Trust Fund. And to do that, of course, we will have to pay interest on that. The interest alone, for which Americans will get absolutely nothing, conservatively, under an optimistic scenario, will be $83.9 billion in interest charges that the President of the United States wants to impose on our children, because that is the generation that will actually be paying this. If it is not so rosy and we are there through 2008, it will be $104 billion in interest charges.

One of the reasons Congress needs to engage in a debate about how to handle this situation is we do not believe we should put those interest charges on our children. It is unconscionable to put $80 billion of debt on our kids of interest for which they get no teachers, no cops, no sailors, no soldiers. This is the biggest item of waste, fraud, and abuse probably in the Federal budget, this interest charge that they want to sneak by the American public so they do not know about it. And they do want to sneak it by. And do my colleagues know why they want to sneak it by? Because the President did not tell us about this when they started this war. I do not remember him saying, this is going to cost $80 billion in interest, and I can borrow it from the Social Security Trust Fund.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in contrast to what the gentleman has just offered about how we are spending on this war, in the Bush I war, if you will, the Gulf War, the total expenditures were about $62 billion, $63 billion. Because of the coalition, whatever one's opinion was on that war or this war, because of the approach that was utilized, a coalition effort, in fact, they were going in to liberate Kuwait, we spent only $7.5 billion. The American people are willing to make sacrifices, but we did it as a coalition.

Right now we are standing postured to spend $150 plus billion, $79 billion and $87 billion, and then possibly another $75 billion, which speaks to the question of layering this country and layering our children with enormous debt and getting nothing for it, and our soldiers and our veterans and our families having no school aid, no impact aid, no mental health aid, nothing for what we are doing. We need to have full oversight of this Congress on behalf of the American people.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to note also that the projections that the President has given us are assuming that he is going to go with his tin cup to the rest of the world and get another $50 billion to $60 billion from the rest of the world. I do not see that money coming in in the next 10 days.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And today, from the reaction of the United Nations, it was clearly that $60 billion from the rest of the world is a pipe dream.

In addition to that, earlier we heard from our Republican colleagues, and they were making the comparison with FDR and how he excited the American people and made a commitment to peace. And yet what a difference, because FDR asked the American people if they would accept a war tax. And yet we have this administration doing exactly the opposite, creating deficits that are looming so large that all economists, from the right to the left and in between, are saying we are on the cusp of real economic danger. We are looking at a bleak economic future if we continue down this road. So any comparison between President Bush and the conduct of FDR, I dare say, is not apropos.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that point. It is very well taken.

We have about 2 minutes left this evening in our Iraq Watch. I would summarize my thoughts based upon what all of us have said, and the President's speech today, it is clearer than ever before that the President needs to do three things. First, he needs to level with the American people about the costs, about the timetables, about what we are getting into. Secondly, we need a plan on how he is going to internationalize the reconstruction and the security challenges in Iraq, and how he is going to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq; how long will it take, when will we know it is going to happen. The third thing we need is an exit strategy. We cannot leave until these other things happen, or until the United Nations steps up in a real way to do it. If they do not step up, we have to stay and do it. How will we judge our progress? When will we know when it is time for us to leave?

We have 1 minute left, I think. Any comments from my colleagues?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just want to offer and hope that we can separate the vote. We are united behind our troops, and to be able to have a deliberative, studied approach to the operation, rebuild, that will allow us to have accountability and an exit plan, and all the remarks that the gentleman said.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I think in conclusion it is important for us to reiterate that what we must avoid is equating support for a political agenda with support for our troops.

□ 2215

To the degree or extent that that is deliberately confused in people's minds by politicians who are attempting to associate their political policies with support for the troops that has to be resisted. That has to be pointed out. That has to be applied and dissected, and so I think that it is important for us to continue to meet, to continue to urge the media to do more than simply take press releases and speeches at face value and to perhaps follow a little bit more analytically what is taking place and most certainly for all of us to stand up and make sure that everyone in this country understands that political agendas and support from the troops and for the troops are two different things.

I do not think anybody recognizes the full degree of anger that is building in this country as a result of trying to confuse those two points.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for everything he has done. This is, I think, our 11th week; and as has been said over and over again, there will not come a week when we are not here to ask those questions because it is our responsibility, it is our patriotic duty; and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the promotion they have given me this evening, but we are all equal in the Iraq Watch, and we will be back next week; and I thank the Speaker for his cooperation.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCOTTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I wanted to take the opportunity to deal with the critical issue of our Environmental Protection Agency, the key Federal agency dealing with the environment and of great import to citizens all across this country.

Recently, we have seen the resignation of Christine Todd Whitman as the administrator. Ms. Whitman was a former moderate Governor of New Jersey and was hailed by some as an important signal, when she was appointed by the Bush administration, of perhaps some environmental moderation and balance, that there would be an opportunity for the administration to use the appointment of someone like Ms. Whitman to send a signal that it was going to try and operationalize some of the rhetoric that was used by then-Governor Bush in his Presidential campaign where at times, in some of the debates with Vice President Gore, he was actually making even stronger statements in support of the environment. My colleagues will remember he was going to deal with all four of the air pollutants dealing with, in the debate, in terms of the regulation.

What we have seen in the course of the past 32½ months, sadly, has been a rather extreme disappointment on the part of those who follow the environmental developments and, in fact, has been rather unnerving for many Americans.

Administrator Whitman has left, some would say, under a cloud, literally and figuratively, being repeatedly undercut or backtracking in terms of her environmental pronouncements, most notably internationally dealing with global climate change, staking out a position of reasonableness and international cooperation, only to be pulled back by the administration and

to repudiate that position by the President himself.

New attention is being directed to the EPA and its administrator, as we have a nomination by the President of Utah Governor Mike Leavitt to replace Ms. Whitman; and indeed, today our colleagues in the other body began hearings on the confirmation. In his opening statement, Governor Leavitt talked about balance, ''Balance between this generation and next, balance between sustainable environments and sustainable economies and balance among regions.''

I was struck by how, in this language, he was closely following the advice of the Republican political consultant Frank Luntz who sent a memo to the Republicans in Congress earlier this year entitled Straight Talk, which has become rather notorious here on Capitol Hill, because its advice to the Republican Party in Congress is not to deal with strengthening its record, not to deal with new initiatives to protect the environment, not pushing back on the President's efforts to erode environmental protection; but instead, it is a blueprint of how to talk about the environment.

The memo starts with: ''Tell them a personal story from your life,'' and it is interesting that Governor Leavitt started out his testimony with a story about being 8 and going to the Grand Canyon.

Luntz urged Republicans to talk about a ''fair balance between the environment and the economy,'' and indeed, Leavitt has even made up a word called ''enlibra,'' which he wants to mean this environmental balance.

The Luntz memo tells Republicans that they need to be even more active in recruiting experts who are sympathetic to your view and more active in making them part of your message. Governor Leavitt has been accused by those working on the environment in Utah of reassigning or demoting dozens of wildlife scientists after they recommended needed protections for endangered species in Utah.

The issue is not making up words. It is about telling the truth about the environment and the public health consequences.

I would like to make clear from the outset that there are some aspects of Governor Leavitt's record that I personally find very interesting. I have done a lot of work over the years in the State of Utah, and I have worked with the people who are involved with a program called Envision Utah, which is planning for the future that people in Utah want to promote livability, to promote sound land use and integrating the built environment with the natural environment; and I will say that Governor Leavitt by all accounts has been involved with smart growth issues.

He was the honorary co-chair of Envision Utah, a public-private partnership to implement this quality-growth strategy, to help protect Utah's environment, economic strength and quality of life from urban sprawl; and I personally think that this is a positive development. There are 130 key stakeholders in Utah, State and local government officials, business leaders, developers, conservationists, landowners, members of the LDS Church and others in the religious community and citizen groups.

They had 150 public workshops where citizens discussed how they wanted to shape future land use, transportation and open space preservation; and in these public workshops, when citizens were given the chance to, they demonstrated that they wanted more investment in public transit, more initiatives with affordable housing, more reliance on alternative transportation like cycling and walking. They were concerned about the preservation of open space and more town-like development along the transit lines.

I have been pleased to note that Governor Leavitt has been part of an implementation of this vision for the future. He supported the creation of a special fund for open space protection, secured funding for 175 miles of railway right-of-way for commuter rail and has been involved with leadership in the National Governors Association as chair, raising the profile of growth issues and promoted tools that States can use to contain sprawl and build healthy cities and towns. He even lobbied the National Governors Association to produce its first-ever land use principle.

This is an encouraging development because this is truly an area of environmental protection that cries out for bipartisan support, for leadership from the administration and Congress, for doing things where Congress leads by example, with the administration, to model the sort of behavior we want from the rest of America, to lead by example.

Another area that I thought was intriguing in the Governor's record, as I have examined it, deals with the accomplishments attendant to the Olympic games. He was Governor during this period. There was a net zero air emissions. There was a voluntary effort where local companies donated emissions reduction to offset pollution from the games, an interesting and innovative approach. There was zero waste from recycling and composting, and there was complete compliance with all environmental standards, unlike what some in Congress would do, exempting parts of the Federal Government.

Most recently, we had an effort here in Congress to eliminate environmental requirements of the Department of Defense to play by the same environmental rules as the rest of America, except of course when there was a need for an exemption for national security; but there are some here who were saying that is too hard for the Department of Defense, we want to exempt them across the board. Governor Leavitt did not use the Olympics and the significant task that that faced for his community and for our country to shortcut environmental standards. Instead, as near as I can tell, his administration was in complete compliance, an interesting and important precedent that I would like to see modeled here in the Federal Government. They were involved with things like planting over 100,000 trees.

So I want to be clear that I am not reflexively opposed to the Governor; and I do think there are elements of his record that are worthy of praise, and I hope that we would find willing people here in the Federal Government to implement some of them; but there must be a full look at the Governor's record, and as a long-tenured Governor, he has achieved a number of other areas.

I have already referenced deep concerns from some of the people who have been following environmental developments in the State of Utah, the notion of not having hands off when it came to allowing the scientific experts to state their opinion. He fired a division of wildlife resource enforcement official who had fined the Leavitt family fish farm for violations that had brought devastating whirling disease to Utah's wild fish stocks. He downplayed toxic releases reported by the mining industry, including releases of neurotoxin mercury by saying, ''In reality, it is not pollution.''

He supported the infamous Legacy Highway, an extremely controversial project that threatens wetlands along the Great Salt Lake. This was a project that was challenged by community activists and local government officials; and taken to court, the Legacy Highway project was rejected by the 10th Court of Appeals for the failure of the people planning this project to consider less environmentally harmful alternatives and for ignoring the impacts on Utah's wildlife and environment, a sad note on his watch.

It is no secret that there was a series of closed-door negotiations with Secretary Norton, after which Governor Leavitt signed a memorandum of understanding that opened up 10 million acres of Federal lands in Utah for possible development under the arcane RS 2477 road provision. He also brokered a back-room agreement with the Interior Department to prevent a new wilderness study area designation. This agreement opens 2.6 million acres of former wilderness study areas to oil and gas drilling, off-road vehicle use, and other development.

It is no accident, I suppose, that Utah has the least amount of designated wilderness out of 11 Western States, in part because of this Governor's dedication to preventing new wildlife proposals from being passed by Congress during his tenure. Utah is one of only a handful of States without any, without any wildlife and scenic river designations, again because the Leavitt administration worked to oppose Federal wild and scenic river reviews in southern Utah.

In objective, objective appraisal of Utah's environmental performance under the Governor's administration, looking at the EPA itself, this administration's recent EPA report on Clean Water Act enforcement from major sources, Utah tied for last place with two other States for performance in six key environmental indicators.

□ 2230

This from the EPA that he seeks to lead, published in February of 2003.

According to the 2001 EPA toxic release inventory, Utah has the second highest volume of toxic chemical releases in the Nation. And between 1995 and 2002, during the Leavitt administration, Utah power plants actually increased their emissions of nitrogen oxide, a pollutant linked to respiratory disease, while the rest of the country decreased such emissions substantially, on average over 21 percent during the same period.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in addition to defending and explaining his environmental record, positive and negative, there are other issues that the nominee should address as he appears before Congress and the American public. These are some of the issues that have caused Senators to place a hold on his nomination, people who are concerned about EPA statements about the pollution in New York City after 9/11; the New Source rules; the Clean Skies administration strategy. Indeed, what may be the major issue in these discussions will not be Governor Levitt's record at all but that of this administration, its environmental record and the fundamental question about the independence of the EPA.

It is interesting to note that Russell Train, who was the EPA Administrator under Presidents Nixon and Ford, and I would state parenthetically that the EPA has a long and proud bipartisan history, being created under the administration of President Nixon, Russell Train, a Republican appointee, has said recently that the White House has constantly injected itself into the way the EPA approaches and decides the critical issues before it. The agency today has little or no independence. I think it is a very great mistake and one for which the American people could pay over the long run in compromised health and reduced quality of life.

The administrator designate, Governor Leavitt, and this administration need to be held accountable in terms of the initiatives on Superfund. Will the administrator and the administration push to reinstate the Superfund tax and help clean up sites? The GAO reported that the Superfund would run out of money next month. There are currently 1,200 sites in the annual $3 billion Superfund program. It has cleaned up only 42 toxic waste sites last year, down more than 50 percent from the late 1990s.

The EPA announced this summer they would have to cut funding for 10 Superfund sites, including one close to home for me, but I have heard from Republican colleagues who have been concerned about loss of projects in their districts, citing lack of funding as a reason. Yet the administration refuses to come to Congress to have the Superfund tax, which is the very principle of ''polluter pays'' that was supported by Presidents Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and Clinton. Silence from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, where will the new EPA Administrator be when it comes to deal with the Clean Air Act? One of the holds that has been placed on the Leavitt nomination deals with the relaxation of the New Source Review rules, which inhibit the intent of the Clean Air Act. As you know, 30 years ago, when the Clean Air Act was enacted, there was a reprieve given to the dirtiest coal-fired plants, giving them a reasonable time to come into compliance. They did not all have to do it immediately, that would have been disruptive and expensive. The notion was that the new technology, under the New Source rule, was designed so that plants would modernize and then the new technology would be put into place when it was the most economical. Instead, what we have seen is an industry that has kept these aging powered dinosaurs in place because they make a lot of money. They are cash cows.

But rather than enforcing the Clean Air Act, as previous administrations have done to put pressure on the industry to deal with the modernization and upgrade of these plants, President Bush has now proposed that the old plants, in effect, be grandfathered permanently, being able to spew forth pollution indefinitely. The changes that he announced to the New Source Review rules would allow plants to make a 20 percent investment without triggering the rule. There is no reason for the vast majority of them to ever come into full compliance.

Now, there are approximately 17,000 of these plants, and the estimates from the scientific experts that we are supposed to listen to are that they caused conservatively 20,000 premature deaths each year. Because of the patterns of prevailing winds that blow the smoke from these plants, the pollution is not just in the vicinity of the plant. If they were just polluting their neighborhood, maybe it would be a sort of rough justice for the cities and States that permitted them. But the effects move away often because of the pattern of prevailing winds.

They are concentrated particularly in the New England States. It is interesting that Attorney Generals in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin are lining up to challenge these rules in court. The changes were also opposed by the States of Massachusetts, Illinois, and California.

Earlier this month, the President was in Michigan for a photo-op for the power plant in Monroe to promote the Clear Skies Initiative, which it is estimated may be responsible for up to 300 premature deaths itself. Now, the President attempted to paint this as a job creation issue, but local labor leaders were quick to point out that when the owner of the Monroe plant, Detroit Edison, found out that the New Source rules were going to be relaxed, they stopped their efforts to install pollution controls required by law. And I understand there are some 800 union workers who are out of work.

The administration and the new administrator should be straight with the American public about the economic, environmental, and national security consequences of continuing to rely on these aging, polluting plants. When we deal with issues like the Clean Skies Initiative, it is an important question for the administrator designate and for the administration: Who are they going to be taking advice from? For instance, there have been calls for the resignation of the Assistant EPA Administrator of Air and Radiation, Holmstead, the leader behind the Clean Air Act overhaul. The Clear Skies Initiative, which actually is going to move us back beyond what would happen if we just enforced the Clean Air Act now, and leave any progress well, well into the future.

The EPA has withheld scientific data from two different EPA studies that undercut the administration's claims about the benefit of the proposed legislation. It has drug its feet in completing the analysis of competing Clean Air Acts before Congress so that we do not have the information before us as a legislative body, and the American public does not have the benefit of this analysis. It took months of delay before the EPA finally agreed to study Senator CARPER's Clean Air bill, but will not include carbon dioxide reductions in the analysis. Carbon dioxide, a critical element in the Senator's bill, one of the key elements of global warming, is not going to be included.

The EPA overstated State and local support for the Clear Skies Initiative. In fact, many of the Governors and mayors cited as allies in an August press release have decided not to support it at all. The Southern Governors Association did not have a policy for or against the plan if they are included. The National Association of Counties has adopted a position that generally supported the reduction of emissions. No reference to this specific bill.

Assistant Secretary Holmstead, is an attorney for the former industry that he is now seeking to—supposed to—regulate. He represented several clients in fighting title I, III, and V of the Clean Air Act. Those clients include the Ad Hoc Industry Group on Regulatory Reinvention, Alliance for Constructive Air Policy, Hughes Communication, Montrose Chemical, and he is an adjunct scholar at a think tank, the Citizens for the Environment, that actually believes that many of these environmental problems are myths and lobbies for deregulation of corporations as

a solution to the environmental problems, something that has not had great effect as we have looked at the securities industry, at the deregulation of energy, and has in the State of Texas, the voluntary program of then Governor Bush, has yielded really pitiful results in terms of cleaning up the air.

There is a deep and troubling question that is circulating now about the representations of the EPA about the World Trade Center pollution. Will the EPA, under the new administrator, be an independent agency that can give the American public the truth? One week after September 11, Christie Whitman assured the citizens of New York that the air was safe to breathe, the waters safe to drink. Her statements focused on asbestos levels and did not mention any other pollutants. Well, an investigation by the EPA Office of Inspector General has revealed that the White House, through its Council on Environmental Quality, told the EPA to downplay these concerns. The facts are that the EPA did not have sufficient data to evaluate short-term or long-term health impacts, and they had only data on four of 14 pollutants. It will be one of, I think, the black marks of former Governor Whitman's administration to make statements like this to the citizens of New York.

A team of independent scientists, led by the University of California, Davis, found that in fact the air was the most polluted the world has experienced. The area had high levels of sulfur, sulfuric acid, titanium, nickel and silicon. The EPA had not tested for these small particles, even though EPA scientists acknowledge that they are the most hazardous. Tragically, tragically, the rescue workers, the people who on this floor were commemorated and celebrated, with whom this administration has been involved with photo-ops and issued flowery words, these rescue workers were the most likely to suffer from this pollution. Yet the EPA was involved in, to be charitable, shading the truth. And we do not know what the long-term consequences will be with a failure to level with the American public.

There is a question about whether the EPA in the remaining term of President Bush, under a new administrator, will be able to change the pattern of manipulating and ignoring science to serve political and their own policy ends. For instance, in June of this year, the EPA released a report that was commissioned by former EPA Administrator Whitman to examine the state of the environment.

□ 2245

It noted improvements which were actually due to landmark legislation passed decades ago. If the EPA does a follow-up report in a decade, what will be the likely increases in air and water pollution, global warming and ozone depletion as a result of this administration's policies because it is claiming credit for what happened 10, 20, and 30 years ago and under its watch is undermining and delaying?

The report ignored global warming, the single most important long-term threat to our environment. The White House forced the EPA to eliminate references to many studies concluding that warming is at least partially caused by human activity. There is a denial despite the 2001 National Academy of Science report that was requested by President Bush that confirmed that greenhouse gases are accumulating in our atmosphere as a result of human activities, and this is causing air and ocean temperatures to rise.

The edits made by the White House and acquiesced to by the former EPA Administrator were so severe that an internal EPA memo stated that the section on climate ''no longer accurately represents scientific consensus on climate change, global warming.''

Another example, last September the annual EPA report on air pollution that for 6 years had contained a section on climate change, this time when the scientific community has reached an even stronger consensus that global warming is a reality, when we have permafrost thawing in Alaska, roads buckling, villages washing away, parts of the Alaskan pipeline sagging and temperatures increasing 4, 6 and 8 degrees Fahrenheit, this report for the first time in 6 years had no section on global warming, climate change.

Mr. Speaker, Russell Trane, the Nixon-Ford EPA Administrator that I quoted earlier, stated that we have moved radically ''away from regulation based on independent findings and professional analysis of scientific health and economic data by the responsible agency to regulation controlled by the White House and driven primarily by political considerations.''

It has been one of the great frustrations and concerns during my tenure in Congress to watch the Environmental Protection Agency, an agency that I have worked with throughout my public service career, where I have worked with many fine, dedicated public servants, professionals, who are in that so-called faceless bureaucracy, but are really doing their best to deal with their mission of protecting the environment, and when I have worked with Republican and Democratic administrations going back over 20 years, it saddens me to see the politicalization of the EPA, the reversal, the abrogation of responsibility to give the American public the truth about the environment, to say nothing of hard work to move forward with policies and programs to give our communities the type of environment that our families deserve.

I can only hope that the Senate in the course of its deliberations will be able to focus on this and that the new Administrator, should Governor Leavitt be confirmed, will be the Governor Leavitt that was so creative in dealing with livable communities, sprawl, planned growth, transportation, and allowing the community to work to gain control over its destiny, and not be the Governor Leavitt of questionable environmental achievements dealing with air and water, open space, and certainly not an EPA that has been characterized by the reversals and the politicization of these last 2½ years.

Mr. Speaker, time will tell, but the American public deserves an answer sooner rather than later, and I will continue to do all I can to put appropriate focus on these critical issues.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and September 24.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, September 24.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today, September 24, and September 30.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, September 24.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and September 24.

The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on September 22, 2003, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.