



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 2001

No. 111

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Presiding Officer, the Honorable JACK REED, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, You have promised that, "In quietness and confidence shall be our strength."—Isaiah 30:15. Thank You for prayer in which we can commune with You, renew our convictions, receive fresh courage, and affirm our commitment to serve You. In Your presence we simply can be and know that we are loved. You love us and give us new beginnings each day. Thank You that we can depend on Your guidance for all that is ahead of us this day. Suddenly we realize that this quiet moment has refreshed us. We are replenished with new hope.

Now we can return to our outer world of challenges and opportunities with greater determination. We want to serve You by giving our very best to the leadership of our Nation to which You have called us. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BILL NELSON, a Senator from the State of Florida, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK REED, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. REED thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today, the Senate will resume consideration of the VA-HUD Appropriations Act under the able leadership of the two managers, Senators MIKULSKI and BOND. The first matter of business today will be an amendment of Senator NELSON of Florida. There will be rollcall votes on amendments to this bill throughout the day. When I say "throughout the day," we have every expectation this bill will end sooner rather than later. We need very badly to get back on the Agriculture emergency bill. We hope to do that very soon.

Cloture was filed on the Agriculture supplemental, so all first-degree amendments must be filed prior to 1 p.m. today. I have conferred with the Democratic manager, Senator MIKULSKI, and both her staff and the staff of Senator BOND have looked at their amendments and are in a position to make a determination as to these

amendments. We hope, as I have indicated, there will be just a few amendments offered today. We know Senator KYL of Arizona has an amendment, perhaps two amendments he will offer, but hopefully we can wrap up this bill quite soon.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2602

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (H.R. 2602) to extend the Export Administration Act until November 20, 2001.

Mr. REID. I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2620, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A 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.

Pending:

Mikulski/Bond amendment No. 1214, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, is recognized to offer an amendment.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S8629

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am waiting for the amendment to arrive. I seek counsel of the manager of the bill.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we know the direction in which the Senator from Florida wants to go. He is deeply concerned about arsenic-treated wood. What he is evaluating, based on our advice, is whether he wants to offer something that is a mandate or pursue a more prudent direction in terms of a study. I believe his staff is coming over with the amendment.

The Senator has a lot of concerns about this. I recommend he state now what those concerns are, and when staff gets here we can step back and he can offer his amendment. I encourage the more prudent course; however, the Senator is within his rights. Either way, we look forward to hearing the Senator's arguments.

Also, I note the cooperation of my colleague, Senator BOND, that we could start at 9:30 and be ready to move forward. He is missing a very important Republican caucus and I thank him for his cooperation. I know President Bush and the Vice President are here. In his commitment, particularly to moving this bill and the funding for veterans and other compelling needs, he was willing to be gracious enough to work with the Democratic leadership and meet earlier in the day. I publicly thank him.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, my sincere thanks to my colleague from Maryland. Obviously, this is the most important thing we have to do. I share Senator MIKULSKI's view we should begin discussion of this serious concern of the Senator from Florida. We look forward to working with the Senator. I thank the Chair and the manager on the Democratic side, who has a very good idea. Normally, when she has a good idea, it is much more successful than some of the other approaches that might be taken. I offer that as a humble suggestion.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I note the Senator from Florida is reviewing his materials with his staff. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1228 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1214

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON] proposes an amendment numbered 1228.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ARSENIC IN PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Department of Health and Human Services has determined that arsenic is a known carcinogen, and the Environmental Protection Agency has classified chromated copper arsenate (CCA), which is 22 percent arsenic, as a "restricted use chemical."

(2) CCA is often used as a preservative in pressure-treated wood, and CCA-treated wood is widely used in constructing playground equipment frequented by children.

(3) In 2001, many communities in Florida and elsewhere have temporarily or permanently closed playgrounds in response to elevated levels of arsenic in soil surrounding CCA-treated wood playground equipment.

(4) The State of Florida recently announced that its own wood-treatment plant would cease using arsenic as a preservative.

(5) PlayNation Play Systems, which manufactures playground equipment, announced in June 2001 that it would no longer use CCA as a preservative in its playground products.

(6) In May 2001, the Environmental Protection Agency announced that it would expedite its ongoing review of the health risks facing children playing near CCA-treated wood playground equipment, and produce its findings in June 2001. The EPA later postponed the release of its risk assessment until the end of the summer of 2001, and announced that its risk assessment would be reviewed by a Scientific Advisory Panel in October 2001.

(7) The EPA also plans to expedite its risk assessment regarding the re-registering of arsenic as a pesticide by accelerating its release from 2001 to 2003.

(8) The Consumer Product Safety Commission, which has the authority to ban hazardous and dangerous products, announced in June 2001 that it would consider a petition seeking the banning of CCA-treated wood from all playground equipment.

(9) Many viable alternatives to CCA-treated wood exist, including cedar, plastic products, aluminum, and treated wood without CCA. These products, alone or in combination, can fully replace CCA-treated wood in playground equipment.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE. It is the Sense of the Senate that the potential health and safety risks to children playing on and around CCA-treated wood playground equipment is a matter of Branch, state and local governments, affected industries, and parents.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Consumer Product Safety Commission, shall submit a report to Congress which shall include—

(1) the Environmental Protection Agency's most up-to-date understanding of the potential health and safety risks to children playing on and around CCA-treated wood playground equipment;

(2) the Environmental Protection Agency's current recommendations to state and local governments about the continue use of CCA-treated wood playground equipment; and

(3) an assessment of whether consumers considering purchases of CCA-treated wood playground equipment are adequately informed concerning the health effects associated with arsenic.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I say to the chairman of the ap-

propriations subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland, I thank her and the Senator from Missouri, the ranking member, for giving me the opportunity to offer this amendment having to do with arsenic-treated wood. This problem has manifested itself, particularly in Florida recently, because of arsenic leaching from treated wood on playground equipment and then flowing into the soil. The health departments have analyzed the soil and found the level of arsenic at a level to create concern about the danger to the children. Thus, local governments have been reaching out to the federal government, wondering whether they should close their playgrounds.

We have asked EPA, the appropriate federal agency, to conduct the study. They say it is underway. Much to my horror, as my constituency of Florida is rising up in arms, wanting to know is this a danger or not, EPA is on a schedule to do a study not to be completed until 2003.

I say to the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, this has nothing to do with partisan politics. This has to do with safety standards and EPA doing a study. The question is: When are they going to finish?

We urged the EPA to accelerate this study because of the conundrum confronting local government in deciding whether to keep playgrounds closed or whether to close other playgrounds that are now open. They want some direction.

We are talking about arsenic. It is a poison. We talked about it last night. We adopted the Boxer-Nelson amendment that will require the EPA to take certain standards into consideration when setting the level of arsenic in our drinking water.

What alarms so many of us, and brought about the Boxer-Nelson amendment last night, was that the EPA—which had announced the deadline when they were supposed to come forth imposing this reduced amount of arsenic in drinking water—announced that they were suddenly pushing that off, thus the reason for the amendment having to do with arsenic in drinking water, which passed overwhelmingly last night.

Now I bring to the Senate for discussion, and hopefully adoption, an amendment that will require the EPA to accelerate this study. Initially, when we had voiced our concern because of the playground situation in Florida, EPA had said it was going to complete its study by June. Then they delayed, and said it would be sometime in the fall. Mind you, this is after we had pushed them pretty hard, because their study was not going to be completed until 2003.

This amendment requires them to complete this study within 30 days of enactment of this bill, so we can give some certainty as to the scientific conclusions. Is the arsenic in the treated lumber leaching into the playground soil? Is this a sufficient hazard that the

city governments and the county governments ought to be closing those playgrounds, or is it at such a level that, with a change in this or that—in the construction, in the wood—that we could eliminate this potential hazard to our children?

I bring to the Senate today a safety issue. Let me recap. What I am asking our colleagues to do is join me in our quest to determine if arsenic-treated playground wood is hazardous to our children. That treated wood is everywhere. It is in our playground equipment. It is in picnic tables. It is in desks. It is in fences. Mr. President, 98 percent of outdoor wood sold in the United States today is treated with CCA, chromated copper arsenate.

CCA is an insecticide that is 22 percent arsenic. As I stated, in our State and in other parts of the country, public playgrounds have been closed or closely examined and are due to be closed because of the potential health hazards that may be posed by high concentrations of arsenic found in the soil in and around the arsenic-treated wood playground equipment.

There are communities all across Florida: Gainesville, Tarpon Springs, Tampa, Port Orange, Ormond Beach, Deland, Deltona, Clermont, Miami, whose local governments have shut down their parks and are looking to the federal government, the EPA, for guidance as to whether or not those parks are safe.

Some communities, such as the one in Cambridge, MA, have already decided to replace all of their playground and park equipment treated with arsenic because many consumer and health groups have urged the State of Massachusetts to ban arsenic-treated wood. Imagine the horror of a parent whose child played in the soil on a playground with equipment treated with arsenic, and that playground was later closed down or torn down due to the high concentrations of arsenic in the soil of that playground.

This amendment is designed to speed the process so the EPA will give us an answer because parents need to know whether their children are playing on or around equipment that poses a health hazard.

At the beginning of this year when we first asked the EPA if chromated copper arsenate, CCA—that is arsenic-treated wood—was safe, they said they would know in 2003, when they completed a reregistration of CCA as a pesticide. As I said earlier, we said that was not good enough. So the EPA revised its timetable and said they would complete their reassessment of the arsenic-treated wood by 2002. They said they would tell us if the arsenic-treated wood playground equipment is safe. Then they changed that to by June of 2001. The EPA missed its own June deadline. They now say they will complete a risk assessment regarding children and arsenic-treated wood at the end of this summer—on into the fall. The EPA also plans to assemble a sci-

entific advisory panel in October of 2001 to review the playground data.

Meantime the Consumer Product Safety Commission has agreed to conduct a review of the safety of CCA-treated wood for use in playground equipment. As my colleagues know, the Consumer Products Safety Commission has the authority to immediately ban CCA-treated wood for use in children's playground equipment if it finds that CCA-treated wood poses an imminent and immediate risk to children.

I am heartened but I am not satisfied with all these announcements because that is all they are: announcements, meaningless declarations, while the American people still do not know if arsenic-treated wood playground equipment is safe.

Earlier, I introduced S. 877 that requires the EPA to complete a risk assessment of the hazards to children within a date certain and to require mandatory labels on each piece of arsenic-treated wood. The wood-preserving industry, in conjunction with EPA, recently committed to a voluntary labeling program.

I personally think mandatory labeling is necessary to ensure the American people are properly informed. But that fight is for another day. We know arsenic is classified by the EPA and the World Health Organization as a known human carcinogen.

In 1999, the National Research Council concluded that there was an indisputable link between arsenic and skin-bladder- and lung cancer. A University of Florida researcher commissioned by the Florida EPA recently declared that simply touching arsenic-treated wood could be a health risk for children. And a research team from the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station found that arsenic is readily available on the surface of CCA-treated wood. The Environmental Working Group has concluded from reviewing the Connecticut study and others that significant quantities of arsenic can be dislodged from the surface of CCA-treated wood and that the cancer risk could be as great as 1 in 1,000. Therefore, the Environmental Working Group is seeking a ban of the substance.

For all these reasons, we need the Environmental Protection Agency and the Consumer Product Safety Commission to give the American people the guidance they deserve.

This amendment stresses the sense of the Senate that the potential health risk to children playing on and around CCA-treated wood and playground equipment is a matter of great importance. This amendment says the EPA must submit a report to Congress within 30 days of enactment, detailing the most up-to-date understanding of the health and safety risk to children playing on and around CCA-treated wood playground equipment. It seeks the EPA's current recommendations to state and local governments about the continued use of CCA-treated wood playground equipment.

It mandates that within 30 days—no more delays. This amendment would require within 30 days of the enactment that the EPA come forth with their recommendations so the people of America will know what to do about their children playing on these playgrounds.

Those are my remarks in offering the amendment.

Does the chairman of the committee have any particular inquiry she would like to make at this point?

Ms. MIKULSKI. No. I wish to make some comments.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, our colleague from Florida raises some very valid concerns. All of us want to ensure that our playgrounds, our back decks, and our picnic tables and anything with wood outside are not harmful to our children's health. If it is harmful to our children, it will be harmful to special needs populations such as the elderly. Of course, there is playground equipment that has a particular risk associated with it.

The issue of arsenic in the ground and around playgrounds has also raised considerable attention. I acknowledge the validity of the Senator's concerns. I also want to acknowledge his frustration that the bureaucracy has not rigorously stood sentry over their voluntary effort and also that they have been a little slow in moving on an evaluation of this matter.

This is an issue of great concern to this committee. In fact, the issue is in two agencies—the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The good news is you have two agencies looking at it. The bad news often is getting them to work together and move it, which requires bilateral treaty negotiation.

We think the Senator's amendment kind of moves it because that is what his amendment is. He doesn't take the position on the outcome. He doesn't come in with a muscular amendment to mandate without an evaluation. We think the Nelson approach is very prudent. He wants to have the EPA study, but at the same time he doesn't want the study to be a career in and of itself.

We need to know. The kids need to know. The parents need to know. Guess what. The wood industry needs to know. They have been cooperating with the EPA in a voluntary way for a voluntary program.

But to give you an idea of the complexity, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has jurisdiction over treated wood and any risk that might come from wood; the EPA has jurisdiction over the chemicals used to treat wood. One has jurisdiction over the chemicals and the other has jurisdiction over the wood. Now we are trying to get them to work together to come up quickly with an evaluation on treated wood.

Both agencies have said they are working to ensure that wood-treated products are safe. The EPA has a voluntary labeling program with which the forestry industry has cooperated, but an evaluation shows that it has some very significant flaws. They say they are now working to enhance the program. But, again, I think we need to push them along to come up with the report that we need.

Senator NELSON's amendment requires EPA, in consultation with the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to report to Congress on health and safety risks of chemically-treated wood and to recommend how consumers and State and local governments can be better informed about the potential health risks. And I am sure the forest industry wants to know that. They want to be good citizens. This is one of the important by-products.

In early July, the Agency completed its review of the American Wood Preservers Institute proposal to strengthen information available to the consumer. The EPA says they are going to hold a public hearing of a scientific advisory board during the week of October 2 to give peer review on the Agency's hazardous assessment methodologies for calculating potential exposure in playgrounds.

The Senator's amendment says 30 days within enactment; Is that correct?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. That is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Within enactment, or 30 days of the fiscal year?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Enactment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. That pretty much takes us into October and November.

We think that is a strong message to EPA to move this process along. We think it is important they hold public hearings. We think it is important that they consult with their scientific advisory board. But we also would like them to operate within a 30-day framework to move this issue along.

I thank the Senator. Rather than coming in saying legislate, mandate, and regulate, let's get the report. Then we can identify the most prudent way to protect consumers and to provide important information for the industry.

I support this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida raises a valid concern. We certainly want to ensure that our playgrounds, boardwalks, and backyard decks are not harmful to our children's health, our grandparents' health, or to our neighbors' health.

The issue of arsenic in the ground around playgrounds receives considerable attention, as has already been indicated. Let me be more specific. This issue is of great concern to two agencies funded in this bill, both the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

For the information of all my colleagues, the CPSC has jurisdiction over

treated-wood products and any risks that might come from them when the wood products are used for playground sets and decks; the EPA has jurisdiction over the chemicals used to treat the wood. These chemicals are used to prevent the wood in our decks, boardwalks, and playground sets from rotting and therefore becoming unstable and unsafe. Both agencies have been working to ensure that treated-wood products are safe. I can appreciate the frustration the Senator from Florida feels about the delay in seeing a result to those studies.

EPA currently oversees a voluntary labeling program so that consumers who purchase treated-wood products are made aware of the potential risks from the chemicals. Admittedly, the program can be more effective. EPA has learned that the program has flaws and is now working to improve that program. By this fall, every piece of chemically treated wood will be labeled and there will be better information made available to the public.

I sympathize with Senator NELSON on the media attention in his State on wood products treated with chromated copper arsenic, or CCA. As I said, EPA has already established a voluntary labeling program. There has been extensive pressure on wood preserver manufacturers to ensure voluntary compliance. Caution labels with EPA-approved wording will be affixed to CCA-treated lumber within 90 days, and information signs will appear in lumber stores and home centers in about 30 days.

For the information of my colleagues and those who might be watching, there is a Web site, www.ccasafetyinfo.com, and a toll-free number, 800-282-0600, to answer consumer questions in both English and Spanish.

The products, while they may sound bad, have previously been approved by EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission. They have been in use for over 70 years. As far as we are aware, no scientifically peer reviewed medical or science journal has ever documented harm to anyone from the regular use of CCA-treated wood. In spite of this, EPA and the CPSC are taking steps to put any doubt to rest by conducting further reviews specifically on the risk to children.

As the manager of the bill, the chair of the subcommittee, has indicated, there is to be peer-reviewed scientific discussion early in October, depending upon when this bill gets enacted. Thirty days may or may not cover it. But it is clear that we will adopt it.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that would make sure we do not wait until 2003 to get the results. We do not yet know when the scientific information can be ready, but whether it is 30 days or 45 days or 60 days, I am confident it will, and must, be during this calendar year, and sooner rather than later.

Sometimes you can set any deadline you want, but if you do not have the

scientific reviews, if they physically cannot get in, you cannot come up with the study. I am sure EPA will do the study. This amendment, that I trust will be adopted overwhelmingly, will send a clear signal to them that they must put all due speed behind it and get this study completed as quickly as humanly possible.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. I thank the Senator for framing it in a way that makes good sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. This is an issue that he brought to my attention some months ago following the initial debate over the arsenic standard. We had a good debate last night, with a very strong vote, to ensure that we get the right kind of standard as soon as possible so people will know what to expect from their drinking water. We also made it very clear that we want to help communities be able to meet these standards.

It should not be an unfunded mandate to take care of your health. We ought to have the best scientific information, made available through the studies that are done or commissioned, to provide the help that communities need to be able to protect themselves, particularly their children.

Senator NELSON came upon a problem I never knew existed. I cannot tell you how many times I have been around playground equipment that is wooden. I always thought it was really attractive. It is the kind I preferred. It is what I bought for my own daughter. It certainly never crossed my mind that—for good reasons, to prevent pest and termite infestations—manufacturers would want to treat that wood. I never thought about it.

But what Senator NELSON has determined—and I applaud him for this because it became an issue in Florida, and he brought it to our attention—is that something called CCA, chromated copper arsenic, is widely used as a preservative in pressure-treated wood, including playground equipment. This CCA is 22 percent arsenic.

I remember when I used to practice law, which seems as if it was a very long time ago, I had a case that involved treated wood that was treated at a plant in Tennessee. I went to visit it. The wood was treated with all kinds of chemicals, but it was used for telephone poles; it was used for railroad tracks; it was not used in playground equipment.

What Senator NELSON has learned is that, through rain and natural deterioration, the arsenic that is in this compound, CCA, to treat this wood, can leach into the ground and can even come off on one's hands. You think about all those little hands and all those little mouths and those little bodies kind of rolling around this playground equipment.

I really commend the Senator for bringing this problem to our attention. Because of his hard work, the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission are conducting reviews of the health and safety risks to children playing on and around CCA-treated wooden playground equipment.

I believe the Senator's amendment is necessary because, again, it sets a deadline. Otherwise, folks can just keep studying and talking and avoiding making a decision. But he is trying to put some teeth into this appropriations bill, which I commend and support because just the other day I had a friend of mine say she heard Senator NELSON speak on this issue in relation to playground equipment. She was just about ready to buy some playground equipment for her grandchildren. She does not know whether to buy it or not. She does not know whether it is safe or unsafe.

If you live in a State that gets as much rain as the good Senator's State of Florida, you have to be even more worried. If it is as humid as it is down there, you have to be more worried.

We do not want to make a decision that is not scientifically based, so we need to get these science studies done and the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission making their decision. They have asked for public comment. But we should pass this Nelson amendment because it really directs the EPA to report to Congress as soon as possible—which is, in effect, a report to the public—so my friend can decide whether or not she is going to buy wooden playground equipment or plastic or steel, or whatever choice she is going to make.

I commend the Senator for understanding this is an issue that is not one of these abstract issues that only concerns somebody sitting in some ivory tower somewhere. This is an issue that concerns every mother and father who takes their child to play at a playground or anybody who is thinking about buying equipment for their backyard.

We need to look to a nonpartisan, independent source such as the scientists who will examine this issue, find out whether this CCA is or is not a health hazard, or whether it can be fixed, and if it can, so it can be a problem that can be prevented. This is one of those public service issues to which I really think we owe the people of this country an answer; otherwise, we may be unfairly tarring this industry. We may be preventing people from buying playground equipment that is totally safe. We don't know. We just know this CCA has arsenic in it. We need to get to the bottom of whether that is harmful or not.

I commend the Senator for his approach. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment so we can get an answer sooner instead of later.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I might have been given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think the statement of all of our colleagues points out why we really have to move this study along. I believe the committee is prepared to accept the Nelson amendment. As we move to conference, we also want to consult EPA about how long it will take them to collect their information.

Here is where we are. EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission are in the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. We take our mandated reports to agencies very seriously because then we need them for the following year's appropriations. And the authorizers need them for the second session of the 107th Congress.

So let's shoot for this 30 days because I think there is this sense of urgency, particularly at the local government rec center level. Right now they are worried about two things. They are worried about their kids being exposed to arsenic-treated wood, and they are worried about lawsuits.

Local government should not be worried about either one. It is our job to stand sentry and give the best advice. I am ready to stand sentry over the bureaucracy to ensure a timely completion of this report so that not only will the concerns of Senator NELSON be settled, but really the concerns of the Nation. We thank him for being so assertive in this area.

We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we are prepared to accept the amendment. We have had a discussion with the Senator. The manager on the Democratic side and I are ready to push for this to make sure we get the information. We are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am so grateful to the chair and the ranking member for their recognition of the emergency nature of this issue. I am very grateful for their acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to see that after almost 40 years, the American people may finally see action that will protect the public from arsenic.

I strongly support Senator NELSON's amendment to direct the EPA, in consultation with the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to report to Congress on levels of arsenic in children's playground equipment, and to recommend how consumers and State and local governments can be better informed about these potential health risks. Preliminary studies have shown that arsenic, used as a preservative in wood may be a harmful carcinogen, especially to children. Last April, the EPA itself found a possible direct link between arsenic and DNA damage.

Senator NELSON's amendment sends a strong message to the EPA that parents must know if their children are safe, and we are taking long overdue action on other aspects of this issue

too. Yesterday, we adopted Senator BOXER's amendment, which requires EPA to immediately put into effect a standard for arsenic in drinking water, and inform the public about the amount of arsenic in the water. Last Friday, the House passed an amendment to reinstate the EPA rule wrongly delayed by the Bush administration, to reduce the accepted standard of arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion and protect millions of Americans. That rule is the result of decades of debate, scientific studies, rule-making, and public comment, and it deserves to be implemented now.

We know that arsenic is a serious threat to public health. The 50 parts per billion standard for drinking water was originally set in 1942, and is clearly out of date. A National Academy of Sciences study in 1999 found that arsenic in drinking water is extremely carcinogenic, causing lung, bladder, and skin cancer. As a Wall Street Journal article on April 19 stated on the 10 parts per billion standard, "few government decisions could have been more thoroughly researched, over so many years."

Action by Congress is long overdue. Senator NELSON's amendment is a needed step in the continuing battle to protect Americans from the dangers of arsenic, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on this amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1228.

The amendment (No. 1228) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we are waiting for 10:30 for the Senator from Arizona to offer an amendment. If there is no business on this bill, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND are located in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I will take 2 or 3 minutes to speak in anticipation of an amendment that will be offered by Senator KYL. I

reluctantly have to oppose the Senator's amendment, although I understand the situation he faces. His amendment would alter the formula for the State revolving fund for the Clean Water Act.

Senator KYL's amendment would alter a Clean Water Act formula for the SRF that has been in place since 1987. While I recognize the Senator's concerns about the lack of funds for his State and the money that goes to Arizona and other States in the face of these great economic needs, I have to oppose the amendment as the ranking Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee which has jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act.

Very simply, this is not the place to change the formula for the SRF—on an appropriations bill. I urge my colleague and other colleagues, if Senator KYL does offer the amendment, to think seriously. They can take a look at a chart, which I will enter into the RECORD, which shows how all of these

formulas will affect everybody's States. If it is simply a matter of will they get more, will they get less, they can vote that way if they wish, but that is really not the issue. I hope my colleagues will understand that this is not the place to try to get into the authorizing business on something as complex as the formula for the SRF, State revolving fund, for the Clean Water Act.

The Environment and Public Works Committee has committed to examine the waste and drinking water concerns of our country and amend the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act. Senator JEFFORDS has pledged to move along those lines. I know when I was the chairman and Senator REID was the ranking member, we did that, and I have been assured by Senator JEFFORDS that water infrastructure will continue to be a priority for the committee.

I commit to Senator KYL right now to examine the issue of the formula he

is looking at, and I urge him to allow us to put this together in a way that is a proper legislative package with the appropriate vehicle. If the Senator does offer the amendment, I urge my colleagues to oppose it and work with me and others on the committee to solve the water infrastructure problems over the years.

Finally, I recognize Arizona and other States, mostly in the West, have been shortchanged on this formula, but this is a complex issue. It should not be adjusted simply by raising somebody's numbers and lowering somebody else's, which is what is going to happen here. It is not the way to do it. I hope we can do it otherwise, and I urge my colleagues to consider that if there is a vote on the Kyl amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the chart to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State or Territory	Need	Percent of total need	Current allocation	Kyl amendment	Kyl amendment allocation	Net change
NEW YORK	15987	12.3516	\$150,144,455	8,2500	\$110,818,125	-\$39,326,330
CALIFORNIA	11839	9.1468	97,287,568	8,2500	110,818,125	13,530,557
ILLINOIS	11203	8.6554	61,520,850	8,2500	110,818,125	49,297,275
OHIO	7698	5.9475	76,578,683	5.9475	79,889,507	3,310,824
NEW JERSEY	7357	5.6840	55,387,715	5.6840	76,350,623	20,762,908
PENNSYLVANIA	6034	4.6619	53,883,131	4.6619	62,620,587	8,737,456
FLORIDA	5400	4.1720	45,916,315	4.1720	56,040,963	10,124,648
MIAMI	5062	3.9109	58,626,146	3.9109	52,533,214	-6,092,932
INDIANA	4964	3.8352	32,783,360	3.8352	51,516,174	18,732,814
TEXAS	4702	3.6328	62,176,356	3.6328	48,797,150	-13,379,206
NORTH CAROLINA	3973	3.0695	24,550,580	3.0695	41,231,620	16,681,040
VIRGINIA	3955	3.0556	27,838,856	3.0556	41,044,817	13,205,961
MASSACHUSETTS	3804	2.9390	46,453,615	2.9390	39,477,745	-6,975,870
MISSOURI	2957	2.2846	37,709,057	2.2846	30,687,616	-7,021,441
KENTUCKY	2317	1.7901	17,313,149	1.7901	24,045,724	6,732,575
ARIZONA	2245	1.7345	9,187,830	1.7345	23,298,512	14,110,682
WISCONSIN	2042	1.5777	37,042,805	1.5777	21,191,786	-15,851,019
OREGON	1929	1.4903	15,366,780	1.4903	20,019,077	4,652,297
CONNECTICUT	1781	1.3760	16,664,360	1.3760	18,483,140	1,818,780
WEST VIRGINIA	1734	1.3397	21,207,231	1.3397	17,995,376	-3,211,855
GEORGIA	1721	1.3296	22,999,127	1.3296	17,860,463	-5,138,664
SOUTH CAROLINA	1548	1.1960	13,334,876	1.1960	16,065,076	2,130,200
KANSAS	1414	1.0925	10,935,398	1.0925	14,674,430	3,739,032
MARYLAND	1378	1.0646	32,902,909	1.0646	14,300,824	-18,602,085
PUERTO RICO	1358	1.0492	17,741,646	1.0492	14,093,264	-3,648,382
WASHINGTON	1281	0.9897	23,655,976	0.9897	13,294,162	-10,361,814
RHODE ISLAND	1281	0.9897	11,820,600	0.9897	13,294,162	1,473,562
LOUISIANA	1044	0.8066	14,979,924	0.8066	10,834,586	-4,145,338
TENNESSEE	927	0.7162	19,760,551	0.7162	9,620,365	-10,140,186
IOWA	877	0.6776	18,410,585	0.6776	9,101,468	-9,309,117
MINNESOTA	866	0.6691	25,001,912	0.6691	8,987,310	-16,014,602
HAWAII	837	0.6467	10,535,110	0.6467	8,686,349	-1,848,761
ALABAMA	801	0.6189	15,210,963	0.6189	8,312,743	-6,898,220
MISSISSIPPI	797	0.6158	12,255,813	0.6158	8,271,231	-3,984,582
MAINE	782	0.6042	10,529,737	0.6042	8,115,562	-2,414,175
NEW HAMPSHIRE	748	0.5779	13,593,690	0.5779	7,762,711	-5,830,979
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	609	0.4705	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
NEBRASKA	563	0.4350	6,958,035	0.5500	7,387,875	429,840
ALASKA	489	0.3778	8,141,438	0.5500	7,387,875	-753,563
COLORADO	461	0.3562	10,880,325	0.5500	7,387,875	-3,492,450
OKLAHOMA	334	0.2580	10,990,472	0.5500	7,387,875	-3,602,597
VERMONT	320	0.2472	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
UTAH	315	0.2434	7,167,582	0.5500	7,387,875	220,293
IDAHO	314	0.2426	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
ARKANSAS	270	0.2086	8,899,031	0.5500	7,387,875	-1,511,156
TERRITORIES	230	0.1777	3,395,736	0.2500	3,358,125	-37,611
DELAWARE	226	0.1746	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
NEW MEXICO	161	0.1244	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
SOUTH DAKOTA	130	0.1004	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
MONTANA	119	0.0919	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
NEVADA	116	0.0896	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
NORTH DAKOTA	94	0.0726	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
WYOMING	39	0.0301	6,677,296	0.5500	7,387,875	710,579
Total	129,433			99,9454		

State or Territory	Population	Need	State or Territory	Population	Need	State or Territory	Population	Need
New York	18976	15987	Missouri	5595	2957	Rhode Island	1048	1281
California	33872	11839	Kentucky	4042	2317	Louisiana	4469	1044
Illinois	12419	11203	Arizona	5131	2245	Tennessee	5689	927
Ohio	11353	7698	Wisconsin	5364	2042	Iowa	2926	877
New Jersey	8414	7357	Oregon	3421	1929	Minnesota	4919	866
Pennsylvania	12281	6034	Connecticut	3406	1781	Hawaii	1212	837
Florida	15982	5400	West Virginia	1808	1734	Alabama	2845	801
Michigan	9938	5062	Georgia	8186	1721	Mississippi	2845	797
Indiana	6080	4984	South Carolina	1548	1548	Maine	1273	782
Texas	20852	4702	Kansas	2688	1414	New Hampshire	1236	748
North Carolina	8049	3973	Maryland	5296	1378	District of Columbia	572	609
Virginia	7079	3955	Puerto Rico	3809	1358	Nebraska	1711	563
Massachusetts	6349	3804	Washington	5894	1281	Alaska	627	489

State or Territory	Population	Need
Colorado	4301	461
Oklahoma	3451	334
Vermont	609	320
Utah	2233	315
Idaho	1294	314
Arkansas	2673	270
Territories	411	230
Delaware	784	226
New Mexico	1819	161
South Dakota	755	130
Montana	902	119
Nevada	1998	116
North Dakota	642	94
Wyoming	494	39

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1229 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1214

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if there is not an objection by the assistant majority leader or ranking members of the committee, I offer this amendment that was just spoken about.

I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. McCAIN, and Mr. BROWNBACK, proposes an amendment numbered 1229 to amendment No. 1214.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To specify the manner of allocation of funds made available for grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure)

On page 105, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 4. STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading "STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS" in title III for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall be expended by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency except in accordance with the formula for allocation of funds among recipients developed under subparagraph (D) of section 1452(a)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(a)(1)(D)) (including under a regulation promulgated under that section before the date of enactment of this Act) and in accordance with the wastewater infrastructure needs survey conducted under section 1452(h) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(h)), except that—

(1) subject to paragraph (3), the proportional share under clause (ii) of section 1452(a)(1)(D) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(a)(1)(D)) shall be a minimum of 0.675 percent and a maximum of 8.00 percent;

(2) any State the proportional share of which is greater than that minimum but less than that maximum shall receive 97.50 percent of the proportionate share of the need of the State; and

(3) the proportional share of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands shall be, in the aggregate, 0.25 percent.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New

Hampshire a moment ago, but it illustrates exactly why we need this amendment. The Senator, who is the ranking member of the authorizing committee, says we should not be doing this amendment on an appropriations bill, which is the pending business before the Senate; we should allow the amendment to come out of the authorizing committee.

He is right, in theory, because almost everyone recognizes the current formula for allocating wastewater treatment grants under the EPA's program is unfair. It is way out of date. It is based on 1970s data and, as he noted, especially for growth States, it is woefully inadequate.

The problem is the authorizing committee has had 14 years to change the formula and has not done so. There comes a time when one's patience begins to wear thin. In representing the interests of the States that are growth States, where needs far exceed what they were back in the 1970s or even 1980s, I think we have an obligation to say enough is enough; it is time to change this formula.

Almost everyone in this body has at one time or another made note of the fact that one of the unique things about the Senate is any 1 of the 100 Senators can offer amendments to change law or to fix things. In the House of Representatives where I served, it is more difficult to do that because of the numbers of people and the rules.

The nice thing about the Senate is we have this opportunity. That is why it is frequently the case that amendments are offered on legislation that comes before us, even though it would be nice to deal with that subject in another way. We do it all the time. Mostly we do it when the need is so great, the case is so good, and the degree of fairness involved is such it would be unfair and unwise for us to do anything else.

I say to my friend from New Hampshire, who says let us take care of it in the authorizing committee, he has had many years to do that. This act has not been reauthorized since it was passed in 1987. It needs to be reauthorized, and it needs to be fixed.

I commend Senator JEFFORDS, the new chairman of the committee, for saying he intends to take this up so he can get a reauthorization. I hope that is done, and I hope it is done this fall. I also hope it includes a formula reallocation if we are not able to do it in this bill, but we have heard that story year after year after year and nothing happens. There is a reason nothing happens—because the States that have it good under the formula do not want to change. That is human nature. There is nothing wrong with that. I do not blame them.

As a simple matter of fairness, if a formula has grown so out of whack over the years that it treats more than half of the people in this country very unfairly, then something needs to be

done. We have it within our power to do it.

This amendment is germane and will be ruled such by the Parliamentarian if there is a question about it and, therefore, it will be offered and it will be voted on.

Since there are far more Senators whose States benefit under this amendment than those that would lose funds because they are getting more than their fair share today, I hope it will be adopted. Those Senators who vote against this amendment, notwithstanding the fact their States benefit, will certainly have some explaining to do to the folks back home.

What does the amendment do? We have some funds in the Federal Government that help localities construct facilities to ensure their drinking water is safe and that they have good wastewater treatment facilities. These are conducted under the Environmental Protection Agency.

The EPA does a needs survey every 4 years. It decides what communities need. It does this on a State-by-State basis. We base the allocations of the drinking water fund strictly on the basis of that needs survey because we recognize EPA is not being political in this endeavor. EPA understands what the needs are. It does this survey and says: Here are the communities that need the money the most.

The formula for the drinking water is based upon that EPA quadrennial needs survey. EPA also does a quadrennial needs survey for wastewater treatment, but we do not base our allocations for wastewater facilities on the basis of that needs survey. No, we base it on a 1970s era construction grant program which has no relevance to wastewater treatment, is way out of date, even if it ever did, is based on 1970 census data, I believe, and, therefore, has been overcome by events and time with respect to the real needs throughout the United States.

Based on the chart, we can see visually what the situation is. There are several States that have a need, and that need, represented by the red bar, is based on the percentage of need the States are currently receiving. In other words, EPA says: This is how much you need, and then here is how much Congress gives.

To use my State of Arizona as an example, we can see Arizona receives a very small amount, less than 1 percent. This is why I am offering the amendment. My State is being treated very unfairly. Under the formula which does not provide a 100-percent allocation, Arizona, as all of the other States, would get up to this minimal level. We can see on the chart the blue line for all the States is the same. Those States below the line would be brought up to that level.

The State of Maryland is the State that has the highest bar on this particular chart. The percentage of current need fulfilled in the State of Maryland is far in excess of my State

of Arizona, even though my State of Arizona has more population and is faster growing. Is that fair? This is according to the EPA. This is not according to population, JON KYL, or the Governor of Arizona. This is the Environmental Protection Agency's survey of needs. Here is Arizona, less than 1 percent, and here is Maryland, much higher.

What we are saying is, let's even it out and make sure everybody gets at least a percentage of what the EPA says they deserve to have. That is what we are trying to do, to make it fair for everybody.

Incidentally, the formula change is very simple. The amendment is a two-page amendment. It reads as follows: "shall be a minimum of 0.675 percent and a maximum of 8.00 percent" of the needs survey of the EPA. So there is a top and a bottom, and within that, everybody receives funds according to the percentage that EPA has recommended.

It reads further:

(2) any State the proportional share of which is greater than that minimum but less than that maximum shall receive 97.50 percent of the proportionate share of the need of the State.

That is the percent everybody within the maximum and minimum will receive.

(3) the proportional share of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands shall be, in the aggregate, 0.25 percent.

I note that even though the EPA lists Arizona as No. 16 on the list of the States in terms of need—we rank 16th from the top—we are 53rd in how much money is received after a couple of the territories and the District of Columbia. That is why I am standing before you today.

There are many other States—I think 28—in addition to Arizona that are in the same box. Some are in a little worse shape than Arizona—actually, I do not think any are in worse shape than my State of Arizona, but there are several that receive more because EPA has said they need more than the State of Arizona. States such as New Jersey and Illinois, for example, receive substantially more money under this amendment.

This is not about anything complicated. It does not take a lot of work to figure out how it works. It is simply a readjustment based on EPA's own figures.

Included in the appropriations bill on VA-HUD and independent agencies is an increase in funding of \$500 million over that requested by the President in the EPA's clean water State revolving fund. It is my understanding that the increase brings current year funding up to a historic level of \$1.35 billion.

I applaud both Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND, who are the chairman and ranking member respectively of the committee, for the work they put in on it. Having been a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know how

difficult it is and how hard they work on this. I appreciate the work they have put in on it.

I wish to make it clear that I support the funding for this program established under the Clean Water Act of 1987. Our States do depend on this revolving fund to provide much needed financial assistance. It comes in the form of low interest rate loans to sewer utility ratepayers who otherwise bear the brunt of the costs associated with compliance of EPA clean water regulations. This is one of the ways in which we impose a mandate on communities but then help them to fulfill that mandate financially.

It is particularly beneficial for customers of the small rural water companies that serve so much of the population in the Western and Midwestern States. Unfortunately, the EPA has been administering this program since its inception with a very seriously flawed allocation formula that I described earlier. It was based on a formula that was derived for Federal construction loans using data that was gathered in the early 1970s.

During these 30 years, I think we are all aware of the fact that the demographic distribution in the country has changed dramatically, as have the other factors that would cause the EPA to rank localities based upon their need for this kind of funding.

In my State of Arizona, our population has nearly tripled from 1.8 million to 5.1 million since 1970. Just think about the changes that has required in terms of infrastructure in the State. I might add, that does not include a very large population that is probably not counted.

Much of that shift in population has come from other regions of the country, so you not only have burgeoning needs in the growth States—and I know the State of the Presiding Officer is in the same position—but you also have declining need in some of the other States that historically have a higher population and receive more money to take care of that population.

It should be obvious that over time these formulas should be adjusted, but as I say, it has never been adjusted, and I have no reason to believe that circumstances today create any greater opportunity for us to do that than last year or the year before or the year before that.

The formula that currently exists reflects neither this current population distribution nor the EPA's documented need of individual States as established in its quadrennial wastewater infrastructure needs survey. The EPA will update its wastewater needs survey in the year 2002, but based on the most recently completed survey from 1998, there is a vast discrepancy in the percentage of need fulfilled from State to State.

I have no doubt that after this next survey, this chart is going to be even more skewed. States that are primarily the growth States are going to be in an

even more difficult situation—States such as California, for example, and my own State of Arizona.

Let me illustrate this disparity using, however, the 1998 EPA wastewater infrastructure need survey and the actual clean water revolving fund allocations to the States in fiscal year 2000. The State of Arizona received funding in fiscal year 2000 to address only .41 percent; that is four-tenths of 1 percent of the validated infrastructure needs. By contrast, four States with populations very similar to Arizona—Wisconsin, Maryland, Minnesota, and Louisiana—each received funding that met from 4 times to 7 times the percentage received by my State: 1.43 percent in the case of Louisiana and 2.89 percent in the case of Minnesota. So there is a 7-to-1 ratio of States with almost equal population.

That is not fair. I understand why the Representatives of those States want to defend what they have, but they cannot defend its fairness, so they are relegated to an argument that procedurally we should not do it on this bill but on another bill. But we never get around to doing it on another bill. It is a catch-22 for us.

My constituents back home ask, Why is Congress so partisan and why can't it ever just act in a fair way to get things done. I have a hard time explaining it in this case because it is a totally bipartisan issue. There are winner States and States that have to give back some of the money they are in effect receiving today, in the future. And it doesn't respect party lines. People from both parties are winners and losers under this current formula and would be under the new formula. I don't think anybody can defend a formula that, based upon EPA's own recommendations, gives one State seven times more than another State of the very same population. It is very hard to defend.

If my colleagues would refer to the floor chart again, we see by graph what I illustrated in terms of actual numbers. It only includes those States not covered by the minimum or maximum shares under the proposed formula, so it avoids a skewed representation.

I make another point about this amendment because there is another fund out of which the committee is able to allocate money, and it is based on so-called earmarks. My change here, this amendment, this formula change, does not in any way affect those earmarks. I make that crystal clear to everybody. Their earmarks are not affected today or tomorrow. They are totally outside the scope of this amendment.

Let me illustrate how the earmarks also work. There is only one State that has double-digit millions of dollars in earmarks. That is the State of Missouri, which receives \$10.250 million in earmark funds, in addition to the formula funds. My State, by the way, gets \$1 million. So there is a 10-to-1 ratio.

For those who say we even it out in the earmarks, no, it is not evened out

in the earmarks. There are only three other States that received over \$5 million in earmarks: Maryland, Mississippi, and Arkansas. We have a situation where not only does the formula discriminate but the earmarks also discriminate.

We have and will hear the argument we should not be legislating on an appropriations bill. After having complimented the chairman and ranking member, I note they represent two of these four States. They are able, in the committee, to ensure that their State is treated as they would consider to be very fairly. However, they argue that those not on the committee shouldn't be able to do anything on the floor of the Senate; that would be legislating on an appropriations bill; we cannot do that. Again, it is a catch-22. You have to be on the Appropriations Committee; otherwise, if you are not on the Appropriations Committee, don't offer an amendment on the floor or they will come to the floor and say they will stick together and urge their colleagues to vote against this amendment because it would be legislating on an appropriations bill. Again, a catch-22 situation.

Last year, I was on the Appropriations Committee, I voluntarily left, so I guess I can't complain, but I didn't think I would be treated unfairly as a result of leaving the committee. This boils down to a matter of unfairness. Every one of my colleagues, I know, has only the best interests of both their constituents and the country at large in their mind. But nobody wants to give up an advantage. If you are inadvertently given \$100 in change from a clerk who should have given you \$10, do you keep the \$100? Most would say no. It is similar here.

The allocation of funds boils down to fairness and honesty. I defy anybody in this body to tell me there is a more equitable distribution, a more equitable fashion to distribute these funds than on the basis of a proportional share of the total validated need as determined by EPA. I don't ask anything more than a fair share of funding for the people of Arizona, my State, and for all other Americans.

As I said, mine is not the only State that is adversely affected. In fact, a majority of the States are adversely affected by the unfair and outdated formula that is in the bill today. Using the simple needs-based formula that I proposed, 27 States and the District of Columbia will receive more than they are currently receiving—not their total percentage share but at least more than they are receiving now. Using this formula, all but three States receive, at a minimum, their exact proportion of share of total need.

This is a very fair way to make an adjustment. Ordinarily, you have to take away from half and give to the other half. This formula works in such a way that very few States could argue they are being shortchanged. In the case of those States, they have simply

been receiving far too much in comparison to what EPA has said their needs are. Two of the three States I noted subjected to the cap in the formula will still receive substantially more than they do under the current system.

It is time to do something to rectify what I think is a gross disparity that impacts the health and welfare of so many of our citizens. I ask my colleagues to recognize the inequity and join me in supporting a reasonable reformulation that takes into account both the aging systems in the East and the growing infrastructure needs in the West that have been driven by this population shift over the last 30 years.

I close by talking just a little bit about the way the committee has legislated on an appropriations bill because we will hear we cannot do that, and also to talk directly to some of my colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I note the distinguished chairman of the committee is here. I complimented him—I don't know if he was here—on his, I think, publicly expressed but certainly privately expressed desire to take up in his committee later this fall the reauthorization of the underlying legislation which is very sorely needed. I applaud the Senator for that. Obviously, there is no commitment to take up the formula or to change the formula, and it will be too late for the fiscal year 2000 funds which, again, will fall far short of what is needed and will be unfairly distributed.

Before anyone votes no on this amendment because Members think it is an inappropriate vehicle, think for a moment about what happens to the fiscal year 2002 funds that we are appropriating if the necessary authorization bill is not passed in time to affect the allocations. I suspect my colleague from Vermont will confirm that would be a tall order to get a formula changed, done in time, and signed into law to affect the appropriations for fiscal year 2002.

Back to the question of legislation on an appropriations bill. Ordinarily, we shouldn't do something dramatically different on an appropriations bill than the appropriators have put in the bill. But it is not true that the amendment is outside of the norm of what we do. Let me focus attention on just a section of the State and tribal assistance grants, which is where we find the funding for the State clean water revolving fund. In other words, you do not have to go very far afield. You can stay right in the same section and find out that we have legislated on an appropriations bill.

On page 76, line 3, I see we are providing funding:

... for Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Water Drinking Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for

health effects studies on drinking water contaminants.

On page 76, line 21, grants specified in the Senate report accompanying this Act are provided:

... except that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds herein and hereafter appropriate under this heading for such special needs infrastructure grants, the Administrator may use up to 3 percent of the amount of each project appropriated to administer the management and oversight of construction of such projects through contracts, allocation to the Corps of Engineers, or grants to the States.

And on page 78 line 4:

Provided further, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional existing colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia [or] the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure.

So that is pretty heavy duty legislating, I would say. It comes straight out of the appropriations bill before us, in fact the exact same section I am attempting to amend.

Basically what we are saying is the Appropriations Committee can amend and legislate when the bill is before the committee, but the rest of the Senators are denied that opportunity when the bill comes to the floor.

As I said, as a general rule it is probably a good thing to let most of the work be done by the committee. But in a case such as this where there is so much disparity, so much unfairness, and where we have not been able to get the authorizers to do this reauthorizing notwithstanding many years of effort, I think we have to take the opportunity that lies before us.

Mr. FITZGERALD from Illinois, Mr. BROWNBACK from Kansas, and Mr. MCCAIN are all cosponsors of this amendment and they and some other Members would wish to speak on this amendment. But at this point, since I see the distinguished ranking member from Missouri here and the chairman of the authorizing committee, I will yield the floor to them for their comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I rise to respond to the amendment offered by my good friend from Arizona, mixed emotions because, No. 1, I could not agree more with the emphasis he has put on the need for clean water, safe drinking water, and proper water infrastructure in this country.

One of the most important things we do on this committee is to get the money that we need to assure healthy water—healthy wastewater systems and healthy drinking water systems

throughout this country. When we look at the needs for water infrastructure, they are overwhelming. We have an annual shortfall of funding of about \$12 billion per year for clean water. Over the next 20 years it is estimated we are going to need \$200 billion in water infrastructure. That excludes operation and maintenance.

We, the distinguished chair and I, have fought every year to increase the amount of money set out by OMB. We have always said the President is underfunding water, but we all know OMB represents the bad guys. They have always decided to cut the money going to the State revolving funds to fund other priorities. So each year we have taken the inadequate—grossly inadequate—funds for State revolving funds for water infrastructure and increased them. We have increased them because even with the increases we have been able to include, we are falling far short.

I do not think there is any other environmental program which has the potential to have more impact on the health of this country than assuring clean drinking water, safe drinking water, and cleaning up wastewater. If we do not do those jobs well, we will have failed in the most basic health requirements for our country.

I have heard, in every area of this country, the cries for more water infrastructure. There is not a community in this country, I do not believe, urban or rural, that does not have tremendous funding needs to upgrade water and sewer systems: Baltimore, MD, St. Louis, MO, Safford, AZ. We all need it. It could be Delaware—the whole State could use some. I know because this is a broad-scale problem. I appreciate the Senator from Arizona raising it to the level of bringing it to the floor because I have been adamant, demanding of our ranking member on EPW and our chairman of EPW that they focus on water problems. I am a humble toiling servant of the EPW committee, and I have said we have to have water issues high on our agenda. It has been too long since we have dealt with the Clean Water Act.

Certainly the funding formula ought to be one component of that review because we have tremendous water needs throughout our country. Whether it is east coast, west coast, the Great Plains, the South, the North, we have water needs. That is why I am glad he brought it up.

The other part of the emotion is it is the wrong place. I am sorry, but we cannot deal with reviewing a complicated formula as part of an overarching programmatic review that is needed on the entire water issue on this appropriations bill.

We come to the floor and we have just now received an amendment. The amendment says that its proportional share, if there is a minimum of .675 percent and a maximum of 8 percent but the State proportional share is greater than the minimum, then they shall re-

ceive 97.5 percent of the proportionate share.

If we fell below the minimum, if we really were way down and we fell below a minimum somehow, then we would be shut out. What happens to those who fall below the minimum? What happens to those who are above the maximum? How do you calculate the proportionate share?

These are all issues that ought to be worked out in a committee markup. They are complicated issues. I have questions that I could debate all day long on how to make this formula work. I do not want to do that in this Chamber. I don't think we have time to do that here. I would like to have my staff spend time, working on a bipartisan basis with the staffs of both sides, with the EPA, with the others who are knowledgeable, to figure out how this works, getting input from the States and the localities that receive the funds to see how it works. Then I can turn in anger and disgust to a staff member if they cannot explain it to me.

Right now we are looking at something that I think has great problems. For that reason, among many others, I say, please, let's take this to the authorizing committee.

If the author of this amendment had come to me last year or the year before or the year before or the year before, I would have been more than happy to sign on to a bill that says let's update this formula. I would be happy to sign on. And I have supported broader measures that said let's deal with this whole problem and figure out how we are going to meet the \$200 billion water infrastructure needs over the next 20 years. This is a vitally important matter for human health.

We talk about a lot of things that have only that much, that tiny impact on the health of our country. We spend so much time debating things that are about a gnat's eyebrow worth of difference, if we do this or do that.

What we are talking about now is something that makes a huge difference, that makes a difference between whether communities are healthy, whether the children, the older people, the people who are sick, who are needy, are getting healthy water. Are the people in that community subject to the disease that comes from untreated wastewater? These are vitally important questions that need to be referred to the committee.

I know the new chairman of the committee has put this issue at the top of his agenda. I know EPA is currently working on a needs survey for clean water funding.

I understand the survey will be completed in early 2002. I would love to get in the middle of the debate over how we utilize these SRF funds. I would like for the authorizing committee to send a clear signal to OMB, to our Budget Committee, and to the Appropriations Committee that we need more money in State revolving funds,

or find another means of funding them, because we are falling far behind.

I appreciate very much this significant issue being raised. I know if I were in Arizona I would want to have a good water infrastructure myself because you get thirsty out there in the heat. But this, unfortunately, as the Senator so well surmised, is not the place, this is not the time, and this is not the vehicle. I wish him well in some other venue. I will be a strong supporter trying to help him get it done.

I urge and plead with my colleagues to recognize the importance of the issue he raised but to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to say that the way the opposition to my amendment was delivered by the distinguished Senator just proves yet again why he is such an effective Member of this body and such a great representative of his State and the constituents of the whole country. He has in some sense agreed that we need to do something, but makes an argument, which he indicated last night he would have to make, in opposition to the amendment. I appreciate that fact. But I don't think one could ever ask for an opponent to an amendment who has more graciously expressed his views. I want to let the distinguished Senator from Missouri know that I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as was pointed out, I am chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction over this matter. I appreciate the Senator from Arizona bringing to the attention of this body the seriousness of the freshwater problems that we have in this country.

When I became the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, one of my top priorities was to craft legislation to ensure that the Federal Government meet its responsibilities to assist communities in meeting their drinking water and waste water infrastructure needs. Under the leadership of our ranking member, Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, the committee has already begun to investigate proper procedures to ensure that every community in this country has good freshwater and is able to dispose of their waste water.

I think it is important that we discuss this, and it has been brought up. But I would have to object very strenuously to the amendment. It is under the jurisdiction of our committee, and we are dedicated to trying to help make sure that we have better quality water and the quantity of funds available for making sure that we improve our freshwater system.

I have to object to the amendment on the basis that it is under the jurisdiction of my committee. But I will certainly do all I can to work with the Senator from Arizona as we move forward in the process of developing a better system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me also acknowledge the comments of the Senator from Vermont. They are very welcome. I appreciate the fact that the authorizing jurisdiction lies within the committee that he chairs, and that in the ordinary course of events he is absolutely right; the formula should be modified when the act is reauthorized under his committee. There are reasons why we make exceptions to that.

Sometimes in the U.S. Congress, the exceptions prove the rule. There are frequent times when we don't do the work in the authorizing committee but rather do it on appropriations bills. In fact, every one of my colleagues—including, I am sure, the distinguished chairman of the committee—will acknowledge that on more than one occasion we have ground our teeth and said it looks as if the authorizing committees are no longer relevant around here; that the appropriators are taking the jurisdiction from us and are making all of the decisions. It is probably a bit of an exaggeration, but I am sure every one of us has felt that at times.

I certainly appreciate the concerns expressed by the chairman of the committee, who has to protect his committee's jurisdiction. I absolutely understand that. As I said, in the normal course of events, I wouldn't disagree with him at all, as a member now of several authorizing committees, having gotten off of the Appropriations Committee. But we are in a situation today where I think almost everybody will acknowledge that the formula is unfair, and yet we haven't been able to get a reauthorization of this act since its inception in 1987. That is not the fault of the distinguished chairman.

But the fact is, it is very difficult to ever change formulas once they are in place because of the opposition of the Senators who perceive that they would be losing under the formula. Let me turn to a chart that I think will also make the point.

Under the Kyl-Fitzgerald-McCain legislation, some States will lose some of the windfalls that they have been receiving. But every State except three, as I have pointed out, still does very well. If you look in the far corner, there is a State that is pretty much above every other State. The line for New York State is way up here. It is true that under our amendment it would be brought down to here. But every other State else in the formula is down here.

While it is true that there are States that will lose—and New York State, I confess to my colleagues from New York, will lose funding under this act. They have been getting a windfall for a number of years. That must be a testament to their great work before the committee. And I suspect a former Senator from New York also had a little something to do with that.

My point is, yes, there are a few States that will lose funding because

they have been getting too much, and almost all of the other States that are within this minimum-maximum range are way down here. I don't think one can say it is unfair.

With respect to the comment that my colleague from Missouri made, that is a complicated formula. I want to make it very clear exactly what we are talking about because it is the epitome of simplicity.

Three factors. In accordance with the wastewater infrastructure needs survey, what does EPA recommend?

You get 97.5 percent of the funds that are available. There is a minimum and a maximum. The minimum is 1.675, and the maximum is 8.0.

It couldn't be simpler. We have available a chart that shows exactly the dollars and percentages—which States receive more, which States receive less, and how the earmarks relate to that. We don't affect the earmarks in any way. The earmarks are untouched. The 2002 earmarks are indicated on this particular chart.

I don't think the formula is at all complicated. I don't think it takes a lot of work to figure out how you fared under the amendment.

I also note that while the Senator from Missouri was concerned about States that receive the minimum amount, actually we shouldn't be concerned about the States receiving the minimum because, according to the survey, they actually would receive less money than that but we guarantee that all States receive a minimum amount. They actually end up receiving more percentage-wise than they should based upon the recommendations.

I think it is a very fair formula. It is very similar to other formulas that we have. We already have a similar kind of formula with respect to drinking water under the same act. The EPA makes a recommendation. We have a formula that allocates funding based upon those recommendations.

I think, A, it is fair; B, the minimum States are protected; and, C, you can see that only a few States that have been receiving what I would refer to as windfalls are going to be rather substantially reduced. Everyone else is reduced only a small amount. There are a few States that actually increase a fair amount. That is, frankly, because of the fact that they have been significantly shortchanged in the past.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to relate a few of the statistics.

The distinguished Presiding Officer represents the State of Delaware, which is currently receiving \$6.7 million but would receive \$9.1 million under the formula.

Let me start at the top. We all know California is a fast-growing State. It is slated to receive \$97 million under the current allocation. It would receive \$108 million under the Kyl-Fitzgerald-McCain amendment.

I think the State of Illinois has been significantly shortchanged probably

more than any other State. It received \$61 million. According to the allocation, it should receive \$108 million. It would gain \$48 million.

I think for the citizens of Illinois, it is just unconscionable that it has fallen that far behind.

The State of Ohio similarly has been receiving less.

The State of New Jersey, which is receiving \$55 million, would receive almost \$75 million—about a \$21 million increase.

This just illustrates the point. I could go on down the list.

Next is Pennsylvania, which is receiving \$54 million but would receive \$61 million. The State of Florida receives \$46 million; it would receive \$55 million. The State of Indiana receives \$32 million; it would receive \$50 million.

You can see how there are States that are really significantly below. Just in the spirit of full disclosure, going down to my own State of Arizona, it receives \$9 million; it should be receiving \$22 million.

My point is, there are a lot of States that are way behind what EPA thinks they should be receiving. There are a few States that are way ahead of what they should be receiving. But as I said, only three States will actually receive less as a result of our amendment. Let's see if I actually have those States listed.

All but three States will receive, at a minimum, their exact proportionate share of total need. And two of them subjected to the cap in the formula will still receive substantially more than they do under the current system.

Mr. President, there are other Members who would like to speak to this amendment. I promised them they would have the opportunity. At least two of them are tied up in the Commerce Committee, which I assume is going to be done with its business pretty soon. So I would like to have an opportunity for them to speak. But I also note the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to table the pending amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Would the Senator withhold? I want to speak. I also understand there are two other Members who wish to speak. Will the Senator withhold because I understand the other Senator from Arizona wishes to speak?

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If the Senator makes his motion to table, does that terminate the debate? I ask the Senator, in the spirit of—

Mr. JEFFORDS. I withdraw my motion to table at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank both Senators because last night

the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, said he would be here at 10:30 this morning, ready to offer his amendment and ready to debate it and line up his speakers. He really met that commitment. We thank him for honoring that commitment.

Also, he made it very clear last night that the other Senator from Arizona wished to speak. We want to be able to accommodate him because I think we have been moving along in a spirit of comity. I would just ask the proponent of the amendment if we could encourage those speakers to come to the Chamber. My remarks will not be of a prolonged nature. If the two Commerce Committee Senators could come over, I believe we could have this amendment wrapped up before lunch and, I think, would be moving in a well-paced way.

Again, we want to keep the kind of atmosphere of civility that has set the tone of the bill. If everyone would notice, there has not even been a quorum call. So I am ready to make my remarks. We would then go to those two other colleagues to speak.

I ask the Senator, are they coming?

Mr. President, we are going to have a little quorum call, just for clarification.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, again, I thank the Senator from Arizona for proposing his amendment and moving with a promptness that is appreciated by both Senator BOND and I. I acknowledge the validity of many of the concerns that the Senator from Arizona raises.

When you have a State such as Arizona, that certainly is growing in population, and you find out you are down on a list of Federal funds, it is, indeed, troubling.

I also acknowledge the fact that the Nation is facing a clean water funding crisis. It is estimated that we have an annual funding shortfall for clean water infrastructure of at least \$12 billion. I can honestly tell the Senator that if I gave \$1 billion to every State in the Union over and above what is in our bill, it would be well used because it is needed.

We have heard about water problems from failing septic tanks in the Delmarva region that you and I represent, where the rural poor really do not have the bucks to do it. We have heard about the big failing water systems in the Chicagos and the Baltimores, where they were built over 100 years ago, and it is beyond the scope of this Appropriations Committee to deal with it.

We need full-scale authorizing hearings on the needs for America's water

infrastructure—both the needs and the formula. So I acknowledge that this is a big deal and a big problem.

There is not a community in this country—urban or rural—that does not have some important funding need related to water, whether it is from Baltimore to St. Louis to Stafford or Scottsdale, AZ. However, I must say, Senator KYL's amendment is outside of the scope of the VA-HUD bill. I truly believe, because it is a formula change, that it will trigger essentially a water war on the VA-HUD bill.

This is, indeed, an authorizing issue and should be addressed by the authorizers in comprehensive water infrastructure legislation.

Last night we had an excellent discussion on the issue of arsenic. We all agreed that arsenic is a problem. We all agreed that complying with the Federal mandate on arsenic will also be a problem. So our colleague, the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, offered an amendment for authorizing on funding. We thought that was an excellent way to go and, wow, suddenly you had a Domenici-Mikulski-Schumer-Clinton-Bond—an amazing list of co-sponsors. The message of that was not only that arsenic is a problem, but, like last night when we talked about it, how do we pay for these water issues?

What we have done—again, working on a bipartisan basis—the VA-HUD bill does not break new ground on environmental issues. We essentially broke no new ground, whether it was on enforcement, whether it was reallocating from sewers to State revolving funds, and so on. We essentially kept the framework from last year to get the President to put his arms around it, to get our new EPA Administrator to put her arms around it, to then look at what EPA should be and what are some of the new changes we need to make.

We think we have gotten off to a good start. Because this is a year of transition, both within the executive branch and also within this subcommittee, that was the framework we approached, so that we could be prudent, that we would not lurch ahead in either the executive or legislative branch and make mistakes that we would have to then go back and evaluate.

As my colleagues know, often on environmental issues, we end up with either unfunded mandates or, in some instances, unintended consequences to what seems to be a good idea.

The new chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works believes that water should be at the top of his agenda. He is here today to speak on that. EPA is currently working on a needs survey for clean water funding. This should be done early in the next calendar year.

I cannot support the Kyl amendment until the authorizers have had an opportunity to examine the needs survey and we have the very important census data related to growth that the Sen-

ator from Arizona has talked about. We all acknowledge that Arizona has grown, but we want to have more data on that. Then we need to have recommendations on how to clearly allocate our clean water.

There is also another issue with the actual formula that the Senator is proposing. It is going to be a little geeky here so stick with me.

This amendment would require EPA to allocate the fiscal year 2002 clean water State revolving fund appropriation to the States using an allocation formula for the drinking water State revolving loan fund.

Remember, we have two revolving loan funds: one for clean water and the other for drinking water. You might say: Why is that such a big deal? Dirty water is dirty water, and why not commingle the formulas?

This is really inconsistent with the Nation's wastewater and clean water needs. Drinking water systems and wastewater systems are fundamentally different. They deal with two different problems. They focus on different pollutants. Wastewater systems concentrate on removing pollution that deteriorates our rivers, lakes, and our bays—the Chair is familiar with it—the nitrogens, the phosphorous. That is why we have those problems on the Chesapeake Bay.

The drinking water system removes pollutants and treats water to make sure it is safe to drink. One, we are drinking it; and the other drops it into the big drink like the Chesapeake Bay—two different things and two different kinds of pollution.

When we get our drinking water, we are not dealing with phosphorous and nitrogen and those issues with which we have had to deal.

In addition, the wastewater systems need to address shortcomings from the past, such as combined sewer overflows. Anyone from the city knows that this combined sewer overflow and the sanitary overflows are really big issues. There is no parallel to those issues in the drinking water systems. You can see how they are different. Then to use the same formulas, it gets to be a problem.

Also, this amendment has another fundamental flaw. It references a water infrastructure needs survey to be conducted under the Safe Drinking Water Act. EPA has advised the committee today that no such survey exists. The wastewater needs survey is required under the Clean Water Act, not the Safe Drinking Water Act.

We are going to get lost here. We don't want to get lost on the Senator's needs or what we want to accomplish. This shows exactly why this is the wrong place to offer this amendment. It is so complicated. We have needs surveys. We have formulas. We have safe water. We have clean water. We have drinking water. We have dirty water. We have wastewater. We need to be clear that the formulas are based on the problem to be addressed as well as on population.

Section 2 of the Senator's amendment is unclear. The Agency would be at a loss on how to calculate the formula given this direction.

The needs for surface water quality projects differ geographically from drinking water projects. For example, some communities are served by central drinking water systems, but there is no municipal wastewater system. In another circumstance, a community may have a minor drinking water problem but might have a terrible or significant combined sewer overflow or a sanitary sewer overflow. As a result, surveying the construction needs of drinking water systems has no connection to the wastewater treatment system in the same community.

The Presiding Officer was a Governor. I am sure he follows that. But most of all, local government follows it.

Which brings me to another issue: Changes of this magnitude applied here with such scant notice would severely disrupt State programs. States must plan ahead. They have to use an expected range of capitalization grants for planning purposes. You have to know what you are going to get and when you are going to get it. Changes of the size implicit in the amendment would stop the State CWSRF, the clean water State revolving fund, loan programs for a significant period of time. This means that States would have to scurry around, prepare new intended-use plans, hold public hearings, try to get their bond issues straightened out.

As you know, States have capital budgets. We don't. Capital budgets are based on what is going to come out of general revenue and what able Governors take to the bond market. A lot of our water and sewer is done on bonds, particularly at the local level.

This is going to wreak havoc in all States. I know the Senator's intention is to get more money into some States. It will wreck havoc even in his own State.

Keep in mind, we will not only have the loss of money but we will have the loss of time. It will affect our drinking water as well as our commitment to the environment.

The clean water State revolving fund addresses clean water needs which are very different from drinking water. I have talked about that. The use of the drinking water State revolving fund would misdirect resources, resulting in a mismatch between the allocation of Federal funds by States and by the State's needs.

I could go on: Who are winners, and who are losers.

The important thing is, when it comes to water, there should be no losers. We all have our needs. We all have our problems. These formulas were originally established to meet those needs.

Maybe there is the need to adjust those formulas. In every formula, some States gain and some States do not do as well as they should. Formulas are

really complicated. They do approach the level of treaty negotiations.

To try to do this on this bill would wreck havoc. It would trigger Senators coming to see what they are going to get and what they are going to lose.

The more prudent way would be for there to be some type of instruction to EPA for evaluation. We would be happy to enter into a colloquy with both Senators from Arizona. We would be happy to sign a letter to the very able Administrator at the EPA outlining the concerns the Senators have. But we don't think we should have this amendment. If we pass this amendment, it is going to wreak havoc in the States with their ability to administer their programs; it is going to wreak havoc with the capital programs; it is going to wreak havoc with their bonds; and, most of all, it is going to wreak havoc with, really, the confusion that is going to come with using one formula for wastewater and use it also for drinking water. We really encourage—because it is not sound—this is not the place to enter into such a significant, complex public policy debate with enormous consequences to our constituents, to our communities, to our States and their ability to meet their fiscal responsibility as well as their environmental and public health stewardship. I am telling you, this is really the very wrong place to do this amendment. I oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the chair of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland, for laying out the concerns, first, that the EPA has about it. I am relieved to see I was not the only one confused by the formula. I tried to figure out how the formula in section 2 would work, and I found a lot more questions than answers.

The EPA has advised us that they don't know how the formula would work. That is why I said a few moments ago that on these complicated items there needs to be substantive hearings. There should be hearings on how the changes might affect existing water bonding issues, existing water programs in the States. There should be hearings on how these changes would affect the States where the needs are. Most important, we need to sit down with all of the players and make sure we have a formula that everybody understands and that works.

So I believe the EPA has given us the reasons that we described in general about the problems in trying to adopt a significant change on the floor. Having said that, I am very enthusiastically a supporter of the suggestion the chair of the committee has made that we join either in a colloquy, letters and instruction, first, to the EPA, to present to us options for revising and updating the formula, if needed, for both the drinking water revolving fund and the clean water revolving fund and the one that deals with wastewater, to

give us their best assessment and to actually provide that to the Environment and Public Works Committee so we will have something with which to work.

As I have said before, I am a most enthusiastic proponent of revising these formulas and finding ways to put more money into this very badly needed area, for investments for the future health and well-being of our community.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, let me say to my colleagues I very much support the Safe Drinking Water Act. There are tremendous needs throughout America and in our Commonwealth of Virginia, especially in the southwestern region of Virginia.

This issue deals with wastewater and the need for cleaning up our wastewater, where there are combined sewer overflow situations in Lynchburg, Richmond, and other areas, as well as the Northern Virginia area, which flows into the Potomac, which affects the Chesapeake Bay, which is important to Virginia and the State of Maryland; and the Chair's home State of Delaware has a few tributaries that flow into the Chesapeake Bay. It is also important to Pennsylvania and New York, which are also part of that watershed.

Now, again, I am very much in favor of all these ideas. The question is: How do you meet the needs? In trying to determine how you meet the needs for clean water, drinking water, and clean water as regards wastewater treatment, you want to have a good, objective, up-to-date determination of needs.

The drinking water allocations are based on EPA's recommendations. There is a needs survey. But as I best understand it—and I may ask, in a moment, my colleague from Arizona, Senator KYL, to join me to explain this because some fellow Senators are saying they don't understand this, and I want to have a better understanding.

The wastewater moneys are based on a 1970s population number and have not changed since the law was passed in 1987, 14 years ago. As I understand this formula change, what it attempts is to bring in fairness and equity and address the needs for wastewater cleanup and base the numbers on EPA's wastewater needs survey. So it is a similar sort of logic and formula and survey that is used for drinking water that we would want to use for wastewater.

It strikes me, regarding the matter of fairness, that a minority of States in this proposal get way more than the percentage EPA recommends under the current formula and a majority receive much less—mostly in States that are growing faster. Regardless, everyone recognizes—and I haven't heard anybody listening to the debate on the floor or in between saying that the current formula is right—now is the time

to make sure the wastewater allocations, the taxpayer dollars, are being utilized in a way that addresses the needs of the various States.

The formula change also does not affect the so-called earmarks. That is separate and in a smaller pot of money. I ask the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, if he will please take the floor and let me ask him a few questions so we can clear up any misunderstandings that have been proffered here by others who may not seem to understand this proposal.

I ask the Senator from Arizona this: The current plan, the current allocation for wastewater moneys, is it a formula based on population from the 1970 census?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Virginia, my staff has tried to find out the basis for the current formula, and they have had a very difficult time getting anybody to tell them what it is. We have gone back in the debates, in the records, and so on. As best we can tell, it is a formula that is based upon a construction grant program using 1970s data, including population data. That is as clear as I can be about it. I urge anybody—of course, I find it interesting that those who are opposing the amendment do so on procedural grounds, not defending the existing formula. I haven't found anybody to defend, let alone explain, what the basis of the existing formula is.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will yield for a further question, I ask the Senator from Arizona this: The formula he is proposing here, though, is based, as he states, on needs, actual needs. How do you determine those needs? What is the formula? What is the criterion by which needs are addressed?

Mr. KYL. I appreciate that question from the Senator because there has been, I think, a misunderstanding here. My understanding is that EPA has at least two different "needs surveys," as they call them. They survey needs of communities for drinking water, and we use that survey with a formula for the allocation of drinking water moneys in a different place in this bill. They also do a survey for wastewater needs.

It is my proposal that we use that survey as the basis for the allocation of wastewater funds. Those are different surveys. We should not confuse the two. We are not suggesting that we use the drinking water survey for wastewater allocations. Leave the drinking water survey for the drinking water allocations and use the wastewater survey for the wastewater allocations.

It is further my understanding that each of these is redone every 4 years on a rotating basis.

In 2002, there will be the new 4-year wastewater treatment survey. Two years ago, we had the most recent drinking water survey. So every 2 years, we have a new survey. One is for drinking water; one is for wastewater. My concern is we will wait until the 2002 wastewater survey, and then it

will be at least fiscal year 2003, or later, when it can be implemented, even if we are all in agreement to use that survey. Clearly, we will be yet another year or even 2 years down the road without having made the formula safe.

To summarize, the Senator from Virginia is correct. There are two different needs surveys, one for drinking water and one for wastewater. We are not using the drinking water survey; we are using the wastewater survey. The formulas also differ slightly.

I believe there is a 1-percent minimum on drinking water for that fund. In ours, it is a .675-percent minimum, 8-percent maximum, and everybody else within that range receives 97.5 of what is available. It is a very simple formula and not dissimilar to the drinking water formula, but it is not the same formula.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will yield for a further question.

There was an assertion that this will affect some of the bonding and expected amounts of money. The Senator is saying after the 2002 analysis, or the survey for wastewater monies, which is calculated on an antiquated, outdated, inaccurate formula, there would be a change. Even if nothing happened, even if the Senate does not act in a far-sighted, appropriate way and vote for the amendment, there still would be changes in allocations to the different States anyway. Isn't that correct?

Mr. KYL. The Senator from Virginia is correct. That is based on two primary factors:

First, as both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri have noted, they have fought very hard for increased funding. One never knows. Each year, from one year to the next, we never know what amount of money is going to be available; that is very true. It would be folly for someone to count on a particular amount of money.

Second, as I said, we do not touch the earmarks. The earmarks come from a separate pot, basically, if we want to simplify it. That comes from a separate pot of money, and the committee can certainly do a lot of adjusting within their earmark authority from year to year. We cannot predict, obviously, from year to year what that would be.

So, yes, the Senator is correct. There are at least two bases, and maybe others, for not knowing exactly how much money one is going to get from one year to the next, even under the existing formula.

Mr. ALLEN. As far as that is concerned in bonding and hypothecating expected revenues from the Federal Government, it is a risky business for State governments or local or regional municipal waterworks anyway.

As I understand it, the Senator is trying to make sure we are allocating scarce taxpayer resources; we are making a priority. Obviously, on drinking water—and that is not affected by

this—in the wisdom of the Senate, the House, and the Federal Government, they said—before the Presiding Officer and I were in the Senate, but it made sense—let us make sure the money is getting to those who need it the most.

The same logic is applied in the measure of the Senator from Arizona, as far as wastewater is concerned, which is very important for recreation, for water treatment and, obviously, for our enjoyment and health.

It seems to me the Senator from Arizona is moving forward, making sure, when the survey is done next year, it will utilize a needs assessment, not outdated population figures that are 20 or 30 years old, and making sure we are getting the funds to the areas that need it the most.

Most tributaries do not just flow out of one State; they start in one State and sometimes travel through several others. For example, as I mentioned, Delaware: Folks from Delaware say everything flows into the Atlantic Ocean or towards the oceanside. Some of the rivers or streams will flow through Maryland into the Chesapeake Bay. Therefore, if there is some waste coming from a stream that—and I am sure there would not be too much, but there can be from time to time, as we all know, on the Delmarva peninsula. But the point is, if one is cleaning it up on the riparian areas of the river in Delaware, that helps Maryland and that helps Virginia as well.

Sometimes we look at it on a State-by-State basis. The Colorado River flows, obviously, out of Colorado through Utah, through Arizona, through a part of or at least the border of Nevada and California. The Potomac River actually starts some of the tributaries in Virginia, goes through West Virginia, obviously through Maryland, and obviously on the banks of Virginia. The same with the Missouri, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Kanawa, the Cheat—all sorts of rivers go through many States.

I ask the Senator from Arizona one final question: What would he say is the most salient point in how his proposal would more accurately reflect the actual wastewater treatment needs of this country than the old formula that is admitted by all to be outdated and wrong? How would his proposal, in the most salient way, make it a more accurate determination and allocation of scarce funds to the actual needs of wastewater cleanup?

Mr. KYL. I will answer the question of the Senator from Virginia by simply saying it is based upon EPA recommendations. We know growth States, population changes, account for a big part of the increased needs.

The Senator is also correct that there are some other localized factors, including waterways, the existence of waterways and other factors that bear on this. That is why I note that States that have been significantly underfunded include a big growth State such as California and the State of Illinois.

I just do not understand why Illinois has been so drastically underfunded. Ohio, maybe that is because both Ohio and Illinois have substantial waterways, as the Senator from Virginia does.

New Jersey is another State that has been woefully underfunded. Yet it is not as big a growth State as California or my own State of Arizona.

Indiana is another State that is underfunded. It could be that series of rivers in the Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois area. I cannot explain why the EPA recommends exactly what it recommends and, in comparison to the existing formula, why some States are so much out of skew. One general reason is that of population growth. There are others, as the Senator has pointed out.

The main reason this formula makes sense is EPA looks at all of this, applies a needs-based test, makes the recommendations, and those are the recommendations that we plug into the formula.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator from Arizona, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senator from Arizona. I think it is the Kyl-Fitzgerald-McCain amendment.

It is a matter of fairness. It is addressing actual needs, and there is a reason population would be more of a concern, because as population increases, obviously there may be a corresponding increase in wastewater treatment needs.

I conclude by saying I urge my colleagues to use objective standards. Do not use politics but look at objective needs to clean up the wastewater in this country.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona for spending this amount of time and effort to try to correct this inequity. It seems to have been around for several decades, and this is the time to act. Who knows when we will have another chance, the way the Senate moves.

Again, I commend the Senator from Arizona. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. It will be good for the water in their States and the water throughout the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I reiterate before a fellow Bay Senator leaves the Chamber, EPA has informed me why this amendment has a fundamental flaw. The amendment references a wastewater infrastructure needs survey to be conducted under the Safe Drinking Water Act. No such survey exists, according to EPA. The wastewater needs survey is required under the Clean Water Act, not the Safe Drinking Water Act. I wanted to make that point.

I have a question for the Senator from Arizona. I know he has put a lot of work into trying to develop this formula, but I really wanted to bring to his attention what EPA has apprised me of, and I think we need to check

that. I know the Senator likes to always operate off the basis of fact.

The EPA says the agency would be at a loss as to how to calculate a formula given this direction. So there is no needs survey on which to calculate it. We are getting "section this of that act" and "section that of that act," et cetera, which is why we need this in an authorizing bill and not on an appropriations bill. I do not dispute the Senator believes this—I want to share this information with him.

I suggest the absence of a quorum to share this information with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Kyl amendment be temporarily set aside at the concurrence of the managers, Senator KYL and Senator REID, and that when Senator SCHUMER offers his amendment regarding the HUD gun buyback, there be 60 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the amendment, with no second-degree amendments in order to either the Kyl or Schumer amendments; that at 12:30 p.m. today, Senator MCCAIN be recognized to speak with reference to the Kyl amendment, with that time not charged against the time on the Schumer amendment; that any time remaining after the time for debate on the Schumer amendment be equally divided among Senators MIKULSKI, BOND, and KYL, with the understanding that Senator FITZGERALD will have some of Senator KYL's time; that at 1:55 p.m. today, there be 2 minutes for explanation prior to a vote in relation to the Kyl amendment, to be followed by 2 minutes prior to a vote in relation to the Schumer amendment, with the time equally controlled and divided in the usual form. I further ask unanimous consent that in case Senator KYL, in his original offer of amendments, cited the wrong statutory section, he have the right to modify his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. There is no objection on this side. We believe this is an appropriate accommodation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1214

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending

amendment be laid aside and we move to the Schumer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1231.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make drug elimination grants for low-income housing available for the BuyBack America program)

On page 25, line 23, before the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That of the amount under this heading, \$15,000,000 shall be available for the BuyBack America program, enabling gun buyback initiatives undertaken by public housing authorities and their local police departments".

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will be brief. I thank the Chair of the VA-HUD subcommittee for her help on this amendment and for her general help to this Senator, for which I am forever appreciative.

I rise to introduce an amendment to restore a valuable initiative to reduce gun violence in the Nation's public housing authorities. The amendment sets aside \$15 million of the \$300 million that we allocate to the public housing drug elimination program for BuyBack America, a gun buyback program to eradicate violence in our Nation's public housing authorities. BuyBack America was introduced by the Department of HUD in November, 1999. In the first year alone, it helped local police departments in 80 cities take 20,000 guns off our streets. Guns were bought back for around \$50. The guns were taken in and then destroyed.

Since the gun buyback policy was first introduced through New York City's Toys for Guns programs in 1993—someone I have come to know, Mr. Mateo, was the initiator—thousands of low-crime, underserved neighborhoods have seized the opportunity to eradicate gun violence. The program works. From Annapolis to Atlanta, from San Francisco to Schenectady, it has helped raise gun control awareness and lower rates of violence. However, HUD last week announced its plans to discontinue BuyBack America. The program has been targeted as part of a campaign, in my judgment at least, by the administration against any kind of gun control, no matter how moderate, how rational, and how protective of the rights of legitimate gun owners—which this program clearly is.

In fact, the President's budget this year zeroed out funding for the entire Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, which had been funded through Senator MIKULSKI's leadership, and I know my colleague has been involved as well, for which we thank him.

If we do not set aside a certain amount for gun buyback programs, it will not be done by the administration,

given its unfriendly position toward even modest measures dealing with taking guns away from kids and criminals.

So I ask that this amendment be supported. I, temporarily at least, yield back my time with the right to come back later and speak further on the amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I acknowledge the cooperation of the Senator working with us. Before I speak on the amendment, I am going to inform the Senator that we are scheduled to move his amendment aside at 12:30 when those tied up in Commerce are coming over. Then we are scheduled to come back to the amendment of the Senator, I believe, at quarter of 1.

I want to advise the Senator of that. I think he was dealing with a very pressing New York need and did not hear the unanimous consent agreement, though we had the cooperation of his staff.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor. I will be back at 12:45 to resume the debate.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Before he leaves, the Senator from New York should know I am going to support his amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Once again, the Senator from Maryland hits a home run for New York, Maryland, and America. Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, one of the things that occurred in the VA-HUD budget as it came from the President was to eliminate \$300 million for drug elimination in public housing.

The Presiding Officer's predecessor was one of the champions of that, the distinguished former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Lautenberg. We worked hands on, on many of the items. We think that \$300 million in drug elimination is a very important program.

At the same time as we have been saying to the Senator from Arizona and others we are not going to break new ground in this bill because of the transitions both of the executive branch as well as the legislative branch, the committee has restored the \$300 million in drug elimination funds. We have restored that because we know we have to get drugs out of public housing. We know we have to make sure, in getting the drugs out of public housing, that public housing provides an opportunity to be not only a way of life, but to lead to a better life.

We turned to the authorizers and we encouraged them to hold hearings on what has the most efficacy, making sure public housing is neither a slum landlord nor an incubator for drug dealing, and we encouraged them to do that. The Schumer amendment mandates that we keep the gun buyback program which Secretary Martinez would like to eliminate.

We think, again, it is the executive branch acting and so on. We need conversation, again, on what is the most effective way to deal with crime in our

communities, gun violence in our communities. I have had in the past several years the most gruesome statistics in Maryland. I like being from a State of Super Bowl champions, and I love the show "Homicide" that was on, that was so terrific. But what I did not like was the homicide rate. Thanks to Mayor O'Malley and Commissioner Norris, we are bringing that down. But gun violence—we are like a war zone.

The Schumer amendment would give our local police departments and our public housing authorities the opportunity to operate a gun buyback program using Federal dollars. But it is their choice. In other words, the Feds do not say you must do it, nor do the Feds say you cannot do it; it leaves it up to the local community whether they think it has efficacy in that area. It might not work in every community. We do not have that one-size-fits-all on how to deal with ending violence and getting drugs out of public housing. But each city or county should have the opportunity to operate a gun buyback program if it chooses.

Many public housing complexes function almost as small cities unto themselves. They have their own police departments; they have their own governing authority. They really are, in some instances, small towns. We, of course, would like to make sure they have the sense of being a village. They have unique needs, require special help and attention.

This program was started in 1999 during the Clinton administration. It provided up to \$500,000 for police departments around the country to buy back and destroy weapons. During the first year of operation, 20,000 guns were taken off the street in 80 different cities.

The amendment gives our local police more resources in fighting crime. We should not second-guess those local decisions on how to do it. Whether it is the cops on the beat or gun buybacks, it will allow the local authorities to do that. We must do everything we can to protect our citizens who live in public housing and those who live around public housing because everything that goes bad with public housing goes bad with the neighborhood near public housing.

I support this Schumer amendment. I look forward to its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes from the opponent's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chair of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland, for explaining why this is an important but misdirected amendment.

First, I express my sincere appreciation to the chair of the subcommittee for including in the bill the money that was zeroed out by the administration for the drug elimination program. I

worked with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina several years ago to include money for eliminating drugs in public housing because it has been our heartfelt belief for a long time that we need to make assisted housing—whether it be public housing or whether it be section 8 financed housing—the kind of housing where a mother, or mother and father, would want to raise their children in a proper atmosphere.

Getting drugs out of public housing, making sure it is safe, is probably one of the very first steps in addition to keeping the rain out and keeping the cold out in winter. Making sure it is safe and drug free is vitally important. I was very disappointed that the administration zeroed it out.

We now have it back in the bill, and there is the flexibility in the PHAs to use this money however they want. The amendment by the Senator, my good friend from New York, would establish a \$15 million set-aside in the public housing drug elimination fund for the gun buyback program. It is unnecessary because right now, if they wish to do so, a PHA can use money for the buyback. It takes away the choice and the decision from the local levels.

Local public housing authorities can conduct drug buy-back programs under the drug elimination grant. The bottom line is it is not mandatory. The PHA makes a choice, based upon its need to eliminate crime and illegal drug activity, what is the best thing we can do in this community to protect our friends and neighbors from drug crime.

That is a legitimate choice. I support that local choice, despite the fact to my knowledge there is no evidence that gun buyback programs actually reduce crime or illegal drug activity. They make people feel good. It is a feel-good program.

But let me ask you, my colleagues. Let's apply a commonsense test. Sometimes back home some of the things you hear on the street corner at the place where you have breakfast make a whole lot more sense than some of the very sophisticated things that we discuss up here. I was talking to some of the guys out at the livestock market breakfast place where I go out for breakfast every Saturday morning. They said: Tell me. If you were a criminal and they had a gun buyback program, would you go in and sell your gun to the gun buyback program?

I said: What do you mean? Say the cops or the PHA have a gun buyback program. Rather than using my good gun to go out and make holdups, I am going to get \$5 for the buyback.

He said: No. You find an old gun that doesn't work, or you go out and steal a few more guns. Say I have 15 or 20 guns that are inoperable, outdated, and ineffective. I will trade them in. You know what I can do with that money. I can either get drugs or buy some ammunition for my good gun.

Ask the gang back home. Go to the town square and ask them. How many

criminals do you think are going to sell their guns to the buyback program? They are going to tell you none, or fewer.

That is just common sense. I don't believe there is any evidence on the other side.

Having that said, if PHA believes it will make everybody feel good, and if they think it will help to use money for a gun buyback program, go for it.

But I tell you it is one program that I just think doesn't meet the common-sense test. It just does not make any sense to me.

I urge my colleagues to leave the discretion with the public housing authorities and not seek to take money away from security needs, or from other things, or from programs that have some questions about it.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

First of all, I thank the managers of this bill for their courtesy. I know they appreciate the fact that we had a markup of some important legislation this morning in the Commerce Committee. I apologize for any delay that may have caused in completing this very important appropriations bill. I thank the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri for their courtesy in not only allowing me to speak on the amendment of my colleague from Arizona but also for allowing me to propose my amendment.

I understand that it is the wish of the managers that it be laid aside after I propose it, and then I would speak on it after 2 o'clock. I ask the Senator from Maryland if that is the case.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona repeat his question?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, my understanding of the parliamentary procedure is that at this time I will speak on behalf of the Kyl amendment, propose my amendment, then ask that it be laid aside, and that I would be allowed to speak on my amendment after the two votes at 2 o'clock.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If the Senator will withhold, we have a very complicated unanimous consent here to accommodate Senators. I wish to bring to the Senator's attention that at about 5 until 2 we are going to have two votes: one on Kyl and one on Schumer. Then we will be happy for the Senator to send up his amendment. Maybe we will not be happy with the Senator's amendment, but we will be happy for the Senator to offer it.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Again, I express my appreciation for her accommodation. I know it is difficult to accommodate each Senator who has a very busy schedule. I thank the managers for their accommodation to mine.

AMENDMENT NO. 1229

I rise to support my colleague, Senator KYL, as a cosponsor of his amendment to the VA-HUD appropriations bill. I believe this is a very good amendment, one that is entirely appropriate to this bill as it directly relates to a more fair distribution of Federal dollars for water and wastewater infrastructure needs among the 50 States and territories of our nation.

This amendment is simple—it will address a funding inequity in EPA funding by applying the formula under the Safe Drinking Water Act revolving loan fund to the Clean Water Act revolving loan fund for fiscal year 2002.

Why is this important?

For about 12 years, the EPA has managed a Clean Water State revolving loan fund for capitalization purposes to construct water infrastructure and related projects. The funds are distributed on a State-by-State basis and utilized as seed money for State-administered loans for water infrastructure needs. It operates as an important source of capital with State flexibility to set their own priorities.

Back in 1996, the Safe Drinking Water Act was amended to establish a similar State revolving loan fund to address safe drinking water infrastructure needs.

While these two operating loan funds are similar in intent, the Clean Water revolving loan fund utilizes outdated information in its allocation distributions. As my colleague, Senator KYL, has noted, it's very difficult to address the various States' growing needs when the allocation formula is based on information relevant to the 1970's.

I would like to describe how my State has changed since the 1970s. We have grown from a very small State in the 1970s with two Members of Congress. As a result of the latest census, we are now a very medium to a large State that will now have eight members of our congressional delegation. Our State has grown, according to the 1990 to the 2000 census, in a 10-year period 40 percent—40-percent growth in a 10-year period.

There has been similar growth in other States in the West. New Mexico, Colorado, California, and a number of other States have grown significantly—perhaps not percentage-wise as large as ours but certainly in the case of numbers; Nevada has also experienced dramatic growth.

What Senator KYL and I are arguing here is that there needs to be a reformulation to reflect demographic reality.

I want to point out what everyone who lives west of the Mississippi knows. Water is more precious than gold. Water is the limiting factor in the growth of our States in the West. Water is what will be and has been the cause of major disputes throughout the West.

I believe Mark Twain said that in the West whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting. Mark Twain had it right

because water is the key factor in the ability of our States to sustain the growth and maintain a lifestyle that allows people to choose to move to the West and have the kind of lifestyle that they deserve. The formula has not been updated to consider states with substantial growth or more recent documented needs established by the EPA in its own analyses.

In contrast, the similar Safe Drinking Water revolving loan fund has been operating by the designated allocation formula under the 1996 Act that required the EPA to allocate funding according to the agency's Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey. While these two revolving funds are substantially similar, only one uses updated and relevant data. This is an unfortunate discrepancy and it should be fixed.

This amendment simply tries to fulfill the intended purpose of the original Clean Water Act by allocating important Federal dollars on a needs-based system that is current and valid to the States' identified priorities.

Communities in my home State of Arizona have been frustrated by the formula distribution inequity as their water and wastewater needs continue to be underfunded and ignored. The Arizona State water authority estimates it may have lost out on \$250-300 million due to the oversight in establishing a fair and updated formula. However, this is not just about Arizona. It is about a majority of the States funded through the current Clean Water revolving loan fund distribution formula whom are facing the same disparities.

Unfortunately, the Clean Water Act has not been amended since 1987. While authorization for the act expired in 1990, the programs under act are continued by annual appropriations while the Congress continues to work toward a comprehensive reauthorization.

In the meantime, Congress has circumvented the act by earmarking as much as 30 percent of the general funds available for water and wastewater needs for special interest projects through this appropriations bill. Many of these funded projects are not authorized in the Clean Water Act and do not abide by the funding distributions process identified in the act.

This continuing earmarking process is not a practice favored by State water quality officials, State infrastructure financing officials, or by the EPA. Earmarking funds from the overall State revolving fund decreases the amount available to other communities that desperately need assistance. It undermines the intent of the State revolving loan fund; it does not allow States to determine their own priorities; and, it prolongs the wait for States to receive the necessary funds to address their water needs.

In my review of the EPA section of this appropriations bill, I found that one-fourth of the earmarks of the 180 earmarks included in the EPA section are not targeted for States—but for

consortiums, universities, or foundations. How is this abiding by the intent of the law?

While I disagree with the earmarking process and I hope that it changes, I also understand that this amendment does not affect those projects identified for funding in this bill under the current water and wastewater accounts. We did that, with all due respect, because we knew that if we affected any earmarking, we would remove whatever chance we might have of adoption of this amendment. What it will impact is the undesignated amounts of funding for the clean water revolving loan fund to ensure a more fair and equitable distribution for this coming fiscal year. This is particularly important as this VA-HUD appropriations bill proposes to increase overall funding in this account by \$500 million, for a total of \$1.35 billion.

With an estimated \$300 billion needed over the next 20 years to fix our existing water systems and build new ones, we simply cannot allow this inequity to continue.

EPA's guidelines stipulate that the intent of the revolving loan fund is:

To provide a basis for equal consideration of all eligible water quality projects for state revolving fund funding.

Let's remedy this problem and fulfill the intent of this important act.

Mr. President, I would just like to mention my appreciation for Senator KYL's efforts on this issue. As many of my colleagues may know, Senator KYL's background in the legal profession was on issues of water. I would put his credentials against those of anyone in this body on this very important issue.

I already described earlier how important water is in the whole future of the western part of the United States, particularly those of us in the Southwest. Barry Goldwater, my predecessor, used to say quite often, only half humorously: "We have so little water in Arizona, the trees chase the dogs." We have not reached that point yet, but the fact is, what we do need, as in every situation where there have been demographic changes—and in the Southwest and in the West there have been profound demographic changes, as we all know, since the 1970s and the 1980s—we just need to upgrade and modernize this formula.

We are not asking for a special deal for Arizona. We are not asking for a special deal for any State. We are simply asking—and we are not even affecting the present earmarking process, on which my views are well known in this body—that an update year 2001 formula be implemented so that everyone can receive funding according to the greatest need, again, according to the guidelines that are stipulated, "to provide a basis for equal consideration of all eligible water quality projects for state revolving fund funding."

I thank my colleague from Arizona for bringing forward what some view as an esoteric issue in some respects but a

vital issue—a vital issue for all of those States that are now not being treated on an equal basis—of our water supplies and projects.

So I thank my colleague from Arizona and urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the amendment to the VA/HUD appropriations bill offered by Senator KYL.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, of which I am the new Chair, has jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act. Through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund provisions of this act, Federal funding is provided to communities throughout the Nation to protect water quality. Senator KYL's amendment would significantly alter the formula" used in the "SRF" to allocate these federal funds among States.

Last evening, in the debate related to arsenic, many Senators noted the tremendous financial challenge that communities face in continuing to provide clean, affordable drinking water. It is important to recognize that these communities face an equally tremendous challenge when it comes to keeping pace with the wastewater treatment, stormwater management, and other types of water infrastructure they need to protect water quality.

The Clean Water SRF was specifically designed to help communities meet these water infrastructure needs. However, over the next 20 years, the water infrastructure needs of our Nation are estimated to be as much as \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion. The current annual level of funding provided through the SRF—averaging roughly \$1 billion per year—comes nowhere near meeting needs of this magnitude.

Because these funds are so desperately needed by so many communities, the Senate should proceed very cautiously when making changes to the Clean Water SRF.

When I became the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I stated that one of my top priorities was to craft legislation to ensure that the Federal Government meets its responsibility to assist communities in meeting their drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs. Under the leadership of the now ranking member, Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, the committee has already begun this process.

I am committed to continuing this effort, and I look forward to working closely with Senator SMITH, the chair and ranking member of our Water Subcommittee, and other members of the committee and the Senate as we move forward.

The Environment and Public Works Committee will carefully consider a number of issues critical to meeting our national water infrastructure needs as this legislation develops. Among these issues will be the subject addressed by Senator KYL's amendment—the allocation of money to States through the Clean Water SRF.

We will be thoroughly studying the current "formula" used for allocating Federal funds by this program and, if appropriate, we will modify it to ensure it is fair and adequately serves the Nation.

As I mentioned previously, the tremendous water infrastructure needs faced by our Nation—coupled with inadequacy of Federal resources currently available to help communities meet them—demands that we proceed cautiously.

I am concerned that changing the funding "formula" for the Clean Water SRF in an appropriations bill, as we rush to complete Senate business before August recess, is not such a cautious approach.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kyl amendment, and allow the Environment and Public Works Committee the opportunity to craft legislation that reflects a carefully and thorough consideration of the solutions to our Nation's water tremendous infrastructure needs.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I appreciate the issue that my distinguished colleague from Arizona has brought to the attention of the Senate with his amendment, and that is the need to re-evaluate how we distribute funding to the states under the Clean Water Revolving Fund. The Senator is right. It appears that it has been a long time since we took a hard look at where our most pressing infrastructure needs are. And don't get me wrong, Montana looks like it would do very well if Senator KYL's amendment were to succeed.

But addressing the serious problems that exist with our Nation's water and wastewater infrastructure is something that falls squarely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. This is an issue that needs the full time and attention of the authorizing Committee. What is the most appropriate floor, or minimum share for each state, because that's where Montana would fall. What is the most appropriate ceiling? Again, I think this just is too important an issue to address in a short debate over an amendment to an appropriations bill. I understand that this is one of the issues Chairman JEFFORDS plans to take up in the fall, and I will encourage him to do that, because frankly, I agree with Senator KYL that it's high time we took a look at these formulas to make sure we are spending our limited resources in the most efficient and effective way possible.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226, AS MODIFIED, TO
AMENDMENT NO. 1214

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, at this time I rise to offer an amendment. I have a modification to my amendment. I believe it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], proposes an amendment numbered 1226, as modified to amendment No. 1214.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, No. 1226, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce by \$5,000,000 amounts available for certain projects funded by the Community Development Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make the amount available for veterans claims adjudication)

On page 105, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 428. (a) REDUCTION IN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS FUNDED BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND.—The amount appropriated by title II under the heading “EMPLOYMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES” under the paragraph “COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND” is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000. The amount of the reduction shall be derived from the termination of the availability of funds under that paragraph for projects, and in amounts, as follows:

(1) \$375,000 for the Fells Point Creative Alliance of Baltimore, Maryland, for development of the Patterson Center for the Arts.

(2) \$150,000 for the County of Kauai, Hawaii, for the Heritage Trails project.

(3) \$375,000 for infrastructure improvements to the School of the Building Arts in Charleston, South Carolina.

(4) \$50,000 for development assistance for Desert Space Station in Nevada.

(5) \$125,000 for the Center Theatre Group, of Los Angeles, California, for the Culver City Theater project.

(6) \$500,000 for the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism for development activities related to the Louisiana Purchase Bicentennial Celebration.

(7) \$225,000 for the City of Providence, Rhode Island, for the development of a Botanical Center at Roger Williams Park and Zoo.

(8) \$100,000 for the Newport Art Museum in Newport, Rhode Island, for historical renovation.

(9) \$125,000 for the City of Wildwood, New Jersey, for revitalization of the Pacific Avenue Business District.

(10) \$150,000 for Studio for the Arts of Pochontas, Arkansas, for a new facility.

(11) \$500,000 for the Southern New Mexico Fair and Rodeo in Dona Ana County, New Mexico, for infrastructure improvements and to build a multi-purpose event center.

(12) \$500,000 for Dubuque, Iowa, for the development of an American River Museum.

(13) \$500,000 for Sevier County, Utah, for a multi-events center.

(14) \$50,000 to the OLYMPIA ship of Independence Seaport Museum to provide ship repairs which will contribute to the economic development of the Penn's Landing waterfront area in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(15) \$250,000 for the Lewis and Clark State College, Idaho, for the Idaho Virtual Incubator.

(16) \$500,000 for Henderson, North Carolina, for the construction of the Embassy Cultural Center.

(17) \$50,000 to the Alabama Wildlife Federation for the development of the Alabama Quail Trail in rural Alabama.

(18) \$175,000 for the Urban Development authority of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for the Harbor Gardens Greenhouse project.

(b) INCREASE IN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR VETERANS CLAIMS ADJUDICATION.—The amount appropriated by title I under the heading “DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION” under the paragraph “GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES” is hereby increased by \$5,000,000,

with the amount of the increase to be available for veterans claims adjudication.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 1226 be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KYL, Senator GRAHAM of Florida, and Senator SMITH of New Hampshire be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. At this time I understand it is the wish of the managers that I lay aside this amendment and that we debate it following the votes that will take place beginning at 1:55.

Mr. REID. I did not hear the request.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be laid aside until following the votes that will take place at 1:55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains for both sides on the Schumer amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor has 21 minutes 10 seconds; the opponents have 24 minutes 42 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. Could you repeat that? The sponsor has how much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor has 21 minutes 10 seconds; the opponents have 24 minutes 42 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will now speak on the Schumer amendment, and I will use such time as I might consume on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator may proceed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator from New York brings an amendment to this Chamber—certainly, I think, with the most sincere of intent—to set aside \$15 million; in other words, to mandate the gun surrender program that just a few weeks ago the Bush administration announced it was terminating, largely because it does not work. So what I thought I would do, for the next few moments, is sketch for us the facts about gun surrender programs over the last several years and why they do not work.

As we know, there is no mandate in the law. President Clinton and Secretary Cuomo changed the description of the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program to allow public housing authorities to make grants available for gun surrender initiatives. It is interesting that of the 1,000 housing authorities this change affected, only about 100 took advantage of the program.

There is a peculiar reason they took advantage of the program. Very early on, starting back in 1978, it became obvious gun surrender programs were a

great photo opportunity for local law enforcement and, in some instances, certain housing agencies or groups. Never mind that they did nothing to deter crime. In fact, they were not taking off the streets guns being used in crimes. It was an opportunity to get rid of some old guns, some antiques, something that filled your closet that your granddad had given you that might not be worth anything and you wanted to get rid of any way; and you did not know how to get rid of it; and along came local law enforcement that said: “We are going to have a gun surrender program.” So you take a gun down to the police station and get \$50 or \$100 or \$150 for it.

The guns turned in belonged to people who least likely were involved in the commission of a crime. For example, senior citizens and spouses who had inherited guns that may have been their husbands’ who had passed away were the ones most often who came to sell their guns.

Some guns turned in were the cheap handguns purchased, as the Senator from Missouri mentioned, for the express purpose of selling them: You go out on the street and buy a gun for \$15 or \$20 and sell it for \$100. Hey, let me tell you, folks are not stupid, they are going to play an advantage if they can find one, and in many instances they did.

So let me give you a little history.

In 1978, when we first saw gun buyback programs, overall crime was not significantly reduced in the 17-month period following the gun buyback program in Baltimore, MD. I believe that was the first one, in 1978. Who reports that? The Comptroller General of the United States.

Then we look at the 1992 Seattle gun surrender program. It too failed. It did not reduce gun injuries, deaths, or crimes. It didn’t save anyone from being victimized by crime. But it made for a great photo opportunity.

In 1996, the program that collected the greatest number of guns, as was mentioned, was the Baltimore program. Yet the rate of gun killings rose 50 percent and gun assaults more than doubled while the program was in effect. This was the largest gun surrender program ever implemented, in terms of the number of guns purchased. Gun deaths shot up 50 percent. And assaults more than doubled.

If you want politics and you want publicity, then gun surrender programs are great. You can show tables covered with 15- or 20-year-old guns that would never have been used in the commission of a crime. It is a great photo op.

In 1998, according to the National Institute of Justice looked at various crime fighting measures and asked, “What doesn’t work?” Their answer? Gun surrender programs. They failed to reduce violent crime in even two more cities: St. Louis, and Seattle.

Many of us who live part time in this city saw the publicity that went on and the very good-faith effort the Washington, DC, police made in 1999 with

their gun surrender program. More than half of the 2,912 weapons bought by the District of Columbia police for \$100 were 15 years of age or older, according to the District of Columbia police themselves.

The Senator from New York knows as well as I do that guns used in crimes are typically 9-millimeter or .38 caliber semiautomatic pistols. Those are the ones most often cited in crime reports that are used in the commission of a crime. Such are not the guns collected by these programs.

Gun surrender programs don't work. That is why the Bush administration—the President, HUD Secretary Martinez—came forward and said: This is a bad use of scarce resources. If we are interested in making public housing safer—and we are—if we are interested in getting drugs out of public housing—and we are—then the \$15 million the Senator from New York would waste on photo opportunities would better be used in law enforcement efforts within public housing and elsewhere.

What the Senator from Missouri, the ranking member of the appropriations subcommittee, has said is that within the current law, it is an option. In other words, if a housing agency wants to divert some of its funds for a gun buyback, they can do so. But the reason none of them do it is because they know it doesn't work. They know that funds are limited, and they know that they can use their money elsewhere to more effectively improve the safety of the citizens who live within those housing units and the community at large.

That is why gun surrender programs are on the wane today, are no longer popular, unless you are interested in a photo op. The facts are out there. They don't work. In many instances, unless you have good law enforcement on the street and you have let the criminal know that if he uses a gun in the commission of a crime he is going to have to do time, then the use of guns in the commission of a crime goes up. It has been proven in Baltimore. It is clearly true in Seattle. I don't think it changed the statistics in Washington, DC.

We did get a lot of old guns and some antiques out of the closets of law-abiding citizens because it was a way for them to market them, in some instances, for a great deal more than they might otherwise have gotten for them.

With that, I yield the floor and retain the remainder of our time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Senator SCHUMER's amendment would, if accepted, waste \$15 million in taxpayer money on a program that has proved to be a failure. This amendment has more to do with partisan politics than sound public policy. In my view, we should not spend even one red cent of taxpayer money for such purposes.

Housing, Urban and Development Secretary Mel Martinez was right to terminate the gun buyback program.

And he did so for a single, sound reason: such programs do not reduce crime. I will cite just a few of the conclusions reached by those who have examined these programs.

First, "overall crime was not significantly reduced in the 17-month period following the [Baltimore] buyback program." Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, *Handgun Control: Effectiveness and Costs*, 2/6/78.

In addition, gun buyback programs may encourage gun thefts, with the Government serving, in effect, as a reliable fence for the stolen guns. Such programs also give offenders a profitable way to dispose of weapons used in crimes. Dr. Philip J. Cook, criminologist at Duke University.

Finally, another study found that "[1992] Seattle buy-back program failed to reduce significantly the frequency of firearms injuries, deaths, or crimes." Callahan, et al., "Money for Guns: Evaluation of the Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program," *Public Health Reports*, July-August 1994.

Thus, this debate should not be about gun politics. It should be about our responsibility to spend the taxpayers' money wisely. If the supporters of this amendment truly care about public safety, we should spend the \$15 million dollars on hiring additional police officers to patrol high-crime public housing areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think I have 21 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, it is always a pleasure to debate with my good friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG. He makes very good but not persuasive arguments, at least in my opinion.

Let me say a couple things about this issue. First, we all know about methods of proof. Senator CRAIG is citing statistics: Crime went up here, gun use went up here while there was a buyback program. I could find just as many localities where crime went down while there was a buyback program.

The bottom line is, the buyback programs mainly occur in cities where there is lots of other factors going on, and no one can prove one way or the other whether this works or doesn't work. You can't prove it beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let's use commonsense logic. Commonsense logic is, if a gun is not in the hands of a family, a person who doesn't want it, isn't our society likely to have less gun violence? It is very hard to prove that is wrong.

Certainly, if you believe there is a moral imperative that everyone have a gun, you are against this program. If you believe the way to reduce law enforcement is to give every man and woman and child a gun—there are some who believe that—oppose this amend-

ment. But if you believe gun owners have rights and Americans are entitled to have guns, but there is also some danger to guns and that we should be careful, why not have a program that says: If you want—you are not being compelled—if you want to bring your gun back in and get \$50 for it, you can. It is perfectly sensible and logical to think that works.

I don't want to oversell this program. It is not a panacea. We have not put hundreds of millions of dollars in but merely 15. In the eyes of most people who should know, it has worked.

Let me quote the mayor of Houston in the State of Texas, hardly a State and a city known for its strong advocacy of gun control. Mayor Lee Brown was the former police commissioner of New York City so he has a great deal of law enforcement background:

Having spent my career in law enforcement, I recognize that gun buybacks are a very effective way of reducing the number of guns in circulation.

This has worked all over the country. In Lexington, KY, 1,517 guns were purchased; Toledo, OH, 1,050; Atlanta, 838. We can talk about criminals and kids going out and using the guns. What about accidents? If a family doesn't want a gun in a home and doesn't know how to dispose of it, doesn't allowing them to go to their local police precinct and have the gun bought back help?

Let's not debate theology here. I would be happy to debate theology, and I did with my good friend from Idaho in many different areas in terms of guns. But this is not a theological issue unless you are part of that small band who believe that the best thing that can happen to America is everyone should have a gun. I don't. I am sort of agnostic. I don't think we should take away everybody's gun, and I don't think we should give everybody a gun. I think we should let law-abiding people make their own decisions. But the very logic that my good friend from Idaho uses: let people make their own decisions, is gainsaid by this amendment.

Let's say somebody has bought a gun and wants to get rid of it. Why not? I don't understand the logic of the opposition. I do understand the opposition.

Let me say to my colleagues that the Bush administration, very quietly but really, has begun a campaign to roll back the moderate, sensible measures that we have had to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals, not just in this issue. Attorney General Ashcroft sent a letter to the NRA, where he said there had to be a compelling State interest to have a gun control law. As a lawyer, we both know that "compelling State interest" is next to impossible to prove. Many lawyers argue that under that theory the Brady law could be thrown out as unconstitutional, despite the fact that not a single person has ever been shown to be legally deprived of a gun because of the Brady law. Yet it has

kept hundreds of thousands of felons from buying them.

Then, amazingly enough—you know, we keep records on everything; the IRS keeps records; every agency keeps records—well, the FBI has kept records on gun purchases, as the ATF has, by gun dealers. Jim Kessler, on my staff, a few years ago, found out something that changed the way we think about gun control. He found that 50 percent of the guns used in crimes came from 1 percent of the dealers. Let me repeat that because it is an astounding finding. Fifty percent of the guns used in crimes come from 1 percent of the dealers. When we found those numbers, I thought there was a real breakthrough because the NRA had always said, “Don’t pass new laws, enforce the existing laws.”

I, again, want to do something to reduce gun violence. And here we had the opportunity to go after the 1 percent of the dealers who are putting guns, a hugely disproportionate amount of guns, into criminal hands. We could come down on them and not come down on all the others—the very thing the NRA preaches, that most people who own and sell guns are law abiding was proven by this report and we could just come down on the 1 percent. All of a sudden, the administration wants to destroy the records so we can no longer come to 1 percent.

I will tell you what happened here. The administration stealthily has been moving to an extreme position on gun control. President Bush, when he campaigned, did not take such positions, but that is where they are moving. On issue after issue after issue, that has happened. That is why this buyback proposal, modest as it was, was taken out of the HUD-VA appropriation, not because they had done exhaustive studies about whether it works or not, not because we could not afford it; these are no new dollars; they come out of an existing program, but because that narrow band of ideologues, way out of the mainstream, the kind of people who think many of our brave law enforcement people are black-booted thugs, it was said, put pressure on the administration to move way over. Hence, they removed this provision.

Again, I say to my colleagues, anyone who tells you absolutely that this program doesn’t work doesn’t have the statistics. Conversely, anyone who tells you we can prove beyond any doubt that it does work is also overselling because they don’t have the statistics either, and I don’t want to claim that. But by simple logic, particularly in inner cities where we know there are too many guns, giving people an incentive to sell the gun back, an unwanted gun, it is very hard to disagree that it would reduce the amount of accidents caused in the home by guns and the amount of crime caused by kids and criminals with guns.

So if you want to brandish your ideological sword, show the NRA that you are with them all the way, vote against

this amendment. If you want to reduce crime or have a good chance of doing it, get some very dangerous things out of the hands of those who don’t want them, vote for this amendment.

This is hardly the most important issue on gun control we will debate. I am amazed it has brought such opposition, such attention, and such focus from the administration. But I do believe, with all due respect to my colleague from Idaho, that the motivation to remove this amendment is not people’s safety, but an ideology that says everybody, everybody, everybody should have a gun, and that makes America a better place.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will use such time as I might consume within our time limitation. I, too, enjoy engaging my colleague from New York on this issue. The Senator from New York, as I said while he was not on the floor, does, I think, bring this amendment with good intent. He has been an outspoken advocate of gun control and wants to eliminate crime in which guns are used. I certainly want to eliminate guns crime. We all do.

Let me suggest to you today that while the Senator from New York might like to engage me in a theological debate, this isn’t one. This debate is over \$15 million and how it can best be used in housing authorities to combat crime and drug use.

The committee has worked its will. They have said it is an option. If you want to do a gun surrender program, it is an option but it is not mandatory.

Let me tell you one reason why.

I think the Senator from New York would find this an interesting fact because it comes from New York City. If I may have the attention of the Senator from New York, I found this a fascinating problem because what is happening out there is that somebody is gaming a bad program.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. When the Senator said this was an option before the amendment, it was an option for the administration. As I understand it, it would not be an option in the New York City Housing Authority, or any housing authority that got \$20 million out of this program; they would not be allowed to take \$1 million and set that aside for a buyback program. The administration has the option of not allowing these funds for this purpose under the present statute. If the Senator will answer that.

Mr. CRAIG. We have the chairman of the subcommittee on the floor. I have not read the specifics of the provision within the appropriation. But I was told by the ranking member that housing authorities, under this current legislation, have the option, if they

choose, to do a gun buyback. Is that accurate or inaccurate? I don’t want to misstate the reality of the legislation.

Mr. SCHUMER. If I may answer—

Mr. CRAIG. I ask the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on VA-HUD if that flexibility exists within the law. Does the chairman know that?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Let me advise the Senator what my staff told me. I might also need a moment for additional clarification.

As I understand the legislation, there is currently an option. What the Schumer amendment does is do a setaside, am I correct?

Mr. SCHUMER. That is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does that clarify it?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes. Therefore, the statement I made was accurate. I said that within the law there is an option to use the money, if an authority wishes to, for the purpose of a gun buyback. Is that an inaccurate statement?

Mr. SCHUMER. If the Senator will yield, it is true, it is an option. As I understand it—

Mr. CRAIG. That is all I need to have.

Mr. SCHUMER. If I might finish.

Mr. CRAIG. On your time only.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to answer on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. The option has been foreclosed by the administration. They said they would not spend any of this money and not allow the housing authorities to spend any of this money for a buyback program. That is what has happened. It would not be available to the housing authority, even though in the law it is an option. The administration sets out regulations, and the buyback program would not be part of the regulation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. I think that is appropriate. I am not going to disagree with the Senator from New York on that proviso, because what is in the law today was done by the Clinton administration and not a mandate of the Congress itself.

President Clinton and Secretary Cuomo did that by regulatory change. So there is flexibility. What is true in the law, which we are dealing with in this Chamber, is the option. The Schumer amendment would mandate a specific amount of money to be used for that purpose.

Let me quote an article I found most fascinating from the New York Daily News Online, July 28, 2000:

A gun buyback program to get illegal weapons off the streets had to be altered yesterday after a stampede of court officers [that is, law enforcement officers] tried to cash in. Brooklyn District Attorney Charles Hynes ordered changes in the initiative when he found out that court officers—some of them in uniform—were handing in their old .38 caliber service revolvers. Because the program had pulled in only about 200 guns since the one-month window began on July 1, Hynes upped the reward on Monday from \$100 to \$250 per gun.

In other words, it was not working, a point that has been driven home numerous times. The Senator from New York says: It feels good. So let us dump \$15 million because it feels good, while we all know it is a whale of a photo-op.

Here is what happened, and this is a quote from the district attorney:

We had a surge last night of about 100 guns and they all seemed to be .38 [caliber] service revolvers.

According to the article:

One court officer collected \$1,500 by turning in six guns.

And even though people were gaming the system, officials had to pay for the guns because they had made the offer. The point is—

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. Let me finish.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. CRAIG. Let me finish my thought, and then I will be happy to give the Senator his time to debate.

The reality is, it confirms the point that the program gets gamed. In 1978, in Baltimore, it did not work. Crime went up. In this city over 2,000 guns were purchased, many of them 15 years of age and older. They are not the current weapon used on the street in street crime.

If a family finds a gun on their hands which they inherited and they do not know what to do with it, they could take it down to the local police department and hand it in. They could do that. They do not have to be paid to get rid of a gun. They can hand it in or they can take it down to a pawn shop and get a little money.

I find this a fascinating quote, and I think the Senator from New York will find it fascinating also. The Boston Globe, Tuesday October 24, 2000:

The threat was gun violence—

And I must say the threat today is still gun violence.

the stakes, the lives of urban youth.

The stakes today, in many instances, the lives of urban youth. Both the Senator from New York and I are concerned about that.

The image was a body face down in blood and the sound was the wail of sirens, funeral hymns, and more gunfire. Amid the violence that gripped urban centers nationwide in the 1990s, America's call to stop the violence was a cry of civic activism: Everybody turn in your guns.

It caught on with the made-for-television popularity. Guns for money. Guns for food. Guns for concert tickets. Guns for therapy, for shopping trips, and in one town in Illinois, firearms for a free table dance at a strip club.

In this case, the offer was and I quote

Buns for Guns. Around the country and in Boston, gun buybacks spurred intense publicity. Private sponsors poured money into the programs. Led by groups Citizens for Safety, Boston collected 2,800 guns in four years.

With gun violence again on the rise this year—

That is the year 2000—

the cry to bring back the buyback is growing among some Boston activists. But almost five years after the last goods-for-guns event, crime specialists and some police officials are warning against them, saying gun buybacks were and are among the least effective tools for public safety.

Studies of gun buybacks, including a Harvard analysis —

And I know the Senator from New York says statistics do not matter. This is just a feel good amendment, but we are talking about \$15 million in taxpayer money

of Boston's program, say unanimously that the programs don't work. In an interview yesterday, Boston Police Commissioner Paul F. Evans said that in retrospect, buybacks failed to produce the impact many had hoped for or expected.

I could go on to quote more of the Boston Globe article. Whether it is food for guns, tickets for guns, or money for guns, it did not work. That is why the Bush administration has said it is a bad use of money. I do not care if one feels good or feels bad, or one does not want to believe in the statistics that come from Harvard University, the reality is we have to get at crime in our housing and it is not done by throwing \$15 million at a program that flat out does not work.

If someone has an old gun in their closet and they want to get it out of the hands of anybody in their family, take it to the police department and give it to them. They do not have to be paid, or they could take it to a pawn shop and get 5 or 10 bucks maybe.

The problem is that much of what we were buying for \$100 to \$250 was not pawnable because it was old, it was antique, and it was nonfunctional. As the Senator from New York says, though, if it feels good, then maybe we ought to do it. We should not do it for \$15 million, not when our budgets are tight and not when we are scrambling over where to get money to do all other kinds of programs that are important to the American people.

I do not always agree with Harvard, but Harvard has studied the program in Boston and they say it does not work. Law enforcement says it does not work and ought not be used. My guess is, that is why President Bush and Secretary Martinez said, let's don't do it anymore. It is not a philosophical or evangelical reason. The reality is: It does not work.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is trying to oversell his point. He says it does not work. He cited one anecdote from a police commissioner in Boston. Then he talked about the Brooklyn program. And then he talked about food and theater tickets. That is like saying we ought to scrap all automobiles because the Edsel did not work.

We are not talking about those programs. We are not talking about \$100; we are not talking about \$250; and we

are not talking about theater tickets. We are not talking about any of those. We are not even talking about law enforcement unless they live in a public housing project, and I do not think many do. We are talking about a program that housing authorities have run with great success. Again, I am not going to cite statistics.

My friend from Idaho has some police saying this is "feel good." No, this is not feel good. It is life and death.

I am trying to be honest in saying neither he nor I can prove whether these programs affect the statistics. It cannot be proven because there is no control. We do not have two identical cities or two identical housing projects, one that had the program and one that did not.

I do not have to oversell my case because it is such a strong case. The strong case is a simple case, and that is when guns are off the streets and not in unwanted hands, our society is likely to be safer.

I go back to the argument I made before. There are some—maybe my friend from Idaho—who do not believe that, but there are some who believe the more guns people have the better. Most people, most Americans, most gun owners do not believe that.

As for his argument about old guns being turned in, the Senator is an expert on law enforcement. Old guns are more dangerous. They misfire more frequently; they fire inaccurately more frequently. And the program, as it is set up, is not supposed to give a reward for a gun that does not work but only those that do. Again, more strawman arguments, maybe about some programs somewhere that did not work, but this program has.

We cannot cite the name and case, but someone is alive today because of this program. Probably more than one person is alive because of this program.

I ask my colleagues not to get wrapped up in the whole ideological fervor here; rather, to commonsense arguments, not some program about movies for guns and not about some program about \$250 for guns but about this program which has a track record. Ask housing authorities throughout the country and law enforcement people in those housing authorities throughout the country if they

Because of this administration's assault on rational laws that keep guns out of the hands of criminals, they took it out. It would be a lot better for our society if we put it back.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If neither side yields time, time will be charged equally against both sides.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 4 minutes 24 seconds remaining; the Senator from New York has 6 minutes 43 seconds remaining. Time will be taken from both sides until someone yields time.

Mr. REID. I say to my friends, if they do not wish to use all their time, they can yield it back. Senator KYL can speak on his amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will be happy—I just made eye contact with my friend from Idaho—to yield back my time. I believe he will yield back his, and we will vote at 1:55 p.m.

I yield back my time.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some articles and some of those terrible statistics from different gun buyback programs be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1994]

ADD GUN BUYBACKS TO THE PUBLIC WISH LIST

(By Erik Eckholm)

It may have started as a holiday exercise in wishful thinking. But last week, as a "toys for guns" exchange in Manhattan's embattled Washington Heights continued to draw in scores of weapons each day, grizzled police veterans were becoming believers and even the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had joined in, laying plans to sponsor similar programs in other cities.

Before Christmas, Police Commissioner Raymond W. Kelley had compared the new program to chicken soup: can't do any harm. But his tone changed as the guns poured in in response to a local businessman's offer of a \$100 Toys-R-Us gift certificate for each surrendered weapon, on top of \$75 in cash offered from an existing city gun-purchase program. "I'm converted," the Police Commissioner told reporters. "Sometimes chicken soup works."

The N.A.A.C.P. saw the buoyant response as a glimmer of sanity in a culture of urban violence that is especially devastating to blacks. Other private sponsors have gotten on board, with makers and sellers of athletic shoes and even Dial-A-Mattress pledging gift certificates for their products. And there was talk in Congress of tax breaks for corporations that contribute.

Gun-purchase programs have been tried over the years in many cities, with varied results. In New York City, the standing cash-for-guns program had yielded modest numbers of guns; somehow, this new combination of toys, Christmas, private leadership, tabloid frenzy and a general desperation about gunfire has worked magic, drawing in some 550 guns in the first eight days of the program, which began Dec. 22.

In Dallas, too, an offer of coveted goods—tickets to Cowboys games—seemed to pull in more weapons than cash alone. Still, probably the most spectacular response yet to any gun buying program involved cash only. In St. Louis in the fall of 1991, the police over a one-month period collected 7,547 guns by offering \$50 for handguns and \$25 for rifles. But the program was not continued, a St. Louis police official said last week, for one reason: money. The cost had been \$351,000, and no police department can sustain that level of spending for long.

Corporate donations may help support the new programs, but the question of costs and benefits remains. It is easy to be skeptical. After all, what difference does it make to melt down a few thousand guns in a country owning 200 million of them? And nobody thinks criminals are selling off the tools of their trade.

Buyback proponents point instead to more modest possible benefits. Fewer guns in

dresser drawers, they say, may mean fewer accidental shootings, fewer crimes of passion, fewer guns stolen for later use in crime and reduced chances of teenagers grabbing household weapons to settle scores. "Taking guns out of circulation is a good thing in itself," said Jeffery Y. Muchnick, legislative director of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence.

But some criminologists are unenthusiastic about gun purchase programs, arguing that resources could be better spent and warning about possible unintended consequences.

Lawrence W. Sherman, a professor at the University of Maryland and president of the Crime Control Institute, said gun buybacks would have to be coupled with a national ban on new sales of handguns, or at least of the semiautomatic pistols wreaking the most havoc, to do any good over the long term. "Otherwise," he said, "taking guns out of circulation in the face of constant market demand unwittingly subsidizes the gun industry."

Philip J. Cook, a professor of public policy at Duke University, studies the economics of street guns and warns that the entry of a major new gun buyer, albeit the police department, can have unforeseen effects.

"You can't see this as exempt from normal market processes," he said. Between vouchers and cash, a person could get \$175 for a gun last week in New York, well above the retail price of many new handguns. Dr. Cook says buyback programs may encourage gun thefts, with government serving, in effect, as a reliable fence. Such programs also give offenders a profitable way to dispose of weapons used in crimes, he said.

On the positive side, Dr. Cook said that if a sustained gun-purchase program were to succeed in raising the floor price for privately traded guns in a community, some teenager seeking illegal guns could be priced out of the market. But this would be achieved at enormous expense, he added, raising questions about the best use of resources. In New York City, at least, where restrictive laws have already prompted black market prices of \$250 to \$300 for pistols retailing in the South for \$39, and prices of \$500 or more for higher-quality weapons, that floor would have to be quite high to seriously alter the market.

At best, a gun-purchase program nibbles at the edges of gun violence. "The central problem of criminal justice is not just to get the guns off the street, but to get the gunmen off the street," said Thomas Repetto, a former police officer and head of the private Citizen's Crime Commission in New York. He calls for more aggressive enforcement of the gun laws, using specially trained gun squads to identify and arrest gun carriers, drawing on knowledge gleaned by community police officers.

Still, whatever their weak points, buybacks are here and happening. Even skeptics have to appreciate their symbolic value in dispirited neighborhoods; responses like the one elicited in Washington Heights suggest that people have had it with senseless killings. "You work on many fronts at once," Mr. Repetto said, "What's most impressive about Washington Heights is the outpouring of community sentiment against guns. That's even more impressive than the numbers of guns turned in."

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 24, 2000]

SPECIALISTS COOL ON CALLS TO REVIVE GUN BUYBACKS

(By Francie Latour)

The threat was gun violence. The stakes, the lives of urban youth. The image was a body face-down in blood and the sound was a

wail of sirens, funeral hymns, and more gunfire.

Amid the violence that gripped urban centers nationwide in the 1990s, America's call to stop the violence was a cry of civic activism: Everybody turn in your guns.

It caught on with made-for-television popularity.

Guns for money. Guns for food. Guns for concert tickets. Guns for therapy, for shopping trips, and in one town in Illinois, firearms for a free table dance at a strip club: Buns for Guns.

Around the country and in Boston, gun buybacks spurred intense publicity. Police unveiled bins of guns. Private sponsors poured money into the programs. Led by the group Citizens for Safety, Boston collected 2,800 guns in four years.

With gun violence again on the rise this year, the cry to bring back the buyback is growing among some Boston activists. But almost five years after the last goods-for-guns event, crime specialists and some police officials are warning against them, saying buybacks were—and are—among the least effective tools for public safety.

Studies of gun buybacks, including a Harvard analysis of Boston's program, say unanimously that the programs don't work. In an interview yesterday, Boston Police commissioner Paul F. Evans said that in retrospect, buybacks failed to produce the impact many had hoped for or expected.

And despite Mayor Thomas M. Menino's appearance on the White House lawn last year, where he and other mayors landed President Clinton's \$15 million federal program to fund buybacks through local housing authorities, the city has yet to take advantage of its share of that money and is unlikely to do so.

"We'll never know the impact of taking even one gun off the street in terms of how many lives that act could have saved," Evans said yesterday. "But you have to step back and analyze the bottom-line results. We found the neighborhoods where we needed the guns to come in were the neighborhoods that brought in the fewest guns."

A series of studies published by the Washington D.C.-based Police Executive Research Forum offers a bleak analysis.

In cities such as St. Louis and Seattle, surveys of buyback participants showed that a significant minority planned on using the money to buy a new gun. In St. Louis, the surveys showed that those who had been arrested at least twice were three times as likely as law-abiding citizens to say they would buy a new weapon; 18- to 34-year-olds were 10 times more likely than older participants to say they would do so.

According to a study of Boston's 1993 and 1994 gun buybacks by Harvard criminologist David Kennedy, few buyback guns were the semiautomatic pistols used in crimes. Nearly 75 percent of the guns were made before 1968, with some qualifying as museum pieces.

That was the case as recently as April, when Springfield conducted a gun buyback using the federal funds. Malden and Worcester have also participated in the federally funded buybacks, which started last fall.

A spokesman for the Springfield Housing Authority, Raymond Berry, said the city's Police Department took 287 guns off the street. They included some handguns, but no assault weapons, and some guns were donated to the Springfield Armory National Historic Firearms Museum.

The Boston Housing Authority said this week it could spend up to \$20,000 from its drug prevention funding to coordinate its own buyback. According to HUD, the federal government would provide \$43 for every \$100 the city uses toward the program. In the past, the city has paid \$50 per gun.

Some Boston Activists, including the gang-intervention group Gangpeace and former members of Citizens for Safety, have said that with gun violence on the rise, it is time to take advantage of the federal money for a program that, at the very least, offers residents a safe way to get rid of unwanted handguns.

"I think Boston is making a mistake by not reinstating the buybacks that relieved our streets of almost 3,000 firearms," said Lew Dabney, who participated in buybacks from 1993 to 1996.

The payoff from buybacks was not just in removing guns from homes, Dabney argued, but in the way it empowered residents to take action against gun violence. It allowed ordinary volunteers to become civic heroes, broke down racial barriers, and created memorable images such as that of author/activist Michael Patrick McDonald coaxing teens to turn over firearms.

According to HUD, the national buyback program has recovered 21,600 guns from 95 public housing developments.

But a spokeswoman for the BHA said investments in youth activities, community policing, and drug intervention were more cost-effective ways to reduce violence.

Even of BHA wanted to initiate a program, spokeswoman Lydia Agro said, it could not do so without the Police Department.

Yesterday, Commissioner Evans said he had discussed the buybacks with BHA officials, but none was planned so far.

"I wouldn't rule another buyback out," Evans said. But with the limited resources we have, and the money and man hours in setting up a buyback, you have to ask what is the value?"

Next to none, according to Kennedy, who authored the Harvard study.

"I don't think anybody who's looked at buybacks in my detail thinks they have very much impact," Kennedy said.

On the one hand, he said, the buybacks offer a civic function akin to garbage disposal, to help people remove unwanted guns they are too afraid to handle.

But the cost of police departments can be considerable, from staffing checkpoints and overtime costs to ballistics testing and disposing of the guns.

The decision to pump \$15 million into a national buyback comes two years after a 1997 study commissioned by the Justice Department called buybacks the best effective use of crime control dollars.

"I think the best conclusion to draw is that the federal HUD buyback program will be a waste of money," said Lawrence Sherman, a criminologist at the University of Pennsylvania who authorized the Justice Department study. "The problem is, there is still this wonderful idea of one life at a time, one gun at a time, that you can associate with these programs. There's an emotional aspect to crime prevention that has nothing to do with the evidence about whether they work or don't work."

[From the National Review, June 15, 2000]

THE MADNESS OF GUN BUYBACKS—ANDREW CUOMO'S POLICY IS FULL OF HOLES

(By Dave Kopel, of the Independent Institute)

Housing Secretary Andrew Cuomo held a press conference last week to announce his success in paying Americans not to exercise their constitutional rights. Although Congress never appropriated money for the project, Cuomo has used federal tax dollars to conduct a "BuyBack America" program, which Cuomo says has claimed more than 10,000 guns in recent weeks.

The program isn't really a "buyback." Since Cuomo's Department of Housing and Urban Development didn't sell the guns in

the first place, it can't buy them "back." Nor will the program contribute anything to public safety.

A criminal, for whom a gun is a tool of the trade, is unlikely to sell his tool for \$50. Instead, the typical sellers in a "buyback" are the widows of hunters, other older people, or other non-dangerous types—rather than teenage gangsters who have suddenly decided to abandon a life of violence.

Because most people who surrender their guns are very unlikely to commit a violent gun crime, the public safety benefit of a buyback, if any, must lie in reducing the supply of guns which can be stolen, or in removing a potential suicide instrument. But the buyback doesn't even provide much in the way of disarmament: a study of a gun buybacks in Seattle reported that sixty-six percent of sellers had another gun that they did not surrender. Indeed, three percent of gun sellers said they would use the money to buy another gun, or would donate the proceeds to the National Rifle Association. [Charles M. Callahan, et al., Money for Guns: Evaluation of the Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program 84 PUB. HEALTH REP. 474 (1994).]

Moreover, the guns sold at buybacks are often old or defective. This shouldn't be surprising; a rational person with a gun worth more than \$50 would sell the gun at a gun store for a fair price, rather than giving it to the government for \$50.

Unsurprisingly, the social science evidence shows that buybacks have absolutely no positive effect in reducing gun crime, gun accidents, or any other form of gun misuse. The research is detailed in Under Fire: gun Buybacks, Exchanges and Amnesty Programs, a book published by the D.C.-based Police Foundation (a think tank for big-city police chiefs).

The money wasted on the Cuomo buyback came from a Drug Elimination Grant Program. Although Congress gave HUD money for the battle against drugs (which are illegal), Cuomo used the money to get rid of guns, which are not only legal, but are specifically protected by the Second Amendment and by forty-four state constitutions.

Why is so much energy invested in buybacks by the anti-gun forces? One reason is that it's a path of relatively little resistance. Gunowners may fight against efforts to take their guns, but they are indifferent to the government buying guns from other people.

Second, buybacks can be initiated without legislative approval, as long as there's an executive branch official, like Cuomo, willing to spend tax money "creatively" or unlawfully.

More importantly, anti-gun activists really do believe that guns are inherently evil. The people who want the government to buy and destroy guns enjoy the same satisfaction that others have enjoyed at book burnings, or at the prohibitionists' rally where whiskey is poured into the river. From the destroyers' viewpoint, there's no need to wait for social science to find benefits from the destruction. The destruction of the wicked object is good in itself.

In a free country, destructionists have every right to their own opinions, including opinions that paying other people to stop exercising constitutional rights is a good idea. But it's hard to balance the motives of a politician who claims not to be against law-abiding citizens owning guns—and then takes satisfaction every time a citizen surrenders her firearms to the government to be melted into a slab of useless metal.

[From the New York Daily News, July 28, 2000]

GUN BUY-BACK BACKFIRES WHEN OFFICERS CASH IN

(By Mike Claffey)

A gun buy-back program to get illegal weapons off the streets had to be altered yesterday after a stampede of court officers tried to cash in.

Brooklyn District Attorney Charles Hynes ordered changes in the initiative when he found out that court officers—some of them in uniform—were handing in their old .38-caliber service revolvers.

Because the program had pulled in only about 200 guns since the one-month window began July 1, Hynes upped the reward on Monday from \$100 to \$250 per gun.

"We had a surge last night of about 100 guns and they all seem to be .38 service revolvers," said a source in the prosecutor's office.

One court officer collected \$1,500 by turning in six guns.

"This is a program with good intentions to get illegal guns off the street and shouldn't be bastardized by people looking for a quick buck," said Hynes' spokesman, Kevin Davitt.

"We're going to be contacting those people who abused the program and ask for our money back," Davitt said.

But a spokesman for the court system, David Bookstaver, said it is not clear that the officers can be forced to do that.

"District Attorney Hynes has indicated that this is really not in the spirit of what the program was designed for," Bookstaver said.

But he added that court officials "have no authority" to tell the officers to give the money back.

He said, however, that word was going out yesterday that court officers can no longer participate.

Some court officers in Brooklyn were upset that Hynes had forbidden them from participating in the buy-back offer. The officers were allowed to keep their revolvers after they were issued 9-mm. semiautomatics last year.

"I have the flyer right here and it says, 'Any working handgun, sawed-off shotgun or assault rifle. No questions asked,'" said Bob Patelli a Senior Court Officers Association delegate at Brooklyn Supreme Court.

"If the DA sees fit to discontinue the program, fine. But he's bound legally to pay for the guns he's already taken."

Patelli added that the program was achieving its goal of getting extra guns out of circulation.

"It gets the gun off the street instead of leaving it in a closet where children or a burglar could find them," he said.

Last year, 659 firearms were turned in for \$100 each. The money comes from drug forfeiture funds, Davitt said.

"We thought that perhaps \$100 was not meeting the value that some people place on these weapons," he said.

To be turned in, guns must be wrapped in brown paper and can be taken to any Brooklyn precinct house. If the gun is deemed operable, the desk officer is supposed to give the person a pink voucher that can be redeemed at the district attorney's office at 350 Jay St.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, what is the status of the amendment in relation to when will it be voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1:55 p.m. there will be a sequence of votes, and this will be the second vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to table the amendment for the vote at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has been made to table the amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I understand that is within the unanimous consent time sequence that has already been established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back on the Schumer amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1229

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time between now and 1:55 p.m. is evenly divided among the two managers of the bill and the Senator from Arizona. Does the Senator from Arizona seek recognition?

Mr. KYL. Yes. I thank the Chair. First, I have two unanimous consent requests. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and the Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, be added as cosponsors to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1229, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I have a modification to my amendment at the desk and I ask that the amendment be modified accordingly. A copy has been provided to Senator MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 105, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 4. STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading "STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS" in title III for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall be expended by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency except in accordance with the formula for allocation of funds among recipients developed under subparagraph (D) of section 1452(a)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(a)(1)(D)) (including under a regulation promulgated under that section before the date of enactment of this Act) and in accordance with the wastewater infrastructure needs survey conducted under section 516 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1375), except that—

(1) subject to paragraph (3), the proportional share under clause (ii) of section 1452(a)(1)(D) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12(a)(1)(D)) shall be a minimum of 0.675 percent and a maximum of 8.00 percent;

(2) any State the proportional share of which is greater than that minimum but less than that maximum shall receive 97.50 percent of the proportionate share of the need of the State; and

(3) the proportional share of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Is-

lands, and the United States Virgin Islands shall be, in the aggregate, 0.25 percent.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I believe there is only one other speaker besides myself. I am informed Senator FITZGERALD is on his way. When he arrives, he will address the amendment, and after that, other than myself, as I said, I do not think there are any other speakers, unless the distinguished assistant majority leader wishes to be recognized to comment at this point.

Mr. President, I apologize for one bit of confusion, and I thank the Senator from Maryland, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for catching an error. The wrong section was cited in one part of the amendment. She correctly noted we had referred to the wrong section, and the modification which has just been adopted refers to the right section. I apologize for any confusion that might have caused.

I do think it has caused some confusion because I am in receipt of one document which I understand has been circulated to some Members of the majority that criticizes the amendment in two primary ways, the first of which is a suggestion that this amendment uses the same formula as used in the drinking water section of the bill. I suspect the citing of the section might have created some of that confusion.

It has been clear from the outset, as I have described this over and over and I went through the description with the Senator from Virginia, that the whole point of this amendment is to use a formula which is based upon a needs survey established by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to wastewater treatment. I pointed out that there are two such needs-based surveys: One relates to drinking water; one relates to wastewater.

Obviously, the drinking water needs survey should relate to drinking water. That is exactly what the law provides. That is the survey that is used for the formula for drinking water. By the same token, the wastewater needs survey should apply to wastewater, but it does not. The law today has a different formula and it is very difficult to understand the origins. As near as anybody can figure out, it relates to a construction grants program that was in existence in the 1970s. It has nothing to do with this needs survey.

We say, just as we should have a needs survey by EPA driving the decisions for drinking water, which we do, we should have a similar kind of formula for wastewater. The wastewater formula is not based on the drinking water needs survey, it is based on the wastewater needs survey.

I note, in this document that has been circulated at least among some Members of the majority, that the criticism is we should not have the same formula apply to drinking water apply to wastewater. It does not. To the extent there was confusion because one of the sections was miscited in the amendment, I apologize for that, again.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for allowing me to make that correction.

We are talking about two different needs surveys, two different formulas. We simply want the type of needs survey EPA conducts to apply to the formula in this case.

The second item I want to point out about the document is a complete error in one of its comments. I quote from this document:

A number of other States, for example, Ohio, Illinois, Florida, Indiana, and New Jersey, would receive reduced allocations.

I assure all my colleagues from those States that is not only true, but the reality is that the States cited are among the States that receive the highest benefits of the formula change—Ohio, Illinois, Florida, Indiana, and New Jersey. In fact, I think they are the highest. Let me go through the numbers precisely.

For the State of Ohio, it would today receive \$76,845,000. Under the formula, the pending amendment, it would receive \$78,423,000. The net increase is \$3,577,000, when you take the earmarks into account.

For the State of Illinois, which I think receives the highest benefit—I confess to the Presiding Officer, I do not know why Illinois would have been so shortchanged in the past, but I appreciate his willingness to cosponsor the amendment because of the clear discrepancy—under the current allocation, the State of Illinois would receive \$61,735,000. Under the pending amendment, Illinois would receive \$108 million, which is a net gain of \$48,764,000, again taking into account the \$2.5 million earmarks. That is an increase from \$61 to \$108 million. The next State cited is Florida. Florida goes from \$46 million to \$55 million; Indiana goes from \$32 million to \$50 million; New Jersey goes from \$55 million to almost \$75 million.

This document floating around titled "Comments on Kyl Amendment," is not only in error; it is almost 180 degrees off. I can't explain why anyone would make this conclusion. The miscitation of the section number has nothing to do with these numbers. Somebody has grossly misunderstood the amendment, misunderstood the charts or the formula, or in some other way deliberately misstated the facts.

I say to my Democratic colleagues who might have received this document, "Comments on Kyl Amendment," this page-and-a-half document is wrong. It is wrong in the first half because we are not using the same formula as the safe drinking water formula. And it is wrong in the second half, for what reason I don't know, but it is grossly wrong. It could not be more wrong with respect to the States it claims are receiving reductions. Those States happen to be the States receiving the largest increases.

For the benefit of my colleagues who were not here for the earlier part of the debate, let me explain what we are talking about while I am waiting for

Senator FITZGERALD, a cosponsor of the amendment. The bill we are debating deals with, among other things, EPA, and it has sections dealing with funding from different funds for projects that the U.S. Government has mandated: To protect drinking water and to protect communities from problems relating to improper wastewater treatment. We provide those mandates. Congress, therefore, provides funding to help local communities create the proper infrastructure to meet the requirements of the statute and EPA.

As Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND have eloquently pointed out, it is always a struggle to get the funding to fill these needs, but they have done a great job in getting additional funding this year for that purpose.

The problem is, whereas the drinking water portion is allocated on the basis of EPA's recommendations and what they call the needs survey, there is no such reference to EPA recommendations with respect to wastewater treatment. Instead, we are reverting to a formula based on 1970s data. It has never been updated since the action was put into place in 1987.

There is a legitimate suggestion we ought to go to the authorizing committee to try to fix this. The authorizing committee has had 14 years to try to correct this, and my staff has repeatedly tried to make contact with people to see if they would be interested in doing it.

Thus far, we have not had any success. Despite the fact that the chairman of the committee has indicated his willingness to take up the reauthorization this fall, there is no commitment to take up a modification of the formula to meet the needs of the high gross States about which I have been talking. There is absolutely no reason to think we will succeed this year in modifying the formula through the authorizing committee. Even if we were to succeed in doing that, the States I named would receive tremendous shortfalls for the fiscal year 2002. There is no way to fix it for the fiscal year 2002. I have a couple of communities in my State that are in dire need of this funding. There is no way they can get it.

We suggested this formula change, which is very simple. It says we should use the needs survey of the EPA and provide 97.5 percent of the funding available in accordance with that recommendation, and we have a minimum and a maximum so that no State gets more than 8 percent and no State gets less than the minimum we provide. That is similar to other formulas. It is very fair. It is very simple. It is easy to apply. The net result, based upon the charts I showed earlier, will go a significant degree toward not only providing funding for those States and localities that need it the most, but reducing the significant unfairness in the formula that exists today. That is what we are talking about. It is that simple.

For those Senators from the following States, I hope since they will

receive more money—again, let me note we are not affecting earmarks. We have included the earmarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. First, an inquiry about the time. Did the Senator from Arizona consume the time to be allocated to the Senator from Illinois, Mr. FITZGERALD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. I inquire of the Senator from Maryland, maybe I misunderstood the unanimous consent request. I thought because the Schumer time had been yielded back that all the remaining time was divided.

Ms. MIKULSKI. That is correct. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the time is parsed into three allocations, three 10-minute segments: One for the Senator from Arizona, one each for the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member.

Mr. KYL. I say to Senator MIKULSKI, if Senator FITZGERALD arrives, perhaps we can accommodate him in some way.

Ms. MIKULSKI. As I understand, the distinguished ranking member has 10 minutes. I am sure he will be happy to yield. We will not preclude Senator FITZGERALD from offering a comment.

We have debated the contents on this bill for a good part of the morning. I think it has been a very constructive debate and a civil debate, which we hope the Senate would be.

I will talk about process for a minute. The Kyl amendment is legislating on appropriations. Ordinarily, I would offer a point of order exactly on that, to knock it down on the point of order under the rules of the Senate.

Because of something the House did—and remember, we work off the House bill, as I understand it, and I believe the Senator's analysis is accurate. We are not able to do that, so this will be a straight up or down—it will not be straight up or down. Either Senator BOND and I have declared our intent to offer a motion to table, which I am not yet offering, but we really are legislating on appropriations. This is so complicated.

Even with the good will from the standpoint of the Senator from Arizona, myself, and Senator BOND, the ranking member, where we tried to explain this formula over that formula or that survey, it shows how complex this is. In fairness, to make sure we have a formula that works for constituents, works for the communities, works for the taxpayer, we cannot deal with this formula on the Senate floor. This truly must be done through the authorizing process.

I acknowledge the problems the Senator from Arizona has had when he says it has been 14 years and it is time to take a new look and a fresh look. Acknowledging the need for a new and fresh look, I also encourage the Sen-

ator in the most collegial tone possible, to also be in discussions with the very able administrator of EPA. I have found Administrator Whitman to be able, accessible, interested in hearing about specific issues and specific problems. We did bring the Senator's amendment to the EPA staff. They furnished a very competent analysis. In fact, it was through them that we identified the error in the drafting.

I do not really recommend that this amendment be agreed to. We really do not know the consequences of the amendment. There is no way to evaluate the consequences of the amendment. It could have very dire effects.

There is no latitude to offer a point of order. We will be offering a motion to table the amendment, but we do not want to table the problem.

The problem is a real problem. This is why, again, with the encouragement of the authorizers, I really share with my colleagues, working with Administrator Whitman has been a very positive experience from this Senator's viewpoint. I suggest perhaps the Senator and colleagues who are so passionate about this issue, as they have expressed themselves on the floor, meet with her and get EPA to start working on the analysis of exactly the consequences, which we would need should we come to an authorizing hearing. Then, if the authorizing hearings do not quite get to it, we would have the benefit of their analysis and their thinking.

Let's not table the problem. One of us will move to table this amendment. But, again, I do not want to table the problem.

I know the time is growing short. We are awaiting Senator FITZGERALD. We know Senator BOND is temporarily off the floor at a meeting with some of his Republican colleagues. I believe the moderates are meeting. He is available.

I will reserve my time for the end. I ask the Presiding Officer, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 3 minutes 10 seconds remaining. The Senator from Missouri has 10 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I inquire of the Senator from Illinois how much time he will need.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only a couple of minutes; 5 minutes will be fine.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent 5 minutes from the time of the minority be allocated to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her generosity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding me the time.

I rise to support my friend from Arizona, Senator KYL, and compliment

him on the amendment he has introduced. I think he has studied this issue very carefully. He has noticed that many States—in fact, about 29 States—appear to get severely shortchanged in the current formula in the clean water development fund. His is a new formula that has a better rationale to it. We cannot really figure out what formula was used back in 1987 in the conference committee. They just picked an arbitrary formula that seemed to steer a lot of money to a select handful of States. But most States, the majority of States, come up short under the current formula.

As I understand it, Senator KYL's new formula is based on the same formula that is used in the safe drinking water revolving fund. It certainly will make for a better need-based distribution of these important allocations of funds for wastewater treatment around the country.

I rise to support Senator KYL's amendment. I understand the Presiding Officer has joined as a cosponsor. This seems to be good legislation for our State and a majority of States around the country. We all know from local communities around our States how important these funds are for these water treatment projects.

I hope we will have a majority vote in favor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent that Senator ALLEN from Virginia be also listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time? If no one yields time, time will be deducted from the time remaining to both sides.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, let's be clear. This amendment totally changes the water formula—totally. New York loses \$14 million, Maryland loses \$2 million. There are winners and there are losers. Under what I am suggesting, we table this and end this debate but we encourage the authorizers to really face the problem of water infrastructure needs and to ask the Administrator of the EPA to evaluate these formulas, taking into consideration the needs of our communities, the new census data, and that we act in a prudent and measured way.

This is not the place to do this legislation. It is absolutely not the place to do this legislation.

I yield the floor and ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 1 minute 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I reserve that time.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 7 minutes 45 seconds.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, let me just check on the time status. We are to begin the votes at 1:50; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1:55.

Mr. BOND. Is there to be a time period for the proponents and opponents

prior to that 1:50, or are we to use the time that is now allotted to us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1:55 there will be 2 minutes equally divided before the first vote and 2 minutes equally divided before the second vote.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 46 seconds remaining.

Mr. BOND. I will use that.

Mr. President, again, I commend Senator KYL, the Senator from Arizona, for bringing to our attention the very important issue of how these vitally important funds are allocated. I have raised my concerns that the allocation he seeks to add in the appropriations bill should go through a thorough process in the authorizing committee because it is very complex.

I have looked at the formula that has developed. I find that it has many, many different aspects. He has figured in earmarks that are not included in the allocation. There is a 1-year formula that is extremely confusing. The EPA has already advised us they would not know how to implement it. Certainly the more I see of it the more I believe it must have a thorough discussion, debate, hearings, and the work of the markup in the authorizing committee.

I commend him for bringing this to our attention. I urge my colleagues to support our tabling motion.

On behalf of the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, I move to table the Kyl amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield back her time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Edwards	Kohl
Bond	Frist	Landrieu
Breaux	Graham	Leahy
Byrd	Gramm	Levin
Cantwell	Grassley	Lieberman
Carnahan	Gregg	Lincoln
Carper	Harkin	Lott
Chafee	Hollings	Mikulski
Cleland	Hutchinson	Miller
Clinton	Hutchison	Murray
Cochran	Inhofe	Nelson (FL)
Collins	Inouye	Nickles
Daschle	Jeffords	Reed
Dayton	Kennedy	Reid
Dodd	Kerry	Rockefeller

Sarbanes	Snowe	Voinovich
Schumer	Specter	Wellstone
Sessions	Stabenow	Wyden
Shelby	Stevens	
Smith (NH)	Thompson	

NAYS—41

Allard	Craig	Kyl
Allen	Crapo	Lugar
Baucus	DeWine	McCain
Bayh	Dorgan	McConnell
Bennett	Durbin	Murkowski
Biden	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Enzi	Roberts
Boxer	Feingold	Santorum
Brownback	Feinstein	Smith (OR)
Bunning	Fitzgerald	Thomas
Burns	Hagel	Thurmond
Campbell	Hatch	Torricelli
Conrad	Helms	Warner
Corzine	Johnson	

NOT VOTING—1

Domenici

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes evenly divided before a vote on the Schumer amendment.

Who yields time? The Senator from Idaho.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is a very contentious amendment. The Senator from Idaho is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, is this a motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. A motion to table has been made.

Mr. BOND. Is the first time to be taken by the proponents of the measure or by the proponents of the tabling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator CRAIG sought recognition in support of the motion to table.

Mr. BOND. I suggest that Senator HUTCHISON would wish 30 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order before we proceed.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, it is my understanding there are 2 minutes equally divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. Or per side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute in support of the amendment and 1 minute in opposition.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am speaking on the motion to table the Schumer amendment. Mr. SCHUMER wishes to allocate \$15 million of this appropriation to what we call gun buybacks. He is taking \$15 million away from AIDS and the homeless and Native American housing and the revitalization of the public housing.

I am telling you what the record says. Since 1978, law enforcement in America has clearly said gun buybacks

don't work. They buy back old and obsolete and unused guns off the street, yes; out of homes, yes. Do they take away the semi-automatics or the .38s used in the commission of crimes? Absolutely not. That is why law enforcement in America today is backing away from gun buybacks. The commissioner of law enforcement in Boston said, "We won't use our money there anymore because it is ineffective." Crime goes up. Yes, they are great photo opportunities, but it does not work.

That is why, 2 weeks ago, the Bush administration said we will allocate money in HUD for those things that work, where we can get at crime through interdiction and law enforcement and not through a photo opportunity.

I ask you to vote to table the Schumer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a commonsense amendment. It says we ought to continue, at a very modest sum of \$15 million, a gun buyback program. Contrary to what my friend said, it is supported by law enforcement. It has worked in public housing authorities, where it is most needed. We are not putting any restrictions on anyone who wants to keep their gun or use their gun, but if people wish to turn in their guns for a modest sum, get it out of the home to avoid accidents, avoid a criminal getting their hands on the gun, avoid a kid going out with the gun on the street, creating havoc, why not?

We should not make this any kind of ideological test. It is simple, common sense that buyback programs have worked. It is funded very modestly. The administration wants to rescind it. We should keep it going. It is that plain and simple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Allard	Burns	Crapo
Allen	Byrd	DeWine
Baucus	Campbell	Dorgan
Bayh	Carnahan	Edwards
Bennett	Chafee	Ensign
Bingaman	Cleland	Enzi
Bond	Cochran	Feingold
Breaux	Collins	Frist
Brownback	Conrad	Gramm
Bunning	Craig	Grassley

Hagel	Lugar	Shelby
Hatch	McCain	Smith (NH)
Helms	McCconnell	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Miller	Snowe
Hutchison	Murkowski	Specter
Inhofe	Nelson (NE)	Stevens
Jeffords	Nickles	Thomas
Johnson	Reid	Thompson
Kyl	Roberts	Thurmond
Leahy	Rockefeller	Voinovich
Lincoln	Santorum	Warner
Lott	Sessions	

NAYS—33

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Cantwell	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Carper	Hollings	Reed
Clinton	Inouye	Sarbanes
Corzine	Kennedy	Schumer
Daschle	Kerry	Stabenow
Dayton	Kohl	Torricelli
Dodd	Landrieu	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Domenici

Gregg

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I believe my amendment, which I offered earlier, is the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the support and cosponsorship of this amendment of Senators KYL, SMITH, and GRAHAM of Florida. I am also especially grateful for the key support of organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Council for a Livable World, and Citizens Against Government Waste.

This amendment provides funding for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs—top priority—by adding \$5 million that is desperately needed for veterans claims adjudication and eliminating more than \$5 million in nonveteran-related earmarked funds contained in the VA-HUD legislation.

I want to get right to it. Currently, it takes an average of 215 days—215 days—at any of the 58 VA regional offices to make a decision on the hundreds of thousands of claims filed annually. There is presently a backlog of over 600,000 claims by our veterans.

That is an unacceptable situation. What we are talking about in this amendment is a matter of priorities.

The amendment will not exceed the budget resolution caps because it is fully offset by cutting funding for 18 separate earmarks by 50 percent, not totally. I am not eliminating the funding for any program or earmark this year. I am eliminating half of the money. Frankly, \$5 million is a small amount as compared with the more than \$40 million or \$50 million that is

needed as stated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

I repeat, I am only cutting half from these specific earmarks in the community development fund account of title II.

For the record, of the 255 total number of earmarked projects in this fund, nearly 9 out of 10 are for States well represented on the Appropriations Committee. The earmarks I propose to cut in half are just a few examples of the pages of earmarks totaling more than \$140 million that are funded from the community development fund.

Unfortunately, the appropriators have substituted their judgment on how best to spend the funds and have earmarked moneys for programs such as bicentennial celebrations, botanical gardens, art museums, art centers, and heritage trails.

I point out the bill language as to what a community development program is all about:

The wide range of fiscal, economic, and social development activities are eligible with spending priorities determined at the local level—

Spending priorities determined at the local level—

but the law enumerates general objectives which the block grants are designed to fulfill, including adequate housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities principally for persons of low and moderate income.

"Principally for persons of low and moderate income." I am going to point out some things such as the deprived area of Newport, RI, that is supposed to get some of this money, and other deprived areas of the country, as I say 9 out of 10 of which are in the States represented on the Appropriations Committee.

I cannot stand here and tell my colleagues that some earmarked projects are not valid and important, but decisions as to whether a project should get taxpayers' funds should not be made by appropriators, bypassing the legitimate funding process. If we earmark funds in this way, I would just as soon transfer some of the funds to help our veterans, unless we are willing to strike all the earmarks so the community development fund can operate as intended. I doubt there will be any takers.

Secretary Principi testified before the VA-HUD subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 2, 2001, that his No. 1 priority is to drastically decrease the backlog in claims against the VA. President Bush also recently emphasized this priority and has promised a top-to-bottom review of VA benefits claims process.

Currently, it takes an average of 215 days—215 days—at any of the 58 regional VA offices to make a decision on the hundreds of thousands of claims filed annually. Furthermore, the Veterans of Foreign Wars wrote me on July 30, 2001, that an investigation of claims processing delays of their members found "a lengthy list of hundreds of claims pending over 720 days."

Balance 720 days for a VA claim with a World War II veteran, one of our greatest generations. We know how old they are. Isn't our obligation to the living as well as to the deceased?

Today there are nearly 600,000 outstanding claims awaiting adjudication by the VA, and that number is expected to continue to rise.

I imagine the managers of the bill are going to say this \$5 million is unnecessary. Let me tell you what the veterans say. Let me tell you what the Veterans of Foreign Wars say:

On behalf of the 2.7 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and its Ladies Auxiliary, I would like to take this opportunity to express our support for your amendment to S. 1216 that would increase the amount available for veterans claims adjudication by \$10 million.

That has been reduced to \$5 million.

As you know, the Department of Veterans Affairs is not completing quality work on benefits claims in an efficient manner. In fact, an original claims for service connected disability that does not require substantial development is averaging 215 days. . . . Additionally, a recent request by the VA Claims Processing Task Force for a list of original claims pending over 720 days resulted in a lengthy list of hundreds of claims.

Your amendment would provide additional dollars crucial to VA's attempt to improve the quality and timeliness of veterans' claims processing.

Thank you for all you do for American veterans.

From the DAV:

On behalf of the more than 1 million members of the Disabled American Veterans (DAV), I am writing to express our support for your proposed amendment to add \$10 million for adjudication of veterans' claims to S. 1216, the Fiscal Year 2002 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill.

As you are aware, the claims backlog at the Board of Veterans' Appeals is at an unacceptable level of approximately 600,000 cases. These long delays that veterans or claimants must endure for claims benefits decisions are unconscionable.

That is what the disabled veterans say.

More needs to be done to ensure quality, timely decisions. Employees need to be added to deal with this backlog. This amendment will provide needed funds to assist in this effort.

Paralyzed Veterans of America:

On behalf of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, I am writing to offer our support for your proposed amendment to S. 216 . . . to provide additional funding for veterans' claims adjudication, would bring this important account closer to the level recommended by the Independent Budget, which is co-authored by the Paralyzed Veterans of America, AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The chronic backlog faced by veterans seeking the benefits they have earned is simply unconscionable. We must take action. This additional funding will not solve the problem overnight, but will be an important step forward to ensure that veterans receive timely and accurate claims decisions.

We appreciate your commitment to addressing this problem.

In another letter:

Dear Senator McCAIN: AMVETS fully supports your amendment. . . .

Disabled veterans must now wait months and sometimes years for their benefit claims to be decided. Your amendment will help VA fulfill its mission and improve the overall quality and timeliness of the service provided to veterans and their families.

We urge the Senate to approve your amendment. Veterans have earned our respect and gratitude, and we thank you for your good work on behalf of American veterans.

Now, the analysis for the Associated Press last year found that the benefits administration takes longer to process claims than it did a decade ago. It took 164 days in 1991 to complete an original claim, compared with currently 215 days, and up to 3 years if appealed. There are more than a few veterans, such as 72-year-old Wayne Young of Cuyahoga Falls, OH, who for more than 44 years has been waiting for final adjudication of his veterans claim benefits by the VA.

Secretary Principi directed a 10-person blue ribbon claims processing task force that will review the Department's handling of applications for veterans benefits. This task force will officially report to him this fall. However, preliminary results indicate that the Secretary will need an additional \$40 million on top of the additional \$132 million provided in the bill to hire additional claims adjudicators to assist already overworked VA employees in reducing the time it takes to process claims.

I am sure the managers of the bill will say they put in a sufficient amount of money. I respect that view. I respect more the views of the veterans organizations who are the ones who are the advocates for and defenders of the veterans of this Nation. I appreciate the dedication and efforts on behalf of veterans that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri have displayed year after year, time after time. I just believe we need additional money.

The additional \$5 million in funding that I am proposing in this amendment for claims adjudication matters would allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to hire approximately 100 additional claims adjudication personnel to begin chipping away at this backlog or, at the very least, slowing its growth a bit.

The current staff members handling these claims are considerably overworked. For every 10 claims for veterans' disability benefits, 4 are actually decided incorrectly, thereby increasing the number of outstanding claims for veterans awaiting to have their healthcare needs met. This already unacceptable number will continue to increase, unless the Congress appropriately funds the VA for personnel adjudication.

In an effort to try and accelerate the claims process and drive down the backlog, claims personnel often ignore the Department's own rules in deciding claims. When the regional offices have rejected a claim, a veteran can appeal to the Board of Veterans Appeals. Last

year that panel overturned the regional offices 26 percent of the time, and sent back another 30 percent of cases. The VA special appeals court returned 64 percent of its cases, mostly because of procedural problems. All the while, our veterans continue to wait for us to fulfill our promise to them.

Secretary Principi has stated that his "top priority is to the living veterans, not the deceased. Many veterans die before their claims are handled, we need to do a much better job of processing these claims before these veterans die. Only 5 million of the 16 million World War II vets who saved the world are alive today. Every day, World War II veterans are passing on before their claims are decided, and that's a real tragedy."

I stand alongside Secretary Principi on this most worthy endeavor to reform this badly broken system.

Mr. President, our veterans risked their lives in defense of our nation, whether charging the beaches of Normandy and Inchon, fighting in Vietnam, or putting themselves into harms way in Iraq and Kosovo. Yet these great Americans must now wait and wait and wait just to get an answer from the Veterans Administration.

Instead of fulfilling a promise that America would take care of their mental and physical injuries incurred while honorably serving our country, we "reward" them with an overworked, inefficient process that results in thousands of veterans everyday being turned away from benefit that were earned, deserved, and promised.

This amendment will go a long way to help our veterans. It also recognizes our government's solemn obligation to take care of these veterans' mental and physical health needs that resulted while defending our great nation. In the words of President Abraham Lincoln, given during his second inaugural address on Mary 4, 1865, "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and his widow and his orphan."

Secretary Principi is dedicated to carrying out this sacred responsibility, and I have every confidence that properly funded, he and the others in his Department will ensure that we here in Congress fulfill our promise to the Veterans of the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

Now I will talk about the projects for which the money has been reduced, actually cut in half. One is the desert space station in Nevada, of \$100,000. Please remember in the context of what the community development programs are supposed to be for, and that is, of course, including adequate housing, a suitable living environment, and an expanded opportunities prescription appeal for persons of low and moderate income, requiring grant recipients to use 70 percent of the block grant funds for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

I repeat: Grant recipients are required to use at least 70 percent of

their block grant funds for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

The title is out of this world. Tourists can look for extraterrestrials in the Nevada desert. Visitors to Las Vegas might find an extraterrestrial or two if they knew where to look. Las Vegas is no stranger to the weird. Many would say the city is a weirdness magnet unless proliferating Elvises, drive-through wedding chapels, and elaborate faux cities make sense. A bird's eye look at the town, however, shows that Las Vegas is simply a small, beautiful cluster of lights sitting within a vast and very dark desert expanse.

Some people come to this city looking for something out of the darkness, something extraterrestrial. When it comes to alien mania, Las Vegas is as popular as Roswell, NM. On the lonely roads that cross Nevada, one of the least densely populated States, reports of swirling lights, government cover-ups, and UFO crashes are not considered odd but commonplace occurrences.

When your client is ready for a break from the gaming tables and the glitz of the strip, you can suggest alien hunting as an alternative to Las Vegas' many wonders. Despite the secrecy, this craze won't go away anytime soon.

An hour away from the strip, in Pahrump, NV, a museum is being built in the shape of a spaceship, to be completed by 2005. It will be the official Area 51 artifact and information center. It will offer a 3-D IMAX center theater, a digistar planetarium, and an Area 51 theme restaurant in the expectation of attracting 374,000 visitors annually.

The 95,000-square-foot facility will call itself the Desert Space Station Science Museum. What it is all about is the Area 51.

Adventure Las Vegas offers commissionable day tours that take visitors to the perimeter of this top secret installation. Clients stop in Slot Canyon along the way to view ancient Indian petroglyphs that some believe to be drawings of aliens. Then they travel through some remote and very mysterious areas, such as a dry lake bed where UFOs are rumored to have been observed. After observing these strange sightings, they will drop into the Little Ale Inn Cafe. There they will have the chance to view top secret documents taken from Area 51 and possibly have a conversation with Capt. Chuck Clark, and ex-Air Force captain and the author of *The Area 51 Manual*. The Area 51 Research Center, located at this quirky location, has a large amount of information about this mysterious region on display, as well as for sale.

We are asking to take half a million dollars for the Desert Space Station Science Museum and give it to help our veterans have their claims processed.

I mentioned earlier about the community development grant programs

being for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons: \$200,000 is for the Newport Air Museum.

Welcome to Newport: Rich in history, Newport prides itself on being a vibrant community offering a wide variety of events and activities year-round. Whether you were drawn here to enjoy the music festivals, yachting regattas, mansion tours, professional tennis at the Newport Casino or a day at the beach, Newport offers you a picturesque location to relax and enjoy.

This unique island community instantly blends the old and the new—colonial homes stand feet away from modern condominiums and offices. The bustling harbor glistens as elegant yachts, luxury liners and lobster boats compete for space. All of these combined are the charm that is Newport . . .

* * * * *

However, Newport was rediscovered in the 1800's by the country's wealthy citizens as the ideal location to spend their summers. Suddenly, elaborate mansions and villas sprung up along Bellevue Avenue and Ocean Drive—each more ornate and luxurious than the one next door. These "summer cottages" provided the perfect backdrop for "The 400," an elite group of the very rich. This extravagant era officially opened the door to America's first resort.

They are going to spend \$200,000 on an art museum in Newport, RI.

Harbor Gardens Greenhouse Project:

When some people think of Pittsburgh, they still envision steel mills and smoky skies. Others identify the city by its sports teams or its three rivers or its colleges and hospitals or Heinz ketchup.

But who'd ever think Pittsburgh could become known for producing orchids?

Well, Bill Strickland would.

The president of the Bidwell Training Center on the North Side is trying to come up with \$3 million to create something called Harbor Gardens Greenhouse.

It would be a 46,000-square-foot glass facility located at Bidwell offices on Metropolitan Street in Manchester and "dedicated to producing orchids," according to a recent funding request submitted to the city's Urban Redevelopment Authority.

Strickland readily admits that growing the delicate, beautiful flowers would be "untraditional" for Pittsburgh but insists that untraditional thinking is what may be needed now.

I really believe it would be a good idea to grow orchids in Pittsburgh. I also happen to believe our veterans need their claims processed as a greater priority.

Here is \$1 million for a multi-purpose events center in Utah. I have a copy of the minutes of the Richfield City Council meeting held on Tuesday, September 19, 2000 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Richfield City office building located at 75 East Center, Richfield, Utah.

Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor David Kay Kimball.

Roll Call was answered . . .

Ruth Jackson, representing the committee promoting the multi events center gave a presentation to the Council. She explained that they are going throughout the County giving this presentation to educate the voters about the multi events center and the upcoming bond election. They showed a model representing what the building will look like when constructed. It was also explained that there would be an advisory board over the maintenance and operation manager of the

building and that some one from the City could sit on this board giving the city some voice in how the building is utilized. One point made is that the community may not need this facility now, but it will within the next five to ten years.

There is a beach resort shore trail in Hawaii. There is a bicentennial party, Louisiana Purchase Bicentennial Commission party for \$1 million; a river museum in Iowa, a couple of million dollars; Culver City Council Theater.

Idaho Virtual Incubator—that is kind of an interesting one. I don't quite understand it—\$500,000, the Idaho Virtual Incubator:

The Idaho Virtual Incubator prepares businesses for e-commerce, offers students "hands-on" experience through virtual internships and fosters partnerships for job creation, expansion and retention.

Madam President, I think I have made my point. We have over 60,000 unprocessed claims. The committee very wisely—and I appreciate it—has added funding to help address this issue. We are trying to add more funding. Not just in my view but the view of every veterans organization in America, this money is needed. Because of the rules, obviously, that I would be subject to a budget point of order, I have found projects that I think are of lower priority than that of processing the claims of our veterans. Some of them are interesting, some of them entertaining; some of them are outrageous.

But the point is, none of these projects that I have identified could possibly, in the view of any objective observer, have priority over the processing of our veterans' claims.

I mentioned earlier, only 5 million of our 16 million World War II veterans survive today. They are leaving us at a rate of 30,000 every single month. It seems to me our first obligation would be to provide, as rapidly as possible, a process where the claims they may have for injuries or disabilities incurred in the service of this country would take priority over desert space stations, or greenhouses, Wildwood vacation resorts, botanical gardens, multi-event systems, multipurpose radio, multipurpose events centers, et cetera, et cetera.

I think the choice is clear. I am not saying the earmarks themselves are something that I approve of; I do not. I am not attacking the earmarks. I am not trying to have them removed. I am trying to cut them in half so we can have an extra \$5 million, which is not a lot of money when you consider the entire budget of this VA-HUD appropriations bill, so we can begin, at least, working with Secretary Principi, to provide for veterans.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, on occasion I have an opportunity to travel

with my colleague from Arizona and go through an airport somewhere in the country. I remember not too long ago going to Dallas, TX, on our way to Phoenix. Veterans coming up to my colleague—he is a lot more recognizable than I am—and saying, “Thank you, Senator MCCAIN, for fighting for us.”

Madam President, does the Senator from Maryland wish to speak at this moment? If I took her time, I apologize for doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does the Senator wish to speak in behalf of the McCain amendment?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, that is what I am doing, yes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. It was my understanding we would follow the tradition of alternating.

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield the floor to the Senator from Maryland. I did not realize she wished to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, thank you very much. I thank the junior Senator from Arizona.

Madam President, first of all, know that in talking about veterans and about the claims processing, not only wouldn't I argue with JOHN MCCAIN, but I wouldn't argue with all the history that we have had on this almost intractable problem. Cutting the time that a veteran must wait for a decision on claims processing has been one of my highest priorities since I originally chaired the committee in 1990. It seems as if we never get a handle on this issue.

The items of concern that were listed by the Senator from Arizona are accurate. Those are exactly the same problems my distinguished colleague and ranking member, Senator BOND, and I had in an extensive discussion with Administrator Principi during our VA hearing.

They are absolutely right. It takes too long for claims. It is absolutely wrong that our veterans who were willing to risk their lives and put their lives in the line of fire to defend the United States of America have to wait in line to find out about adjudication, particularly for a disability benefit. There is absolute agreement that it is wrong for veterans to have to wait 205 days or 7 months to get a decision on the claim.

Having agreed on the problem, what my colleagues in the Senate need to know is, on a bipartisan basis, working with the executive branch we have attempted to solve this problem.

First of all, for the VA-HUD bill, we put \$1.1 billion in for the administration of benefits. That is \$1 billion-plus for the administration of the benefits. We have also increased it by \$132 million. Where did we get that number? We got that number from George Bush.

We got that number from President Bush. This isn't BARBARA MIKULSKI's number. This isn't KIT BOND's number. This isn't something that we pulled off a Ouija board. This came from President Bush.

My colleague from Arizona says: I don't want to argue with you about what the veterans have to say. I don't want to dispute our veterans. But I have to believe that President Bush and Tony Principi, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, knew what it would take to begin to really solve this problem this year, which has been a disaster for more than a decade. The money recommendation came from President George Bush. That is from where the \$132 million come.

Let's talk about our very able new Administrator of Veterans Affairs. I think the world of our new Administrator. I want to say this as a Democrat. I think President Bush has given us an outstanding Veterans Affairs Administrator. I am so excited about the possibility of working with Administrator Principi, a Vietnam vet himself, a former Under Secretary of VA during the Bush-Quayle administration, and with a substantial stint in the private sector picking up even more management skills.

Secretary Principi brings to us the heart and soul of a veteran—and committed to it because he was a foxhole guy himself; all the way up now to the considerable experience he has had not only with VA but also with the private sector.

I am telling you that Tony Principi and the President say we need \$132 million. I am willing not only to take it to the bank, but I am willing to take it to the Federal checkbook. That is where we got the money. I believe that it will really make a substantial dent.

We haven't been laggards, nor have we been deleterious, nor have we invented numbers out of the thin air.

Let me tell you what we are going to buy with this new money. We are going to buy close to 900 new employees to handle the backlog, and also to handle the new cases triggered by legislation enacted last year. Forty-six million dollars of that will be to hire these processors to implement what they call “duty to assist”—to actually help the veterans prepare their claims.

One of the problems in doing claims is that our veterans often don't prepare them properly. It is through no fault of the veterans. Many of them have visual problems. They are old. They are not well. If you have a disability, you stand to be pretty sick. And also you are pretty sick of the bureaucracy and you are pretty sick of the paperwork. But some of these new people will actually help the veterans do it right so we can get it done in the right time.

There is a new law to require the VA to review 98,000 cases—we have to go over the backlog—and another 244,000 that were pending when the legislation was enacted.

By the way, the VA will be able to also carry out a new policy of adding

type 2 diabetes to the list of presumptive disability conditions. Over 100,000 new claims are expected to be in this category, particularly from our Vietnam vets.

Additionally, the fiscal year 2001 supplemental spending also gave the Veterans Affairs \$19 million in this category. We have \$132 million, and in the supplemental that we just passed there is another \$19 million. I think that takes us to \$151 million. That is not potato chips, but it will buy us a lot of microchips to try to move this backlog.

I think we are keeping our promises to our veterans. We have not been laggards. We don't want to dump money on the problem, but we want to engage in solving the problem. That is why we ask the administration to give us the right amounts needed, and we will see that we step up and do that. That is where we come in on the money. That is why I am going to oppose the Senator's amendment. We are honoring President Bush's request, and we think if President Bush thinks it is adequate, the Senate ought to think it is adequate.

The other issue I am going to take up is this question of earmarks. People use the term “earmarks” as if it is a Darth Vader stain on the bill. Let me tell you, we can look at these projects; we can analyze them; we can joke about them, and so on. But when you talk to colleagues the way I have, we often end up meeting very compelling community needs. I know the Presiding Officer has spoken to me about the desperate need in her community to help the Meals on Wheels community. As I understand, the ability to really meet that overwhelming case-load is tremendous. We are going to try to work with her. I do not know if you are on this hit list or not. But I do know that when we follow the earmark, it is not something that a Senator makes up out of thin air.

My distinguished colleague and I wanted to weed out the pork. We established criteria that is within the framework of the community development block grant. We don't even consider a project unless a list is filled out for a project. You filled one out. In fact, you filled out more than one because of the needs of the State of Michigan.

What is it that we ask? Question No. 1, can you demonstrate that it will create jobs or a compelling human need? Does it create jobs or meet a compelling human need? Does it benefit a low- or moderate-income neighborhood? Does it eliminate physical or economic stress? Is there matching funds from a non-Federal source to show that there is grassroots support behind this? And is it essentially limited to a 1-year endeavor? That is what we ask our colleagues.

Does it create jobs? Does it help poor or moderate neighborhoods? Does it eliminate that distress? Can you show there is money from other sources? And also, this is not meant to be a year to year to year entitlement.

I want to talk about one in my own neighborhood. It is money for something called the Fells Point Creative Alliance to develop the Patterson Center for the Arts. I think when you read it, I can understand where someone might think this is for some yuppie, artsy, Gucci, woo woo kind of thing. I am not into "woo woo," but I am into empowerment.

Let me tell you about the neighborhood. This neighborhood is called Highlandtown. In the city of Baltimore, neighborhoods have names because Baltimore, the very nature of it, is a city of neighborhoods. And, God, I love it. And I am so proud of it. I love those neighborhoods. The neighborhoods are really what make Baltimore.

It is not the Inner Harbor and not Camden Yards and not PSI Net Stadium. The Inner Harbor is great in terms of an entertainment area, but it is the neighborhoods that are the heart and soul of Baltimore. This Highlandtown neighborhood was made up of people who represented the Polish, the Italian, the German, and the Greek community. They built this country. They sat on their white steps. They went to war. And while the men were at war on the battled front, the women were at home being "Rosy the Riveters" on the home front. We are both men and women, the veterans of World War II.

That neighborhood is aging in place, as are the people in it. I have a substantial number of aging World War II, GI, red-blooded Americans in that neighborhood, and their wives, who worked in factories called Bethlehem Steel, Martin Marietta, building the radar at Western Electric, who live in that neighborhood.

They are old. And we are fighting off the predators, the predatory lending crowd, the flipping crowd. We are fighting off the drug dealers. What was once a proud neighborhood is now teeter-tottering on disaster.

Now we have a new mayor and a new spirit. And guess what we are doing. We are transforming that teeter-tottering neighborhood into revitalization and creating a new village, with this theater being one anchor and the regional library being another. We are creating a new village, not only to keep out the bad but to build up the good.

With these young artists, we are creating a new sense of a new kind of village. So this isn't some gooshy little Playdough project. This is not a gooshy little Playdough project.

Now, if the mayor of the city of Baltimore is ready to work to anchor it, we have the right people ready to anchor it. The police commissioner is working to keep out the drug dealers. Our housing commissioner is keeping out the predatory lenders. I do not think we should eliminate this to keep out the empowerment money.

I will tell you, our people fought for their country. I think they now are trying to fight for their neighborhood. That is what this project is all about.

So I wanted to talk about mine. But behind every one of these congressionally designated projects is a story such as this. So if you really want to help the veterans of Highlandtown, you let me bring this help to them.

So, Madam President, I feel very strongly about this. I feel so strongly about those veterans who are waiting in line. I do not want them in line any more than my colleague does. He and I would be partners in this, including my wonderful colleague from Missouri. We are ready to go hand in hand. But do not punish neighborhoods to be able to help the neighborhoods.

Remember, our veterans fought for the neighborhoods. Now we have to fight for the neighborhoods and fight for our veterans, and not pit them against each other.

Madam President, I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4 p.m. today be equally divided and controlled in the usual form with respect to the pending McCain amendment No. 1226; that no amendments be in order to the McCain amendment; that the only other amendment in order during this period be a managers' amendment; and that at 4 p.m., if the managers' amendment has not been agreed to, the amendment then be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, if the amendment has been agreed upon by the two managers and the two leaders, Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT; that the Senate then vote in relation to the McCain amendment; that upon disposition of the above amendments, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, with the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. No objection on this side.

Ms. MIKULSKI. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, we have a difference of opinion, obviously. Do we want these projects that I described, or do we want to go along with the strong recommendations of our veterans organizations? It really isn't too much more complicated than that. Some of these projects are absolutely ridiculous, but we have seen many other ridiculous projects in this

porkbarrel spending which has lurched totally out of control.

But the fact is, do we want to have these projects funded—9 out of 10 of them are the Appropriations Committee; things such as desert space stations and orchid greenhouses—or do we want to add \$5 million—which we are not destroying; we are only cutting in half—or do we want to take the strong advice and recommendation of every veterans organization in America? It is that simple.

I would be willing to vote. I will be glad to be on record siding with the veterans of America, with whom I have had some experience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I started to comment earlier about the degree to which veterans organizations and individual veterans around the country have relied upon my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, to carry their flag in battles here in the Congress.

It always personally impresses me when I see people come up to him, as I frequently do, and thank him for the work that he has done or their behalf.

It always pains me when either of us—and sometimes both of us—have had to vote against the VA-HUD appropriations bill, which has money for many veterans programs, because of our concern that not enough of the money is allocated to veterans programs vis-a-vis the HUD programs.

I have explained to my very good friend and colleague, Senator BOND from Missouri, on many occasions why I have cast that vote, wishing very much that I could support the good work that he and others have done in support of our veterans.

I recognize that, as a result, this particular amendment is, in many respects, a symbolic amendment. It only takes half of the funding away from these projects that Senator MCCAIN described. And it is a relatively small amount of the money that we believe will be necessary to supplement the funds that have been made available for the resolution of these veterans' claims.

It is true that the committee has set forth an amount that was recommended for the resolution of those claims, but it is also true that this fall—when the blue ribbon task force established to make recommendations comes out with its recommendations—we anticipate that they will be for a lot more money that is needed to adjudicate the claims of the veterans. It will be too late by then to get that money in this appropriations bill.

Senator MCCAIN's effort was a modest attempt to put a very small amount of money, but symbolically important to our veterans, as he noted, back into the veterans part of this bill. It is for that reason I strongly support it.

I will not go through all of the other arguments Senator MCCAIN has so eloquently cited as the basis for his amendment.

I appreciate very much what Senator MIKULSKI said. She has taken the amount recommended by the administration and put that in the bill. As I said, all of us recognize, as she noted, it is not nearly enough. The question is, do we exercise some independent judgment here, anticipate that there will be a recommendation for funding in the future, but that it will come too late in this appropriations process or do we put that money into projects Senator McCAIN has targeted for at least some treatment under his amendment?

I agree with him. The choice is clear. I tell all of my veteran friends when they confront me and ask, why did you have to vote against that VA-HUD appropriations bill there is a process in Washington to put the sweet with the sour, to make sure that whatever you do that doesn't go down very easily, you put something sweet with it so it is hard to vote against it.

Nobody wants to vote against veterans programs. We all want to support our veterans. That is why you take programs that can be subject to some criticism in the HUD portion of the bill, put them with the VA part of the bill and, voila, you have a recipe for success; Members will not dare vote against it.

I have voted against it. I will probably vote against it again in the future. I hope my veteran friends, by observing what is occurring here today, appreciate the fact that when we try very hard to move some of that money from programs that we think are not as useful for people into the veterans part of the budget, you can see how hard that is going to be. That is why, at the end of the day, we fight as hard as we can to get as much support for the veterans in the bill. And if we can't get more than we have been getting, then in many cases we end up opposing the bill. While it is true and in some respects symbolic, I think the symbolism is very important.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator McCAIN's amendment to begin to send two messages. The first message is to our veterans, that we understand your needs, we understand your requirements, and we support you. Secondly, to those who have the difficult job of putting together this bill, it is time to begin to exercise some discretion here, and with respect to these projects that each Member likes so much, all earmarked projects, put less money against those projects and transfer some of that money into the veterans part of the budget.

As Senator McCAIN said with respect to these World War II veterans, they don't have much time left. I hope my colleagues will support his amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to Senator McCAIN's amendment to S. 1216, the appropriations bill for VA HUD.

This amendment would remove badly needed resources for many communities throughout the country and spe-

cifically in Sevier County in my home State of Utah. It furthermore seeks to overturn the carefully crafted work performed by the Senate Appropriations Committee when putting together this bill. I understand that legislating oftentimes means making difficult decisions, but the cuts proposed by Senator McCAIN go too far and would hurt too many.

I urge my colleagues to vote to table this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KYL. Might I inquire of the Senator from Missouri or Maryland if it would be all right if I take a couple minutes off the subject of the McCain amendment to simply talk about a part of what will be included in the managers' amendment?

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I assume the Senator from Arizona is controlling the time of the other Senator from Arizona. He is free to utilize such time as he wishes. We will extend him our good wishes.

ALLOCATION FORMULA FOR STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUND

Mr. KYL. Let me thank the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Maryland for agreeing to accept as part of the managers' amendment an amendment which I was going to offer. They have done this in good faith. I especially appreciate the fact that they have expressed support for what I am trying to achieve. I will explain it very briefly.

It was an amendment that expressed the sense of the Senate essentially that since we were not able to modify the formula for the wastewater treatment programs under EPA by an amendment on the floor on this appropriations bill, largely because of the argument that it is more appropriately done on the authorization bill, the authorizing committee, in September, should take up the reauthorization of the legislation, including an attempt to deal with this particular formula.

The operative paragraph says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate should be prepared to enact authorizing legislation (including an equitable needs-based formula) for the State water pollution control revolving fund as soon as practicable after the Senate returns from recess in September.

That is the result of the fact that my earlier amendment was defeated but, frankly, defeated on a technicality, as most of the individuals noted.

There is a good case to be made for evaluating the current formula for distribution of these funds, that it can be done in the authorizing committee, that it should be done shortly after we return here, and I hope it can be done in time for changes to be made to affect the fiscal year 2002 numbers. That is the only way the formula can be made more fair for this next year.

I express to my colleagues, the managers of this legislation, my thanks for their willingness to include this sense-

of-the-Senate resolution in the managers' amendment as a way of at least moving forward on the reform that most people agreed to earlier but were not willing to make on the appropriations bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I claim such time from the time of the opponents of this amendment as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

Mr. BOND. First, let me thank my dear friend from Arizona for his amendment that is going to be in the managers' amendment. It is a pleasure to be working with the Senator from Arizona again. He formerly was on this committee. We regret he is no longer on our appropriations subcommittee. We still miss him, but I assure you, our aim is getting better.

I would like to tell the Senator from Arizona that we strongly support his admonition/instruction to the Environment and Public Works Committee to move on the subject which he addresses. That subject, of course, is the equitable allocation and the badly needed funding for our water infrastructure. I cannot emphasize too much how important that is to the health and well-being of all of our people and to the progress of this country.

He has done a great service, raising the question about allocation of the revolving funds, and we look forward to working with him. We are going to have to provide more resources than are now available. I assure him and my other colleagues that we want to do that in an equitable manner. I look forward, as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, to working with our chairman and ranking member to see that that occurs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1226, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BOND. With respect to the amendment by the other Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN, while I am very sympathetic to the point he has made about the need to improve VA's claim processing, I join with the manager of the bill, the distinguished chair, in opposing it.

We have been concerned. We have worked all year long to assist VA in dealing with the unacceptable backlog in VA claims processing. Nobody has been a more forceful, consistent spokesperson about the need to bring up-to-date and up-to-speed VA claims processing than the Senator from Maryland. I have listened to her for hours on end in the Appropriations Committee as she has sought more money, as she has admonished officials of the VA to get with it and get on the ball and get these claims processed.

This has really been a crusade she has led. I agree with her 100 percent. We are totally in agreement that VA claims processing is extremely important. It is a matter of justice and fairness to the people who have protected our country, and we have a long way to

go. We believe this should be the high-priority.

I agree with her, and I thank her for her kind words about Secretary Principi. We are excited to have a man of his background, his commitment, and his dedication at the helm in VA.

This is a difficult management problem. It is a resource problem. It is a personnel problem. We are totally committed to supporting Secretary Principi as far as we can. Secretary Principi has set a goal of processing regional disability claims within 100 days by the summer of 2003. That is an admirable and, unfortunately, ambitious goal considering that it now takes VBA more than 200 days to process a claim.

Nevertheless, he has set forth a timetable. He has set forth a budget he needs. He has set forth his plan to develop an effective processing operation that will assure that our Nation's veterans receive the service and the compensation they deserve. To address this need, to fulfill our part of the bargain, the bill before us provides significant funding increases to the VA, as requested by Secretary Principi. He said: This is my goal; this is where I want to be, no more than a hundred days. We will get there by 2003. He told us what he needed.

Our bill provides \$1.1 billion for the administration of benefits. That is \$132 million, or a 13-percent increase over the fiscal year 2001 level. And, at the request of the administration, we have already provided the additional \$19 million in the recently enacted fiscal year 2001 Supplemental Appropriation Act that gives the VA the ability to hire new claims processors immediately. So that is actually \$151 million that we are putting into Veterans Affairs.

This funding will increase the VA's budget and allow the VA to hire much needed additional staff, increase training, and modernize and upgrade information technology. Specifically, the VA will be able to hire and train 890 new employees to help resolve the backlog of cases and handle new cases due to legislation, such as the "duty to assist" enacted last year. This is a significant hiring increase. Bringing on all these people is a tremendous workload for the personnel section. Therefore, we have questions as to whether they could do more. They have outlined for us what they think is the optimum capacity for hiring new personnel, bringing them on board, giving them the training so they can accomplish the goal that Secretary Principi has sent down the pike for the 100-day limit for the processing of claims.

Frankly, the money that the Senator from Arizona has proposed is not in his request. It has not been requested by the person who has to do the job, who has to administer and make sure the money is well spent. Frankly, I believe we need to stay with the responsible work plan that the Secretary has outlined.

Finally, let me talk about some of the rhetoric we have heard on

porkbarrel. I come from a background of working in State government. One of the most important things we can do for the people in our States is to assure that we have strong communities. That means education, health care, and housing. But it also means strong communities. I spent a great deal of time, when I was Governor, working on how we develop communities, how we bring together the facilities that are needed to make sure we have livable communities.

Now, housing, obviously, in this budget is second only in priorities to taking care of our veterans. Veterans are our first priority. Housing is second. Below that, is assuring that the communities have what they need to be strong communities. We need good communities to support good housing so families can raise their children in the proper setting.

I am very pleased that we have been able to put money into community development. This is a very important priority. This is something that is recognized across this country and is strongly supported.

There is \$5,012,993,000 going into the community development fund. These funds go back and are administered by locally elected officials and State-elected officials—except for roughly 2.8 percent of those funds that are allocated here.

Now, if you don't think any of these buildings or any community development activities should be carried forward, you could save \$5 billion by knocking out community development funds. Given the many, many different objects for spending, I can assure you, as one who lives in a small town and who travels to communities of all sizes in our State, the community development activities are vitally important from a governmental standpoint, from a quality-of-life standpoint, and from an economic development standpoint. They help draw and attract the kinds of economic activities and the kinds of community activities that are beneficial. I believe in them. I believe it works.

Community development block grant funds are extremely important, and I will strongly oppose anybody who wants to cut the \$5 billion we put into community development block grants.

It is easy to pick out a project that has been recommended here and included by an elected Senator—anything you want—that goes to a different State than yours and call it "pork." If it is in your own State, it is a "strategic investment." How is that \$5 billion allocated? It is allocated by elected officials. That is what this process of government is all about. It is a republican form of government. They elect people at the local level and State level to make decisions on how to spend the money that is raised in taxes. A small portion of it—\$5 billion out of the total budget—goes to community development.

Who is best to make these decisions? We say, by and large, the decisions

should be made at the local and State level. This is money the Federal Government raises and sends back for community development. But do the people who are elected to serve their States in the Senate know what some of those priorities are? I happen to think they do. I travel around my State, and I know the need and the opportunities that economic development initiative grants and community development block grants can meet. I think those are very important.

Do we make decisions on all these funds? No, only about 2.8 percent. I think that anybody in this body who takes their job seriously is going to be seeing needs in their States. They are going to have the ability to identify improvements and projects or buildings that would benefit the communities—particularly the communities most in need, the communities needing a hand-out.

I am proud to have been able to work with the Senator from Maryland and with most of my colleagues. The 1600 requests we had went to communities all over this Nation to try to provide some funds for the top priorities as identified by our colleagues from the 50 States in the Nation. I will be happy to discuss at any length the contention of those who think that community development funds from the Federal Government through the community development block grant are not necessary. They make a great difference, and I do not apologize for the fact that those elected by the voters of the 50 States ought to have a say in allocating 2.8 percent of that.

Madam President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I thank the committee chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for their commitment and adherence to the needs of our veterans. I appreciate it very much. I know that all veterans and all Americans do as well.

I point out that there was a \$132 million addition for the VA, and it was a \$211 million addition over the President's budget for community development grants. I listened carefully to the comments by the Senator from Missouri about elected officials being wise enough to determine spending for projects in their own State. I wonder if that wisdom now resides in the Appropriations Committee, where 9 out of 10 of the earmarks came from. I am sorry the rest of us are not as well informed. In fact, I read this: Missouri, 15 projects, the largest number of projects, for \$9.150 million. And, of course, we can go down the list of the Appropriations Committee: Maryland, 13 projects, \$5.260 million; West Virginia, \$8 million; Alaska, \$7.490 million. Of course, there is a dramatic demarcation there between these funds and those who are not members of the Appropriations Committee.

That may be some coincidence. I believe \$5 million is a very modest

amount of money. I described the projects that half the money is taken from, and I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENDING VA CASES BY STATE

Vermont, White River Junction—1,420
West Virginia, Huntington—5,926
Maryland, Baltimore—5,958
Ohio, Cleveland—13,715
Alabama, Montgomery—13,758
Wisconsin, Milwaukee—10,049
Missouri, St. Louis—11,561
New Mexico, Albuquerque—5,859
South Dakota, Sioux Falls—1,919
Montana, Fort Harrison—2,454
Alaska, Anchorage—2,674
Idaho, Boise—3,031
Iowa, Des Moines—5,183
New Hampshire, Manchester—2,224
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia/Pitts.—14,854
Kentucky, Louisville—10,724
South Carolina, Columbia—9,394
Mississippi, Jackson—7,442
Illinois, Chicago—10,832
North Dakota, Fargo—2,399
Louisiana, New Orleans—9,198
Texas, Houston/Waco—38,598
Colorado, Denver—9,001
Utah, Salt Lake City—1,574
Washington, Seattle—13,091
California, Oak/L.A./S.D.—47,448
Nevada, Reno—7,105
Massachusetts, Boston—5,147
Rhode Island, Providence—4,042
New York, NYC/Buffalo—22,745
Connecticut, Hartford—3,411
Maine, Togus—4,395
New Jersey, Newark—7,384
Indiana, Indianapolis—6,289
Michigan, Detroit—9,687
Delaware, Wilmington—1,984
Virginia, Roanoke—17,635
Georgia, Atlanta—16,714
North Carolina, Winston-Salem—20,784
Tennessee, Nashville—14,276
Florida, St. Petersburg—33,218
Nebraska, Lincoln—4,229
Minnesota, St. Paul—7,357
Kansas, Wichita—6,971
Arkansas, Little Rock—7,881
Oklahoma, Muskogee—10,767
Oregon, Portland—12,368
Arizona, Phoenix—8,687
Hawaii, Honolulu—4,481
District of Columbia—6,872
Puerto Rico, San Juan—11,581
Philippines, Manila—7,890
Total cases pending: 524,186

STATE COSTS BY PROJECT

State	No. of projects	Total (in thousands)
Missouri	15	\$9,150
Rhode Island	14	3,900
Pennsylvania	13	3,700
Maryland	13	5,250
Alabama	12	4,400
Illinois	12	3,000
South Dakota	11	3,750
Wisconsin	10	3,000
California	9	3,700
Nevada	9	4,000
Louisiana	8	2,900
Vermont	8	5,000
Iowa	7	4,000
New York	7	2,000
Hawaii	6	3,000
Mississippi	6	5,250
New Mexico	6	4,400
Alaska	5	7,490
West Virginia	5	8,050
South Carolina	5	3,000
North Dakota	4	3,300
New Hampshire	4	2,500
Washington	4	3,300

STATE COSTS BY PROJECT—Continued

State	No. of projects	Total (in thousands)
Massachusetts	4	1,050
New Jersey	4	1,050
Colorado	3	2,800
Ohio	3	2,500
Texas	3	2,000
Florida	3	2,050
Delaware	3	1,100
Georgia	3	1,050
Indiana	3	1,800
Nebraska	3	1,800
Oregon	3	1,750
Maine	3	2,750
Tennessee	3	1,850
Idaho	2	1,500
Montana	2	1,750
Utah	2	1,800
Michigan	2	1,050
Minnesota	2	1,050
Arkansas	2	1,300
Connecticut	2	600
North Carolina	2	1,300
Kansas	2	1,500
Oklahoma	1	1,000
Kentucky	1	3,500
Virginia	1	1,000
Arizona		
Wyoming		
50 states	255	140,000

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE, Washington, DC, August 1, 2001.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN, Russell Senate Office Building Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCAIN: On behalf of the one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I would like to express our support for your efforts to reduce wasteful spending in the fiscal 02 appropriations bill for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA/HUD). Your leadership on these issues is greatly appreciated.

Last year, CCAGW chronicled a record of 6,333 pork-barrel items in spending for fiscal 01 that totaled \$18.5 billion. Congress seems to be on track to beat that dubious achievement. Ignoring the absence of earmarks in this year's House VA/HUD spending bill, the Senate exceeded the record levels of last year and added 256 earmarks in Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs), totaling \$138 million.

Some examples of this self-indulgence include: \$1,000,000 for a multi-purpose center for the Southern New Mexico Fair and Rodeo in Dona Ana County, New Mexico; \$750,000 for development of an arts center in Baltimore, Maryland; \$500,000 for the Idaho Virtual Incubator at Lewis and Clark State College in Idaho; \$350,000 for the Harbor Gardens Greenhouse project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; \$300,000 for a heritage trails project in Kauai, Hawaii; \$300,000 for a new facility for Studio for the Arts in Pocahontas, Arkansas; \$250,000 for the Culver City Theater Project in Culver City, California; \$100,000 for development assistance for the Desert Space Station in Nevada; and \$100,000 for the development of the Alabama Quail Trail.

Your amendment will eliminate much of this egregious spending and spare the taxpayers from being forced to pay for the appropriators' largess. CCAGW applauds your efforts and urges your colleagues to support your amendment. The vote on your amendment will be among those considered for CCAGW's annual Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

THOMAS SCHATZ, President.

[Citizens Against Government Waste release, July 26, 2001]

PORK ALERT: CAGW'S PORK PATROL TAKES A CLOSER LOOK AT FISCAL 2002 VA/HUD PORK

Next week, the Senate is expected to consider the FY 2002 appropriations bill for the

Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (VA/HUD). The Senate ignored the House request of zero earmarks and picked up beyond where they left off last year, adding 256 earmarks totaling \$138 million for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program in the bill. The 13 VA/HUD Appropriations subcommittee members gobbled up 101 of those earmarks (39 percent), totaling \$54.7 million. The other 16 Senate appropriators received another 104 earmarks (41 percent), totaling \$55.7 million. That means 29 percent of the Senate would get 80 percent of the projects and dollars, proving, once again, that appropriators abuse their privileges. A few examples:

Taxpayers Left Out in the Cold, Alaska. Senate Appropriations Committee Ranking Member Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) earmarked \$2.25 million for the city of Fairbanks to provide winter recreation alternatives to military and civilian residents. Sen. Stevens might just have asked federal taxpayers to send their old sleds and ice skates up north.

Leadership Has Its Privileges, Missouri. Senate VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee Ranking Member Christopher "Kit" Bond (R-Mo.) earmarked \$7.1 million in CDBGs for his home state, including: \$1 million for the City Market renovation project in Kansas City; \$1 million for the University of Missouri-Kansas City Life Sciences Initiative; and, \$250,000 to the city of St. Joseph for redevelopment of its downtown area.

We Have Enough Bull, New Mexico. Cowboys, cotton candy, and kicking bulls must be on the mind of VA/HUD Appropriations subcommittee member Pete Dominici (R-N.M.). The senator earmarked \$1 million for infrastructure improvements and for a new multi-purpose and event center for the Dana County Rodeo and Fair. YEE-HAW!

Out of This World, Nevada. As if the International Space Station didn't cost enough, a new tribute to man's heavenly aspirations is being built in the desert. Senate Appropriations Committee member Harry Reid (D-Nev.) must be seeing stars over the \$100,000 that was earmarked for a futuristic space museum in his home state. It won't fly with taxpayers.

Not-so Bravo, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Appropriators are taking taxpayers to the cleaners and the theater. Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont are slated to receive a total of \$1.1 million for the refurbishment of theaters and performance centers. Although some theaters may be historic, preserving the past probably took a back seat to preserving their starring role on Capitol Hill for VA/HUD Appropriations subcommittee member Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) and Appropriations Committee members Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii) and Jack Reed (D-R.I.)

Taxpayer Always Comes Last, Nevada. Known for tourists, gambling, and friendly service, Las Vegas has made a name for itself with its billion-dollar hospitality industry. From showgirls to costumed Romans, the customer always comes first. The taxpayer, though, obviously comes last. Senate Appropriations Committee member Harry Reid (D-Nev.) gamble away \$700,000 for a hospitality training facility in Las Vegas.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are coming now to the closing moments of this bill. I know we are waiting for a clearance to take up the manager's amendment, and we should be coming to that shortly. As soon as we have cleared the manager's amendment, I will be offering it.

As we go into the final minutes, I am going to make some final comments on the bill. We have really done a good job, and we have done a good job working on a bipartisan basis, working with President Bush and his Cabinet.

There are 13 appropriations subcommittees. The big three are Defense, Labor-HHS, and VA-HUD. VA-HUD spends \$84 billion of the taxpayers' money. Of that, \$51 billion goes to veterans, and it is worth every nickel of it. Housing and Urban Development receives \$31 billion. A substantial amount of that goes to community development block grant money, which is decided by the local community: housing for the elderly, the special needs population, and housing for the poor. We have tried to use the best ideas and the best practices to make sure subsidies are not a way of life but a way to a better life. That is what we have concentrated on again in this bill.

We have the Environmental Protection Agency. We have worked to clean up the environment. We have the National Space Agency and the National Science Foundation, very important for public investments in new ideas, in new knowledge, which always leads to America being on the competitive edge and the cutting edge.

We try to inspire young people through a national service program where they get value by working in the community and taxpayers get value by the work they do, and we create the habits of the heart that hopefully will inspire the next generation to have the spirit of voluntarism.

We think we have done a very good job in this bill. The reason we have done a good job is cooperation, collegiality, courtesy, and civility. I thank my ranking member, Senator BOND of Missouri, for the way we have worked together on this bill.

This has been a very difficult year. First, there was the delayed transition of the executive branch. President Bush took office in a timely manner, but because of the delayed transition we were late getting started. The President was late getting started. We have worked to catch up, and he has given us some terrific Cabinet people to work with in VA-HUD, our Secretary of Housing, and our Administrator of the Environment. I extolled the virtues of our Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

So many people think we are pretty prickly in politics, but we think we have worked well with the Bush administration. I have been delighted at their courtesy.

It was the Senator from Missouri, when there was the transition of power with the Democrats taking control, who, with enormous graciousness, provided practical help in transitioning the gavel to me. He was so courteous and the transition so effective and so seamless, that we did not miss a beat in terms of holding our hearings, trying to be responsible to the needs of our communities, and trying to be responsible to the needs of the taxpayer.

In the most sincere and genuine way, I want to thank my colleague for his graciousness because I believe we have truly been able to serve the people and serve the Nation.

He has an outstanding staff, and I want to thank them now:—Jon Kamarck, Cheh Kim, and John Stody—for their wonderful work with my staff. I thank my staff—Paul Carliner, Gabrielle Batkin and Joel Widder, a detailee from the National Science Foundation—for the outstanding job they have done.

This committee has also had a tradition of bipartisanship. We have kept that tradition, and I think America benefits from it. As we now come to these closing minutes, we will really be able to complete our bill with pride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no time to yield. The time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 3 minutes in order to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Madam President, I congratulate the two Senators who have been managing this bill. I thank them for their vision with regard to America's space program, and indeed I have entered into a written colloquy with the Chair of the committee that will be inserted in the RECORD. I want to take this opportunity to express my concern and share that concern with the Chair and the ranking member of the committee. I have been afraid there may be some attempt, because NASA has had almost \$5 billion of overruns in the space station, that there may be some attempt to punish NASA by the administration.

I want to express my concern that if we starve NASA of the funds it needs, particularly with regard to the space shuttle upgrades, that could endanger the safety of the space shuttle program. I do not have to even conjecture further for the chairman and the ranking member that should there be another catastrophe in the manned space flight program, that could severely not only cripple but end the manned space flight program.

I thank the Chairman and the ranking member for recognizing space shuttle upgrades need to be addressed, not only in the bill but when we go to conference. I want to state clearly and unequivocally we cannot starve this space shuttle upgrade program, because if we do, we are getting to the point of risking the safety of the crews we fly.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I assure the Senator from Florida that we are safety-obsessed when it comes to the safety of our astronauts. In this bill, we have actually provided \$3.2 billion for the shuttle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator would suspend, the Senator has used 3 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We agree. The Senator can count on it, and everyone should know he is a Senator-astronaut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want to make one additional comment to the Senator from Florida for whom I have the highest respect, admiration, and appreciation of his advocacy for the space program. I say in all candor to the Senator from Florida, he knows these cost overruns go on and on. There is no one more qualified than the Senator from Florida to start exercising some fiscal discipline because we do not have an unlimited amount of taxpayers' dollars.

Unfortunately, before the authorizing committee, the Director of NASA keeps coming back and back saying: We have it under control; we keep imposing caps, and every year they tend to increase.

Madam President, I say to the Senator from Florida, whom I admire enormously, he is beginning to lose support when the costs just continue without any end in sight, and that should be of concern most of all to the Senator from Florida who is the advocate and spokesperson for this very important part of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I may respond—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 4 minutes. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland and 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will claim 1 minute. I say to my colleagues from Arizona and Florida, first, on the cost overruns, Senator BOND and I absolutely agree. The space station is running a \$4 billion overrun. We want to shake, rattle, and roll this culture of permissiveness with these overruns. We are trying to work with the administration to deal with it.

While we are dealing with that, though, we want to ensure for each and every mission that we can send our astronauts into space and return them home safely and maintain our shuttle upgrades.

I yield back whatever time is remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding 2 minutes. I agree with him. It is inexcusable that there is the lack of discipline so that the overruns to the tune of \$5 billion have occurred on the space station. I agree with Senator MCCAIN on that.

The fact is, however, that the space shuttle account has been starved 40 percent less over the last 10 years, and

we cannot continue to rob from Peter to pay Paul in other parts of the program without endangering the safety of the program.

The Senator and I share the vision of this country. We share the character of the American people, which is, by nature, we are explorers; we are adventurers. We never want to give that up because if we do, we are dead as a country; we are a second-rate country. We want to continue to explore into the unknown, but we have to do that with the utmost of safety. We all suffered through the tragic explosion of the 25th flight of the space shuttle, and from that we learned that we simply have to have the two-way communication and we have to have adequate resources.

There is a plan over the next 10 years of upgrading the shuttle so that it provides reliable and safe access to space, and that is what I am advocating.

Mr. MCCAIN. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Arizona has 1 minute 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. It is appropriate to say, though, when he says the budget was starved, that budget was recommended by NASA. We agreed to administration budget requests, and we were told time after time they could live within those budgets. I do not disagree with the Senator's depiction that the budget was "starved" or reduced, but those were the budget requests to which we agreed. Therefore, we have to get much more realistic estimates of the costs so that we can plan on them and also impose fiscal discipline, which I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me is somewhat lacking, at least in comparison to the pledges they make to the Congress of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Florida. I look forward to discussing this with him in the committee and also on the floor. It is a very important issue and one to which we have not paid enough attention. Now that the Senator from Florida is here, I think we will be paying a lot more attention.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to table the McCain amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES, I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMEN-

ICI) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Bayh	Durbin	Lincoln
Bennett	Edwards	Lott
Biden	Enzi	McConnell
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bond	Frist	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Gregg	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Byrd	Harkin	Roberts
Cantwell	Hatch	Santorum
Carnahan	Helms	Sarbanes
Carper	Hollings	Schumer
Chafee	Hutchinson	Sessions
Clinton	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Johnson	Specter
Corzine	Kennedy	Stabenow
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Wyden

NAYS—30

Allard	Feingold	Murkowski
Allen	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Graham	Nickles
Bunning	Gramm	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Inhofe	Snowe
Cleland	Kyl	Thomas
Collins	Lugar	Voinovich
Dayton	McCain	Warner
Ensign	Miller	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Domenici

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I compliment our two managers. We have come a long way, and, I understand we are not far off from the point where we can have final passage. The managers have done an outstanding job. My hope is that we could go back on Agriculture.

I announce to my colleagues that we have two remaining pieces of business. We have, of course, the Agriculture bill, and we have nominations that I would like to be able to take up and complete.

If there is any way we could finish it tonight, there would be no session tomorrow. I hope, perhaps, we can all work together to see if there might be a way to accomplish the rest of our work tonight. There is still plenty of time. Then we can go all make our plane reservations for tomorrow. I announce that if there is a way to do it, we sure would like to find a way.

Again, let me compliment our colleagues for getting us to this point.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the leader very much for those kind words.

I have a unanimous consent request, and then we will go to final passage.

Once again, I thank Senator BOND and his staff and my staff for their cooperation. I also thank Senator HARRY REID who helped us move the amendment process.

As you noticed, this bill had a minimum, and we are proud of our content and proud of our process.

AMENDMENT NO. 1338

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I send the VA-HUD managers' amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), for herself and Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 1338.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in the RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the amendment includes the Harkin amendment for a 1-year public housing agency, an Iowa issue;

A Hollings amendment on earmark corrections;

An Inouye amendment on the eligibility standards for mortgages for Hawaii homeland;

A Lincoln-Hutchison amendment certifying the eligibility of HOME program funds project;

A Torricelli amendment to conduct a study at VA on particular diseases;

A Mikulski amendment clarifying a plan on HOPE VI;

A Wellstone amendment preventing discrimination in the rental or sale of housing—a nondiscrimination provision;

A Lott amendment to ensure that NASA-funded rocket propulsion testing is assigned according to existing procedures;

A Dorgan amendment on funding for EPSCoR programs;

A Conrad amendment on technical and other assistance for Turtle Mountain;

A Dorgan amendment on the eligibility of North Dakota cemeteries;

A Durbin amendment extending the comment period on this network 12 cares process by 60 days;

A Kerry amendment on increasing funds for Youthbuild;

And a Kyl amendment on the sense of the Senate that the Environment and Public Works Committee should report equitable clean water funding legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the managers' amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland still has the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Alabama why he surprised us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have to clarify one of the amendments that we thought was cleared. We ask our colleagues to please stay because we think we will be able to clear it.

While we are doing this clarification with our colleague from Alabama, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers' amendment, as previously offered, with the deletion of the Lott amendment, be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1338) was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, let me express my sincere appreciation for the work of the chair of the committee. She has done an excellent job by making sure everybody knows what is going on. We have taken care of many of the problems and challenges that arise in this bill. I thank her for the tremendous cooperation she has provided us throughout.

She said some kind words about collegiality, but on this side, what we know about collegiality we have learned from the distinguished Senator from Maryland, which she has shown us in the past, on how to work effectively, both as chair and ranking member. It is my great pleasure to work with her. And I share her enthusiasm for cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay. I assure you, Mr. President, it is one of my highest priorities.

I express my appreciation to Senator MIKULSKI's staff: Paul Carliner, Gabrielle Batkin, Joel Widder; and, obviously, to my staff: Jon Kamarck, Cheh Kim, and John Stoddy. They have made a very difficult bill work well.

I hope now that we can accept this bill and send it on to conference. I appreciate the work and accommodation of all of our colleagues who were kind and understanding to know why we could not take all 1,600 proposed amendments worth \$22 billion to add on to the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1214

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment No. 1214, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1214), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

EPA'S REGULATION OF PESTICIDES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss two important issues facing agriculture and EPA's regulation of the use of pesticides.

First, as my colleagues know, 1996 capped a major shift in pesticide policy in this country with the unanimous passage by this House of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA). This act, which was later signed into law, provided new protections for infants, children, and other subpopulations potentially vulnerable to the effects of pesticide residues.

That act accelerated a trend in our country to move toward safer, reduced risk pesticides. It is important that all pesticides on the market meet FQPA's safety standards, and safer products allow farmers and others to better protect public health and safeguard our environment. It is a winning situation for everyone. Ensuring that effective, reduced risk pesticides continue to come to market is essential to ensuring that farmers and others continue to have a complete, effective, and affordable toolbox to address pest issues facing agriculture, industry, and our urban areas.

An additional \$5 million is needed to adequately support the registration of additional safer, reduced risk compounds. I would ask that this need be considered when this bill goes to conference.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I wanted to commend the Senator for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. It is my understanding that, in the last few years, over half of the applications received by EPA for new pesticides are for reduced risk, safer products.

In addition, there is a commitment by everyone, environmental groups, industry, farmers, and others, that it is important to review the older pesticides to ensure they meet today's higher health and safety standards.

Given that some of the older pesticides have had their uses adjusted as a result of FQPA, this additional money will help ensure that our farmers have a complete tool box to control the pests that threaten our agriculture. It will help bring new, cost-effective products to market and will help provide adequate alternatives for farmers.

It also helps ensure that farmers have the tools they need to continue to provide a safe and abundant supply of food. I want to express my support for these additional funds as well.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his support and his help on this issue. He and I have worked together closely on several pesticide issues over the years on the VA/HUD subcommittee, and I always value his insights into agricultural issues facing this body.

The second issue I wanted to discuss involves EPA's pesticide evaluation process. Making evaluations of a particular pesticide's safety requires complex scientific analyses that ultimately depend on having complete and reliable data to base the analyses upon. Data that you need include pesticide residues in food and water and exposures to applicators and farm workers, among others.

While EPA's ability to conduct through scientific analyses on possible pesticide exposures from drinking water and to farm workers has improved, additional work remains to be done.

I am urging that the conference committee consider including an additional \$1 million for this purpose.

Mr. CRAIG. Again, I commend my colleague for bringing this matter to our attention.

It is my understanding that this additional money could be used by EPA in a collaborative way between industry and the environmental community to strengthen EPA's information and assessment techniques.

Better data, with enhanced methods to evaluate potential pesticide exposures, will result in more accurate and scientifically sound risk assessments, thereby contributing to better quality decisions by EPA.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Iowa to include these funds in the final conference report.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If the gentlemen will yield, I thank the Senators for their discussion. Reduced-risk pesticides can provide farmers and others with alternative pesticides that may present lower risks to public health and the environment, and can help ensure that farmers continue to have the tools they need. Also, given the difficult task that EPA faces in making timely, scientific decision about pesticides, providing the tools that EPA needs to improve its decision making should be a high priority.

I will work to ensure that these items receive every appropriate consideration as the VA/HUD bill moves forward.

Mr. BOND. I rise in support of the statements by my colleagues Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HARKIN, I have a longstanding interest in ensuring that pesticides meet FQPA's safety standards based on factual, reliable scientific data. The additional funding discussed by Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HARKIN for strengthening EPA's scientific analysis on

worker exposure and drinking water would also help enhance sound scientific decisions by EPA. Moreover, the additional funding for faster review and approval of reduced risk pesticides will enable these products to be on the market sooner, and help ensure that farmers and others have a complete tool box to control pests that attack their crops and threaten public health.

I look forward to working with Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI to consider these additional funds in the conference report.

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to thank the distinguished chair and ranking member of the VA/HUD Subcommittee for their consideration. I am also hopeful that we will be able to agree upon a legislative package that will address several issues with pesticide fees currently facing the EPA and chemical industry. The Senator from Indiana, Mr. LUGAR, and I have been working together in the Agriculture Committee to come up with long-term fix for several pesticide fee provisions that expire this year.

I am very hopeful that this work could lead to an agreement that could help resolve issues that are likely to arise in conference on the VA/HUD bill.

Mr. CRAIG. I would like to commend Senators HARKIN and LUGAR for their work in the Agriculture Committee on pesticide fees.

As they and my colleagues know, the legal authorization for the collection of fees from pesticide manufacturers soon expires. The expiration of the so-called maintenance fee authorization will mean that EPA will face a significant funding shortfall as it attempts to implement FQPA.

There has been a widespread consensus in Congress to prevent the tolerance fee rule from taking effect. We have postponed the rule for 2 consecutive years, and another year postponement is included in this bill, as well as the House's version. I would urge the Senate to follow the House's action and reauthorize maintenance fees at \$20 million for fiscal year 2002. I would hope this is the first year of a multi-year fix. This would help maintain the critical base funding necessary to ensure that FQPA protections for public health are realized.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my colleague from Idaho for putting his finger on exactly why it is so important to come to a resolution on these pesticide fee issues.

Mr. CRAIG. I would like to thank the Senators HARKIN and LUGAR for their efforts and leadership on this issue. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find an agreement that is acceptable to all parties on pesticide fees.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I want to thank the Senators from Iowa and Idaho for their remarks. You've laid out the issues regarding pesticide fees and EPA funding very well, and I look forward to working with them and the Senator from Missouri to resolve them.

Mr. REID. As we have discussed, the legal authorization for the collection of fees from pesticide manufacturers soon expires. The expiration of the so-called maintenance fee authorization will mean that EPA will face a significant funding shortfall as it attempts to meet important FQPA pesticide protections for children. EPA is far behind the schedule we set for them in that unanimously adopted law. This means that the important FQPA provisions we wrote 5 years ago to protect children from the dangers posed by toxic pesticides are still not being fully implemented.

At a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee hearing on EPA's proposed budget, EPA Administrator Whitman testified that she supported these important protections. She has taken additional steps during her tenure which demonstrate her support in concrete ways. At the hearing, the Administrator recognized that the shortfall I've mentioned above would cause a reduction of 200 EPA employees dedicated to making sure our pesticide standards protect kids. She promised that those reductions would absolutely not occur.

To her credit, Administrator Whitman testified that this shortfall would not be realized because she pledged to complete the so-called tolerance fee rule proposed during the Clinton administration. The administration to its credit also took this position in its budget. The tolerance rule would provide roughly \$51 million in fees to support and accelerate FQPA work. That was an important statement. It was an affirmation of FQPA's provisions that the costs of pesticide programs should be paid for by the pesticide industry rather than by the taxpayer. I look forward to working with the Administration to follow through on its pledge.

Recognizing, however, that it may be difficult to complete that rulemaking on schedule, it is extremely important that we extend the maintenance fee authorization in conference to ensure that EPA has the funds to at least continue their current level of work. I would underscore the remarks of my colleague from Idaho that this authorization needs to include an increase so that funding meets at least the \$20 million level.

Will my colleague from Maryland work in conference to ensure that EPA is provided with the critical base funding for FQPA children's health protections by supporting the extension of such fees?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I want to thank the Senator from Nevada for raising this issue. I look forward to working with him as well to resolve this issue in conference.

NESCAUM

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished manager of the bill in a brief colloquy regarding funding for the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM). As she knows,

for many years now, NESCAUM has received support in the VA-HUD conference reports. The \$300,000 in funds provided in previous Subcommittee bills has enabled the organization to do outstanding work that is helping to protect the health and welfare of citizens in Vermont and the Northeast from air pollution.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I would like to echo the words of my colleague from Vermont. As Senators BOND and MIKULSKI know, I have supported funding for NESCAUM before and would hope that we can continue that at current levels in the fiscal year 2002 bill. The organization is very important to developing workable and cost-effective air pollution control strategies in the Northeast. I encourage the Chair to continue that past support.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I appreciate the views of the chairman and ranking Member of the authorizing committee. As they have indicated, NESCAUM has received support from the subcommittee from the past and I will ensure that it receives every appropriate consideration as we move forward.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Chair for her consideration.

NATIONAL SPACE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE (NSBRI)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Maryland and chairman of the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. As the Senator knows, several years ago, NASA established the National Space Biomedical Research Institute (NSBRI) to enlist the broad scientific community in the effort to develop solutions to the health-related problems and physical and psychological challenges men and women will face on long-duration space flights. These 2 to 3 year missions will one day allow astronauts to travel to other planets and explore our solar system. The Institute also investigates ways to deliver medical care on these missions through new technologies and remote treatment advances. While addressing these space issues, the NSBRI plans to rapidly transfer discoveries that will also benefit human health on Earth.

As the distinguished Senator knows, the NSBRI is headquartered in Houston, TX at the Baylor College of Medicine. Eleven other prestigious research organizations make up the 12-member consortium of NSBRI Institutions, including the renowned Johns Hopkins University in Maryland. If we are to meet our established goals for human space flight and the continued exploration of the final frontier, we must better understand the physiological and psychological effects of space travel on the brave men and women who we launch into space. The NSBRI is the primary institution charged with this task.

I know that the Senator from Maryland shares my concern that NSBRI receive adequate funding. I have been informed that in order to fully fund current NSBRI research projects, an increase above the president's Fiscal Year 2002 budget is required.

I ask the Senator from Maryland to work with me in ensuring that NSBRI is provided with an increase in funding for NSBRI within the available amounts appropriated in the bill.

Mr. MIKULSKI. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I share her concern for the brave men and women who risk their lives to achieve the national goals that we have established for space travel. I agree that the health effects of these travels must be better understood, and that we should not endanger our astronauts who engage in long-term space travel without fully understanding the effects such travel has on the human body.

I thank the Senator from Texas for raising this important issue, and I offer my commitment to work with her to provide the NSBRI with the resources to achieve the goals we both share.

PHILADELPHIA'S NEIGHBORHOOD
TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to enter into a colloquy with Senator BOND to discuss efforts to assist the city of Philadelphia in its Neighborhood Transformation Initiative. On Monday, July 30, 2001, I met with Mayor John Street for an hour and a half regarding this initiative, which seeks to eliminate "blight" in the city of Philadelphia as well as focus on the elements that are essential for a neighborhood to thrive. These elements include the development of recreational facilities, retail opportunities, transportation, secure streets, cultural outlets and quality schools. I was very impressed with Mayor Street's plan to transform the city. I believe that the city is on the right track and could provide the prototype for addressing overall blight that plagues so many American neighborhoods.

In order to assist Philadelphia in reducing inner city blight, I aim to provide even greater flexibility in the use of CDBG funds. I believe this increased flexibility is imperative in order for the city to develop a long-term plan with a predictable funding stream.

Additionally, I understand that there may be additional funds available in the HUD Neighborhood Initiative program when the VA/HUD appropriations bill goes to conference. I would appreciate any funds that may be available for implementation of the city of Philadelphia's blight removal plan.

Mr. BOND. I understand that like so many neighborhoods in large urban cities, the neighborhoods in the city of Philadelphia have been devastated by depopulation and that other Philadelphia neighborhoods are experiencing the initial signs of decline with stagnant or declining property values, ris-

ing crime, and a breakdown in public infrastructure. Still, other neighborhoods are largely stable, but are hardly flourishing.

I respect what the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to accomplish with these provisions. The CDBG is a flexible block grant program used by States and communities for critical projects such as affordable housing, economic development, and human service projects. Last year the committee provided approximately \$5 billion for the program. While this program is already a very flexible program, I am happy to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania to assist the city of Philadelphia to use CDBG funding to develop a long-term blight removal plan.

I understand that the city of Philadelphia is in dire need of neighborhood development and blight removal, and I would be glad to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania in conference to try to secure funding under the Neighborhood Initiative effort for this meritorious program.

NASA

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, one of the agencies funded in this bill is particularly important to me and to my constituents in Florida: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA supports programs that invest in our Nation's future. At present, NASA's most significant and visible investment is the International Space Station. But, we have a problem on our hands: The Space Station is now expected to cost almost \$5 billion dollars more than projected just a few months ago. If we are going to complete this project, we have to find the money somewhere. Does the Senator agree?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I wholeheartedly agree. We must complete this project. It is an investment in our children's future. This laboratory of the heavens will allow us to conduct research in tissue growth, looking at the causes of cancer and potential medical treatments. We are going to investigate new drugs, and develop a whole new understanding of the building blocks of life. Using the microgravity environment of space, our industries will develop new advanced materials that may lead to stronger, lighter metals and more powerful computer chips. The station will also house experiments in combustion science, that could lead to reduced emissions from power plants and automobiles, saving consumers billions of dollars. And these are just a few of the possibilities. At the same time, I am deeply disturbed about the recent cost overruns in the Space Station program. We have to find funds to complete the station, and as Chair of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, I attempted to balance this need with those of other programs within the agency.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator, and agree with her that recently announced ISS cost increases are disturbing. Funding these cost overruns without adding more money

to NASA's budget—as the Bush Administration has proposed—necessitates cutting many of NASA's programs, and possibly endangering the future viability of the station itself. At the same time, there are many other worthwhile projects being conducted at NASA—that have nothing to do with the space station—such as research in extra-galactic astronomy using the Hubble Space Telescope, global climate change research by remotely sensing the Earth, and launch technology development that could decrease the cost of getting to space by a factor of 10 or more. Not to mention the other human space flight programs impacted by station cost overruns. Cuts to the Space Shuttle Program may have catastrophic consequences. We have to continue supporting these and other projects, but where will all the money come from? I recognize that this situation has tied the hands of appropriators in both chambers, and applaud the efforts of Senators MIKULSKI and BOND, as well as Representatives WALSH and MOLLOHAN in the House, in attempting to solve this problem. While the Chambers are far apart in their approaches, I understand that Senator MIKULSKI plans to work with conferees to support a combination of the priorities in each bill. Is this correct?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator is correct. The committee has endorsed the projects included in the bill's report. At the same time, I also recognize the need to support some of the priorities that were endorsed by the House. I plan to press for a marriage of the two bills during conference, combining the priorities of each Chamber. In fact, during this year's appropriations process, I have especially appreciated the input of Senator NELSON, as I believe that the combined interests of his constituents in Florida, and my own constituents in Maryland best represent the diversity of programs supported by NASA. Although programs in Florida largely focus on human space flight and supporting a robust commercial space industry, and programs in Maryland center around the remote sensing of Earth and exploring our own solar system, we both believe in doing everything we can to support a robust civilian space program for our Nation and the world. For this reason, I look forward to continuing to work with Senator NELSON and his staff in best representing the interests of both of our constituencies, as well as those of the rest of my colleagues.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the distinguished Senator. I appreciate her support and that of her staff on this issue, and look forward to continuing to work with her.

INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Maryland and chairwoman of the VA-HUD-Independent

Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee concerning the International Space Station and NASA's funding.

We are both concerned about the recently projected cost growth for the International Space Station. I support a space station that is fully functioning, and in order to achieve that goal, NASA must work within the budget that Congress has given it. At the same time, I understand the difficulty in estimating the costs of such an amazing engineering feat. We are now within a year of the station being "core complete," and I believe Congress must adequately fund the station so that we can begin to see the benefits of its unique scientific research.

NASA's projected 5-year cost growth of over \$4 billion includes many program liens that reflect 2 years of actual operational experience for the station. That on-orbit experience has eliminated many unknowns and has significantly enhanced NASA's awareness of what it takes to operate the space station. Unfortunately, the greater awareness has come a price tag that threatens reaching the full capability of the space station as originally planned in terms of research, a permanent crew of six, and a crew rescue vehicle.

I understand NASA is dealing with the budgetary challenges and has proposed a "core complete" plan for the station to stay within budget constraints. Importantly, NASA and OMB have put into place an independent external review board to assess the space station's budget and to assure the station will provide maximum benefit to the U.S. taxpayer. This external review board will evaluate the costs and benefits for enhancing research, a habitation module for a crew of six and a crew rescue vehicle.

Does the Senator agree it is important in conference that we not preclude the full review of these potential enhancements by the independent external review board, and not preclude the ability of NASA to undertake these enhancements, in order to ensure the originally planned capability for the space station?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am concerned about the continued cost overruns on the space station and the lack of real urgency at NASA to really get the station budget under control. We have to send NASA a message that it cannot keep spending more and more money that is meant for other programs. The committee supports administration's objectives of reining in station cost growth, reforming program management to avoid cost overruns in the future, and creating an independent panel to validate the budget estimates and management reforms. The external review committee will present its recommendations this fall to address the space station funding problem. We are, necessarily, in a "wait and see" mode until NASA and OMB give us a new plan that will be the result of the independent external review.

I agree that we should not take any action that would prevent the achievement of the original scientific mission of the station. Despite the space station funding challenge, the committee is committed to completing the station: one that is capable of supporting world-class research.

But let me say, I will ensure that the space station problems do not threaten NASA's science programs. We can never shortchange safety or the science, and I'm afraid with the overruns we are going to be shortchanging science.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator and would like to reassert that I do not disagree with what you said about the real concerns with cost overruns that, unchecked, will limit the space station's ability to perform as intended. I want to work with you to make sure that we do not cut off capabilities of the space station, and thereby never see the scientific contributions for which we have already made a significant investment.

VETERANS' HEALTH CARE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Maryland, the chair of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, to enter into a colloquy.

I had intended to offer an amendment to the bill before us to increase the spending for veterans' health care.

I think the need is there, as the President's budget plainly shows that next year VA will need nearly \$1 billion to cover the cost of payroll and inflation. But the President's budget only provided an additional \$800 million.

VA needs additional funding to pay for the long-term care needs of an aging population, emergency care coverage in non-VA hospitals, hepatitis C treatment, and new outpatient clinics.

I do understand the very restrictive allocation that Senator MIKULSKI's subcommittee faces—due to a budget resolution not of her own making. Because of that, I have decided against offering my amendment, but I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Toward the end of the year, I feel certain that Congress will need to revisit various spending bills. I feel strongly that one of the areas which should receive more attention at that time is VA health care. I ask, therefore, for the Senator's assurance that we can go back and add additional funding for VA health care.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The subcommittee recognizes that increased funding for VA healthcare is very important to keeping our promises to our nation's veterans.

Within our allocation, which was very tight, we were able to provide \$21.4 billion for VA medical care. This is \$1.1 billion above the fiscal year 2001 level, \$400 million above the President's request, and \$100 million above the House.

The VA also retains copayments from veterans and third-party health insurance. CBO estimates that these will provide an additional \$900 million for VA medical care in fiscal year 2002.

VA will also carry over \$882 million in unobligated medical care funding from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2002.

This level of funding will allow VA to open at least 33 more community based outpatient clinics, and improve waiting times for veterans to receive care.

We also provide \$390 million for VA medical and prosthetic research. This is \$40 million above the fiscal year 2001 level, and \$30 million above the President's request. This funding is critical to making more progress in: One, recruiting and retaining high quality medical professionals; two, the treatment of chronic diseases; three, diagnosis and treatment of degenerative brain diseases like Alzheimers and Parkinsons; and four, research involving special populations, especially those who suffer from spinal cord injury, stroke, nervous system diseases, and post traumatic stress disorder.

So within our tight allocation, the subcommittee was able to keep our promises to our nation's veterans.

But we recognize that there is always more we can do.

So I assure Senator ROCKEFELLER that within our available resources we will continue to do all we can to meet the needs of our Nation's veterans, and keep the promises we made to them.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OUTPATIENT CLINIC IN PASSAIC COUNTY, NJ

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. president, I request unanimous consent to engage the distinguished chairwoman of the VA/HUD appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy about a critical health care matter facing the veterans in my State of New Jersey.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would be happy to accommodate my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank my distinguished colleague from Maryland. In my State of New Jersey, the veterans population is facing an epidemic in receiving the health care services they need. They have earned these health care benefits by virtue of their service to our country in the Armed Forces, and I believe, as many other Members of this body believe, that we should make every effort to ensure that the men and women who have served their country in times of war should have access to quality and dependable health care when they need it.

The problems that the veterans of New Jersey come across in receiving the care that they need are many. Each year, under the Veterans Service Integrated Network, our region has been seeing its veterans health care funding dwindle as it is reallocated to other parts of the country. This means that there are fewer hospital beds, fewer doctors, fewer nurses, and fewer support staff members to respond to the needs of the 750,000 veterans who still live in New Jersey.

This also means that there are fewer facilities where veterans can go to get checkups, prescriptions for much needed drugs or therapy and rehabilitation for ailments incurred during their service.

Indeed, a veteran in New Jersey who puts in a request to have a routine checkup may have to wait several months before they receive an appointment. I cannot overstate the critical situation that thousands of New Jersey veterans face each day. There is a severe backlog of appointments at all of the New Jersey's veterans hospitals and outpatient clinics and unless this matter is addressed in the near future, the problem will only become more acute.

Earlier this year, I met with members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from New Jersey. In our conversation, they stated that one of the ways we can alleviate the current problem being faced by the veterans in our state is to establish a new outpatient clinic in Passaic County, NJ. This new clinic could provide services to veterans throughout the northern part of my state where a large concentration of veterans live. Currently, many veterans in this region of New Jersey have to travel long distances to get health care, some even as far as New York City.

The House VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee agreed with the merits of establishing a new outpatient clinic in Passaic County, and encouraged the VA to establish one there. It is my hope that the members of the Senate will recognize this need as well and encourage the VA to locate a new outpatient clinic in Passaic County. It will provide a great measure of relief to a veterans population that has been underserved for many years.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his thoughts on this matter.

MOORESVILLE, NC LIBRARY PROJECT

Mr. EDWARDS. Senator MIKULSKI, you have made available \$140,000,000 for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of economic development efforts. I want to make you and your committee aware of a project I think is worthy of an EDI grant.

The town of Mooresville, NC is in dire need of assistance in rebuilding its library. The current library has more than 60,000 books, despite the fact that it was built to hold only 26,000. The Town plans to add 20,000 square feet to house library materials as well as community room as well as a large research and reference area. The library is on the National Register of Historic Landmarks. I am certain this project will contribute to the overall revitalization of the neighborhood.

I am certain the Senator would agree that the Mooresville project is a worthwhile investment. I respectfully ask you to urge members of the conference committee to provide \$1 million in EDI funds for the Mooresville library project.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for bringing this project to the committee's attention. The subcommittee will give it every appropriate consideration as we move forward.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with Senator MIKULSKI, the chair of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee.

As the Senator is aware, I have always been a supporter of the State and Tribal Assistance Grants program administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. Over the years, the STAG program has provided millions of dollars to many of the rural communities throughout the State for wastewater treatment, waters systems, and programs designed to improve air quality.

For good reason, this program is tremendously popular with Members and I know that the chairwoman receives far more requests for funding that she can possibly accommodate.

However, I would like to ask my friend to consider two STAG grant requests for the State of Nevada should additional funds become available to the subcommittee in conference.

The first involves funding for restoration of the Las Vegas Wash. As my friend knows, the Las Vegas is the primary wetland area in southern Nevada that filters the drinking water that supplies Las Vegas and the rapidly growing areas around it. For several years, the local, State, and Federal governments have been working cooperatively—a remarkable success story—to restore and protect these wetlands. This STAG grant will allow this important work to continue.

The second request is for Lake Tahoe. As the Senator from Maryland knows, I have always marveled at her commitment and dedication to saving the Chesapeake Bay. I have similar passion for protecting and restoring the Jewel of the High Sierra's, Lake Tahoe. The relatively modest STAG grant I am seeking for Lake Tahoe will provide funding for a series of air and water quality projects that will contribute to fulfilling the requirements of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, a 10 year Federal, State, local, and private sector blueprint for saving Lake Tahoe.

All I ask is that my friend and colleague give these two requests her consideration during the House-Senate conference committee.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader for his thoughtful words. I agree that the two matters you have brought to my attention are important and worthy. Senator BOND, our ranking member, and I will certainly work with the House conferees and consider these grant requests for funding.

SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING FOR MICHIGAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the fiscal year 2002 Appropriations Act for VA/HUD and Independent Agencies, which includes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Maryland would

be willing to consider in conference funding for sewer projects in Michigan.

In Michigan, we are facing an urgent need to maintain and improve our aging sewer systems. In southeast Michigan alone this will cost between \$14 and \$26 billion over the next 30 years. I would greatly appreciate the committee's assistance in protecting water quality in Michigan by funding these much-needed sewer projects.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So many of our communities are facing enormous funding needs to upgrade aging wastewater infrastructure, including Michigan communities, and we regret that we could not fund the new combined sewer overflow program within existing funding constraints. The Senator from Michigan's request will receive every appropriate consideration as we move forward.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend from Maryland and the committee for their hard work in putting together this important legislation.

GEORGIA COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

Mr. MILLER. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished subcommittee chairwoman about a very important community development initiative taking place within the great State of Georgia.

First, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairwoman for her continued support of community redevelopment and empowering neighborhoods. Additionally Senator MIKULSKI, through her tenure as ranking member and now chair, has always made education one of her top priorities.

In my State of Georgia, three institutions of higher education, which are also Historically Black Colleges and Universities, are participating in a group community redevelopment initiative. Morehouse College, the Morehouse School of Medicine and Spelman College have formed a nonprofit corporation—College Partners, Inc.—and are working with the city of Atlanta in a land acquisition deal. The deal will result in the expansion of the Atlanta University Center, AUC, space, as well as surrounding community development and revitalization.

The West End community, which sits at the boundary of these AUC campuses, has been unable to significantly capitalize on the renewed interest in residential and commercial development within the Atlanta area. This community has high unemployment, low educational attainment, deteriorating and/or vacant housing, and a preponderance of families that live at or below the Federal poverty level. All of this exists less than three miles from downtown Atlanta, where there sits prime commercial developments.

Acquisition of the land in question will allow the campuses to expand and enable the surrounding community development process to continue and remain on target with the objectives of the city's empowerment zone, which already has improved the neighborhoods east and north of the campuses.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I appreciate very much the comments from the Senator from Georgia. How will the surrounding neighborhood benefit from the result of the land acquisition?

Mr. MILLER. Each participating school, which are all currently landlocked, will be able to expand their capabilities and establish and/or expand programs in their particular areas of expertise. But what makes the initiative so worthwhile is that the program expansion will move beyond the confines of the institutions and out into the community. For instance, Morehouse College will continue its partnership with Fannie Mae Foundation and HUD to provide leadership training to community organizers, local nonprofit organizations, and members of the Neighborhood Planning Units. Morehouse also plans to establish a charter school. Morehouse School of Medicine will be expanding its Community Health and Preventive Medicine Programs, as well as expand an initiative to stimulate the interest of and introduce minority elementary and middle school students to medical and science careers early in their education. Finally, Spelman College plans to provide local residents with training in early childhood development and childcare while simultaneously providing a hands-on laboratory for student education majors. In addition to the request for the CPI project, as we have discussed, Spelman College is seeking additional funds to renovate one of their primary buildings, Packard Hall, and include its use in the larger community revitalization efforts. Specifically, \$1 million is sought from the Economic Development Initiatives account in your bill for each of these projects, for a total of \$2 million. This funding is urgently needed to ensure the completion of this vital community development initiative.

I hope that language for both College Partners, Inc., and Spelman College can be included in the conference report for these initiatives that work to further community revitalization and educational attainment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I appreciate the inquiry from the Senator from Georgia and the subcommittee will work with him and Mr. CLELAND to ensure that these initiatives receive every appropriate consideration as we move forward.

ACQUISITION AND REVITALIZATION OF ATLANTA'S WEST END

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the Subcommittee, Ms. MIKULSKI, regarding a joint collaboration between three of Georgia's finest academic institutions, Morehouse School of Medicine, Morehouse College and Spelman College. As the Senator is aware, these neighboring institutions have come together for the purpose of acquiring and revitalizing an 11 acre parcel of land in Atlanta's West End community that is contiguous to all

three schools. The acquisition of this land is critical to the future success of each institution, due to the fact that all three schools are essentially landlocked.

The acquisition of this property will enable each school to significantly expand their education and community based programs, as well as contribute to the revitalization of Atlanta's West-End Community. All three institutions are working very hard to secure private resources for this project. However, given the scope of this initiative, the schools are also seeking federal support from the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Economic Development Initiative program.

I applaud the Chairman for her leadership in promoting community revitalization programs in the VA-HUD appropriations bill. I would ask the Chairman if she would give every consideration to supporting the important initiative I have just described in the upcoming conference with the House on the VA-HUD bill.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am aware of the joint collaboration between these three Historically Black institutions in Atlanta, and I applaud their effort to contribute to the revitalization of Atlanta's West-End Community. I would tell the Senator that during the development of this year's bill, we received a large number of meritorious requests for projects within HUD's Economic Development Initiative account—including the project he just described. With respect to the conference, I can assure my friend from Georgia that this project will receive every appropriate consideration.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership and look forward to working with her as the process moves forward.

SPINA BIFIDA

Mr. BROWBACK. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the No. 1 permanently disabling birth defect in the United States. Spina Bifida is a neural tube defect and occurs when the central nervous system does not form properly close during the early stages of pregnancy. The most severe form of Spina Bifida occurs in 96 percent of the children born with this disease. People with Spina Bifida often have paralysis of muscle groups, difficulties with bowel and bladder control, and learning and developmental challenges. There are approximately 70,000 individuals living with the challenges of Spina Bifida in our Nation.

This is also a very preventable birth defect. Sixty million women are at risk of having a child born with Spina Bifida, and each year approximately 4,000 pregnancies in this country are affected by Spina Bifida. Unfortunately, only 2,500 of these children are born. This translates into approximately 11 Spina Bifida and neural tube defect affected pregnancies in this country each and every day. Yet, if all women of

childbearing age were to consume 0.4 milligrams of folic acid before becoming pregnant, the incidence of folic acid-preventable Spina Bifida would be reduced between 50-75 percent. Let me repeat this. If all women of childbearing age had a multivitamin with 0.4 milligrams of folic acid everyday with breakfast, we could reduce the incidence of this birth defect by 50-75 percent.

Fortunately, we are working to get the word out regarding the importance of folic acid consumption. Created by the Children's Health Act of 2000, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities' mission is to improve the health of children by preventing birth defects and developmental disabilities. I have just heard that the center's folic acid prevention campaign has reduced neural tube defect births by 20 percent. This public health success should be celebrated, but it is only half of the equation—2,500 babies are born each year with Spina Bifida.

Much more must be done to improve the quality of life for those 70,000 individuals and their families that live with this disease day in and out. Major medical advances have permitted babies born with Spina Bifida to have a normal life expectancy and live independent and fulfilling lives. However, living with this disease can be expensive—emotionally, physically, and financially. The lifetime costs associated with a typical case of Spina Bifida—including medical care, special education, therapy services, and loss of earnings—exceed \$500,000. The total societal cost of Spina Bifida exceeds \$750 million per year. The Social Security Administration payments to individuals with Spina Bifida exceed \$82 million per year. Tens of millions of dollars are spent on medical care covered by Medicaid and Medicare. Clearly we need to do more to improve the quality of life for people suffering from Spina Bifida. With improved quality-of-life for individuals and families affected for Spina Bifida, the stigma and fear associated with a Spina Bifida birth will decrease significantly.

I support efforts to examine the current state of and opportunities in the practice of secondary prevention—including in utero surgery—and efforts to reduce and prevent secondary health effects of Spina Bifida. One step of many we must take to improve the quality of life for those suffering from this disease is in the creation of a national registry of persons affected by Spina Bifida and its secondary conditions so we can know who is affected and how we can help them.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I, too, share my distinguished colleague's concern about this permanent and disabling birth defect. The exact causes of Spina Bifida are unknown. While we know that consumption of the recommended daily dosage of folic acid plays a tremendous part in the prevention of this disease,

we still have much to learn. We also need to help those that suffer from this disease and their loved ones deal with the day-to-day challenges of living with this birth defect. As more and more individuals with Spina Bifida live longer, it is increasingly important to ensure that their quality-of-life is maximized—this includes educational and vocational attainment, amelioration of secondary health effects, and ongoing support for them and their families. In 1996, this Senate passed the Agent Orange Benefits Act which provides benefits for persons affected by Spina Bifida whose biological father or mother is or was a Vietnam veteran. I was proud to support this important Act, but I am troubled that not all of the 3,000 eligible families have been identified by the Veterans Administration.

Mr. BOND. How many families have been identified under the Agent Orange Benefits Act?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Only 900 families out of the 3,000 eligible have been identified for these benefits.

Mr. BOND. Is there a reason why less than half of the eligible families have been identified since passage of the Agent Orange Benefits Act.?

Mr. BROWNBACK. The Veterans Administration's funding capacity to conduct outreach, educational, and programmatic initiatives has been limited to this number so far.

Mr. BOND. I, too, am concerned about the effects of this devastating disease and am pleased to stand with two of my colleagues on this important public health issue. I supported the passage of the Children's Health Act last year that created the new birth defects center at CDC and I am pleased that their prevention education efforts have already led to a downturn in Spina Bifida cases. I am also pleased that the identified families to date are utilizing the benefits under the Agent Orange Benefits Act. I, in addition to the distinguished Senators from Kansas and Maryland, support efforts that would improve the quality of life for those suffering from this condition and further support the development of a national registry. Both the CDC and the Veterans Administration are making strides in the study of this disease and I support a collaborative initiative for the two agencies to improve upon existing registries of persons affected by Spina Bifida, and other birth defects, especially for those whose father or mother served our nation during the Vietnam war.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I agree with my colleague from Missouri. The key to developing and maintaining a national registry will be the collaboration between the various federal agencies. I also support collaboration between the CDC and the Veterans Administration to further conduct outreach education initiatives to ensure that all of the 3,000 eligible families receive benefits as designated under the Agent Orange Benefits Act.

I thank the Senators from Kansas and Missouri for their support of this bipartisan effort to begin to establish the groundwork for improving the quality of life for individuals affected by Spina Bifida.

NSF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH (EPSCoR)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I commend Chairman MIKULSKI and Ranking Member BOND for their foresight and leadership in providing a \$256 million, or 6 percent, increase for the National Science Foundation. I also appreciate their willingness to provide \$85 million for the NSF Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, EPSCoR, program. EPSCoR is a proven program that is helping researchers in historically underfunded States to improve their competitiveness for federal R&D.

The managers of this bill have been gracious enough to accept an amendment from me that increases the EPSCoR funding in the Senate bill to \$90 million in fiscal year 2002. This modest \$5 million increase does not need to be offset because it comes out of the amount already appropriated through the NSF Education and Human Resources line-item.

EPSCoR helps these States to build infrastructure and expertise in areas of scientific importance to the States and the Nation by providing seed money that allows smaller research universities to hire faculty, obtain equipment, support the development of young faculty members, and other vital tasks that the Stanfords and MITs of the world take for granted.

While I am glad that the EPSCoR level in the Senate bill is \$10 million above the current level and the President's budget request, we are still falling woefully short of the level needed to help under-funded States. The top 5 States—California, New York, Massachusetts, Colorado, and DC—received 48 percent of total NSF funding in 2000. One State alone receives twice as much NSF funding as the 21 EPSCoR States combined. California received \$452 million in NSF funding in fiscal year 2000, which is 15 percent of the total NSF funding. The 21 EPSCoR States, plus Puerto Rico, share only 7 percent of total NSF funding, \$207 million.

In 1990, the NSF EPSCoR budget was only \$8 million. While it is true that this funding has grown steadily in the years since then, these increases have been extremely modest in comparison to total Federal R&D expenditures. In fact, even with the additional co-funding that NSF provides to EPSCoR grantees, the \$90 million, plus the \$25 million in co-funding, in total EPSCoR funding provided under my amendment would still represent only 2.5 percent of the total NSF budget in fiscal year 2002.

I have already heard from a number of my colleagues who support my amendment and 17 Members of the Senate joined Senator NICKLES and me in sending a letter to the subcommittee requesting this funding level.

EPSCoR is good Federal policy. At its most basic, scientific research is about ideas. When you have research institutions in 5 States receiving half of the basic science research funding, a whole universe of ideas are left unexplored. EPSCoR has been invaluable to States like North Dakota becoming more competitive for Federal research dollars. North Dakota's total NSF funding increased by 307 percent from 1990–1999. The number of competitive NSF awards that North Dakota researchers received increased by 71 percent between 1993–1998. More than 30 topnotch young faculty were brought to North Dakota, through the support of EPSCoR, that would otherwise have gone elsewhere. Those EPSCoR-supported researchers have successfully competed for more than \$12 million in Federal and private R&D funding.

EPSCoR is also a key to economic development in EPSCoR States like North Dakota. A single, typical \$100,000 research grant generates \$230,000 back into the local economy, according to an analysis by NDSU. EPSCoR-supported researchers were awarded 12 patents between 1986–1999. Michael Chambers, whose early research was supported by an EPSCoR award, has now founded Aldevron, a biotech company in Fargo. The Small Business Administration named Michael its Region 8 Young Entrepreneur of the Year in 2000.

The NSF EPSCoR program has also funded an innovative program in North Dakota that supports university faculty and students in providing technical expertise to North Dakota companies with scientific questions and problems. More than 180 students, a dozen faculty members, and 75 companies have benefitted from the program so far. For instance, Dr. Joel Jorgenson of Fargo designed an on-board recorder, monitoring and read-out system to solve a problem for Global Electric MotorCars (GEM) of Fargo, which is now the nation's largest manufacturer of Neighborhood Electrical Vehicles. GEM has since been acquired by Daimler-Chrysler and will be doubling its 130-employee workforce by the end of 2001. Dr. Robert Nelson with North Dakota State University devised a means for Ottertail Power Company to detect when and where a fault has occurred on its power line, increasing the efficiency of the transmission lines.

Despite the progress being made to help EPSCoR States improve their competitiveness, they still tend to lag behind—especially in winning large-scale center and multidisciplinary awards. Addressing this challenge is the next step needed to improve competitiveness, and full funding for EPSCoR at the \$90 million level called for by the amendment I have offered is key.

I think \$90 million for the NSF's Education and Human Resources for the EPSCoR program is important to ensure full implementation of the NSF EPSCoR's new infrastructure program.

The additional \$25 million in cofunding will ensure a robust NSF EPSCoR program next year. I thank the Chair and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee for agreeing to include my amendment.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING ASSISTANCE IN NEW YORK AND MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I believe that we need to provide additional clarification regarding section 226 of the VA/HUD Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act, Public Law 105-276, that provides a prohibition of public housing funding for certain State-developed housing in New York and Massachusetts, covering some 12,000 units. This transfer has been described as the "federalization" of this housing, but it should be called a sham, with the analogy of a husband walking out on his wife and children and leaving them with nothing. This housing was developed by State government with no nexus to public housing.

To be clear, the Senator Banking Committee in the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 had sought to fund the long-term housing needs of low-income housing developed with New York and Massachusetts funding with new Federal public housing funding, despite the fact, as I have noted, that these are not public housing units and have absolutely no nexus to public housing or any Federal housing program.

As a result, the Congress passed section 226 of the VA/HUD Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act to ensure for fiscal year 1999 and every following fiscal year, including all appropriation acts in every succeeding fiscal year, that these state-developed low-income housing units remain the responsibility of New York and Massachusetts, and not create the unusual, unfair and unique precedent of requiring the Federal Government to fund this housing as public housing. The costs of this "federalization" will exceed \$100 million annually for New York alone, totaling well over \$1 billion in the next 10-year period. This likely is an underestimate of costs. I warn all Members that this scheme will result in a reduction of funds to all PHAs throughout the Nation, each will see a loss of needed funds whether the public housing is in Baltimore, MD; Kansas City, MO; Anchorage, AK; San Francisco; West Virginia and every other State.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The legislation is clear on its face that it is a permanent law and a permanent prohibition on funding these State-developed low-income housing units as public housing. In addition, to fund State-developed units as public housing, there must be an affirmative change in law, a change I cannot support.

Frankly, it is not fair to other States to have their funding cut to pay for State-developed and supported housing in New York and Massachusetts.

Mr. BOND. I agree with everything you have said and I am embarrassed for these States and their attempt to

transfer the responsibility for their own low-income housing responsibilities to the Federal Government through public housing funding. Even more important, unlike the current chairman and ranking member of the House VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, we were responsible as Senate chair and ranking member for the VA/HUD Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act which included this provision that rejected the federalization of these State-developed units as public housing. The law was drafted as a permanent prohibition on the use of Federal funding for these units and I urge both New York and Massachusetts to acknowledge their responsibility to maintain this low-income housing for low-income families. We have been in a period of economic growth and these States should accept their responsibilities to their State residents consistent with their promise to provide affordable low-income housing.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank both Senator BOND and Senator MIKULSKI for their hard work on this important legislation which provides federal funding for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies. Unfortunately, I must again speak about the unacceptably high funding levels of parochial projects in this appropriations bill. Although the level of add-ons in some sections of this bill has decreased, this bill still contains approximately \$523 million in porkbarrel spending.

Overall, this bill spends 7.6 percent higher than the level enacted in fiscal year 2001, which is greater than the 4 percent increase in discretionary spending that the President wanted to adhere to. In real dollars, this is \$2.69 billion in additional spending above the amount requested by the President, and \$8.015 billion higher than last year. So far this year, with the appropriations bills considered, spending levels have exceeded the President's budget request by nearly \$7 billion. A good amount of this increase is in the form of parochial spending for unrequested projects. In this bill, I have identified 492 separate earmarks totaling \$523 million, which is greater than the 400 earmarks totaling \$472 million, in the legislation passed last year.

The committee provides \$23.8 billion in discretionary funding for the VA. That amount is \$452.7 million more than the President's budget request and \$1.5 billion above the amount in fiscal year 2001. Some progress has been made to reduce the overall amount of earmarks for the VA in this spending bill. Chairman Byrd of the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman Mikulski of the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, have held the amount in earmarks to approximately \$24 million this year. Nonetheless, it is \$24 million that will not be available for higher priorities.

Among other Senators who have stood on the Senate floor to fight for

additional funding for veterans healthcare, I am concerned that the Committee has directed critical dollars from veterans healthcare to fund spending projects that have not been properly reviewed. Certain provisions funded under the VA in this legislation illustrate that Congress still does not have its priorities in order.

One especially troubling expense, neither budgeted for nor requested by the Administration over the past ten years, is a provision that directs the VA to continue the ten year old demonstration project involving the Clarksburg, West Virginia, Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC) and the Ruby Memorial Hospital at West Virginia University. Several years ago, the VA-HUD appropriations bill contained a plus-up of \$2 million for the Clarksburg VAMC that ended up on the Administration's line-item veto list and since then the millions keep flowing.

Last year, the Committee "recommended" \$1 million for the design of a nursing home care unit at the Beckley, West Virginia, VAMC. This year they strengthened their report language urging "the VA to accelerate the design of the nursing home care unit at the Beckley, WV VAMC."

This year, for Martinsburg, West Virginia, the Committee provides \$1 million for a feasibility study to establish a Center for Healthcare Information at the Office of Medical Information Security Service at the Martinsburg VAMC to identify solutions to protect the privacy, confidentiality, and integrity of the sensitive medical records of the VA patient population.

Alaska also has a number of items that will include funding above the budget request of the President and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. The Committee report directs the VA to start up and operate by 2002 a community-based outpatient clinic (CBOC) on the Matanuska-Susitna Valley, Alaska, costing \$1 million. The Committee initially directs the VA only to report by March 30, 2002, on its progress to establish a Matanuska-Susitna Valley CBOC, but then expects the VA to ensure it is operational by 2002. It further recommends that all veterans living farther than a 50-mile radius from Anchorage be authorized to use contract care from local private physicians.

For St. Louis, MO, the committee "encouraged" the VA to pursue an innovative approach at a cost of \$7 million for leasing parking spaces at the John Cochran Division of the VA Medical Center in St. Louis as a means to address a parking shortfall at the VA hospital. The committee also suggests that funds be transferred from the minor construction VA account in order to secure additional private sector investment for this VA Medical Center.

The Committee also directs the VA to explore new uses for the Miles City, Montana VA facility and to continue to support the Hawaii VA Pacific Tele-

medicine Project. In addition, the Committee directs the VA to conduct a feasibility study on the need for a VA Research Center for the Clarksburg VAMC on the campus of West Virginia University.

Additionally, the committee "expects" the continuation at the current spending level of the Rural Veterans Health Care Initiative at the White River Junction, VT VAMC. The current level is an astounding \$7 million.

On a more positive note, one provision directs the VA to submit a report on the number of homeless veterans and the type of homeless veterans services that the VA provides. I am pleased that the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee has focused on the critical plight of our Nation's homeless veterans. I had hoped, however, that they would have prevailed in conference in recent years on a relevant amendment that I had first offered to the VA-HUD appropriations bill in 1999, which was adopted, but later dropped in conference. I hope that the proposed VA report provides the catalyst for legislation next year. I am disappointed that it has already taken this long to address this matter. We owe it to these less fortunate veterans who served their country so well only to find nowhere to call home.

Although the Committee report calls for yet another study on the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation (VERA) system, I continue to be pleased by the General Accounting Office and the VA reports, which recommend that veterans health care funding should be shifted from northeastern states to southern and southwestern states. This helps ensure that critical health care funding for veterans follows them to the actual locations where their medical care takes place.

While I am encouraged by the increase specifically in veterans health care funding over last year's enacted levels, we must do much more. We made a promise to our veterans that we would take care of their mental and physical health needs incurred for their many sacrifices for our Nation. The VA currently has a backlog of 600,000 claims. Currently, four out of every 10 claims for veterans' disability benefits are decided incorrectly further contributing to the backlog. The millions in dollars wasted in porkbarrel spending would go a long way to decreasing the backlog in veterans claims by funding additional claims adjudicators and training.

This bill also contains the funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The programs administered by HUD help our Nation's families purchase their homes, helps many low-income families obtain affordable housing, combats discrimination in the housing market, assists in rehabilitating neighborhoods and helps our Nation's most vulnerable the elderly, disabled and disadvantaged have access to safe and affordable housing.

Unfortunately, this bill shifts money away from many critical housing and

community programs by bypassing the appropriate competitive process and inserting earmarks and set-asides for special projects that received the attention of the Appropriations Committee. This is unfair to the many communities and families who do not have the good fortune of residing in a region of the country represented by a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Some of the earmarks for special projects in this bill include: \$300,000 for the County of Kauai, Hawaii, for the Heritage Trails project; \$750,000 for infrastructure improvements to the School of the Building Arts in Charleston, South Carolina; \$100,000 for development assistance for the Desert Space Station in Nevada; \$1 million for the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism for development activities related to the Louisiana Purchase Bicentennial Celebration; \$450,000 for the City of Providence, Rhode Island, for the development of a Botanical Center at Roger Williams Park and Zoo; \$200,000 for the Newport Art Museum in Newport, Rhode Island for historical renovation; and \$500,000 for the Lewis and Clark State College for the Idaho Virtual Incubator.

This bill also funds the Environmental Protection Agency which provides resources to help state, local and tribal communities enhance capacity and infrastructure to better address their environmental needs. I support directing more resources to communities that are most in need and facing serious public health and safety threats from environmental problems. Unfortunately, after a review of this year's bill for EPA programs, I find it difficult to believe that we are fully responding to the most urgent environmental issues. Nearly one-fourth of the 180 earmarks provided for the EPA are targeted for consortiums, universities, or foundations.

There are many environmental needs in communities back in my home state of Arizona, but these communities will be denied funding as long as we continue to tolerate earmarking that circumvents a regular merit-review process.

For example, some of the earmarks include: \$250,000 for the Envision Utah Project; \$250,000 for the Central California ozone study; \$750,000 for the painting and coating assistance initiative through the University of Northern Iowa; \$2.5 million for the National Alternative Fuels Training Consortium in Morgantown, West Virginia; and \$3.9 million for the Mine Waster Technology Program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center in Butte, Montana.

While these projects may be important, why do they rank higher than other environmental priorities? It is also important to note that none of the 180 earmarks for the EPA were even requested by the President's budget.

For independent agencies such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this bill also includes earmarks of money for locality-specific projects such as: \$5 million for the planetarium for the Clay Center of the Arts and Sciences in Charleston, West Virginia; and \$2 million for the University of Mississippi Geoinformatics Center.

I also want to comment on the many cost overruns and management problems at NASA. Last year, as part of the authorization bill for NASA, Congress established a cost cap on the International Space Station. Before establishing this cost cap, we worked with NASA to ensure that the funding levels of the cap were accurate. NASA indicated that the funding levels were sufficient to complete the Station. Earlier this year, NASA notified the Commerce Committee of \$4 billion in cost overruns for the International Space Station.

I know that it is difficult, if not impossible, to envision NASA having cost overruns for one year that amount to twice its annual budget. I can only conclude that either NASA did not know about the cost overruns or they knew and did not notify Congress about these problems. In either case, it is a major shortfall in the program's management.

However, NASA has attempted to pay for these cost overruns from within existing budgetary limits. NASA has proposed drastic reductions in the station design. Included in these reductions is the crew return vehicle. This cut has reduced the maximum crew for the station to three astronauts. Given the fact that two and a half astronauts are required to operate the facility, only half of an astronaut's time can be devoted to research.

A recent NASA and OMB agreement reveals that research time by the permanent crew will be limited to 20 hours per weeks. This amount of time may be further reduced if NASA makes its goal of providing 30 percent of the research time available to the commercial sector. NASA is currently exploring several options of how to increase crew research time. With this limitation on research time, the question for us is whether the Government wants to continue spending on this project which may add up to \$100 billion, for only 20 hours of research per week in return.

To further add to the cost concerns, NASA announced earlier this year that the X-33 program, a joint program with Lockheed Martin, would be canceled. This cancellation represented another \$1 billion investment with no final product. It is our understanding that the Defense Department is reviewing the program to see if they can utilize any of the project.

I continue to be concerned about NASA fundamental management approaches. An example of NASA's mismanagement is the ill-fated Propulsion Module that was supposed to provide a U.S. capability for long-term propulsion of the space station. This program

was canceled, due to cost growth and poor management. According to the General Accounting Office, NASA began to build the Propulsion Module for the Space Station before it had completed a project plan, a risk management plan, or developed realistic cost and schedule estimates.

Further review revealed that the propulsion model design proposed a tunnel diameter that was too small to accommodate crew operations and did not have detailed analyses to even quantify the amount of propulsion capability that would be required. This lack of planning led to a \$265 million increase—from \$479 to \$744 million—and schedule slippage of 2 years.

I am greatly concerned that NASA has significant infrastructure problems for the Space Shuttle program looming in the near future. Many of the vital facilities to support the Shuttle program are literally falling apart. The Vehicle Assembly Building at the Kennedy Space Flight Center, built in the early 1960s for assembly of Apollo/Saturn vehicles and currently used to prepare the Space Shuttle launch assembly, has nets inside the building to prevent concrete from falling from the roof onto the workers and equipment below. The sidings on the outside of the building are becoming loose due to time and weather. Addressing the risks associated with a crumpling infrastructure is in of itself a Shuttle upgrade project that has potential to increase the overall safety and reliability of the Shuttle program. These renovations along with many others will be costly. NASA must start making plans today to address these infrastructure problems on an agency-wide basis in order to prevent a crisis. We must get these management problems under control.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to thank Chairman MIKULSKI and Senator BOND for all of the hard work they have put into the Fiscal Year 2002 VA-HUD Appropriations bill. Given the serious fiscal restraints facing the Congress this year as a result of the budget resolution and the unsound tax cut, they have masterfully negotiated the many and often competing demands of the programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In particular, I would like to thank Senators MIKULSKI and BOND for restoring much needed funds to a number of important Department of Housing and Urban Development programs that were slated for drastic cuts under the President's budget.

Despite the economic prosperity that our country has experienced, many Americans are still lack safe and affordable housing. In my own state of Rhode Island, 46 percent of Rhode Islanders are unable to afford this rent without spending over 30 percent of their income on housing. In terms of homeownership, the average sales price of a home in Rhode Island went up by \$24,000 between 1999 and 2000. In the same period, the number of houses on the market decreased by over 50 per-

cent, and only 25 percent of these homes were affordable to low-income families.

This housing affordability crisis has been affecting families around the country. The latest HUD worst case housing needs study indicates that there are over 4.9 million low-income Americans who pay more than 50 percent of their income for rent. In addition, a broader study done by the National Housing Conference, the mortgage bankers and others shows that 14 percent or 13.7 million American families have worst case housing needs. Ten million of these people are elderly or work full or part-time.

This is why I was so concerned about the President's budget proposal to cut HUD programs by \$1.7 billion. Once you factor in inflation, the Administration was proposing to cut housing programs by \$2.2 billion, an 8 percent real spending decrease compared to Fiscal Year 2001.

One of the President's cuts that most concerned me was the \$859 million net cut in public housing, the program that supports some of our nation's most vulnerable families. In my own state of Rhode Island, approximately two-thirds of our public housing units are used by the elderly and disabled.

I also was disappointed by the Administration's decision to eliminate the public housing drug elimination program (PHDEP). This flexible, community-based program has made public housing much safer by helping local housing agencies create comprehensive anti-crime and anti-drug strategies.

I applaud both Senators MIKULSKI and BOND for restoring funding to both of these programs. The VA-HUD bill before us today contains almost \$3 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund, \$650 million more than the President's request, and \$300 million for the drug elimination grant program.

I also approve of the bill's requirement that 30 percent of the funding for HUD homeless programs be set aside for permanent housing for the disabled homeless. This shows the Senate's commitment towards helping end homelessness, not just funding programs for those who are homeless. Likewise, the committee's allocation of \$500,000 for the Interagency Council on the Homeless will help Federal Government agencies better coordinate their programs for preventing and ending homelessness. I also want to commend the committee for putting Shelter Plus Care renewals for the homeless in a separate account. As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, I personally believe that the long-term solution to the renewal problem should be solved by transferring renewals to the Section 8 program, and I hope the committee considers doing this in the future.

I am also pleased about the language in the bill supporting the reauthorization of the Mark-to Market program. I held a subcommittee hearing on this issue on June 19, 2001, and the Banking

Committee successfully marked up a reauthorization bill yesterday morning on August 1, 2001. It is my hope that this important legislation will be enacted into law well before the expiration of the original program on September 30, 2001.

I also would like to commend both the administration and the committee on increasing funding for HUD's office of Lead Hazard Control by \$10 million. Nonetheless, much more needs to be done. I, and a number of my colleagues, believe that this number should be much higher and will continue to work to increase funding for this extremely important program. No family in this country should be forced to live in housing that can cause permanent brain damage to their children.

Finally, I was pleased to see language in the bill asking HUD to institute a computer program to adequately calculate the amount of credit subsidy necessary to support the FHA multifamily mortgage insurance programs and to establish a task force to determine the costs of multifamily defaults. I am disappointed that the administration has chosen to allow this program to stay shut down. Clearly, the FHA multifamily program has some problems that need to be solved; however, the administration's solution of raising the insurance premiums misses the larger point of ensuring that these programs continue to construct affordable housing. Thus, I also support the bill's language regarding the need for FHA premium changes to be made through notice and comment rule making. I hope to work with my colleagues over the next several months to see if we can't come up with a longer term solution to the repeated shutdown of this important FHA insurance premium program.

There are two issues with this year's VA-HUD appropriations bill that I hope we can address as the bill moves forward. The first is the Committee's decision to cut Section 8 reserves from two months to one month, without protecting public housing authorities from budget shortfalls. The second is the implications of the decision to expand the traditional rescission language to include all funds recaptured from the Section 8 program.

I know that the chair and ranking member of the subcommittee care very much about supporting hard-pressed parents who are struggling to provide a decent home for their children. The Section 8 program is the principle source of housing assistance for these extremely low-income parents who face the most acute housing needs of any segment of our population. It is an especially critical support for parents who have just left welfare and who may be earning too little to afford decent housing. It also helps parents move their kids out of areas of concentrated poverty and into neighborhoods with educational and employment opportunities.

For all these reasons, we must maintain our commitment to the Section 8

program and make sure it works efficiently. Keeping the Section 8 reserves at adequate levels is an important part of making this housing program work. Basically, the Section 8 reserves provide additional funds to Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) whose voucher program costs exceed their budget allocation in a given year. Thus, if a PHA approaches the final months of its fiscal year and needs more funds to pay landlords or pay for utility costs, it can request up to 2 months of additional funding from HUD. The reserves are critical to the program's financing because HUD bases each PHA's annual budget not on its expected costs in the coming fiscal year, but rather on its actual costs in the prior year. Since the factors that cause such increases can be unpredictable from year to year, sufficient reserves are necessary so that PHAs won't be forced to reduce the number of families they serve.

I am also concerned about the current rescission language in the bill. It is not unusual for Congress to reclaim Section 8 monies that HUD does use. However, this year's bill goes one step further by rescinding all future recaptures from Fiscal Year 2002 and prior years, and diverting them into other accounts, some of which are not even related to the housing needs of low-income families.

As I mentioned previously, PHAs' budgets are based on the prior year's actual costs and not on their expected costs if they adopt changes to serve more families. They may need additional resources beyond their budget allocations if they succeed in making their programs work better. But this bill cuts the Section 8 reserves that could provide these additional resources. And, by rescinding all recaptures that HUD could make this year and next, it deprives HUD of funds to ensure that PHAs that are increasing voucher utilization do not get caught in a budget squeeze. HUD may also use recaptures to adjust contracts with owners under the project-based Section 8 program if unforeseen costs arise, such as rising utility prices. If HUD does not have the resources to make these adjustments, these owners may opt-out of the Section 8 program. Finally, HUD can currently redirect at least some recaptures to offset Section 8 costs in the upcoming fiscal year, reducing the appropriated dollars needed to maintain the size of the program. This in turn, frees up funds to provide more new vouchers.

If we are serious about helping extremely low-income families benefit from voucher assistance, then we need to ensure that the needed resources are available to make this program work well and efficiently. But this bill contains two provisions that run the risk of doing just the opposite. Both the reduction in reserves and the rescission could run the risk of undermining the financing of the Section 8 program, and undermining efforts to serve more families with vouchers. Let's not run this

risk. Let's ensure that the Section 8 program is our first priority for use of recapture funds.

Again, I thank Senators BOND and MIKULSKI for all of their hard work on this bill and I hope that we will be able to discuss these matters in more detail, and that we work together to find ways to address these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Dorgan	McConnell
Allard	Durbin	Mikulski
Allen	Edwards	Miller
Baucus	Ensign	Murkowski
Bayh	Enzi	Murray
Bennett	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Frist	Nickles
Bond	Graham	Reed
Boxer	Grassley	Reid
Breaux	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bunning	Harkin	Santorum
Burns	Hatch	Sarbanes
Byrd	Helms	Schumer
Campbell	Hollings	Sessions
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Carnahan	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Carper	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Inouye	Snowe
Cleland	Jeffords	Specter
Clinton	Johnson	Stabenow
Cochran	Kennedy	Stevens
Collins	Kerry	Thomas
Conrad	Kohl	Thompson
Corzine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Craig	Leahy	Torricelli
Crapo	Levin	Warner
Daschle	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dayton	Lincoln	Wyden
DeWine	Lott	
Dodd	Lugar	

NAYS—5

Feingold	Kyl	Voinovich
Gramm	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Domenici

The bill (H.R. 2620), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. STEVENS conferees on the part of the Senate.

BIPARTISANSHIP ON
APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares to adjourn until September, I thank the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee who have worked so hard to report nine bills from committee for the fiscal year that begins on October 1. In particular, I thank my distinguished colleague, the ranking member on the full committee, TED STEVENS and the chairmen and ranking members for the five bills that have passed the Senate.

The five chairmen and ranking members include Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI and Senator KIT BOND on the VA/ HUD and Independent Agencies bill, Senator HARRY REID and Senator PETE DOMENICI on the Energy and Water bill, Senator PATTY MURRAY and Senator RICHARD SHELBY on the Transportation bill, Senator RICHARD DURBIN and Senator ROBERT BENNETT on the Legislative Branch bill and Senator CONRAD BURNS on the Interior bill.

We have a longstanding tradition on the Appropriations Committee of working together on a bipartisan basis to produce the thirteen appropriations bills. This year, we established a goal of reporting nine bipartisan and fiscally responsible bills prior to the August recess. We have met this challenge. I thank my good friend TED STEVENS for his leadership in helping us meet this goal.

Based on that tradition of bipartisanship, the transition in party leadership on the Appropriations Committee was seamless. The hard work of the committee to produce 13 bills preceded the transition and continued after I assumed the chairmanship and the committee was reorganized on July 10, 2001. This is a credit to all of our colleagues and our dedicated staff who have labored unceasingly to bring these bills to the Senate.

Producing the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bills has been a particular challenge this year. With the election of a new President, the President's budget was sent to the Congress on April 9, 2001, 2 months later than in a normal year. When we received the President's budget, it included a number of proposed reductions in discretionary programs. We have scrutinized the budget and where appropriate we