistake, but maybe he would like to support H.R. 3615. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) has a bill that would reimburse the families for the expense of buying their own body armor.

According to the Enlisted Association of the National Guard, as of November 30, 2003, the Army National Guard lacked \$11 billion of the \$40 billion in military equipment and training it needed to go to war. Among the missing crucial equipment components were nearly 11,000 Humvees, 20,000 radios, 156,000 night vision goggles and 148 Black Hawk helicopters that are required to meet modernization requirements.

That seems to me to be a mistake. Our troops were not properly equipped. Currently we are told that every member of the National Guard is being provided with body armor once they are in Iraq, but many of the soldiers are not even given an opportunity to train with the modern equipment before deployment.

On November 2, 2003, an Illinois National Guard Chinook helicopter was downed. This helicopter was not equipped with the latest automatic antimissile blocking system. I met the aunt of one of the soldiers who went down in that Chinook, who died because of that accident. I think she would like to tell the President that was a mistake, the cost of life of her nephew.

We know that soldiers coming home on R and R were being asked to pay to get to their homes once they came to the United States. Now, that was a mistake. The President could say that that was fixed, but is he going to support legislation introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) to reimburse the families for their travel?

How about the fact that soldiers, wounded soldiers in the hospital, were being charged every day for their food? Well, we have corrected that, thank goodness, but that is something that the President might think about as a mistake that was clearly made and affected our troops.

Now for the latest report that I heard of from my State of Illinois. This was on CBS local news today, I believe. The 333rd Military Police Unit in Freeport, which just had their tour in Iraq extended, may not be adequately supplied for battle. That is because everything they owned was shipped back home. The 333rd is presently sitting on the Kuwaiti border awaiting orders, but they have since surrendered their equipment such as radios and armored vehicles to the troops who replaced them. But now since the 333rd is going to remain in Iraq, they are without any supplies. Even their personal belongings were sent home, including spare

uniforms, boots and toiletries. The soldiers only have what they are wearing and are being forced to purchase new uniforms and some equipment out of their own pockets. Military families have been receiving their soldiers' footlockers the past few days and are now frantically repacking boxes and sending all of this gear back at their own expense. This has angered families who did not believe the military thought this redeployment through.

Let me just say that the DOD has responded to these families, saying that they are looking into whether they will be reimbursed for sending equipment back.

A few mistakes. I will forward this to the President. Maybe he would like to use it at his next press conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNHAPPY EARTH DAY FOR EPA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mention another mistake that President Bush has made: His mistake in forgetting that protecting our environment is a bipartisan effort that for 30 years has put people over polluters and public health over profits.

President Bush forgot that both Earth Day and the Environmental Protection Agency were born in 1970, created from the bipartisan resolve to clean up and protect our environment. As we prepare to mark Earth Day on April 22, the unhappy consequences of the President's mistakes are clear. The Bush administration is undermining EPA's years of hard-won achievements in carrying out and enforcing our Nation's bipartisan environmental laws.

EPA's mission is to protect human health and safeguard the natural environment, air, water and land. The Bush administration is retreating from EPA's mission and instead making politically driven decisions that benefit polluters at the expense of the American public. At a time when we should be strengthening our environmental protections, the Bush administration has taken steps to weaken our environmental protections and the enforcement of our existing environmental laws.

Rolling back bipartisan environmental protection is President Bush's mistake, but it is not an accident. There is a deliberate, systematic three-step plan from this administration.

Step one is to try to pass weak environmental legislation. Step two is to seek to weaken Agency regulations. And if all else fails, step three is to cut the enforcement budget to disable Agency compliance efforts.

A quick review of the administration's failures to clean up air pollution highlight the trends. EPA should be taking action to clean up mercury pollution from power plants, but the Bush administration has failed to take that action. Mercury pollution has poisoned the fish in millions of acres of our lakes and thousands of miles of our streams. And according to EPA scientists, approximately 630,000 infants are born in the United States each year with blood mercury levels at an unsafe level.

As required by the Clean Air Act in December of 2000, EPA determined that it was appropriate and necessary to regulate mercury emissions from power plants, the single largest source of mercury in the United States. But in December of 2003, when the Bush administration's EPA released its proposal for controlling mercury, it was shockingly inadequate. The Clean Air Act requires a much larger reduction in mercury pollution in much less time than the Bush EPA proposal.

Tellingly the Bush proposal is exactly what the power industry wanted. In fact, parts of the administration's mercury proposal were literally copied from memos prepared by industry lobbyists. Last month's Los Angeles Times article revealed that EPA staff were not told to perform studies on the costs and public health benefits of more stringent mercury reduction proposals, even though such studies were requested by the expert panel tasked with recommending an appropriate regulation. Also shocking is that the White House apparently made considerable changes to the EPA's mercury proposal before its release, minimizing the health risk of mercury exposure.

In addition, the Bush administration has failed to require power plants to install modern pollution controls. In August 2003, the Bush EPA finalized a rule that significantly weakens the Clean Air Act by allowing thousands of old power plants to make upgrades to their plants without installing pollution controls. If EPA's rule stands up to current legal challenges, these power plants and factories will be allowed to continue to pollute the air with no responsibility for the resulting damage to the American people. According to technical studies using EPA models, the result will be at least 4,300 premature deaths and at least 80,000 asthma attacks each year that could otherwise be prevented by simply requiring modern pollution controls.

EPA should be taking action to address global warming, but the Bush ad-

ministration has refused to address this important issue. A report by the U.S. National Research Council commissioned by the Bush administration confirmed that greenhouse gases are increasing the temperatures of the Earth's air and oceans primarily caused by human activity. There is overwhelming evidence that greenhouse gases must be reduced in order to slow global warming, yet in March 2001, the Bush administration refused to take any responsibility for reducing global warming when it rejected the Kyoto Protocol.

The administration then announced last summer that EPA does not have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, reversing a Bush campaign promise and a legal opinion issued by the EPA general counsel under the Clinton administration. Rather than taking real action, the Bush administration's answer to air pollution has been to introduce the so-called Clear Skies Initiative, which environmental experts say would actually result in weaker standards for controlling pollution from power plants than existing laws being enforced.

The administration's failure to enforce environmental law extends beyond the Clean Air Act. The EPA's own research shows that polluters are egregiously violating the Clean Water Act. According to EPA data, 60 percent of large facilities across the country exceeded their Clean Water Act permit at least once between January of 2002 and June of 2003. Large facilities that exceed their permits are dumping on average six times more pollution into our waterways than they are allowed. In spite of these facts, EPA's enforcement of the Clean Water Act are declining.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action to clean up our air and water pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The EPA must be empowered and provided the resources to carry out its mission. And this is one mistake that the Bush administration must correct, if not for ourselves, but for future generations who deserve the opportunity to look back on Earth Day 2004 from the perspective of a cleaner and stronger environment.

Both Earth Day and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were born in 1970, created from the need to clean up and protect our environment. While Earth Day draws public awareness, EPA is the federal agency ultimately responsible for the day-to-day protection of our environment. On this Earth Day, I think it fitting to examine the way the Bush Administration is undermining EPA's years of hard-won achievements in carrying out and enforcing our nation's bipartisan environmental laws.

EPA's mission is to, "protect human health and safeguard the natural environment—air, water, and land . . ." The Bush Administration is retreating from EPA's mission and instead making politically driven decisions that benefit polluters at the expense of the American public. At a time when we should be strength-

ening our environmental protections, the Bush Administration has taken steps to weaken our environmental protections and the enforcement of our existing environmental laws.

There seems to be a three-step plan from this Administration: try to pass weak environmental legislation, seek to weaken agency regulations and if all else fails, cut the enforcement budget to disable agency compliance efforts.

A quick review of the Administration's failure to clean up air pollution highlights the trend.

EPA should be taking action to clean up mercury pollution from power plants, but the Bush Administration has failed to do so. Mercury pollution has poisoned the fish in millions of acres of our lakes and thousands of miles of our streams. According to EPA scientists, approximately 630,000 infants are born in the United States each year with blood mercury levels at an unsafe level.

As required by the Clean Air Act, in December 2000, EPA determined that it was appropriate and necessary to regulate mercury emissions from power plants, the single largest source of mercury in the United States. In December 2003, when EPA released its proposal for controlling mercury, it was shockingly inadequate. The Clean Air Act requires a much larger reduction in mercury pollution, in much less time, than EPA's proposal.

Tellingly, this proposal is exactly what the power industry wanted. In fact, parts of the Administration's mercury proposal were literally copied from memos prepared by industry lobbyists. Last month's Los Angeles Times article revealed that EPA staff were told not to perform studies on the costs and public health benefits of more stringent mercury reduction proposals even though such studies were requested by the expert panel tasked with recommending an appropriate regulation. Also shocking is that the White House apparently made considerable changes to EPA's mercury proposal before its release, minimizing the health risks of mercury exposure.

In addition, the Bush Administration has failed to require power plants to install modern pollution controls. In August 2003, EPA finalized a rule that significantly weakens the Clean Air Act by allowing thousands of old power plants to make upgrades to their plants without installing pollution controls. If EPA's rule stands up to current legal challenges, these power plants and factories will be allowed to continue polluting the air with no responsibility for the resulting damage to the American people. According to technical studies using EPA models, the result will be at least 4,300 premature deaths and at least 80,000 asthma attacks each year that could otherwise be prevented by simply requiring modern pollution controls.

EPA should be taking action to address global warming but the Bush Administration has refused to address this important issue. A report by the U.S. National Research Council, commissioned by the Bush Administration, confirmed that greenhouse gases are increasing the temperatures of the earth's air and oceans, primarily caused by human activity. There is overwhelming evidence that greenhouse gases must be reduced in order to slow global warming.

Yet, in March 2001, the Bush Administration refused to take any responsibility for reducing global warming when it rejected the Kyoto Protocol. The Administration then announced

last summer that EPA does not have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, reversing a Bush campaign promise and a legal opinion issued by the EPA General Counsel under the Clinton Administration.

Rather than taking real action, the Bush Administration's answer to air pollution has been to introduce its so-called "Clear Skies" initiative, which environmental experts say would actually result in weaker standards for controlling pollution from power plants than fully enforcing existing law.

Bruce Buckheit, former Director of EPA's Air Enforcement Division, states he is, "deeply troubled by the current state of federal environmental enforcement," and noted the program is now "on life support."

"Commencing with the creation of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance in 1994 and accelerating in the 1996–2000 timeframe," Mr. Buckheit said, "EPA was building a robust enforcement program that targeted and prosecuted the most serious environmental scoff-laws. . . . These violations involved significant unlawful emissions with identifiable adverse health impacts. Appropriate resolution of these violations would result in a reduction in national pollution levels—not by a few tons—but by several million tons per year and save thousands of lives each year."

"We were embarked on a vigorous program that was beginning to show results," Mr. Buckheit said. "Within 90 days of the departure of the prior Administration, the Bush Administration began transmitting a clear message to industry that there was a new Sheriff in town—a Sheriff that did not intend to prosecute these kinds of cases."

The Administration's failure to enforce environmental laws extends beyond the Clean Air Act. EPA's own research shows that polluters are egregiously violating the Clean Water Act. According to EPA data, 60 percent of large facilities across the country exceeded their Clean Water Act permit at least once between January of 2002 and June of 2003. Large facilities that exceed their permits are dumping, on average, six times more pollution into our waterways than what they are allowed. In spite of these facts, EPA's enforcement of the Clean Water Act is declining.

For fiscal year 2005, the Administration proposes cutting EPA's overall budget by \$606 million. This will result in over 2,600 fewer inspections for violations of the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and other environmental laws than were conducted in fiscal year 2000.

I commend EPA's dedicated professionals who have, through hard work, made significant progress in cleaning up air and water pollution. Unfortunately, I believe the Bush Administration is undermining the ability of EPA staff to do their jobs effectively. As Mr. Buckheit notes, EPA employees are ready and willing to enforce the law but "the White House will not tolerate more than tokenism when it comes to environmental law enforcement."

The Bush Administration continues to put the interests of polluters first, undercutting EPA's tools for protecting our air, water, and land. The federal government owes a responsibility to all Americans to strengthen, not weaken, our environment. We must take action to clean up air and water pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. EPA must

be empowered—and provided the resources—to carry out its mission. Future generation deserve the opportunity to look back at Earth Day 2004 from the perspective of a cleaner and stronger environment.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2004 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2004 THROUGH FY 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2004 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 501 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through April 9, 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does now show budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2008. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 401(a)(3) of the budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2013. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2004 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary

budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This table also compares the current level of total discretionary appropriations with the section 302(a) allocation for the Appropriations Committee. These comparisons are needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach either the section 302(a) allocation or the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The last table gives the current level for 2005 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 501 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriations bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2004 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of April 9, 2004—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—	
	2004	2004–2008
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,880,555	(¹)
Outlays	1,903,502	(¹)
Revenues	1,325,452	8,168,933
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,877,536	(¹)
Outlays	1,893,542	(¹)
Revenues	1,334,119	8,383,689
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	– 3,019	(¹)
Outlays	– 7,954	(¹)
Revenues	8,667	214,756

¹ = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2005 through 2008 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2004 in excess of \$3,019,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2004 in excess of \$7,954,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2004 in excess of \$8,667,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period FY 2004 through 2008 in excess of \$214,756,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.