continue to yield, that, yes, it is. We have 4 hours of debate. We would like to make sure half of that time on each side of the aisle is divided equally among those opponents and proponents of the legislation. The gentlewoman has explained it exactly right.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 1320

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. HULSHOF (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 52, line 2.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CDBG PUBLIC SERVICES CAP

SEC. 209. Section 105(a)(8) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(8)) is amended by striking ''1998'' and inserting ''1999''.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; $26,431,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further,* That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further,* That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $6,500,000: *Provided,* That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants, loans, and technical assistance to qualifying community development lenders, and administrative expenses of the Fund, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES–3, $80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, of which $12,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to $1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided,* That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $32,000,000: *Provided further,* That not more than $25,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading may be used for programs and activities authorized in section 114 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $46,000,000. No funds shall be expended in promulgating a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking or Final Rule under the Flammable Fabrics Act, which could directly or indirectly lead to increased chemical treatment of upholstery fabrics, unless the published Notice of Proposed Rulemaking or Final Rule includes the final recommendations of the Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–65, the Corporation for National and Community Service shall use such amounts of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of (1) the programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 103–82); the Corporation; and (3) the Corporation's Office of Inspector General: *Provided,* That such sums shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation and the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. sections 7251–7298, $10,195,000, of which $865,000, shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102–229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $11,666,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $656,505,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That the obligated balance of such sums shall remain available through September 30, 2007 for liquidating obligations made in fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; and not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $1,856,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That the obligated balance of such

sums shall remain available through September 30, 2007 for liquidating obligations made in fiscal years 1999 and 2000: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to develop, propose, or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in contemplation of implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of such Protocol: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or administer the interim guidance issued on February 5, 1998 by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and designated as the ''Interim Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits'' with respect to complaints filed under such title after the date of enactment of this Act and until guidance is finalized. Nothing in the above proviso may be construed to restrict the Environmental Protection Agency from developing or issuing final guidance relating to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $31,154,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That the obligated balance of such sums shall remain available through September 30, 2007 for liquidating obligations made in fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $60,948,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; not to exceed $1,500,000,000, consisting of $650,000,000 as appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–65, notwithstanding the second proviso under this heading of said Act, and not to exceed $850,000,000 (of which $100,000,000 shall not become available until September 1, 1999), all of which is to remain available until expended, consisting of $1,175,000,000, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101–508, and $325,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended by Public Law 101–508: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further,* That $12,237,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA or any other provision of law, $74,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of SARA: *Provided further,* That $40,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the ''Science and Technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided further,* That $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available only for grants to State, local, and tribal governments for ''Brownfields'' site assessment projects; grants to State, local, and tribal governments for the development of State, local, and tribal cleanup programs; and related Environmental Protection Agency personnel and administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 1999.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That hereafter, the Administrator is authorized to enter into assistance agreements with Federally recognized Indian tribes on such terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate for the same purposes as are set forth in section 9003(h)(7) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $15,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, and to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $3,233,132,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,250,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and $775,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended; $55,000,000 for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; $15,000,000 for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages as provided by section 303 of Public Law 104–182; $253,475,000 for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this Act (H.R.); and $884,657,000 for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, Federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, Tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities: *Provided,* That, consistent with section 1452(g) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12(g)), section 302 of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (Public Law 104–182) and the accompanying joint explanatory statement of the committee on conference (H. Rept. No. 104–741 to accompany S. 1316, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, States may combine the assets of State Revolving Funds (SRFs) established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, and title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, as security for bond issues to enhance the lending capacity of one or both SRFs, but not to acquire the State match for either program, provided that revenues from the bonds are allocated to the purposes of the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in the same portion as the funds are used as security for the bonds: *Provided further,* That hereafter, the Administrator is authorized to enter into assistance agreements with Federally recognized Indian tribes on such terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate for the development and implementation of programs to manage hazardous waste, and underground storage tanks: *Provided further,* That beginning in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, pesticide program implementation grants under section 23(a)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended, shall be available for pesticide program development and implementation, including enforcement and compliance activities: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the matching requirement in Public Law 104–204 for funds appropriated under this heading for grants to the State of Texas for improving wastewater treatment for the Colonias, such funds that remain unobligated may also be used for improving water treatment for the Colonias, and shall be matched by the State funds from State resources equal to 20 percent of such unobligated funds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III through page 65, line 16, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. STOKES:

Page 61, line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through ''expenses'' on line 20.

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry it is necessary to offer this amendment. I wish the committee had not included the language limiting the amount and usage of the Environmental Protection Agency's brownfields money.

I think the provision included in the reported bill that reduces brownfields funds from the administration's request of $91 million to $75 million is misguided; and I think the language restricting the brownfields money to assessments, prohibiting the capitalization of local government and revolving fund loan funds for cleanup, is also misguided.

My amendment is very simple: By deleting the brownfields limitation, it would allow the EPA to spend up to the budget request of $91 million for the program. This is approximately the same amount as was made available for the program in each of the last 2 years. It would also allow brownfields funds to be used for revolving fund capitalization. That is to say, the funds could be used not only for assessments but also for cleanups.

This past January, the United States Conference of Mayors issued a report entitled ''Recycling America's land: A National Report on Brownfields Redevelopment.'' I am going to read three statements from the executive summary of the report.

First, the report shows that a failure to address brownfields redevelopment will result in a wasted opportunity for America to recycle its land, create jobs, increase local tax bases and revitalize neighborhoods.

Second, the report also finds that the proliferation of brownfields is a problem that affects communities of all sizes. Fifty-three cities, or 36 percent of respondents, were communities with populations of less than 50,000. Eighty-eight cities, or 56 percent of respondents, were communities with less than 100,000 population. These responses confirm that brownfields are not an isolated problem and can be found in communities of various sizes and locations.

Finally, cities participating in the study identified several major obstacles to the redevelopment of brownfields. Cities noted the lack of cleanup funds as the number one impediment.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, before I make the rest of my statement, I would like to thank our distinguished ranking member for working so closely with me and my office on this brownfields amendment. I would also like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for assisting in this matter.

As written, the bill prohibits the EPA from giving much-needed, much-sought-after assistance to localities and jeopardizing the cleanup of sites. Our amendment gives local communities the tools they need to clean up decaying and sterile brownfield sites, creating jobs and revitalizing our neighborhoods.

Brownfields are abandoned and often contaminated properties that can be found in urban, suburban and rural areas across the United States. We all have brownfields in our communities; the abandoned gas station on the corner, the dormant steel plant in the valley, the old mill by the river.

The GAO has estimated there are approximately 450,000 brownfields sites around the country. Cleaning up these sites and returning them to productive use will not only benefit the public health and the environment, but it will create jobs and economic opportunities. In urban areas like Denver, redevelopment of brownfields can also prevent urban sprawl and development of pristine areas called greenfields.

The EPA's brownfields initiative has been tremendously successful. It has awarded 2-year brownfields pilots intended to bring together public and private efforts at all levels of government. In fact, the EPA has awarded more than 228 project grants, including 71 new pilots that the Vice President just announced this week.

However, this bill has three problems. First of all, it prevents any of these funds from being used by localities to set up revolving loan programs.

Secondly, it provides only $75 million in funding, $16.3 million below the administration's request, and, frankly, well below the real needs in this country for brownfields redevelopment.

Thirdly, the legislation prohibits the funds from being used for research and community outreach, a vital component of the program which furthers understanding of brownfields and gives community tools to redevelopment.

Many communities in the country have benefitted from brownfields redevelopment, and we need to make sure that we do not limit them by the language in this legislation.

I have received numerous letters from mayors across the country, including Denver, Commerce City, Colorado, and Salt Lake City, expressing the need for full funding for the studies and for the money to be used for redevelopment.

This is a widely supported bill by communities across the country. I urge adoption of our amendment so that it can be used to its fullest potential.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Stokes amendment and would associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Many of us who represent the northeast have come to value the importance of the brownfields program at the Environmental Protection Agency. The program funded in this bill will give communities with abandoned industrial sites the opportunity to assess these problems more closely and to find alternatives to clean up these sites.

Brownfields need to be redeveloped, whether they are in urban centers or elsewhere, and this program goes a long way towards addressing this national problem. Unfortunately, the language contained in this bill would have the unintended consequences of prohibiting any use of the funds for education, outreach or technical assistance.

I believe that the National Conference of Mayors, who strongly supports the brownfields program, put it best when they said, ''This provision would take brownfields redevelopment efforts in the wrong direction.''

It is imperative that our communities have access to these funds in order to educate themselves about how to best achieve the goal of rebuilding their communities and putting these sites back into productive commercial use.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the brownfields program is a good program and the committee supports efforts to turn abandoned and possibly contaminated properties into thriving commercial areas. On the other hand, both the GAO and the Inspector General have issued reports questioning some past EPA grants to nongovernmental organizations, where scarce dollars have gone for case studies, conferences and workshops.

□ 1330

The committee's intent is to ensure that brownfields funds are used appropriately within the boundaries of the law that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), has done so much to develop in the first place.

In that spirit, but with those reservations, I reluctantly support the amendment.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stokes-Degette Amendment, which would remove restrictive anti-environmental language in the bill which would prevent the clean up of contaminated brownfield sites. The Committee has reduced President Clinton's request for Brownfields by more than ninety million dollars, a sixteen percent cut from last year. Additionally, the bill would prevent EPA from providing brownfields program support for brownfields site cleanup, research, and job training.

In January 1998, the U.S. Conference of Mayors stated that cities ranked the lack of clean up funds as the number one impediment to the redevelopment of brownfields. My home state of Connecticut is one of the oldest industrialized states in the union, and unfortunately the caretaker of many of these contaminated sites. We in the state have been working over

the last several years to identify, clean and recapture these sites for public use. However, the language in this bill would work to prevent us from carrying on this important work.

With the inability of this Congress to reach a compromise on a bipartisan Superfund reform and reauthorization bill, continued funding for the Brownfields Initiative is imperative to the health and safety of America. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the amendment number 19 of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES)?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to this title?

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies is willing to engage in a colloquy with me regarding the amendment just passed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I guess I will have a colloquy with my friend.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear in the legislative history, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) that the enactment of that amendment that just passed does not give EPA any new or additional statutory authority to conduct its brownfields programs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, which has primary jurisdiction over the Superfund law in the House, I do not want the EPA or anyone else to think that the current Superfund law authorizes the Agency to use brownfields money to capitalize revolving loan funds. Moreover, brownfields money may be used pursuant to section 311(c) of CERCLA to fund only, and I quote, ''Research with respect to the detection, assessment and evaluation of the effects on and risks to human health of hazardous substances and detection of hazardous substances in the environment.''

The language of section 311(c) does not, I emphasize, does not, authorize the Agency to use brownfields money to fund conferences, seminars, meetings, workshops, or other activities that have nothing to do with actual research.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I concur with the gentleman's view that the current text of the bill before us does not authorize activities not currently authorized under CERCLA.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that being the case, I hope that the gentleman will make the permissible scope of the activities clear in his work in conference.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we will do everything we can to ensure that EPA is not permitted to exceed the scope of its current authorized activities.

I might add that we have made serious effort to put pressure on EPA in a number of other areas, and they are not always as responsive as I might like.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to be clear that the use of the EPA funding that is contemplated in the brownfields program, we have no objection to it being used for the purposes which the statute was intended, but I think it is a little inaccurate to say that there has been legal authority saying that it is not intended to be used for revolving funds and other purposes.

First of all, the Inspector General audited pilot programs issued by the EPA and in March 1998 issued a report that said there was not any misuse of funds. In fact, the Inspector General's report concluded that the activities reviewed were authorized under CERCLA.

The Inspector General's only recommendations were administrative in nature, such as the recommendation to revise the EPA's ranking criteria. None of the recommendations implied, as I understand it, that the grant should be terminated, or that the grant program itself was at all questionable. In fact, the Inspector General praised the program.

The EPA has agreed, I would like to stress, to all of the Inspector General's recommendations and states, ''We believe the corrective actions underway and planned by the agency address the report's recommendations. Therefore, we are closing this report upon recommendation.''

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), our Chairman, asked the GAO to review grants and agreements awarded by the EPA since 1993, the first year the Agency began the brownfields efforts. The GAO found during its 1998 on-site audit of financial records that overall, the recipients were spending the funds in accordance with guidance of OMB.

So I guess I would just like to state for the record that I agree that EPA should not be able to use these funds for any illegal purpose beyond its legal authority, but I think that to state that they have been using them for illegal purposes goes beyond what the Inspector General and GAO have, in fact, said.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and would concur in what she said, pointed out that she was not referring to any case to revolving loan funds and the money therein, because obviously, they could not be conducted under the current law, and as long as we clarify that, I think that is important to put in the RECORD.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in 1997, EPA issued 24 grants to States and local governments to establish revolving loan funds, and on October 2, 1997, the general counsel issued a legal memorandum identifying the EPA's legal authority to set up the brownfields cleanup revolving loan request programs.

The EPA legal authority for these revolving loan funds has never been independently evaluated or challenged by the GAO or the Inspector General.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say we welcome the authorizers presence when we have our bill on the floor any time. I know authorizers often like to use appropriations bills to effectively implement their work, especially when these kinds of disagreements occur from time to time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time again, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman for working with us on these issues.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Members who are present to know that our bill will be taken up one more time on Tuesday of the coming week. Further discussion regarding matters that relate to the bill will be taking place at that time in case there are those present who might have been expecting some further activity on the part of the committee this afternoon.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULSHOF, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING FURTHER AMENDMENTS TO SHAYS AMENDMENT DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2183, pursuant to H. Res. 442 and H. Res. 458, no other amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) shall be in order, except