FLOOR STATEMENT Congressman Les AuCoin HR 12927 - HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations, FY 1979

Mr. CHAIRMAN,

I RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM CALIFORNIA (Mr. Brown).

When we discuss the R&D function of the Environmental Protection Agency, we are not talking about some ivory-tower research that has no relevance to anyone other than those actually undertaking it. This is live research providing data and information that is fundamental to our ability to evaluate our environmental quality, implement sound policy decisions and predict and prepare for future environmental trends. Such research is integral to the Congressional process. In our decision-making and oversight capacities, we need and depend on research data to ensure that we obtain cost-effective environmental programs.

In this context, I welcome the House Appropriations
Committee's request for an additional \$3.9 million for environmental R&D above the Agency's budget request. What concerns
me, however, is that this increase is achieved by an addition
of \$17.9 million for various items not contained in the budget
request, and the deletion of items totalling \$14 million that
had been originally included in the budget.

Looking more closely at the proposed cuts of \$14 million, I am concerned that they will fall exactly on those parts of the EPA research program where we need more information, not less. Anticipatory research is proposed to be reduced by \$8 million, affecting specific research programs concerned with acid rain, cancer, research centers and innovative research. I believe this sort of investment in forward-looking research should be one of our highest priorities to allow for sound future decision-making.

MONITORING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT IS TO BE REDUCED BY \$4 MILLION. YET, MONITORING IS NO LESS IMPORTANT THAN FUTURE RESEARCH. IT IS DATA PROVIDED FROM THIS RESEARCH AREA THAT TELLS US HOW EFFECTIVE OUR ACTIONS HAVE BEEN, WHETHER WE HAVE BEEN TOO AMBITIOUS, OR TOO LAX WITH THE STANDARDS WE PROPOSE.

\$2 MILLION IS TO BE TAKEN FROM EXTRA-MURAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, \$1 MILLION OF WHICH IS SPECIFIED TO BE TAKEN FROM THE AIR-ECOLOGY RESEARCH PROGRAM. THE DATA PROVIDED BY THE AIR-ECOLOGY PROGRAM IS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN SETTING AIR-QUALITY STANDARDS AND FOR THEIR PERIODIC REVISION AS CALLED FOR BY THE CLEAN AIR ACT LEGISLATION. TO UNDERLINE THE POINT I AM MAKING, DURING CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION IN 1976, CONGRESS WAS RELYING, FOR THE MOST PART, ON DATA THAT DID NOT EXTEND BEYOND 1973.

AT A TIME WHEN VARIOUS EPA REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS ARE BEING QUESTIONED FOR THEIR COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND INFLATIONARY IMPACT -- AND RIGHTLY SO IN MY OPINION -- IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT CONGRESS HAS THE BEST AVAILABLE DATA UPON WHICH TO BASE ITS REVISIONS. IT IS IN THE VERY NATURE OF R&D THAT THE FEW MILLIONS THAT WE MIGHT SAVE NOW, CAN BE STORING UP BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF COSTS IN THE FUTURE, COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH OVER-AMBITIOUS STANDARDS, UNNECESSARY LITIGATION, AND THE SOMETIMES SUPERFLUOUS CONSTRUCTION AND INSTALLATION OF NEW PLANTS AND TECHNOLOGY.

In urging members to support these two amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown), I would emphasize that the restoration of the \$14 million for these three programs and the addition of \$6 million for research into the reuse of wastewater, would not require exceeding the total amount of money included in the Appropriations Committee recommendation. Taken together, these two amendments have the effect of transferring a modest cut of \$10 million from the construction grants program, which would still have \$4.18 billion, to research and development. I believe such a transfer makes good sense and would urge members' support for these amendments.