GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on further consideration of the bill H.R. 4194, and that I be permitted to include tables, charts and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 501 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4194.

□ 1549

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4194), 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, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, July 17, 1998, the bill was open for amendment from page 52, line 3, to page 65, line 16.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 59, before the period on line 12, insert:

: *Provided further*, That any limitation on funds for the Environmental Protection Agency or the Council on Environmental Quality in this Act shall not apply to conducting educational outreach or informational seminars.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to supersede language in the report on page 59 which states that the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality are thus directed to refrain from conducting educational outreach for informational seminars on policies underlying the Kyoto Protocol until or unless the protocol is ratified by the Senate. This amendment would allow such educational outreach and informational seminars to proceed.

I think most people would agree that there is considerable difference of opinion concerning the Kyoto Protocol and global warming and climate change. I think most would also agree that the only possible way to reach an understanding or potential compromise on such an emotionally charged issue is if there is a full and free exchange of information and ideas.

Having said that, though, there is truth in the statement in the committee report that there can be a fine line between education and advocacy on an issue. Assuming adoption of the amendment, I would still encourage the EPA and the CEQ to pay close attention to the line between education and advocacy and stay on the right side of that line.

Now, as to what the amendment does not do, it does not change any of the statutory language in the bill regarding Kyoto. The limitation on page 58 of the bill still prohibits the use of funds to develop, propose or issue rules or regulations or decrees or orders for the purpose of implementation or in contemplation of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. I am not fully satisfied with that language because I think it in fact may block some activities that it should not block, but I recognize that there should be no imposition of rules or regulations or decrees until and unless the Kyoto Protocol is actually ratified.

Regardless of the outcome of the Kyoto Protocol, we all need to know much more about the issues of potential global warming and climate change. In order to have an informed public policy debate, the Congress should be encouraging, rather than stifling, education and outreach and informational dissemination activities.

This amendment does exactly that. It takes no position on the merits of Kyoto; it just allows for the educational process and the free flow of information to continue. I think that any objective person would recognize that there is nothing wrong with that, and I would urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I appreciate very much how much he has put into the efforts to come to an agreement on this issue. I am concerned how the EPA will interpret his language. Whether or not the gentleman's amendment is approved today, I look forward to working with him and others to find common ground and clarify the intent of the language.

The Member from Wisconsin is bringing up the issue of preserving an open debate on environmental issues. Although he and I may disagree on how we get there, we both agree on the policy of an open and public debate. My work to make sure we do not implement the Kyoto Protocol until we implement ratification specifically was to ensure that we do have the debate, that we do have the debate, as the U.S. Constitution requires, in the U.S. Senate with its advice and consent.

Since coming to Congress I have supported an open and public debate concerning environmental issues, including the issue of climate change, clean air, clean water, Superfund, environmental justice, and other important environmental issues. I will continue to work to make sure the EPA does not implement environmental policies through the back door, through regulatory tactics, especially when it does not have the legal authority to proceed forward.

There have been some who have claimed the language in this bill concerning the Kyoto Protocol would stifle the debate on climate change. As far as my personal goals on this issue, nothing could be further from the truth. I have been working to ensure that the Kyoto Protocol is not implemented until Senate ratification, as required by the U.S. Constitution. This gives us the open debate this issue so richly deserves.

Let us be clear. The language included in this bill does not do anything to interfere with valuable research, existing programs, or ongoing initiatives designed to carry out the United States' voluntary commitments under the 1992 Climate Change Convention.

And, education is another function conducted by the EPA. However, it should educate using balanced information without advocacy. The taxpayers deserve a balanced presentation of information. This is especially true when the EPA conducts educational outreach on climate change. I want to caution my colleagues. There is a very fine line between education and advocacy.

The EPA should never use taxpayer dollars to advocate their own agenda when it is not the official policy of the United States of America.

The EPA must be allowed to serve its primary purpose: To ensure that we have a clean, safe and healthy environment. We may have differing views on how to accomplish this goal, but we must be able to air those differences in the light of day. I will continue to work with my colleagues and fight for open debate on these important issues. I would challenge the EPA to join me in accomplishing this rather modest goal.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment and in support of the language that has been put in this bill by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). This entire effort is designed to protect the rights of the American people against an anti-American effort resulting from the Kyoto Treaty that has been proposed before the United States Senate. Thank goodness that the American people have risen up and said we do not want this treaty to be passed and the Senate has actually listened to the American people.