

not going to get any more money by doing this study. In progress, they have emergency evacuation of commercial aviation under aviation; under highways they have a child-passenger protection study; a study of passive grade-crossing study; effectiveness of school bus seat belt study; a fishing vessel safety study; evacuation damage prevention for pipeline safety; safety at passive grade crossings and rail safety.

In addition to that, at the moment they have 24 ongoing major accident investigations in all modes of transportation; 8 of them are in aviation. We are not going to give them more resources, but we are going to ask them more or less let us do another study. That is the reason I think the gentleman from Georgia's amendment is appropriate at this point in time. If we want to have people do more studies, we are going to have to pay for it. Is that not what we all said when we talk about a balanced budget? I think the gentleman from Georgia's amendment is a good one and I recommend it to my colleagues.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me make several points. There is nothing magic about the age 60. It is strictly an arbitrary age. We can pick 59, we can pick 50 or 70. It is arbitrary. People are living longer and more productive lives. All common carrier planes have to have at least two pilots. A heart attack will not cause the plane to go down and they also, most of them, have a flight engineer. No other profession requires the termination of their careers at age 60, not the railroad engineer, not a bus driver, not a truck driver, not a physician, a nurse. Age 60 is not consistent with the Age Discrimination in Employment Act which states that ability, not age, should determine an individual's qualifications for getting and keeping a job.

These pilots are willing to subject themselves to rigorous medical or physical tests in order to keep flying. That should be what determines whether they are qualified to fly or not is if they are physically capable of doing so. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the gentleman from Georgia's amendment. Let me tell Members why. I am not asking to let STORM THURMOND fly, but in my experience, I can name a dozen people that are flying in air shows right now at that age that are pulling minus 5 G's and positive 9 G's every day. And we go through a rigorous examination, an annual physical. They even check for drug and alcohol, for eye, for heart, for sonograms, and that picks out what it

is. If my colleagues ask me, with my experience, what flying requires, if I am going to fly with a young pilot or an experienced pilot, I am going to take the experienced pilot because in the long run that is going to be safe.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe, and I know Members have good intentions on this amendment, that age 60 should limit someone. When we talk about it is a wasted study, when we are talking about taking someone's livelihood, that is not proportionate to the safety exercised. I believe that is wrong and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to a Member who will be so convincing, the next Senator, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I hope I can meet up to our chairman's expectations.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, based on a couple of reasons. First of all, my good friend from Minnesota said that we have studied this forever and we agree about 99 percent on what we need to do with the FAA. But the problem is, there is no data to study. We do not have any pilots in this country flying commercial airlines over the age of 60 because the law has prohibited it for 37 years. So it is very difficult to study the performance of people over the age of 60 if you do not let them fly in the first place.

So in order to reach some kind of a logical agreement, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF], the vote was tonight to raise the age limit. I think I would be opposed to it simply because we do not have the data available to do it. All that the chairman is asking us to do is to try to look at other countries that are allowing commercial airline pilots over the age of 60 to perform, to see how they meet the safety standards, to see how they stack up, to see what their accident rate is, and then perhaps the NTSB, working with FAA can make the proper decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS.]

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: the amendment of-

ferred by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS]; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 212, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—193

Abercrombie	Eshoo	McHale
Andrews	Evans	McIntosh
Baessler	Farr	McKinney
Baldacci	Fattah	McNulty
Ballenger	Fazio	Meehan
Barcia	Fields (LA)	Meek
Barrett (WI)	Filner	Menendez
Becerra	Ford	Millender-
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	McDonald
Bentsen	Frost	Miller (CA)
Berman	Furse	Minge
Bevill	Gejdenson	Mink
Bishop	Geren	Moakley
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Bonior	Goodling	Montgomery
Borski	Gordon	Moran
Boucher	Green (TX)	Murtha
Browder	Hall (TX)	Nadler
Brown (CA)	Hamilton	Neal
Brown (FL)	Harman	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Cardin	Hefner	Olver
Chabot	Hilliard	Ortiz
Chapman	Hinchey	Orton
Clay	Holden	Owens
Clayton	Hoyer	Pallone
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Clinger	Jackson-Lee	Payne (NJ)
Clyburn	(TX)	Payne (VA)
Coleman	Jefferson	Pelosi
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Poshard
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Quillen
Condit	Kanjorski	Rahall
Conyers	Kaptur	Rangel
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Reed
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Richardson
Cramer	Kennelly	Rivers
Cummings	Kildee	Roemer
Danner	Kleczka	Rose
de la Garza	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Deal	LaFalce	Rush
DeFazio	LaHood	Sabo
DeLauro	Lantos	Sanders
Dellums	Levin	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
Dicks	Lipinski	Schumer
Dixon	Lofgren	Scott
Doggett	Lowey	Serrano
Dooley	Luther	Shuster
Doyle	Maloney	Sisisky
Duncan	Manton	Skaggs
Durbin	Markey	Skelton
Edwards	Mascara	Slaughter
Engel	Matsui	Spratt
English	McCarthy	Stenholm
Ensign	McDermott	Stokes

Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman

Torres
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters

Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—212

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen

Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman
Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hayes

Houghton
Jacobs
Lincoln
Linder
Martinez
McDade
Peterson (FL)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stark

Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 0027

Mrs. SMITH of Washington and Messrs. HAYWORTH, FOLEY, FRANKS of Connecticut, STEARNS,

and GREENWOOD changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BALDACC changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 238, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—162

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baesler
Barcia
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner

Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klecza
LaHood
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markay
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler

NOES—238

Allard
Archer

Armey
Bachus

Baker (CA)
Baldacci

Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren

Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers

NOT VOTING—33

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gibbons
Goodling
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)

Hayes
Houghton
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
LaFalce
Lincoln
Linder
Martinez
McDade
Obey
Peterson (FL)

Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 0035

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. WHITFIELD changed their vote for “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 280, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—123

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Moakley
Andrews	Frost	Moran
Baldacci	Furse	Nadler
Barcia	Gejdenson	Neal
Barrett (WI)	Gonzalez	Obey
Becerra	Gordon	Olver
Beilenson	Green (TX)	Ortiz
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Berman	Hilliard	Pallone
Bonior	Hinchey	Pastor
Browder	Holden	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Chapman	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Clay	(TX)	Richardson
Clayton	Jefferson	Rivers
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Coleman	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Rush
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Conyers	Kennelly	Sanders
Coyne	Kildee	Schroeder
Cummings	Klecza	Schumer
DeFazio	LaFalce	Scott
DeLauro	Lantos	Serrano
Dellums	Levin	Slaughter
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
Dicks	Lowey	Thompson
Dingell	Manton	Thornton
Dixon	Markey	Torres
Doggett	Mascara	Traffant
Dooley	McDermott	Velazquez
Doyle	McHale	Vento
Edwards	McKinney	Visclosky
Engel	McNulty	Waters
English	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Evans	Meek	Waxman
Farr	Menendez	Williams
Fattah	Millender	Wilson
Fazio	McDonald	Woolsey
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Wynn
Filner	Mink	

NOES—280

Allard	Blumenauer	Canady
Archer	Blute	Cardin
Armey	Boehlert	Castle
Bachus	Boehner	Chabot
Baesler	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baker (CA)	Bono	Chenoweth
Baker (LA)	Borski	Christensen
Ballenger	Boucher	Chrysler
Barr	Brown (FL)	Clement
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Clinger
Bartlett	Bryant (TN)	Coble
Barton	Bunn	Coburn
Bass	Bunning	Collins (GA)
Bateman	Burr	Combust
Bereuter	Burton	Condit
Bevill	Buyer	Cooley
Bilbray	Callahan	Costello
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cox
Bishop	Camp	Cramer
Bliley	Campbell	Crane

Crapo	Johnson (SD)	Pryce
Creameans	Johnson, Sam	Quillen
Cubin	Jones	Quinn
Cunningham	Kaptur	Radanovich
Danner	Kasich	Rahall
Davis	Kelly	Ramstad
de la Garza	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Deal	Kim	Regula
DeLay	King	Riggs
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Roberts
Dickey	Klink	Roemer
Doolittle	Klug	Rogers
Dornan	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	LaHood	Roth
Dunn	Largent	Roukema
Durbin	Latham	Royce
Ehlers	LaTourette	Salmon
Ehrlich	Laughlin	Sanford
Ensign	Lazio	Sawyer
Eshoo	Leach	Saxton
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Scarborough
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Schaefer
Fawell	Lightfoot	Schiff
Fields (TX)	Lipinski	Seastrand
Flanagan	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Foley	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Forbes	Lofgren	Shaw
Fowler	Longley	Shays
Fox	Lucas	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Luther	Sisisky
Franks (NJ)	Maloney	Skaggs
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Skeen
Frisa	Martini	Skelton
Funderburk	Matsui	Smith (MI)
Galleghy	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)
Ganske	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Gekas	McCrery	Souder
Geren	McHugh	Spence
Gilchrest	McInnis	Spratt
Gillmor	McIntosh	Stearns
Gilman	McKeon	Stenholm
Goodlatte	Metcalf	Studds
Goodling	Meyers	Stump
Goss	Mica	Talent
Graham	Miller (FL)	Tanner
Greene (UT)	Minge	Tate
Greenwood	Molinari	Tauzin
Gunderson	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
Gutknecht	Montgomery	Tejeda
Hall (TX)	Moorhead	Thomas
Hamilton	Morella	Thornberry
Hancock	Murtha	Thurman
Hansen	Myers	Tiahrt
Harman	Myrick	Torkildsen
Hastert	Nethercutt	Upton
Hastings (WA)	Neumann	Volkmer
Hayworth	Ney	Walker
Hefley	Norwood	Walsh
Hefner	Nussle	Wamp
Heineman	Oberstar	Ward
Herger	Orton	Watts (OK)
Hilleary	Oxley	Weldon (FL)
Hobson	Packard	Weller
Hoekstra	Parker	White
Hoke	Paxon	Whitfield
Horn	Payne (VA)	Wicker
Hostettler	Petri	Wise
Hunter	Pickett	Wolf
Hutchinson	Pombo	Young (AK)
Hyde	Pomeroy	Zeliff
Inglis	Porter	Zimmer
Istook	Portman	
Johnson (CT)	Poshard	

NOT VOTING—30

Ackerman	Hayes	Stark
Brewster	Houghton	Stockman
Bryant (TX)	Jacobs	Stokes
Flake	Lincoln	Taylor (NC)
Foglietta	Linder	Torricelli
Ford	Martinez	Towns
Gephardt	McDade	Vucanovich
Gibbons	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Gutierrez	Smith (TX)	Yates
Hall (OH)	Solomon	Young (FL)

□ 0042

MESSRS. DINGELL, DOOLEY of California, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

[Roll No. 291]

The CHARIMAN. This is a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 159, not voting 27, as follows:

AYES—247

Abercrombie	Ehrlich	Longley
Andrews	Engel	Lowey
Bachus	English	Lucas
Baesler	Ensign	Luther
Baldacci	Eshoo	Maloney
Barcia	Evans	Manton
Barr	Everett	Manzullo
Barrett (WI)	Farr	Markey
Barton	Fattah	Martini
Becerra	Fawell	Mascara
Bentsen	Fazio	Matsui
Berman	Fields (LA)	McCarthy
Bevill	Filner	McDermott
Bishop	Flanagan	McHale
Blumenauer	Forbes	McKeon
Blute	Ford	McKinney
Bonilla	Fox	McNulty
Bonior	Franks (CT)	Meehan
Borski	Frelinghuysen	Meek
Boucher	Frisa	Menendez
Browder	Frost	Meyers
Brown (CA)	Furse	Millender
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	McDonald
Brown (OH)	Gilman	Miller (CA)
Brownback	Gonzalez	Minge
Buyer	Goodlatte	Moakley
Calvert	Goodling	Mollohan
Camp	Gordon	Montgomery
Campbell	Green (TX)	Moorhead
Cardin	Gutknecht	Moran
Chambliss	Hamilton	Murtha
Chapman	Hastings (FL)	Myers
Clay	Hefner	Nadler
Clayton	Hilliard	Neal
Clement	Hobson	Ney
Clinger	Hoekstra	Norwood
Clyburn	Holden	Oberstar
Coble	Hostettler	Obey
Coleman	Hoyer	Ortiz
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Orton
Collins (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Collins (MI)	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Conyers	(TX)	Parker
Costello	Jefferson	Pastor
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)
Cramer	Johnston	Payne (VA)
Cummings	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Danner	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Davis	Kelly	Pombo
de la Garza	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Deal	Kennedy (RI)	Porter
DeFazio	Kennelly	Poshard
DeLauro	Kildee	Quillen
Dellums	King	Quinn
Deutsch	Klecza	Rahall
Diaz-Balart	Klink	Ramstad
Dicks	LaHood	Rangel
Dingell	Lantos	Reed
Dixon	LaTourette	Richardson
Doggett	Lazio	Rivers
Dooley	Levin	Roberts
Doolittle	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Doyle	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Linder	Rose
Duncan	Lipinski	Roth
Durbin	LoBiondo	Roukema
Edwards	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard

Rush	Stenholm	Velazquez
Sabo	Stokes	Vento
Sawyer	Studds	Visclosky
Saxton	Stupak	Volkmer
Schroeder	Tanner	Walker
Schumer	Tate	Ward
Scott	Taylor (MS)	Waters
Serrano	Tejeda	Watt (NC)
Shuster	Thomas	Watts (OK)
Siskisly	Thompson	Weller
Skaggs	Thornton	Williams
Skelton	Thurman	Wilson
Slaughter	Torkildsen	Wise
Smith (MI)	Torres	Wynn
Smith (NJ)	Trafficant	Young (AK)
Spratt	Upton	Zimmer

NOES—159

Allard	Ganske	Miller (FL)
Archer	Gekas	Mink
Army	Geren	Molinari
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Morella
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Myrick
Ballenger	Goss	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Neumann
Bartlett	Greene (UT)	Nussle
Bass	Greenwood	Olver
Bateman	Gunderson	Oxley
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Packard
Bereuter	Hancock	Paxon
Bilbray	Hansen	Petri
Billirakis	Harman	Pickett
Bliley	Hastert	Portman
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Pryce
Boehner	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bono	Hefley	Regula
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Riggs
Bunn	Herger	Rogers
Bunning	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hinchey	Royce
Burton	Hoke	Salmon
Callahan	Horn	Sanders
Canady	Hunter	Sanford
Castle	Hyde	Scarborough
Chabot	Inglis	Schaefer
Chenoweth	Istook	Schiff
Christensen	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Chrysler	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Combest	Jones	Shaw
Condit	Kasich	Shays
Cooley	Kim	Skeen
Cox	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Crane	Klug	Souder
Crapo	Knollenberg	Spence
Cremeans	Kolbe	Stearns
Cubin	LaFalce	Stump
Cunningham	Largent	Talent
DeLay	Latham	Tauzin
Dickey	Laughlin	Thornberry
Dornan	Leach	Tiahrt
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Walsh
Ehlers	Lightfoot	Wamp
Ewing	Livingston	Waxman
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Weldon (FL)
Foley	McCrery	White
Fowler	McHugh	Whitfield
Frank (MA)	McInnis	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Wolf
Funderburk	Metcalf	Woolsey
Gallegly	Mica	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—27

Ackerman	Hayes	Stark
Brewster	Houghton	Stockman
Bryant (TX)	Jacobs	Taylor (NC)
Flake	Lincoln	Torricelli
Foglietta	Martinez	Towns
Gephardt	McDade	Vucanovich
Gibbons	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Gutierrez	Smith (TX)	Yates
Hall (OH)	Solomon	Young (FL)

□ 0050

Mr. PACKARD and Mr. PAXON changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997".

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3675, the fiscal year 97 Transportation Appropriations bill and would urge my colleagues to support its passage today.

I do, however, want to register my concerns about the omission from this bill of funding that would enable the NHTSA to conduct an audit of compliance by auto companies with the American Automobile Labeling Act [AALA]. The administration had requested \$500,000 for the purpose of verifying the required labeling information. Periodic audits are necessary for us to convince the Japanese that we have the capability to verify their figures submitted under the AALA. These audits are necessary to assure the credibility of the AALA reports.

The AALA was enacted in 1994 as a means to provide consumers with information about the origin of motor vehicles and their parts, information they can take into account in their vehicle purchasing decisions. Thus, consumers who want to "Buy American", can do so. In this way, the Act promotes the jobs of American workers in the automotive industry.

It is my hope that as H.R. 3675 proceeds through the legislative process, there will be an opportunity to provide the funding requested by the Transportation Department and NHTSA for the audits of auto content under the AALA.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. This year's funding level demonstrates our continued commitment to America's Transportation networks.

America's productivity and global competitiveness depends on our ability to move products and people in an efficient manner. At the current rate, highway passenger travel is expected to double in only 30 years. To prevent excessive congestion and pollution, we need alternative ways of transporting our people and products. Rail systems are a clean and efficient alternative.

Although this bill reduces funds for Amtrak and the northeast corridor, it increases funding for the next generation high-speed rail programs.

In short, investing in America's passenger rail lines ensures a more efficient, prosperous and environmentally sound future. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3675, the fiscal year 1997 Transportation Appropriations Bill. Under current fiscal constraints, Chairman FRANK WOLF and ranking member RON COLEMAN should be commended for their efforts to craft a bill which seeks to balance the needs of transit systems, highways, and aviation. I want to extend my thanks to both of them and the subcommittee for their continued support of transportation infrastructure initiatives in my region and throughout California. I also want to extend my best wishes to Representative COLEMAN on the occasion of managing his final Transportation Appropriations bill as a Member of this body.

I rise today to highlight two programs of particular importance to the Los Angeles area. The bill includes funding to continue our partnership with the Federal Government on the metro rail redline subway—an integral component of our efforts to build a comprehensive transportation system. H.R. 3675 also includes essential Federal assistance for the Alameda Corridor Project, which promises to accrue

substantial benefits not only to the Los Angeles area, but to the entire Nation.

The Transportation Appropriations bill provides \$59 million for direct loans of \$400 million over 3 years to be used for the construction of the Alameda Corridor under sections 505 of the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976. This \$2 billion project consolidate over 90 miles of rail with 200 at grade crossings into a single 20-mile grade separated system. The corridor will link the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach with the National Railroad System and widen and improve the truck route paralleling the rail facility to expedite truck traffic.

The Alameda Corridor will mitigate traffic congestion and pollution, enhance the competitiveness of the San Pedro ports, bring jobs to a hard-pressed region, and enhance redevelopment along the corridor. These are important local benefits. But it is essential that Members not from California understand the national significance of the Alameda Corridor Project.

The current value of trade traveling through the San Pedro Bay ports is estimated today at \$116 billion annually. Nationally, this trade generates 2.5 million jobs, \$14 billion Federal taxes, and over \$5 billion in State and local revenues. One need only look at some of the regional figures included in those estimates to understand the significance of the corridor project to the Nation.

The estimated value of Atlantic seaboard region trade traveling through the San Pedro ports totals \$14.9 billion; in the Great Lakes region \$16.6 billion; in the South East region \$5 billion. Jobs related to these trade figures number in the hundreds of thousands, and State and local revenues in the hundreds of millions.

Forecasts of the projected growth of U.S.-Pacific rim trade consistently project a doubling of trade volumes over the next 15–20 years. We cannot take full advantage of this expanded growth by depending on freight traveling at speeds of 5 miles an hour—as it now is apt to do along the Alameda Corridor. This situation will be exacerbated as train traffic along the corridor grows from its current 29 trains per day to an expected 97 trains by the year 2020.

It is seldom that we encounter a project that makes greater sense from a local, State, and national standpoint.

The Transportation Appropriations bill also includes \$90 million for further design and construction of segment 3 of the metro rail red line. While this is significantly less than the Federal Transit Administration's recommendation and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority's [MTA] request, we recognize that a number of worthy projects are competing for tight Federal dollars. I am also well aware of the committee's concern about a number of matters associated with metro rail construction. I am gratified by the committee's continued support of the Los Angeles subway and its expectation that, under new leadership, any outstanding problems facing the project will be overcome.

A broad-based bipartisan coalition of elected officials, and business and community leaders support the L.A. MATS's efforts to implement our comprehensive transportation plan. That plan includes combining heavy-rail subway, at grade light-rail, commuter rail, and improved bus service. The People of Los Angeles have levied a one-cent sales tax on themselves to

improve transit in our area. This source of revenue, which totals approximately \$750 million per year, coupled with State and Federal funds, is partially used to fund the Los Angeles metro rail project—a 23.4 mile, heavy-rail subway, which will act as the spine of our transit network.

Extensions from the metro rail spine include the 22 mile light-rail blue line—from Long Beach to downtown Los Angeles; the blue line extension, north to Pasadena; and the green line which intersects the blue line from the Los Angeles international airport area. These are all locally funded projects built without Federal assistance. In addition, Los Angeles has continued to seek a 50-percent Federal share for construction of the metro rail project, well below the maximum 80 percent allowed by law.

Segment 3 of the metro rail red line MOS-3 will add an additional 11.6 miles to the metro system upon completion. This segment is particularly important to those of us who represent economically and ethnically diverse constituencies. The mid-city segment, East Los Angeles and North Hollywood extensions, will provide services to an ethnically and economically diverse community comprised of African American, Asian, and Latino residents traditionally dependent on public transit.

Residents of these communities have the same, if not greater, transit needs as our more affluent neighborhoods, but lack significant transportation options. Access to metro rail will not merely enhance the daily lives of these residents, it will also enable many to easily travel to other job rich areas of Los Angeles County.

With the Los Angeles area continuing to recover from a stubborn recession, L.A.'s metro rail also provides thousands of needed jobs to residents of the area, with Federal dollars leveraging local and private funding vital to expansion of the local economy. Last year, 15,000 jobs were created through metro rail construction, and the MTA estimates that over 100,000 jobs will be created by the time the metro rail is complete.

The Alameda Corridor and the metro rail system are essential to improving the quality of life in the Los Angeles and to providing economic stimulus and security to the region, as well as the entire Nation. Statistics pointing to dramatic increases in the future population of the State and region, as well as the lessons learned from the transportation upheavals in the aftermath of the 1994 Northridge earthquake, demonstrate that it is essential that we continue to move ahead aggressively on our plans for a comprehensive intermodal transportation network. I commend the committee for acknowledging the importance of the Federal role in achieving that goal and urge support for the bill.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to draw my colleagues attention to funding for Amtrak. We are at a critical stage with regard to our national rail passenger policy as we attempt to transition Amtrak from Federal financial support. However, are we being penny wise and pound foolish?

We are all aware that the budget resolutions for the last 2 years have put Amtrak on a glide path off of operating support. Additionally, after months of hearings and deliberations, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee brought a bill before the House to reauthorize Amtrak last year, which passed the House by

a vote of 406 to 4. The House-passed bill also constructs a gradual phase out of Amtrak's operating support by 2002. Moreover, Amtrak's own business plan also eliminates the need for Federal assistance by 2002. Essentially, we all made an agreement with Amtrak. We told them to do what no other national passenger railroad in the world has been able to do: be free of operating support. This is indeed a major accomplishment and one that Congress should encourage. In return, we offered Amtrak a structured funding phaseout and passage of cost saving legislation.

Yet, from 1995 to 1997, Amtrak's funding levels are \$1.2 billion less than what they requested and what they told us was necessary for operating self-sufficiency. In fact, this year the Northeast Corridor Improvement program will receive no funding. The President requested \$200 million and in fiscal year 1996 it was appropriated \$115 million. Amtrak's capital budget also took a severe hit. It is appropriated \$120 million, which is \$176.5 million less than the President requested and \$110 million less than the fiscal year 1996 level. How can we expect them to operate our national railroad passenger system given these deep cuts?

Congress has deviated from the plan we set forth in the budget resolution and the House-passed reauthorization bill. Without adequate capital funds during this critical transition period, Amtrak will not be able to make the necessary investment to survive once Congress ceases its financial support. Additionally, the Senate has failed to pass their vision of the Amtrak reauthorization bill, thus, Amtrak does not benefit yet from any of the cost savings contained in that bill.

A railroad is a capital intensive enterprise. Since Amtrak came into existence 25 years ago, Congress has never provided it with adequate funding. Consequently, Amtrak has not been able to modernize its locomotives and purchase more reliable and fuel-efficient engines. Many of their maintenance shops are still from the engine era and need to be upgraded. The electric wires that are used on the Northeast Corridor are the same ones the Pennsylvania Railroad first strung in 1933. We will never get them to a legitimate point of self-sufficiency, if we do not give Amtrak the ability to reinvest now.

Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that if Amtrak becomes insolvent, the liability to the Federal Government is going to be a far greater cost to the taxpayer than giving Amtrak the funds they need to successfully transition into self-sufficiency.

I ask my colleagues to weigh carefully what we are doing here and ask ourselves if the end justifies the means.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is appropriate for me to rise at this time to express my concern about funding for Amtrak. It is my understanding that this bill includes \$542 million for fiscal year 1997. This is well below the \$922 million assumed for Amtrak in the 1997 Republican budget resolution.

Amtrak is our national passenger railroad. It has been in existence for more than a quarter of a century, built on a commitment by Congress. Amtrak is a cross-country passenger system that services the commuter and travel needs of Americans. This passenger railroad relieves congested highways while reducing pollution. This intercity railroad is a necessary component of a balanced transportation system.

Amtrak will not be able to continue its present level of service under the funding levels in this appropriations bill. The railroad would be forced to discontinue a number of routes and many workers would lose their jobs. Amtrak employs more than 25,000 people. The taxes on the salaries of these workers and on sales of supplies to Amtrak exceed congressional funding. Drastic cuts in Federal funding of Amtrak will result in the decline and the eventual elimination of this railroad system.

Amtrak meets the transportation needs of many small communities that are poorly served by buses and air services. Trains are an important travel option for senior citizens, the disabled, and for persons with medical conditions that prevent them from flying.

Amtrak's goal is to operate an efficient rail passenger system that does not have to depend on Federal dollars, and it has a business plan to accomplish this goal by the year 2002. Until that time, Amtrak needs Government support in order to successfully achieve its goal. By cutting Amtrak's budget in half over the past 2 years, we are putting America in jeopardy of losing its national passenger railroad and the essential services it provides to its citizens.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3675, the Transportation Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. I would like to commend Chairman FRANK WOLF and his entire subcommittee colleagues for their bipartisan work on this legislation.

I am particularly pleased that the bill funds the Alameda Corridor project in Southern California. The Alameda Corridor will facilitate the nationwide movement of goods from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which already account for 25 percent of all U.S. waterborne international trade. The bill's \$59 million appropriation will be used to finance a \$400 Federal loan for the project. This Federal component will be leveraged against an additional \$1.4 billion in non-Federal funds from the ports, local municipalities and railroad users.

The Alameda Corridor is about the economy, not politics. Members from both sides of the aisle have fought hard for the program in the Democratically-led 103d Congress as well as in the Republican-led 104th. The administration has also made the Corridor a priority by including the project in the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request. The Alameda Corridor is proof positive that we can make sound policy as long as we work together on a bipartisan basis.

In addition to funding the Corridor, this bill provides much needed Federal support for the L.A. County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. By funding the Metro Rail Red Line, the legislation helps ensure that Southern California residents will soon be able to break free of their cars in favor of dependable mass transit. By financing the Advanced Technology Transit Bus—also known as the "Stealth Bus"—the bill guarantees that defense technology will play an important role in our Nation's developing advanced transportation industry.

Mr. Chairman, investments in transportation are investments in our future. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation to do just that.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3675, the Transportation Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997.

As we debate this measure it is particularly important for Members to focus on assuring that Federal policy continues to help address the mounting infrastructure needs and transportation priorities of major cities such as Chicago.

It is the opinion of this Member that the minuscule increases offered by the Gingrich-Army budget simply do not keep pace with the Nation's transportation needs. And that, Mr. Chairman, is very disheartening.

Furthermore, it is outrageous that this Republican budget rescinds funding for surface transportation demonstration projects at a time when our urban centers are in their greatest need for such projects. In the city of Chicago, for example, at least 237 bridges need substantial rehabilitation and maintenance work; the city's arterial street network is in need of major rehabilitation, and resurfacing and other improvements are desperately needed.

This Republican proposal which is nearly \$170 million below the administration's request is flawed. It is asking States and municipalities to do a whole lot more with a whole lot less.

America's major urban centers are maxed-out. Our cities cannot continue bearing the heavy economic burden of attracting residents back to our urban areas without the continued assistance of the Federal Government.

In the Chicago metropolitan area the funding of several important transportation initiatives such as improvements to the Chicago Transit Authority's bus and rail fleet and other street and road repair projects would go far in increasing the economic base of the area. This requires a lot more assistance than what this funding proposal offers. And that Mr. Chairman, is why I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3675.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, funding America's transportation needs is absolutely essential to the viability of our nation's business and industry. And for the most part, the House 1997 transportation spending bill recognizes this national priority for economic expansion and job creation. While the bill is \$50 million below President Clinton's request for 1997, and more than \$1 billion below 1995 levels, this bill does represent an increase of about \$150 million from current year levels.

Yet despite this significant increase, this bill eliminates funding for one of the most important and successful transportation projects in this country. Amtrak's Northeast Corridor Improvement Project will speed travel between Washington and Boston; alleviate airport and highway congestion and the associated environmental problems; and create jobs.

The Transportation Committee recommended the elimination of Amtrak corridor improvement funds for 1997 because of the belief that Amtrak had a backlog of unspent funds due to unavoidable project slowdowns. Yet these funds will be expended by the end of the year. If this happens, Amtrak will not have money to complete Northeast corridor projects needed to bring high-speed rail to America.

We'll have the opportunity to fix these cuts when the House and the other body meet to work out differences between our respective transportation spending bills. But the cuts in the House bill are harmful to America's workers, harmful to consumers, and harmful to business. Nearly every Member of the House of Representatives, myself included, supported Amtrak's efforts to end Federal operating sub-

sidies for Amtrak by the year 2002. Yet these cuts are \$1.2 billion below what Amtrak needs for operating self-sufficiency until the phase-out of subsidies. We cannot expect them to continue to operate a national system given these deep cuts.

Amtrak needs to invest in order to strengthen future business prospects. Creating the high-speed corridor in the Northeast is just one example of how Amtrak can run more like a private business and create jobs and economic growth in this country.

Let's give them what they need to get the job done so that they can operate more like other businesses. Let's not be shortsighted in our obligation to ensure that Americans have the best transportation system in the world.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, Metropolitan Atlanta is the fastest growing major metropolitan area in the nation. DeKalb County, a major part of metropolitan Atlanta, is the second most populated county in the State of Georgia, with 577,877 residents in 1994 and a projected growth to 719,761 residents by the year 2010. This growth is bound to exacerbate current stress on the county's increasingly insufficient public transportation system.

Regarding the modes of transportation used in DeKalb County, 75 percent of commuters drive alone and only 8 percent use public transportation to reach their work on a daily basis. Moreover, almost half the county's residents work within the county. Clearly these present factors contribute to the daily traffic jams that occur throughout the populated communities of DeKalb County.

While the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority's [MARTA] rail system serves the city of Atlanta, only two lines are dedicated to serve DeKalb County, and the vast number of rail stations exists outside DeKalb County.

For these reasons, I requested \$1 million to be included in H.R. 3675 to conduct a study exploring the feasibility of a light-rail line in DeKalb County. This study will examine the impact of the line and its effect on the surrounding communities. Among the institutions and communities that will benefit from the MARTA extension are the Emory community that is home to the university, the Center for Disease Control, several other prominent health institutions, and the residential area of South DeKalb. One excellent possibility would be a rail line connecting the Lindbergh Station on the current North-Northeast-South Line nexus with the East Line at East Lake Station and extending into Southern DeKalb County to DeKalb College South Station. Such a line would be a vital connection between these important areas.

Thus, to ensure the future vitality of Metro Atlanta, we must continue to explore new ways of transporting its residents. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this bill, and for their efforts to meet the transportation needs of America's fastest growing metropolitan area.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3675, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. I am particularly concerned about the drastic cuts that are proposed for Amtrak. Under H.R. 3675, the Northeast corridor improvement program would receive no funding for fiscal year 1997. In addition, Amtrak's capital assistance and operating assistance budgets would be cut by a total of \$173 million compared to last year. This will have a devastating impact on railroad

service in the Northeast corridor and, therefore, on travelers in New England.

It should be clear by now that Congress intends Amtrak to be self-sufficient by fiscal year 2002. Last year, the House of Representatives approved a reauthorization bill for Amtrak which gradually phases out financial support by the year 2002. In addition, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution places Amtrak on a glidepath toward self-sufficiency. However, with the proposed level of funding for fiscal year 1997, Congress has moved away from the blueprint envisioned in the budget resolution and in last year's reauthorization bill. Amtrak's funding levels from 1995 to 1997 are \$1.2 billion less than what they indicated was necessary for operating self-sufficiency.

Railroads are capital intensive operations, and yet Congress has kept Amtrak on a slim-fast capital diet for the better part of its 25-year existence. Without adequate capital funds during this critical transition period, Amtrak cannot make the essential investments necessary to survive once Congress has provided its last dollar of operating support. Amtrak will need to modernize its locomotive fleet by purchasing more reliable and fuel-efficient engines. In addition, many of their maintenance shops, which date to the steam era, need to be upgraded, and the electric wires on the Northeast corridor, which are the same ones the Pennsylvania Railroad first strung in 1933, also need to be replaced. If we do not give Amtrak the ability to reinvest now, we will never get them to a legitimate point of self-sufficiency.

We are at a pivotal time with regard to our national passenger rail policy. We have told Amtrak to do what no other national passenger railroad in the world has been able to do—to be free of operating support. This is a major accomplishment and one that Congress should encourage. However, without adequate capital funds now, Amtrak will forever be dependent on Congress to meet its operating needs. Should Amtrak become insolvent, the liability to the Federal Government is going to be a far greater cost to the taxpayer than giving Amtrak the funds needed to successfully transition to self-sufficiency.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3675, the Fiscal Year 1997 Transportation Appropriations Act. For the second consecutive year, Chairman WOLF and the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee have produced an excellent bill that builds America's infrastructure while helping to balance the Federal budget.

While there are many fine provisions contained in this bill, there is one provision of particular concern to my constituents. The provision to which I am referring is a \$1 million appropriation for the West Trenton Line in New Jersey. This appropriation is a major step forward in restoring commuter service on this line.

The West Trenton Line would provide transit service to southern and central Somerset County as well as the northern and western portions of Mercer County. It is expected to provide service to 1,750 commuters a day by 2015. The service would be offered from West Trenton to Bound Brook. The train would then joint the Raritan Valley Line and terminate at Newark. Passengers traveling south could board SEPTA trains to Philadelphia or other points in Pennsylvania. In fact, there are plans

to have future coordination with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to eventually extend the line into Bucks County.

I believe restoring the line makes sense for a number of reasons. First, it would provide cost-effective relief from traffic congestion along Routes 31, 27, 1, 206, and 22. Somerset County's highway system is already overburdened and building new roads or expanding existing ones is a costly and potentially difficult proposition. Additionally, the line would help the state meet its Clean Air Act mandates, and improve the current 1.08 average vehicle occupancy for this area—which is the lowest in the State.

While a large number of residents in this area go to work everyday to Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, or New York, there is no scheduled public transportation. This was not always the case. The West Trenton Line was established in the 19th century and continued under various owners until 1982. Unfortunately, service was forced to terminate in 1982 because of declining ridership due to old equipment, poor on-time performance, and infrequent service. The line is now used by Conrail as a freight line.

Much has changed since the line stopped carrying passengers 14 years ago. The population has soared, which has resulted in increases of traffic congestion on both State and local roads. The township of Hillsborough alone has experienced a 51-percent increase in population from 1980 to 1990. According to NJ transit, the government entity which would operate this line, a total of 104,000 people now reside in the West Trenton corridor.

This project enjoys the support of many groups, including: the Union County Transportation Advisory Board, the Lower Bucks County Chamber of Commerce, the Somerset County Planning Board, the Greater Princeton Transportation Management Association, the Mercer County Chamber of Commerce, the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, the Somerset County Environmental Stewardship Council, RideWise of Raritan Valley, the West Trenton Coalition, and the Middlesex County Planning Board. Moreover, I thank Mayor Ken Scherer of Hillsborough, NJ, and Barbara Roos, president of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, for coming to Washington to testify before Congress in support of this project. I believe their testimony was crucial in finally getting this project off the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I support this project because of its positive benefits regarding economic cost effectiveness, energy efficiency, congestion mitigation, and safety. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on this important bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to the bill, under the the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PETRI] having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman 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. 3675), making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule IV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Conyers	Gilman
Allard	Cooley	Gingrich
Andrews	Costello	Gonzalez
Archer	Cox	Goodlatte
Armey	Coyne	Goodling
Bachus	Cramer	Gordon
Baesler	Crane	Goss
Baker (CA)	Crapo	Graham
Baker (LA)	Creameans	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Cubin	Greene (UT)
Ballenger	Cummings	Greenwood
Barcia	Cunningham	Gunderson
Barr	Danner	Gutknecht
Barrett (NE)	Davis	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Hamilton
Bartlett	Deal	Hancock
Barton	DeFazio	Hansen
Bass	DeLauro	Harman
Bateman	DeLay	Hastert
Becerra	Dellums	Hastings (FL)
Bentsen	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Berman	Dickey	Hefley
Bevill	Dicks	Hefner
Bilbray	Dingell	Heineman
Bilirakis	Dixon	Herge
Bishop	Doggett	Hilleary
Bliley	Dooley	Hilliard
Blumenauer	Doolittle	Hinchey
Boehert	Dornan	Hobson
Boehner	Doyle	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Dreier	Hoke
Bonior	Duncan	Holden
Bono	Dunn	Horn
Borski	Durbin	Horstettler
Boucher	Edwards	Hoyer
Browder	Ehlers	Hunter
Brown (CA)	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hyde
Brown (OH)	English	Inglis
Brownback	Ensign	Istook
Bryant (TN)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Bunn	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Bunning	Everett	(TX)
Burr	Ewing	Jefferson
Burton	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Fattah	Johnson (SD)
Callahan	Fawell	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Fazio	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Campbell	Fields (TX)	Jones
Canady	Filner	Kanjorski
Cardin	Flanagan	Kaptur
Castle	Foley	Kasich
Chabot	Forbes	Kelly
Chambliss	Ford	Kennedy (MA)
Chapman	Fowler	Kennedy (RI)
Chenoweth	Fox	Kennelly
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Chrysler	Franks (CT)	Kim
Clay	Franks (NJ)	King
Clayton	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Clement	Frisa	Klecicka
Clinger	Frost	Klink
Clyburn	Funderburk	Klug
Coble	Furse	Knollenberg
Coburn	Galleghy	Kolbe
Coleman	Ganske	LaFalce
Collins (GA)	Geldenson	LaHood
Collins (IL)	Gekas	Lantos
Collins (MI)	Geren	Largent
Combest	Gilchrest	Latham
Condit	Gillmor	LaTourette

Laughlin	Norwood	Shadegg
Lazio	Nussle	Shaw
Leach	Oberstar	Shays
Levin	Obey	Shuster
Lewis (CA)	Olver	Siskis
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Skaggs
Lewis (KY)	Orton	Skeen
Lightfoot	Owens	Skelton
Linder	Oxley	Slaughter
Lipinski	Packard	Smith (MI)
Livingston	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Parker	Smith (WA)
Lofgren	Pastor	Souder
Longley	Paxon	Spence
Lowey	Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Lucas	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Luther	Pelosi	Stenholm
Maloney	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
Manton	Petri	Studds
Manzullo	Pickett	Stump
Markey	Pombo	Stupak
Martini	Pomeroy	Talent
Mascara	Porter	Tanner
Matsui	Portman	Tate
McCarthy	Poshard	Tauzin
McCollum	Pryce	Taylor (MS)
McCrery	Quillen	Tejeda
McDermott	Quinn	Thomas
McHale	Radanovich	Thompson
McHugh	Rahall	Thornberry
McInnis	Ramstad	Thornton
McIntosh	Rangel	Thurman
McKeon	Reed	Tiahrt
McKinney	Regula	Torkildsen
McNulty	Richardson	Torres
Meehan	Riggs	Trafficant
Meek	Rivers	Upton
Menendez	Roberts	Velazquez
Metcalf	Roemer	Vento
Meyers	Rogers	Visclosky
Mica	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Millender-	Ros-Lehtinen	Walker
McDonald	Rose	Walsh
Miller (CA)	Roth	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Ward
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Watt (NC)
Mink	Royce	Watts (OK)
Moakley	Rush	Waxman
Molinari	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
Mollohan	Salmon	Weller
Montgomery	Sanders	White
Moorhead	Sanford	Whitfield
Moran	Sawyer	Wicker
Morella	Saxton	Williams
Murtha	Scarborough	Wilson
Myers	Schaefer	Wise
Myrick	Schiff	Wolf
Nadler	Schumer	Woolsey
Neal	Scott	Wynn
Nethercutt	Seastrand	Young (AK)
Neumann	Sensenbrenner	Zeliff
Ney	Serrano	Zimmer

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—29

Beilenson	Schroeder
Ackerman	Hayes
Blute	Houghton
Brewster	Jacobs
Bryant (TX)	Lincoln
Flake	Martinez
Foglietta	McDade
Gephardt	Peterson (FL)
Gibbons	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	Solomon
Hall (OH)	Stark

□ 0108

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1880. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102