

Spending in 1993, when we talk about the deficit reduction, went up and continues to go up at 5 percent. When you are talking about \$1.5 trillion, 5 percent of that is a very large amount of money.

But I am encouraged now that the President has endorsed the idea of balancing the budget that we should get there as quickly as possible. It is a little hard to imagine that in a \$7 trillion economy that a \$60 billion change in Government spending is going to hurt our prosperity. I think George Will said that it was very hard to figure out how that can discombobulate a \$7 trillion economy.

So we should move boldly. We have the chance to move boldly. We have the chance to do the things that we talked about for a very long time, that almost everyone talks about on the campaign trail—balance the budget, reduce Government, reduce spending. But when we get here, there are arguments about who does it, where it ought to be, and we end up not doing the things that you and I know need to be done.

We can balance the budget. Very likely we will find 6.1 million more jobs, we will lower interest rates on student loans, and on mortgages.

Mr. President, I think that we are going to hold the administration's feet to the fire. His track record does not indicate a great deal of confidence. His actions do not match the rhetoric that we have been hearing. The President promised a 5-year balanced budget plan as a candidate, then rejected a 7-year budget plan, and now proposes a 10-year budget plan. The budget deficit reduction in 1993 he talks so much about was a matter of increasing taxes.

So we have a history of more taxes, more spending—spending has never been reduced—and more Government. As a matter of fact, in the 1993 deficit reduction bill, domestic discretionary spending actually accelerated rather than decreased.

In addition, this administration last year made an effort to have the Government take over health care. We have to do something about Medicare. Americans rejected the idea of a Federal Health Care Program. We have now an opportunity to save Medicare. If we do not do something, according to the trustees—some of whom are Cabinet members—in 2 years we will be into the reserves and in 5 more years it will be broke. So it is not a question of whether we do something, it is a question of what we do and how we do it. If we want to have Medicare, if we want to have health care for the elderly, we have to change the program. Yet the administration only keeps Medicare solvent for 3 more years, until 2005.

So I certainly hope that the President of the United States joining the debate will cause us to move toward a balanced budget. I am decidedly pleased he has moved away from the February budget proposal which was rejected 99 to zip in this body.

We need to use the Congressional Budget Office's [CBO] numbers. The

President suggested 2 years ago that those were the better numbers. Now we find he chooses to use other numbers which actually reduce the need by about \$200 billion per year, and according to most people's accounting, would come up at the end of the 10 years still hundreds of billions in arrears. We have the best chance in memory to take a real bona fide look at doing something about overspending, about doing something with the size of Government, and we can do it this year, Mr. President.

So I welcome the President's entry, his recognition that we do need to balance the budget, and some of the ideas that he has, but I suggest to you we have to be honest and fair about it. We cannot wait until the next century to have the pain come. We have to start now and do the things that most people agree need to be done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we have just had an opportunity for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] myself, and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] to meet with Mr. Rodney Slater, the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, and he will soon be forthcoming with some clarifications of the positions of the administration on a series of amendments.

The Secretary of Transportation did forward to all Senators today a letter respecting a special interest in the safety provisions in the pending bill, and at an appropriate time, I will introduce that letter into the RECORD.

But I encourage all Senators who have a particular interest in this legislation to come forward today when we have the opportunity to work out a number of amendments and to, hopefully, have arguments on others and hold over until tomorrow, pursuant to the decision of the majority leader and Democratic leader on the time for the votes.

So, at any time, this Senator and, I am sure, my distinguished colleague would be pleased to interrupt our remarks to allow a Senator or Senators to pursue their individual interests with respect to amendments.

MEASURE READ THE SECOND TIME—S. 939

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 939) to amend Title 18 United States Code to ban partial-birth abortions.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, at this time, under the instructions of the majority leader, I interpose an objection to further proceedings on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 440, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 440) to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there are some 20 amendments of which the managers have notice. There may be more. I know it is the intention of the majority leader and the Democratic leader that we proceed as expeditiously as possible to bring this pending matter to a conclusion in the Senate. Again, I urge all Senators having an interest to come to the floor and take up those matters.

This legislation is critically important to maintaining the transportation planning and construction programs in our several States, to providing for the efficient and timely movement of American products carried by commercial activities, and to the safety of the motoring public.

As provided in the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act, known as ISTEA, the Congress must approve the National Highway System map by September 30, 1995. With the cooperation of all members of the Committee on the Environment and Public Works, we were able to expedite this bill such as the Senate has it at this particular time, well in advance of the deadline created by ISTEA.

Now, if Congress does not meet the deadline, \$6.5 billion in interstate maintenance and National Highway System annual apportionments will be withheld from the several States. Therefore, we must not permit this penalty to be further imposed on our States.

In February of this year, I introduced this legislation, along with 14 of my colleagues, to ensure prompt action on the National Highway System. Today, this legislation enjoys the bipartisan support of 26 Senators.

The Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which I am privileged

to chair, held four hearings on the importance of the National Highway System. The subcommittee also heard testimony on the impact of various transportation mandates, such as metric sign conversion and the use of rubberized asphalt. We also examined innovative financing proposals to increase State flexibility to maximize the use of highway dollars by allowing public funds to leverage nontraditional, private sources of funding for infrastructure development.

This is very definitely the direction in which our Nation must go if it wishes to continue to modernize our transportation system.

The subcommittee's hearings clearly demonstrated that continuing Federal investment, with our State partners and new private ventures, in our Nation's infrastructure is crucial to improving America's mobility and the efficiency of our surface transportation network.

The National Highway System reaffirms the Federal commitment to this limited network of highly traveled roads to provide for the consistency of road engineering and safety for commercial and public travel.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may be asking, "What is the National Highway System?"—a legitimate question—let me take this opportunity to offer some historical perspective and a brief description about the system.

We are particularly fortunate today that the manager on the minority side is the distinguished Senator from New York, who really has spent much of his career in the U.S. Senate on this subject. I look forward to hearing his remarks about the historic concepts of this system.

In the 1950's, President Eisenhower challenged the transportation community to provide an effective system of highway connections among the 50 States. Thus, the era of the Interstate Highway System was born, and for the next 25 years, Federal transportation policy focused on the completion of the Interstate Highway System.

There is a little anecdotal history here that is interesting. My understanding of the reading is that Eisenhower, when he was a young major in his very late thirties, was instructed by the chief of staff of the U.S. Army to determine what would be the best route and, indeed, what difficulties might be incurred if a military envoy left one coast and traveled all the way to the next. And then Major Eisenhower was somewhat appalled by the system and how inadequate that system was to transfer military cargo, military troops, equipment, and other systems essential to our national defense, and at that time the major was also quite knowledgeable of the rapid advancement in Germany, under Nazi control in those days, and the Auto-bahn system.

So at that time, apparently, he determined at some future date he would have a hand in developing a system for

the United States which would ensure, for the purposes of national security and other purposes, an adequate interstate highway system.

During the debate on ISTEA, the future role of the Federal Government in surface transportation was debated at length as the completion of the Interstate System neared. The debate questioned the level of Federal obligations to the maintenance of the Interstate System and other primary routes, the appropriateness of providing greater flexibility and responsibility to the States, and the most effective means of ensuring the safety of our surface transportation system for the traveling public.

I happen to have been a member of the committee and a member of the conference on ISTEA, and the distinguished Senator from New York was then the chairman of the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the U.S. Senate and took a very active role in that ISTEA conference.

I concurred in the Senate's view that a National Highway System should be established to maintain a minimum level of Federal involvement with our State partners. Ensuring the efficient performance and consistency of our existing road system between individual States remains the foremost Federal responsibility.

As provided in ISTEA, the National Highway System map consists of 159,000 miles. Of this amount, 44,000 miles are interstate highways; 4,500 miles are high priority corridors identified in ISTEA; 15,700 miles are noninterstate strategic highway network routes; and 1,900 miles are strategic highway network connectors.

The remaining 91,000 miles were identified by the Federal Highway Administration and the States in cooperation with local governments.

May I stress, Mr. President, this is not a map concocted by the Congress. We are, essentially, about to confirm and ratify the work of the Federal Highway Administration in full cooperation with the counterpart authorities in each State, and down to the very local level. Many Senators have taken an active participation as it relates to their particular States.

The product of this 2-year dialog is the map before us, which must be enacted, as I said, by the Congress promptly to meet the September deadline.

The committee-reported bill commends the successful efforts of the several States, the Federal Highway Administration, and the local authorities in developing the NHS map, and provides authority for this process to continue to evolve.

May I pause to say this is not a static situation. It is a continuing situation, Mr. President. As new roads are constructed and State transportation priorities change, the States and the Federal Highway Administration can continue to make necessary adjustments to the map.

The National Highway System, as developed by our States, contains just 4 percent of America's 4 million miles of public roads. I would like to repeat that, Mr. President: The National Highway System, as developed by our States, contains just 4 percent of America's 4 million miles of public roads. This 4 percent, however, carries over 40 percent of all highway traffic and 70 percent of all truck freight traffic.

Most of the NHS roads are already built, and the system reflects a fair distribution of mileage between rural and urban roads.

I am committed to the National Highway System because it will increase economic opportunities to communities not served directly by the interstate system. Also, it will provide a direct link with roads in Canada and Mexico, uniting the North American commercial links. This is particularly appropriate in view of the American free-trade zone with a high-performance, continental road network.

For the first time, the NHS will allow States to focus their investments on connecting air, rail, commercial water ports, freight facilities, and highways so that the performance of the entire system can be maximized. In other words, we combine in this new map all of those essential parts to make up the infrastructure for this highway system. These intermodal connections will provide our entire transportation system with the flexibility needed to cope with the changing economic geography for this decade and beyond.

Reinforcing this economic backbone is the fact that nearly 85 percent of the Nation's freight travels at least part of its journey over a highway. As American companies rely more and more on just-in-time delivery to get raw materials to plants, and as American wholesalers and retailers count on rapid delivery to keep their inventories lean, the economic importance of an efficient, national transportation infrastructure is actually growing every day.

Mr. President, in February, when this legislation was introduced, I also indicated my intention to respond to the concerns raised by our State partners and other users of the system to increase the flexibility to use Federal highway funds and to reduce Federal mandates.

I am pleased that the bill before the Senate today provides relief from costly and burdensome mandates by the following:

First, repealing the usage requirement for the crumb rubber in hot mix asphalt;

Second, repealing the requirement that States convert transportation signs to metric measurements;

Third, repealing the requirement that States implement management system;

Fourth, repealing the national maximum speed limit;

Fifth, repealing the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage mandate on federally funded transportation construction projects. The Chair will note, as of the close of business on the preceding day of Senate business, namely, Friday, that amendment was taken out of this bill. So it no longer applies.

Sixth, streamlining the transportation enhancement process;

Seventh, clarifying that transportation conformity requirements apply only to Clean Air Act nonattainment areas;

Eighth, modifying the commercial motor vehicle hours of service requirements as applied to the drivers of groundwater drilling rigs.

In responding to the need to increase State flexibility of highway apportionments, the committee bill:

First, allows for larger transfers from the highway bridge program to other accounts;

Second, expands Federal aid eligibility to public highways connecting the NHS to intermodal facilities;

Third, provides for a soft match which allows private funds, materials, and services to be donated and applied to the State matching share;

Fourth, allows States to use advance construction funds for projects beyond the ISTEA authorization period;

Fifth, permits bond costs to be eligible for reimbursement as a cost of construction;

And sixth, allows States to use NHS and congestion mitigation and air quality funds for an unlimited period of time on intelligent vehicle transportation system projects.

Mr. President, another section of this legislation responds to the Federal need to move forward on a replacement facility for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, located here in the greater metropolitan Washington area. The proposal the committee puts forward accomplishes three major objectives:

First, it offers an opportunity for the Federal Government to transfer ownership of the bridge to a regional authority established by Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, thereby relieving the Federal Government of the sole responsibility for this facility.

Second, it provides a framework that will stimulate additional financing to facilitate the construction of the alternative identified in the environmental impact statement.

Third, with less than 10 years of useful life remaining on the existing bridge, this approach addresses the need to provide for the safety of the traveling public and for the efficient flow of commerce.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President, that particular provision as it relates to the Wilson Bridge. I have been down and personally inspected it. I talked to the appropriate authorities.

Mr. Herrity, the distinguished public servant here in northern Virginia, has actively written on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1995]

PUT THE PEDAL TO THE METAL

On the Wilson Bridge Reconstruction of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is essential not only to our region's economic health but to maintain the sanity of this area's commuters. We don't have time for the usual bureaucratic crawl toward completion—engineering experts say the bridge will be unusable in 10 years.

An interim proposal has been floated to prolong the bridge's life by closing it to truck traffic in the next two to five years. That, however, would be a disaster in terms of time and money. Ask any Beltway commuter what he or she thinks of diverting 18,000 trucks to the Cabin John Bridge. And all of us would see costs for the delivery of fuel, furniture, groceries etc. go up.

To build any road or bridge, first you plan and design it, then you find money. Finally, you build it. But we are moving too slowly. In the case of the Wilson Bridge, we must do all three steps quickly—and simultaneously. We don't have the luxury of a common bureaucratic timetable of 15, 20 or even 25 years.

The good news is that we already have taken steps to plan, design and find money for the reconstruction. In 1991, the Interstate Study Commission was established to find ways to raise money from Virginia, Maryland and the District (combined with federal government money) to own, construct, operate and maintain a new Wilson Bridge. Last December this commission recommended the creation of a regional authority to finance the construction. Maryland, Virginia and the District have passed or soon will pass legislation to allow the creation of such an authority, which will require amendments next year. As part of these amendments, the governors of Maryland and Virginia and the mayor of the District must select someone from each of their respective transportation departments to expedite:

The selection procedures for design engineering.

The procedures for right-of-way acquisition.

The bid procedures for expedited construction.

A coordinated and privatized effort can produce quick results. For example, the privatized Dulles Greenway (the Dulles Toll Road extension to Leesburg) is taking only 24 months to construction; it would have taken four to five years through normal bureaucratic channels.

A committee charged with recommending a bridge plan has selected three design options and soon will narrow its choice to two. Its recommendations will go to the Transportation and Planning Board of the Council of Governments, which will have the final say. At that point, the authority will be activated to get the bridge built.

We don't need a new bureaucracy for a bridge authority. Instead, the authority should be able to rely on the professional staffs of existing agencies. Then Virginia, Maryland and the District could work toward a common goal: the rapid rebuilding of a link vital to them all, the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

Mr. WARNER. I conclude, Mr. President, by saying the goal of the NHS is to leave a legacy for the next generation. That legacy is an intermodal transportation system, a system that is not fragmented into separate parts, but rather one that works to serve the

many diverse interests of Americans, to serve the growing demands of the competitive global marketplace, and to help ensure the safety of the traveling public.

I also feel there are certain national security interests involved in having an efficient system. I will address that particular section at another time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, might I express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for his masterly account of the provisions in our bill and for his very thoughtful statement about the continuity of this act, S. 440, with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, which had among other purposes the declaration that the Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate and Defense Highway System, had been built, finished. It took quite a bit longer and a very great deal more than we had expected. But we had done it.

I would like to make just a slight modification to my friend's account because it is relevant. President Eisenhower would tell this story, and it is related in his book "At Ease: Stories I Tell to Friends."

It is 1919, a young Army lieutenant colonel, soon to revert to his peacetime rank of captain, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was given command of a serious military exercise. He was to assume that wartime events had disabled the railroads. He was to lead a convoy of army trucks across the country from Fort Meade, just out on the edge of the District, in Maryland, technically, to the Presidio in San Francisco. It took him 2 months. The convoy averaged less than 7 miles per hour. It proved that you could cross the continent by truck if you had to, but not if it was a wartime emergency. He wrote in his book:

To those who have known only concrete and macadam highways of gentle grades and engineered curves, such a trip might seem humdrum. In those days we were not sure it could be accomplished at all. Nothing of the sort had ever been attempted.

The idea for an interstate system emerged, if I could be just a little parochial, out of the 1939 World's Fair in Flushing Meadow, in Queens, NY, at the great General Motors Futurama exhibit. I can remember sitting there as a child, in one of those gliding contraptions that moved around and you saw this great scene of highways, with what we would come to call cloverleaf intersections crossing over one another, going through mountains. President Roosevelt who, along with most others here in Washington, was very much concerned that the Depression of the 1930's would resume with the end of World War II, in 1944 got a national interstate highway system authorized. But it was nothing more than that, an authorization. In New York we built the first segment as the Thruway, starting immediately in 1946, but the system lagged elsewhere.

When President Eisenhower came to office he very much had that early

command in mind, and he hit upon the idea with Jim Wright of Texas, a young Congressman at that time, to have a gasoline tax and dedicate it to the construction of this system. And, by golly, we did it. But there came a time when we in fact had done it, built the system, and yet a certain inertia, you might say, pushed us on and on, and we would just build another segment and yet another.

We finally came up with a better idea, though, as the chairman has indicated—a new national highway system which would supplement the Eisenhower interstate system. It would consist of only about 4 percent of the Nation's road mileage, but it would carry 40 percent of its traffic. And it would be a combined, cooperative effort of State governments and the Federal Government at its best.

In 1991, President Bush very much wanted to have this National Highway System, but in fact the Department of Transportation had not yet drawn it. We had a big meeting down at the Executive Office Building with a map of the country and lots of red lines over it, but it did not represent real highways. It just indicated what would be someday.

That someday has come. We will have until the 1st of October—am I correct?

Mr. WARNER. The 30th of September.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes, the 30th, the end of this fiscal year, to authorize this system. And this legislation does that. It does it in a timely manner, as anticipated. We have funds available. And we have very real needs.

We are not building new highways. We are maintaining and improving their capacity. The intermodal system was very explicit on the idea that you do not want to add to the mileage of the system, you want to make it more efficient. We made very clear our view that a free good—and these are free-ways—will be overconsumed. We made it clear that we were not in the least alarmed by the idea of pricing this good, as we do in points of congestion like tunnels and bridges.

We began the legislation—the conference report and the legislation itself—with a declaration of policy for the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. It said:

The National Intermodal Transportation System must be operated and maintained with insistent attention to the concepts of innovation, competition, energy efficiency, productivity, growth, and accountability. Practices that resulted in the lengthy and overly-costly construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System must be confronted and ceased.

We went so far, Mr. President, as to require that this table of principles be printed up and provided to every member of the Department of Transportation—and they were. In this system, in the present bill, we find continued reference to those principles. We find ourselves completing the 4-year work that we were asked to do.

Note, “intermodal.” It is one of the ironies of President, then captain, Eisenhower's journey across the country that to assume the railroads had been destroyed and you find you could not get from here to there in any effective way without them led to an interstate highway system which pretty soon had destroyed the railroads. And not necessarily a good idea.

We, of course, made it clear that by intermodal we mean not just vehicle transportation. We talk about rail. We talk about air links. We talk about sea links. In this particular legislation there is a specific provision, “Sec. 126, Intermodal Facility In New York. [The] engineering, design, and construction activities to permit the James A. Farley Post Office in New York, New York, to be used as an intermodal transportation facility and commercial center.”

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will my colleague allow me to observe?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Surely.

Mr. WARNER. He said something about the destruction of the railroads? I am not sure the distinguished Senator from New York wanted to indicate the interstate highway system destroyed the railroads. I would think there was a period of time when there was a decline of passenger travel, but the railroads today are very strong in terms of freight transportation. And many of the things that Eisenhower was concerned about in terms of heavy equipment being moved—I am glad the Senator brought it back. It did jog my memory. I, too, went to the World's Fair of 1939 with my father. It was a memorable trip. But it was formulating in Eisenhower's mind through all those years. This was always in the recess of his mind.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. He got it built. General Motors thought it up, you might say.

And the Senator, the chairman, is highly correct. What we have seen is not the disappearance of the railroads but their disappearance as a principal mode of passenger transportation, save on certain corridors where it is efficient. If you were looking for the major reason for that—well, probably the airlines did it to continental transport, and the automobile. Although we may have overdone it. We had a very efficient rail system in Los Angeles, for example, which they closed down around 1950 and they wish they could get it back, now that it is probably too late.

In any event, with tribute to my friends once again, the Committee on Environment and Public Works brings to this floor a near unanimous measure. I have been 19 years in that committee, and I do not think I can remember many times in which we have had a party-line vote. We have tried to think about the environment. We have tried to think about public works in terms of national interests. If we have not always succeeded, it is not for lack of trying. Once again, we have done

that, and very much to be congratulated and thanked at a time when partisan issues rise, as they ought—but they rise a little higher even as we approach Presidential years. This is a good example of the capacity of the Senators between the different parties, different regions, different interests to cooperate and produce a fine bill.

I for my part want to congratulate all those involved. Senator BAUCUS is necessarily absent or he would be saying substantially the same things from the point of view of the High Plains even as I speak from the point of view of the island of Manhattan.

Mr. President, with great appreciation for all of the work that the Senator from Virginia has done, and with the expectation that we will now go forward and get it through the Senate in the same period, I want to thank him.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to reciprocate and thank again my distinguished colleague from New York. It was simply because he certainly handled the ISTEPA legislation, and that in many respects gave rise to this national evolution of the highway system.

Mr. President, we are anxious to have Senators come to the floor for purposes of amendments. We will accommodate them as they arrive.

At this time, I see our distinguished colleague from Georgia who wishes to address the Senate I believe on a different subject.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, before I speak briefly on another subject, I would like to congratulate my friends from Virginia and New York on their leadership in this important area, and I think that they have indeed worked together very carefully and prudently in the Nation's interest. I congratulate them for that.

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to speak just a few moments about the situation in Bosnia today and share with my colleagues some of my thoughts on the subject.

The Senate Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of Senator THURMOND, the chairman of the committee, has had a series of four hearings on the subject of Bosnia. We heard from a number of, I think, very well-informed witnesses.

We heard from, of course, the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Bill Perry, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili, the former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Al Haig, and former President of the United States, President Carter, and another former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Gen. Jack Galvin, now retired,