The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Debbie Stabenow, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:
Almighty God, on this day designated by Congress to be a Day of Reconciliation, we confess anything which stands between us and You and between us and anyone else. We long to be in a right relationship with You again. We know the love, joy, and peace that floods our being when we are reconciled with You. We become riverbeds for the flow of the supernatural gifts of leadership: wisdom, knowledge, discernment, vision, and authentic charisma. We confess our pride that estranges us from You and our judgmentalism that strains our relationships. Forgive our cutting words and hurting attitudes toward other religions or races and people with different beliefs, political preferences, or convictions on issues. So often we are divided into camps of liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat, and are critical of those with whom we disagree. Help us to express to each other the grace we have received in being reconciled to You. May our efforts to reach out to each other be a way of telling You how much we love You. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable Debbie Stabenow 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,
To the Senate:
Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Debbie Stabenow, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair. 
Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore.
Ms. Stabenow thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate from Nevada.

SCHEDULE
Mr. Reid. Madam President, this morning the Senate will consider the Transportation conference report under a 60-minute time agreement. A vote on the conference report will occur today. At approximately 10:30, the Senate will resume consideration of the Railroad Retirement Act with the Daschle substitute amendment pending under postcloture conditions. There will be rollcall votes on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act during today’s session.
The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences.
On behalf of the majority leader, I have been asked to tell everyone we appreciate the cooperation yesterday. We are moving along on the legislation. There are just a few things left we have to do before we leave for the Christmas break.

NOTICE
Effective January 1, 2002, the subscription price of the Congressional Record will be $422 per year or $211 for six months. Individual issues may be purchased for $5.00 per copy. The cost for the microfiche edition will remain $141 per year with single copies remaining $1.50 per issue. This price increase is necessary based upon the cost of printing and distribution.
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funding to increase seat belt use across the nation.

The bill before us also includes a full $1.25 billion in funding to launch the transportation security act, which is the aviation security bill that was enacted just a few days ago.

The act required that the revenues from its user fees be appropriated before becoming available.

The security act includes many strict deadlines for the improvement of our aviation security system.

And we expect the DOT to meet those deadlines.

That is why we worked hard to get the $1.25 billion in user fees into the hands of the Transportation Secretary in this bill as soon as possible—rather than wait for the Defense supplemental.

For highways, our bill includes $100 million more than the amount guaranteed under TEA-21.

The bill also fully funds the levels authorized under AIR-21 for the FAA’s air traffic control improvements and airport grants.

When the Senate considered this bill, we spent a lot of time debating the safety of Mexican trucks entering the United States.

While the conference agreement provides the administration flexibility in implementation, it carefully follows the safety provisions of the bill that passed the Senate in August.

The safety requirements in this bill are considerably stronger than anything the administration had proposed, and anything that was presented to the Senate as an alternative during our debate this past summer.

Let me mention quickly just a few of the safety provisions in the bill.

Licenses will be checked for every driver transporting hazardous materials and for at least half of all other Mexican truck drivers every time they cross the border.

Mexican trucks will undergo rigorous inspections before they are allowed full access to our highways, and they will be reinspected every 90 days.

And truckers will need to demonstrate that they have a drug and alcohol testing program, proof of insurance, and drivers who have clean driving records before the first truck crosses the border.

There are many people to thank for their contributions to this bill.

The former chairman of the subcommittee and now its ranking member, Senator Shelby, has been a stalwart ally and regular contributor to our efforts.

Congressman Rogers, the chairman of the House subcommittee is not only an outstanding chairman, he is a true Kentucky gentleman as well.

I also want to thank Representative Sabo of Minnesota, the ranking member of the House subcommittee, whose leadership on the Mexican truck issue was essential to our getting an outstanding subcommittee package reported overwhelmingly from the conference committee and as just described by the Senator from Washington.

This is the first year the Senator from Washington is chair of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and I believe that she has accounted herself well on this bill. This is a balanced bill.

Clearly, the Mexican truck issue reflects that balanced approach. I believe that the Senator from Washington did an admirable job of managing this issue through a lengthy debate on the Senate floor and through the conference committee negotiations with the House and the administration.

The resolution of the Mexican truck issue allows for the safe opening of the border to Mexican trucks with appropriate inspections, oversight, and audits of Mexican-domiciled trucks and trucking companies. This compromise kept the focus on truck safety and security at our border and never lost sight of the need to work with the administration and the House to forge a workable solution.

Our approach on this issue was always to move the debate forward and allow a resolution based on safety standards rather than prohibiting any action by the department to manage the truck safety issues we face at our southern border. I think the conference report treatment of this matter meets that test.

The FAA, the Coast Guard, and the Department’s new Transportation Security Agency are all adequately, if not...
generously, funded in this bill. The funding levels match the AIR 21 levels for the FAA’s two capital accounts, and the funding for FAA operations meets the President’s budget request.

Accordingly, the conference report meets the criteria of the Transportation Subcommittee. It has always operated in an open and bipartisan manner. I am pleased to see that this tradition has continued under the leadership of Senator Murray. She and Senator Shelby have considered on all aspects of this bill. Both of them were required to take on the very contentious issue regarding the safety risks of Mexican trucks traveling on our highways. We debated that issue for several days here in the Senate and took a total of three cloture votes during that debate. Senators Murray and Shelby stood their ground on the floor of the Senate and they prevailed. They then went to conference and negotiated a compromise with the House that maintains the strong safety requirements passed by the Senate but eliminates the threat of a veto against this bill.

I commend both managers and their respective staffs for a job well done and I encourage all members to support the conference report to be disposed of this bill.

Mr. Byrd. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee members for their determination to protect our highways from unsafe Mexican trucks.

I am not eager for trucks to freely cross from Mexico into the United States, for many reasons, but I am pleased that these trucks will at least be required to pass a safety compliance review.

The remainder of my comments have to do with the portion of the conference report that funds the Federal-aid highway program.

As the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, with authorizing jurisdiction over the highway program, I am pleased with the overall funding level for Federal-aid highways.

As my colleagues will recall, one of the major accomplishments of TEA-21, passed by Congress in 1998, was that for the first time, gas tax revenues into the Highway Trust Fund were guaranteed to be promptly returned to the States for transportation spending.

The remainder of my comments have to do with a provision in TEA-21 called Revenue Aligned Budget Authority, or RABA as it is known. RABA calculations compare actual gas tax receipts to our 1998 estimates, and guaranteed funding will go up or down depending on whether we have more or less revenue in the Highway Trust Fund than TEA-21 anticipated.

Reflecting several years of a strong economy, gas tax receipts have been billions of dollars more than we anticipated in 1998.

This year, as guaranteed by TEA-21, the Federal-aid highway program is funded at almost $33 billion ($32.954 billion); an increase of about $1.2 billion over last year; which includes $4.5 billion from RABA funds.

As I said, I am pleased with the success of these funding guarantees.

But I am concerned about the diversion of over $1.5 billion to project earmarks instead of being distributed fairly under formulas developed in TEA-21.

There are 590 project earmarks from the Highway Trust Fund, and 55 more highway projects taken from the general fund.

I want to alert my colleagues to such extensive earmarking contained in this appropriations report. This earmarking is mostly within discretionary programs created in TEA-21 and mostly funded with the RABA funds.

Currently a billion dollars in RABA funds are diverted away from the fair distribution that we agreed to in TEA-21, and are used for earmarks in this conference report.

This money does not get distributed evenly as authorized in TEA-21, but there are winners and losers.

Some States get a lot of this money for projects, some get very little.
This process completely distorts the funding formulas we agreed to in TEA-21.

It also distorts the discretionary programs we created in TEA-21 for projects that meet specified criteria.

For a pilot program, one that we created to fund local projects that link transportation and community needs, for instance, was authorized in TEA-21 at $25 million per year.

This year, that program has become the catch-all for project earmarks, with a total of 219 projects at a cost of $276 million.

This is incredible that a small discretionary program has grown to an earmarking account at over 10 times the authorized amount.

The Appropriations Committee began earmarking these TEA-21 accounts a few years ago, over strong objections from the authorizing committees, and the practice has grown exponentially each year.

Indeed, the Appropriations Committee has begun the practice of soliciting project requests, creating a terrible dilemma where the number of projects that Members submit far exceed any authorized amount.

And Members have no choice but to compete for these discretionary funds in the appropriations process.

I am compelled to register my strong objections to the conference report that would ‘direct [the Federal Transit Administration] not to sign any new full funding grant agreements after September 30, 2002 that have a maximum federal share of higher than 60 percent.’ The Senate Banking Committee has already considered and rejected transit authorization legislation issued next year.

In the meantime, we have not had the benefit of any hearings or other public debate on this issue that would justify such report language.

The Appropriations Committee was seeking to reallocate funds in the appropriations process involving the Iowa DOT

Where any fault for this situation rests with the framework in TEA

I much prefer to send Highway Trust Fund dollars back to the States and I do not think Congress should pick and choose projects from the list that Members submit far exceeding the amounts authorized.

I have opposed any project earmarks. I support the concept of a local match for New Starts projects.

Where any fault for this situation rests with the framework in TEA-21, we will address it in the reauthorization of TEA-21.

Next year the Environment and Public Works Committee will bring hearings on reauthorization, and I know that there is a lot of concern about this earmarking process.

I will vote in favor of this conference report for the good it contains, but I am compelled to register my strong objections to the hundreds of highway projects that do not belong in an appropriations bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to take a moment while the transportation appropriations conference report is pending before us to express my concern, as chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Federal transit laws, about a provision in that report that attempts by report language to rewrite the law by reducing the Federal match for New Start transit projects from 80 percent to 60 percent.

I am referring to language in the conference report that would ‘direct [the Federal Transit Administration] not to sign any new full funding grant agreements after September 30, 2002 that have a maximum federal share of higher than 60 percent.’ The Senate Banking Committee has already considered and rejected transit authorization legislation issued next year.

In the meantime, we have not had the benefit of any hearings or other public debate on this issue that would justify such report language.

The Appropriations Committee was seeking to reallocate funds in the appropriations process involving the Iowa DOT

and the local transit authorities to be used for bus replacement, bus expansion and for facility and equipment costs.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is correct regarding the allocation of these funds. The intent is that the funds may be used for the authorized purposes that you noted.

FUNDING OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I say to Senator MURRAY, I would like to reaffirm my understanding that between the funding you have included in the conference report for the Transportation Security Administration and the funding included in the bill for the Federal Aviation Administration’s research, engineering and development, there are sufficient funds for the expanded use of existing technology and research and development of new technology to improve aviation security. Is that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator is correct. The funds appropriated are intended to cover those costs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.
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wishing to speak on this conference report later.

First of all, I compliment the chairman and ranking member from the Senate side. I think they have done an extraordinary job on the conference report. Most of the work they have done on a range of issues. I think the Senate owes them a debt of gratitude. I could spend some long period of time talking about the important provisions in this Transportation conference report, but I think it took a long while to get to this point. Senator MURRAY, chairing the subcommittee on the Senate side, and others who have worked on this bill for some length of time undoubtedly wish this had been completed much earlier, but there were a series of things that prevented it from happening. In any event, at the end of this session we have a conference report that contains a lot of important items for this country’s transportation system. I compliment Senator MURRAY and Senator SHELBY and thank them for their work.

I do want to say—and I will say it briefly—there are two items in the conference report that provide some heartburn for me. The conference was required to accept a provision dealing with the spending of $400,000 to put airport signs up that describe National Airport really as Reagan National Airport. This conference report, because the House insisted, required the Metro Authority to spend $400,000 changing signs so that people will not be confused that they are at the airport when, in fact, the signs now say “National Airport.”

George Will had a little something to say about that in a piece in April of this year. He said:

Travelers too oblivious to know they are at an airport, when large, clear signs say they are, should be given those little plastic pilot wings that are issued to unaccompanied children taken into protective custody. The conservatives want to get Congress to order Metro officials to spend several thousand dollars to add Reagan to the signs and all references to the station on the maps.

He is talking about the station at the Metro stop.

He said:

Reagan had a memorable thing or two to say about that in a piece in April of this year. He said:

I wish we had in fact had the House mandatory job. They run a subcommittee that is subject in the appropriations process. I think that will not and cannot be the last word on this subject. The Appropriating committee and those of us who will return to this subject in the appropriations process next year will say the conference itself forced that weakening. I think that will not and cannot be the last word on this subject. Those on the authorizing committee and those of us who will return to this subject in the appropriations process next year will say.

But having spoken on both of those issues, let me again say to my colleagues, Senator MURRAY, and my colleague, Senator SHELBY, they operate in good faith and do an extraordinary job. They run a subcommittee that is very important to this country, especially again in relation to post-September 11, the issue of transportation, the security of our transportation systems in the country.

Our transportation industry is so important to this country’s economy. There is no way you can overstate it. The appropriations bill offered to us today by Senators MURRAY and SHELBY is an appropriations bill that I think the Senate will want to approve. This conference report will get the Senate’s approval today.

Madam President, I yield the floor and request the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will withhold, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I asked unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong opposition to the conference agreement on H.R. 2299, the fiscal year 2002 Transportation appropriations bill approved by the House and Senate conferences last week.

I once again find myself in a position in which I must express strong concerns with yet another appropriations bill. This measure, like the eight appropriations bills approved by the Congress this year and like so often has been the case during recent years, continues what I believe is an inappropriate overreach by the appropriators in an effort to fulfill their own agendas at the expense of both current law and the work of the authorizers.

They again are redirecting programmatic funding, funding that in many cases is authorized to be distributed by formula or at the discretion of the Secretary and based on competitive merit.

Instead of allowing the normal funding distribution process to go forward, the appropriators have earmarked that funding for pet projects for the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Before citing a host of examples of the pork barrel spending associated with this conference report, I want to first address the very important trade issue that the appropriators have tied to the pending measure, that is, the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA.

As my colleagues well know, provisions in both the House and the Senate versions of the Transportation appropriations bill proposed to restrict the
administration’s ability to abide by our obligations under NAFTA. As a result of this fact, the Statement of Administrative Policy included a very clear and direct veto threat stating that “the Senate Committee has adopted provisions that would cause the United States to violate our commitments under NAFTA. Unless changes are made to the Senate bill, the President’s senior advisors will recommend that the President veto the bill.”

Several of us also strongly objected to the appropriators’ actions. As a result, we spent considerable floor time—nearly two full weeks in July—discussing the importance of NAFTA and our obligation to abide by our commitments to our trading partners.

At no time has the senior Senator from Texas or I argued that safety concerns were not of considerable importance in this debate. In fact, it was our position that the DOT appropriations bill effectively altered our solemn agreement with our neighbors to the South. If our trading partners are subject to the whimsical mood of the appropriators, how can we ever expect any re-negotiation to abide by our agreements with, or one we are seeking to enter into trade agreements with, to have any faith that our word is true and we will abide by our agreements? If the appropriators’ agenda had prevailed, I should consider the consequences and the impact as we attempted to negotiate new trade agreements or renewed ones.

After receiving assurances from the ranking members of the Appropriations Committee that he would work with the administration to ensure the conference agreement would not include any provisions that would prevent use from abiding by our NAFTA commitments, the senior Senator from Texas and I agreed to forgo some of our procedural rights and allowed the bill to go to conference without several additional votes and the expenditure of additional floor time. While early into the conference the Senate managers of the bill issued a release indicating a determination to provoke a Presidential veto, the appropriators finally agreed last week to incorporate provisions agreeable to the administration.

Upon hearing of the agreement with respect to Mexican trucks last week, I raised reservations over some of the provisions that I felt could be troublesome. However, in response to these concerns, the administration has assured the Congress that it is not in violation of NAFTA.

The compromise reached by the House and Senate appropriators on Mexican trucking is an important victory for safety and free trade. We must promote the highest level of highway safety and security while meeting our commitments to our friends to the South. The compromise reached by the conferees will achieve these twin objectives, permitting our border to be opened in a timely manner and ensuring that all United States safety standards will be applied to every truck and bus operating on our highways.

Moreover, I have received a letter from U.S. Trade Representative, Robert Zoellick, which states:

The Administration supports the agreement reached by the House and Senate appropriators on Mexican trucking as fully promoting highway safety and U.S. trade commitments. In addition, it will permit the United States to meet the commitments made to Mexico as part of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I ask unanimous consent a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this is a bittersweet victory for highway safety and free trade. On the one hand the United States will be allowed to keep its promise to abide by the NAFTA.

Yet on the other hand, the egregious process of pork barrel earmarking continues. Unless you are from a state with a member on the Appropriations Committee, your State’s transportation dollars most likely will be redirected through an enactment agreement, which in many cases redirects authorized funding programs for the sake of the home-state projects of the appropriators.

I recognize that there are very important provisions in the legislation, sections that appropriate funds for programs vital to the safety and security of the traveling public and our national transportation system over all. Yet despite that necessary funding, and the fact that the legislation is not in violation of NAFTA, it once again goes overboard on pork barrel spending.

It is so bad, in fact, yesterday’s Wall Street Journal included an article highlighting the very egregious actions of the appropriators to direct those funds to earmarked projects. The article is entitled “Bill Gains To Cut State-Controlled Highway Funds.”

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

Bill Gains To Cut State-Controlled Highway Funds

(David Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—In a total display of patronage politics, Congress is poised to remove nearly $400 million of federal highway aid from state control to instead spend the money on road projects selected by lawmakers.

The appropriations leadership added the provision to a $59.6 billion transportation bill for fiscal-year 2002 that was filed just before dawn Friday and rushed through the House hours later, where it passed 371-11. Tight limits on Senate debate all but ensure final passage this week, despite complaints that lawmakers are tampering with funding formulas laid out in the 1998 highway act.

Until the dust settles, it is difficult to say precisely how individual states will fare, but three—Kentucky, Alabama, and West Virginia—are clear winners. Rep. Hal Rogers (R., Ky), who led the House effort, engineered the arrangement and used it to corral extra dollars for his state. Alabama had three votes at the negotiating table, including Sen. Richard Shelby, the Senate’s top GOP negotiator. West Virginia needed only one. Sen. Robert Byrd, chairman of the Appropriations panel and a master at capturing highway money for his rural state. Among the four largest earmarked highway accounts, Kentucky, West Virginia and Alabama are promised $211 million, almost a fifth of the $1.1 billion.

Never before has the Appropriations leadership gone so far in tampering with the 1998 highway act, which was built on the premise that federal gas-tax receipts should be returned quickly to the states regardless of other federal spending priorities. The act
even created a mechanism to adjust authorized highway funding upward as revenue rose. In recent years, that pot of money—identified by the title Revenue Aligned Budget Authority, or RABA—has exploded, reaching $4.5 billion this year.

Under the highway law, $3.95 billion was to be apportioned among the states this year with the remaining $574 million going to about 40 highway programs authorized in the highway act and administered through the Transportation Department. The bill would cut the state share to $3.5 billion and combine the extra $450 million with the $574 million, creating a $1 billion-plus pot.

The negotiators’ changes in the priorities set in the highway act, substituting projects they favor for the ones preferred by the House and Senate transportation committees that wrote the highway law. A $25 million community-preservation pilot program, for example, ballooned to $276 million, with virtually each dollar earmarked as to where it should be spent.

The Bush administration had opened the door by proposing changes in how RABA dollars are distributed. Negotiators said the $3.5 billion apportioned to the states narrowly exceeds the amount proposed in the president’s budget, and an additional $100 million has been moved elsewhere to conserve highway funds available to the states. There is little doubt the deal was driven by pork-barrel politics. There were bitter fights over unsuccessful Republican attempts to deny money for vulnerable Democrats in conservative House districts in Mississippi and Arkansas.

The bill would impose a much tougher safety regimen than the White House had prepared to confront Republicans with the impending Pentagon budget, and an additional $100 million has been moved elsewhere to conserve highway funds available to the states. There is little doubt the deal was driven by pork-barrel politics. There were bitter fights over unsuccessful Republican attempts to deny money for vulnerable Democrats in conservative House districts in Mississippi and Arkansas.

The bill would impose a much tougher safety regimen than the White House had wanted for Mexican trucks that are due to begin operating in the U.S. next year. The Transportation Department expects to meet the requirements and open the border by the spring—just a few months later than planned. But the final settlement is a personal victory for Rep. Martin Salo (D., Minn.) and Sen. Patty Murray (D. Wash.), the two managers of the bill who had insisted lawmakers must consider safety.

For Sen. Byrd, there will be more at stake than the transportation bill. The West Virginia Democrat will be at center stage again this week, which he is expected to force Senate roll calls on adding more money for homeland security to a pending Pentagon budget. Though the White House should win an early procedural vote, Sen. Byrd appears prepared to confront Republicans with the choice of accepting the money or pulling down the entire military budget.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues, how much longer are we going to let the appropriators subordinate the jurisdiction and responsibilities of the authorizers? Didn’t most of us think the multi-year highway funding legislation, known as TEA-21, would essentially be the law of the land through fiscal year 2003 with respect to highway funding formulas and state apportionments? I guess we were wrong; given the appropriations reprogramming maneuvers.

Let me again quote from the Wall Street Journal: “The negotiators made wholesale changes in the priorities set in the highway act, substituting projects they favor for the ones preferred by the House and Senate transportation committees that wrote the highway law.” This is precisely why no projects should be earmarked by either the authorizers or the appropriators and we should instead allow the states to fund the projects that meet the legitimate transportation needs of their states.

Mr. President, the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority—RABA—funds mentioned in the article are to be distributed proportionately to the states through formula apportionments and to allocated programs. This conference report represents a fundamental departure from that approach.

To pay for some of the report’s many earmarks, $423 million will be redirected from state apportionments, meaning the states lose 10.7 percent of RABA funds from the regular formula program. Further, another $423 million will be redistributed from allocated programs in a manner in which the appropriators have selected programmatic winners and losers. In fact, 24 of 38 highway funding programs will receive none of the funding under RABA they were to receive before the appropriators’ stroke of pen. But again, if you have the good fortune to reside in a state with a member in a leadership position on the D&DP Appropriations Subcommittee, you are among the winners in this appropriations bill lottery. I ask unanimous consent that two charts prepared by the Federal Highway Administration to show the impact on each state and the allocated programs through the RABA redistributing work of the appropriators be printed in the Record at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION—ESTIMATED RABA DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocated Programs</th>
<th>Federal-aid highway programs</th>
<th>TEA-21</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads</td>
<td>36,050,486</td>
<td>36,565,651</td>
<td>(485885)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highways</td>
<td>37,249,049</td>
<td>31,851,912</td>
<td>(539337)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Roads and Parkways</td>
<td>21,631,440</td>
<td>21,339,991</td>
<td>(291451)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge Roads</td>
<td>2,624,255</td>
<td>2,746,543</td>
<td>(122288)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Corridor Planning &amp; Desrl. &amp; Coord. Border Infrastructure Prg</td>
<td>18,633,932</td>
<td>19,275,000</td>
<td>(641678)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Ferry Busrhs and Ferry Terminal Facilities</td>
<td>5,059,012</td>
<td>5,275,000</td>
<td>(216012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scene Rivers Program</td>
<td>3,193,170</td>
<td>3,345,000</td>
<td>(151830)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Pricing Pilot Program</td>
<td>1,464,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1464100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority Projects Program</td>
<td>236,671,037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(236671037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Use Tax Evasion Projects</td>
<td>666,113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(666113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Highway Program</td>
<td>14,442,598</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14442598)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge</td>
<td>29,946,166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(29946166)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Studies, Reports, &amp; Projects</td>
<td>2,503,665</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2503665)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Levitation Transp. Tech. Deployment Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program</td>
<td>3,334,822</td>
<td>251,092,600</td>
<td>(2477678)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Incentive Grants for Use of Seat Belts</td>
<td>14,907,146</td>
<td>14,907,146</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Research</td>
<td>13,442,846</td>
<td>13,442,846</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development Program</td>
<td>5,989,243</td>
<td>5,989,243</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Education</td>
<td>2,326,625</td>
<td>2,326,625</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Transportation Statistics</td>
<td>4,128,751</td>
<td>4,128,751</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Standards, Research, Operational Tests, and Development</td>
<td>13,975,885</td>
<td>13,975,885</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Deployment</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Transportation Research</td>
<td>3,525,804</td>
<td>3,525,804</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Relief Program</td>
<td>13,310,772</td>
<td>13,310,772</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary</td>
<td>13,310,772</td>
<td>76,025,000</td>
<td>62,714,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>2,503,665</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2503665)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>48,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48650)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>570,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(570567)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE &amp; Supportive Services</td>
<td>2,664,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2664451)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Program</td>
<td>2,664,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2664451)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of CMAQ Program Effectiveness</td>
<td>48,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48650)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Pavement</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freedom Initiative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route Information</td>
<td>54,300,000</td>
<td>54,300,000</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Carrier Safety Grants</td>
<td>24,221,241</td>
<td>23,896,000</td>
<td>(325241)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Discretionary</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>15,969,481</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 4,543,000,000 | 4,543,000,000 | 0 |
Mr. McCAIN. In addition to the RABA funding shell game, host of other actions by the appropriators merit concern. For example, section 300 of the conference appropria-
tions bill provided $144 million in grants for surface transport-
port projects while the Statement of Managers then earmarks the entire allotment for 55 projects in 31 States. I should point out that the Senate-
possessed version of the appropriations bill included $20 million for these grants, not a dime of which was earmarked, while the House bill did not approve any funding for such grants. But through the will of the con-
feres, the level of funding for surface transport projects has in-
crease by $124 million and the conferees have recommended earmarks for every penny of the grant funding instead of allowing it to be made avail-
able for distribution on a competitive or meritocratic basis.

Examples of these earmarks included in the Statement of Managers include: $1.5 million for the Big South Fork Scenic Railroad enhancement project in Kentucky; $2 million for a public ex-
hibition on “America’s Transpacific Stories” in Michigan—this sounds like a very critical and legitimate use of transportation dollars—and one of my favorites, $3 million for the Odyssey Maritime Project in Seattle, WA. What makes this last one a highlight is that the “Odyssey Maritime Project,” is not a surface transportation project of all. It is, in fact, a museum. But the spon-
 sor of that project must have wanted us to really know what the funding was paid for and instead chose to incorporate some clearer pen-
manship to mask the true nature of the so-called transportation project.

With respect to the Coast Guard, the conference Appropriations Bill earmarks $2,000,000 for the Coast Guard to participate in an unrequested joint facility that would locate a new air station in Chi-
cago with a new facility that would also house city and State facilities. The new marine safety and rescue sta-
tion is not justified, not requested, and in fact would provide duplicative air coverage already met by other Coast Guard air stations.

The conference report also earmarks $4,650,000 to test and evaluate a current and 85-foot fast patrol craft that is manufactured in the United States and has a top speed of 40 knots. Interestingly, there is only one company with such a patrol craft, Guardian Marine International, LLC, in Florida, and Washington. The Coast Guard did not re-
quest this vessel, does not need this vessel, nor does this vessel meet the Coast Guard’s requirements. The Coast Guard’s resources are already stretched thin and this unnecessarily limits its abil-
ity to meet its new challenges since September 11. But again, the appropri-
ators know best.

The conference report further earmarks $500,000 for the Columbia River Aquatic Non-indigenous Species Initi-
ative—CRANSI—Center at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, to support surveys of nonindigenous aquatic species in the Columbia River. This earmark is directly taking away much needed Coast Guard R&D funds that could be used to fight the war on drugs, protect our ports, or aid in search and rescue efforts.

And, as with other modes of trans-
portation, the appropriators have lauded the DOT’s aviation programs with numerous earmarks and author-
izing language that is within the juris-
diction of the Commerce Committee. For example, the Statement of Man-
gers earmarks more than $200 million in funding for airport projects at dozens of specific airports. I am not sure how the appropriators seem to know precisely which pieces of equipment need to be installed at which airports, but I believe that we should be leaving these decisions to the FAA. The earmarks that are forced upon the agency, the less ability it has to focus on those that are truly needed to enhance safety and capacity.

The appropriators do the same thing with regard to airport projects and the expenditure of discretionary funds. The Statement of Managers earmarks more than 100 specific airport construc-
tion projects totaling more than $200 million. Once again, this is intended to take away significantly from the dis-
cretion of the FAA to determine the most important needs of the system as a whole.

This might be the time to remind the Secretary and the modal administra-
tors that the list of projects included in the Statement of Managers are advisory only. The Statement of Managers does not have the force of law and the FAA and other modal agencies must exercise its judgment in complying with the recommenda-
tions of the managers.

While the aviation earmarking is bad, the raiding of existing aviation ac-
counts for unrelated purposes is even worse. The FAA’s Airport Improv-

ease Program is supposed to be de-
voted to the infrastructure needs of our nation’s airports. Yet, the conference report takes tens of millions of dollars out of AIP to pay for the FAA’s costs of administering AIP, the Essential Air Service program, and the Small Community Air Service Developing Pilot Program. These are worthy activities and programs, but it violates the long-

established purpose of AIP to use mon-
ies for these things.

Mr. President, last year I warned that we should just as well get rid of DOT and let the appropriators act as the authorizing agency since they do so routinely substitute their own judg-
ment for that of the agency’s. Well, ap-
parently I have a job in my retirement predicting the future. There is a provi-
sion in this bill that prohibits the use of any funds for a regional airport in southeast Louisiana, unless a commis-
sion of stakeholders submits a com-
prehensive plan for the Administrator’s approval. While that is not necessarily good government, that is well within the agency purview and the bill goes further and requires that if the Administra-
tor approves the plan, it must be then submitted to the Appropriations Committees for approval before funds can be spent.

This is unconscionable. Clearly the appropriators do not want that airport to be funded unless they say so. Are the appropriators now going to require that every decision that is made by the oversight agency be approved by them first? Will the Administrator or Sec-
retary have to send letters regarding transportation policy to Congress for approval? Will DOT leave requests and travel schedules have to be sent to the Appropriations Committees? Where does this end? I understand that Con-
gress is supposed to act as a check and balance to the executive branch, but I must ask, who is serving as a check and balance to the appropriators? At a minimum, isn’t it supposed to be the authorizers? But passage of this con-
ference report will provide clear proof that there are no checks and there is no balance.

Mr. President, I could go on and on but will refrain. It is hard to imagine but despite the seemingly unlimited...
Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2299, the Transportation Bill, which was agreed to by both houses be counted as recorded votes.
verify 50 percent of all other vehicles crossing the border. On the issue of overweight trucks, the administration did not intend to implement any special effort to address overweight vehicles—even though Mexican weight limits far exceed those in the U.S.

The conference agreement, however, requires that—within 1 year of the date of enactment—each and every truck crossing the border at the ten busiest border crossings between the U.S. and Mexico will be weighed.

In fact, the conference agreement prohibits the border from being opened at all—until half of these border crossings have weigh-in-motion systems fully installed.

The administration did not intend to require that Mexican trucks cross the border only where DOT safety inspectors are on duty.

The conference agreement requires that the trucks cross where inspectors are on duty.

It also requires that they enter the U.S. at crossings where there is adequate safety for the inspectors to conduct meaningful inspections and, if need be, place vehicles out-of-service for safety violations.

The DOT was planning to open the border whether or not a number of critical truck safety rules and inspections had already been finalized and published.

Some of these make rules have been delayed for years, but the DOT planned to open the border anyway. The conference agreement, however, requires that the Secretary either implement policy directives or publish interim final rules that will immediately govern the behavior of trucking firms—before the border can be opened.

Now let’s look at the hauling of hazardous materials across the border. The administration had not planned on implementing any unique requirements for hazardous materials trucks even though they represent a unique and dangerous threat for our highways.

The conference agreement, however, requires that even if other trucks have already been allowed to cross the border no hazardous material trucks will be allowed to enter the U.S. until the governments of the U.S. and Mexico enter into a separate agreement confirming that U.S. and Mexican drivers of these vehicles have been subjected to the same requirements.

Finally, concerning the oversight of the inspector general, the administration was planning to open the border without regard to the long list of safety deficiencies that had been cited by the DOT inspector general.

As far as the DOT was concerned, the inspector general could continue to publish as many critical audits as he wanted to—but they were going to open the border on January 1 without regard to whether any of the deficiencies had been addressed.

There is a process in place to require the Transportation Secretary to acknowledge the findings of the IG.

Under the conference agreement, no trucks may cross the border until the IG has completed another entire audit of the DOT’s efforts and no trucks may cross the border until the Transportation Secretary has received the IG’s findings and has certified in writing, in a manner addressing each of those findings, that the opening of the border does not present an unacceptable risk to our constituents.

So, the conference agreement includes a serious mechanism to hold the Transportation Secretary accountable for his decision to open the border.

And you can be sure that the Transportation Appropriations subcommittee will be holding a hearing with both the Transportation Secretary and the inspector general once the IG has made his findings and the Secretary is poised to issue his certification.

Some observers have suggested that the requirements of the conference agreement are not as restrictive as the measures that passed the Senate. As I view it, the safety requirements are effective.

The conference agreement gives the administration a degree of flexibility in implementing these safety requirements. Others have said that the border is likely to open more quickly under the provisions of the conference agreement than under the Senate-passed bill.

That may be true. But I want to remind my colleagues that, it has never been our goal to keep the border closed.

I voted for NAFTA. I represent a state that is highly-dependent on international trade. And I believe in the economic benefits that come with lower trade barriers.

Throughout this entire process, my goal—and that of Senator SHELBY—has been to ensure the safety of our highways.

And I am proud that this conference agreement makes great progress for our safety.

I am prepared to yield back all of our time on the bill if there is no one to speak.

I yield back the remainder of our time.

COMPREHENSIVE RETIREMENT SECURITY AND PENSION REFORM ACT OF 2001—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 10) to provide pension reform and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dachle (for Hatch/Baucus) Amendment No. 2170, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader, Mr. REID, Mr. President, will the Chair indicate how much time is remaining on this matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 14 hours 40 minutes.

Mr. REID. 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.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2202 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2170

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes an amendment numbered 2202 to amendment No. 2170.

(Purpose: To strike the provision related to directed scorekeeping)

Strike section 105(c).

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I put before the Senate an extremely simple amendment that we as a Senate should adopt. I hope this amendment is aired for a while. Because Senators have asked me not to, I do not have any intention to move rapidly. Other Senators are presently indisposed and they might come and perhaps become cosponsors. We will see what we can do.

But I want to make sure the Domenici amendment No. 2202 will not be mistaken for anything other than what it is. This amendment is not a killer amendment with reference to the underlying amendment. The railroad retirement bill will in no way be damaged by this amendment. This amendment is just a very simple recognition that the bill has some language in it that shouldn’t be in it. As much as we want to do for the railroad retirees and for all of those who have joined in a rather mass number of Senators who want to see this happen—that is, pass the bill—the bill itself should join in saying we want to do this. But we want to be honest with the American people in terms of what the bill costs and how you should score the actual costs against the Treasury.

My amendment would strike what we call directed scorekeeping language out of section 105. This technical language inserted just before the House passed the bill instructs the Office of Management and Budget not to deviate—let me go slow here so everybody will get it—from the standard accounting practice when implementing this bill.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the provision allowing private investment in equities would increase outlays by $15.3 billion in 2002. That means, if you follow the way we do things in a normal manner pursuant to the rules and guidelines in the law, this bill adds $15.3 billion in increased outlays. We should consider that is a matter of the Congressional Budget Office doing its work and telling us the answer when they are asked