

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MACK. I yield the floor. 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. COATS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. COATS. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. FRAHM] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Ford	Mack
Akaka	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Glenn	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Grams	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grassley	Murkowski
Bond	Gregg	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nickles
Bradley	Hatch	Nunn
Breaux	Hatfield	Pell
Bryan	Helms	Pressler
Bumpers	Hollings	Pryor
Burns	Hutchison	Reid
Byrd	Inhofe	Robb
Campbell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Roth
Coats	Johnston	Santorum
Cochran	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kempthorne	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Simon
Craig	Kerrey	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerry	Smith
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
DeWine	Kyl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenici	Leahy	Thomas
Dorgan	Levin	Thompson
Exon	Lieberman	Thurmond
Feingold	Lott	Warner
Feinstein	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—6

Brown	Faircloth	Heflin
Conrad	Gramm	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Frahm

The bill (H.R. 3754), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to the bill, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair ap-

point conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MACK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MACK. 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. EXON. 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. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska be allowed to proceed as in morning business for not exceeding 2 minutes the purpose of introducing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of S. 2003 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of calendar order 504, H.R. 3675, the transportation appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in *italic*.)

H.R. 3675

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, **[\$53,816,000]** *\$53,376,000*, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,000,000 in funds received in user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to maintain custody of airline tariffs that are already available for public and departmental access at no cost; to secure them against detection, alteration, or tampering; and open to inspection by the Department.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, **\$5,574,000**.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, and development activities, to remain available until expended, **[\$3,000,000]** *\$4,158,000*.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Transportation Administrative Service Center, not to exceed \$124,812,000, shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Transportation Administrative Service Center without the approval of the agency modal administrator: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND) (INCLUDING RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, as is payable by the Department of Transportation, **[\$10,000,000]** *\$25,900,000*, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of **[\$10,000,000]** *\$25,900,000* for the Payments to Air Carriers program in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make payment of compensation under subchapter II of

chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, in excess of the appropriation in this Act for liquidation of obligations incurred under the "Payments to air carriers" program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the payment of claims for such compensation except in accordance with this provision: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for service to communities in the forty-eight contiguous States that are located fewer than seventy highway miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport, or that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of \$200 unless such point is greater than two hundred and ten miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport: *Provided further*, That of funds provided for "Small Community Air Service" by Public Law 101-508, [\$28,600,000] \$12,700,000 in fiscal year 1997 is hereby rescinded.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (RESCISSION)

Of the budgetary resources remaining available under this heading, \$1,133,000 are rescinded.

RENTAL PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for rental of headquarters and field space not to exceed 8,580,000 square feet and for related services assessed by the General Services Administration, [\$127,447,000] \$132,500,000: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$2,022,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, \$39,113,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$840,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and \$193,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund: *Provided further*, That in addition, for assessments by the General Services Administration related to the space needs of the Federal Highway Administration, [\$17,294,000] \$17,192,000, to be derived from "Federal-aid Highways", subject to the "Limitation on General Operating Expenses".

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of direct loans, \$1,500,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$15,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$400,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of the Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$2,900,000, of which \$2,635,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

COAST GUARD OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)); and recreation and welfare; [\$2,609,100,000] \$2,331,350,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed two hundred and eighteen, exclusive of aircraft and parts stored to meet future attrition:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for pay or administrative expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yacht documentation under 46 U.S.C. 12109, except to the extent fees are collected from yacht owners and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Commandant shall reduce both military and civilian employment levels for the purpose of complying with Executive Order No. 12839.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, [\$358,000,000] \$393,100,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which [\$205,600,000] \$227,960,000 shall be available to acquire, repair, renovate or improve vessels, small boats and related equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2001; [\$18,300,000] \$19,040,000 shall be available to acquire new aircraft and increase aviation capability, to remain available until September 30, 1999; [\$39,900,000] \$46,200,000 shall be available for other equipment, to remain available until September 30, 1999; [\$47,950,000] \$52,900,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities, to remain available until September 30, 1999; and [\$46,250,000] \$47,000,000 shall remain available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That funds received from the sale of the VC-11A and HU-25 aircraft shall be credited to this appropriation for the purpose of acquiring new aircraft and increasing aviation capacity: *Provided further*, That the Commandant may dispose of surplus real property by sale or lease and the proceeds of such sale or lease shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the property in Wildwood, New Jersey shall be disposed of in a manner resulting in a final fiscal year 1997 appropriation estimated at \$338,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended to continue the "Vessel Traffic Service 2000" Program.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS (RESCISSIONS)

[Of the available balances under this heading provided in Public Law 104-50, \$3,400,000 are rescinded.

[Of the available balances under this heading provided in Public Law 103-331, \$355,000 are rescinded.]

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Coast Guard's environmental compliance and restoration functions under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, [\$21,000,000] \$23,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PORT SAFETY DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for debt retirement of the Port of Portland, Oregon, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, [\$16,000,000] \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to

lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55) \$608,084,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; \$65,890,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, [\$19,000,000] \$19,550,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$5,020,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries, for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

BOAT SAFETY

(AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

For payment of necessary expenses incurred for recreational boating safety assistance under Public Law 92-75, as amended, [\$35,000,000] \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Boat Safety Account and to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities and the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, and carrying out the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 471 of title 49, United States Code, or other provisions of law authorizing the obligation of funds for similar programs of airport and airway development or improvement, lease or purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, [\$4,900,000,000] \$4,899,957,000, of which [\$1,642,500,000] \$2,742,602,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed [\$30,000,000] \$75,000,000 from additional user fees to be established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar for dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1997, to result in a final fiscal year 1997 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than [\$2,127,398,000] \$2,082,355,000: *Provided further*, That the only additional user fees authorized as offsetting collections are fees for services provided to aircraft that neither take off from, nor land in, the United States: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and, for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station

certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a nonprofit standard setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under 5 U.S.C. 5546(a) to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended to operate a manned auxiliary flight service station in the contiguous United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund may be used to support the operations and activities of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities and equipment as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this head; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, **[\$1,800,000,000] \$1,788,700,000**, of which **[\$1,583,000,000] \$1,571,700,000** shall remain available until September 30, 1999, and of which \$217,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment and modernization of air navigation facilities.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, **[\$185,000,000] \$187,000,000**, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and for noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations, \$1,500,000,000, to be derived from the

Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of **[\$1,300,000,000] \$1,460,000,000** in fiscal year 1997 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 47117(h) of title 49, United States Code.

AVIATION INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures and investments, within the limits of funds available pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44307, and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program for aviation insurance activities under chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code.

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE
PROGRAM

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for activities under this heading during fiscal year 1997.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FRANCHISE FUND

There is hereby established in the Treasury a fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for the costs of capitalizing and operating such administrative services as the FAA Administrator determines may be performed more advantageously as centralized services, including accounting, international training, payroll, travel, duplicating, multimedia and information technology services: Provided, That any inventories, equipment, and other assets pertaining to the services to be provided by such fund, either on hand or on order, less the related liabilities or unpaid obligations, and any appropriations made prior to the current year for the purpose of providing capital shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be paid in advance from funds available to the FAA and other Federal agencies for which such centralized services are performed, at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including accrued leave, depreciation of fund plant and equipment, amortization of Automated Data Processing (ADP) software and systems (either required or donated), and an amount necessary to maintain a reasonable operating reserve, as determined by the FAA Administrator: *Provided further*, That such fund shall provide services on a competitive basis: *Provided further*, That an amount not to exceed four percent of the total annual income to such fund may be retained in the fund for fiscal year 1997 and each year thereafter, to remain available until expended, to be used for the acquisition of capital equipment and for the improvement and implementation of FAA financial management, ADP, and support systems: *Provided further*, That no later than thirty days after the end of each fiscal year, amounts in excess of this reserve limitation shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration, operation, including motor carrier safety program operations, and research of the Federal Highway Administration not to exceed **[\$510,981,000] \$534,846,000** shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That **[\$214,698,000] \$234,840,000** of the amount provided herein shall remain available until September 30, 1999.

HIGHWAY-RELATED SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402 administered by the Federal Highway Administration, to remain available until expended, \$2,049,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of **[\$17,550,000,000] \$17,650,000,000** for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1997.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are attributable to Federal-aid highways, including the National Scenic and Recreational Highway as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 148, not otherwise provided, including reimbursements for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 308, \$19,800,000,000 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND
(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds under this head are available for net obligations for right-of-way acquisition during fiscal year 1997.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 31102, \$74,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of **[\$77,425,000] \$79,000,000** for "Motor Carrier Safety Grants".

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

To carry out the State Infrastructure Bank Pilot Program (Public Law 104-59, section 350), \$250,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended, to be distributed by the Secretary to more than 10 States: *Provided*, That these funds shall be used to advance projects or programs under the terms and conditions of section 350: *Provided further*, That any State that receives such funds may deposit any portion of those funds into either the highway or transit account of the State Infrastructure Bank: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated and deposited into transit accounts authorized by section 350(b)(3) shall be drawn from the Mass Transit account of the Highway Trust Fund and that funds appropriated and deposited into highway accounts authorized by section 350(b)(2) shall be drawn from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall ensure that the Federal disbursements shall be at a rate consistent with historic rates for the Federal-aid highways program.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under part C of

subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, and chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, **[\$81,895,000] \$80,000,000**, of which \$45,646,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to plan, finalize, or implement any rulemaking to add to section 575.104 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations any requirement pertaining to a grading standard that is different from the three grading standards (treadwear, traction, and temperature resistance) already in effect.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under 23 U.S.C. 403 and section 2006 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240), to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, **[\$50,377,000] \$53,195,000**, of which \$27,066,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 153, 402, 408, and 410, chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, and section 209 of Public Law 95-599, as amended, to remain available until expended, **[\$167,100,000] \$169,100,000**, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding subsection 2009(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 1997, are in excess of **[\$167,100,000] \$169,100,000** for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 410, as amended, of which **[\$127,700,000] \$129,700,000** shall be for "State and community highway safety grants", \$2,400,000 shall be for the "National Driver Register", **[\$11,000,000] \$12,000,000** shall be for highway safety grants as authorized by section 1003(a)(7) of Public Law 102-240, and **[\$26,000,000] \$25,000,000** shall be for section 410 "Alcohol-impaired driving counter-measures programs": *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed **[\$5,268,000] \$5,468,000** of the funds made available for section 402 may be available for administering "State and community highway safety grants": *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$150,000 of the funds made available for section 402 may be available for administering the highway safety grants authorized by section 1003(a)(7) of Public Law 102-240: *Provided further*, That the unobligated balances of the appropriation "Highway-Related Safety Grants" shall be transferred to and merged with this "Highway Traffic Safety Grants" appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for section 410 "Alcohol-impaired driving counter-measures programs" shall be available for technical assistance to the States.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, **[\$16,469,000] \$16,739,000**, of which \$1,523,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of a program making commitments to guarantee new loans under the

Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970, as amended, and no new commitments to guarantee loans under section 211(a) or 211(h) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, as amended, shall be made: *Provided further*, That, as part of the Washington Union Station transaction in which the Secretary assumed the first deed of trust on the property and, where the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation or any successor is obligated to make payments on such deed of trust on the Secretary's behalf, including payments on and after September 30, 1988, the Secretary is authorized to receive such payments directly from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, credit them to the appropriation charged for the first deed of trust, and make payments on the first deed of trust with those funds: *Provided further*, That such additional sums as may be necessary for payment on the first deed of trust may be advanced by the Administrator from unobligated balances available to the Federal Railroad Administration, to be reimbursed from payments received from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation.

RAILROAD SAFETY

For necessary expenses in connection with railroad safety, not otherwise provided for, \$1,407,000, of which \$2,476,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other law, funds appropriated under this heading are available for the reimbursement of out-of-state travel and per diem costs incurred by employees of state governments directly supporting the Federal railroad safety program, including regulatory development and compliance-related activities.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, **[\$20,341,000] \$20,000,000**, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

For necessary expenses related to Northeast Corridor improvements authorized by title VII of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended (45 U.S.C. 851 et seq.) and 49 U.S.C. 24909, **\$200,000,000**, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL TRAINSETS AND FACILITIES

For the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, \$80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999, to pursue public-private partnerships for high-speed rail trainset and maintenance facility financing arrangements.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 512 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding: *Provided*, That no new loan guarantee commitments shall be made during fiscal year 1997.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

For necessary expenses for Next Generation High-Speed Rail studies, corridor planning, development, demonstration, and implementation, **[\$19,757,000] \$26,525,000**, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds under this head may be made available for grants to States for high-speed rail corridor design, feasibility studies, environmental analyses, and [track and signal] track, signal and station improvements.

TRUST FUND SHARE OF NEXT GENERATION
HIGH-SPEED RAIL
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For grants and payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of the High-Speed Ground Transportation program as defined in subsections 1036(c) and 1036(d)(1)(B) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, including planning and environmental analyses, \$2,855,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

ALASKA RAILROAD REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the Alaska Railroad, **\$10,000,000** shall be for capital rehabilitation and improvements benefiting its passenger operations.

RHODE ISLAND RAIL DEVELOPMENT

For the costs associated with construction of a third track on the Northeast Corridor between Davisville and Central Falls, Rhode Island, with sufficient clearance to accommodate double stack freight cars, **[\$4,000,000] \$10,000,000** to be matched by the State of Rhode Island or its designee on a dollar for dollar basis and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That as a condition of accepting such funds, the Providence and Worcester (P&W) Railroad shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to reimburse Amtrak and/or the Federal Railroad Administration, on a dollar for dollar basis, up to the first **[\$10,000,000] \$16,000,000** in damages resulting from the legal action initiated by the P&W Railroad under its existing contracts with Amtrak relating to the provision of vertical clearances between Davisville and Central Falls in excess of those required for present freight operations.

[DIRECT LOAN FINANCING PROGRAM

[Notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$58,680,000, for direct loans not to exceed \$400,000,000 consistent with the purposes of section 505 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 825) as in effect on September 30, 1988, to the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority to continue the Alameda Corridor Project, including replacement of at-grade rail lines with a below-grade corridor and widening of the adjacent major highway: *Provided*, That loans not to exceed the following amounts shall be made on or after the first day of the fiscal year indicated:

[Fiscal year 1997	\$140,000,000
[Fiscal year 1998	\$140,000,000
[Fiscal year 1999	\$120,000,000

Provided further, That any loan authorized under this section shall be structured with a maximum 30-year repayment after completion of construction at an annual interest rate of not to exceed the 30-year United States Treasury rate and on such terms and conditions as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Transportation: *Provided further*, That specific provisions of section 505(a)(b) and (d) shall not apply: *Provided further*, That the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority shall be deemed to be a financially responsible person for purposes of section 505 of the Act.]

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD
PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24104, **[\$462,000,000] \$592,000,000**, to remain available until expended, of which \$342,000,000 shall be available for operating losses and for mandatory passenger rail service payments, and **[\$120,000,000] \$250,000,000** shall be for capital improvements: *Provided*,

That funding under this head for capital improvements shall not be made available before July 1, 1997: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles or for the hire of vehicle operators for any officer or employee, other than the president of the Corporation, excluding the lease of passenger motor vehicles for those officers or employees while in official travel status.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, **[\$41,367,000] \$42,147,000.**

FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5307, 5310(a)(2), 5311, and 5336, to remain available until expended, **[\$490,000,000] \$218,335,000.** *Provided*, That no more than **[\$2,052,925,000] \$2,149,185,000** of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That, *notwithstanding any other provision of law*, of the funds provided under this head for formula grants, no more than \$400,000,000 may be used for operating assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5336(d): *Provided further*, That the limitation on operating assistance provided under this heading shall, for urbanized areas of less than 200,000 in population, be no less than seventy-five percent of the amount of operating assistance such areas are eligible to receive under Public Law 103-331: *Provided further*, That in the distribution of the limitation provided under this heading to urbanized areas that had a population under the 1990 census of 1,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall direct each such area to give priority consideration to the impact of reductions in operating assistance on smaller transit authorities operating within the area and to consider the needs and resources of such transit authorities when the limitation is distributed among all transit authorities operating in the area.

UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION CENTERS

For necessary expenses for university transportation centers as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5317(b), to remain available until expended, \$6,000,000.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses for transit planning and research as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5303, 5311, 5313, 5314, and 5315, to remain available until expended, \$85,500,000, of which \$39,500,000 shall be for activities under Metropolitan Planning (49 U.S.C. 5303); \$4,500,000 for activities under Rural Transit Assistance (49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2)); \$8,250,000 for activities under State Planning and Research (49 U.S.C. 5313(b)); \$22,000,000 for activities under National Planning and Research (49 U.S.C. 5314); \$8,250,000 for activities under Transit Cooperative Research (49 U.S.C. 5313(a)); and \$3,000,000 for National Transit Institute (49 U.S.C. 5315).

TRUST FUND SHARE OF EXPENSES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5338(a), \$1,920,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That \$1,920,000,000 shall be paid from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund to the Federal Transit Administration's formula grants account.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execu-

tion of programs the obligations for which are in excess of **[\$1,665,000,000] \$1,900,000,000** in fiscal year 1997 for grants under the contract authority in 49 U.S.C. 5338(b): *Provided*, That *notwithstanding any provision of law*, there shall be available for fixed guideway modernization, **[\$666,000,000] \$725,000,000**; there shall be available for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities, **[\$333,000,000] \$375,000,000**; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except for fixed guideway modernization projects, **[\$10,510,000] \$8,890,000** made available under Public Law 102-240 and Public Law 102-143 under "Federal Transit Administration, Discretionary Grants" for projects specified in those Acts or identified in reports accompanying those Acts, not obligated by September 30, 1996; together with, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$744,000 funds made available for the "New Bedford and Fall River Massachusetts commuter rail extension" under Public Law 103-331; together with, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$47,322,000 funds made available for the "Chicago Central Area Circulator Project" in Public Law 103-122 and Public Law 103-331, shall be made available for new fixed guideway systems together with the **[\$666,000,000] \$800,000,000** made available for new fixed guideway systems in this Act, to be available as follows:

\$6,390,000 for the Alaska-Hollis to Ketchikan ferry project;
[\$66,820,000] \$62,000,000 for the Atlanta-North Springs project;
[\$10,260,000] \$5,000,000 for the Baltimore-LRT Extension project;
[\$40,181,000] \$30,000,000 for the Boston Piers-MOS-2 project;
\$2,000,000 for the Burlington-Charlotte, Vermont commuter rail project;
[\$5,500,000 for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project;
[\$25,000,000.] \$20,000,000 notwithstanding any other provision of law, for transit improvements in the Chicago downtown area;
\$3,000,000 for the Cincinnati Northeast-Northern Kentucky rail line project;
[\$10,000,000] \$12,000,000 for the DART North Central light rail extension project;
[\$12,500,000] \$18,000,000 for the Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN project;
[\$1,000,000 for the DeKalb County, Georgia light rail project;
[\$3,000,000 for the Denver Southwest Corridor project;
[\$9,000,000] \$20,000,000 for the Florida Tri-County commuter rail project;
\$2,000,000 for the Griffin light rail project;
[\$40,590,000] \$24,000,000 for the Houston Regional Bus project;
\$7,400,000 for the Jackson, Mississippi Inter-modal Corridor;
[\$15,300,000 for the Jacksonville ASE extension project;
[\$1,500,000] \$3,600,000 for the Kansas City Southtown corridor project;
\$6,000,000 for the Little Rock, Arkansas Junction Bridge project;
[\$90,000,000] \$55,000,000 for the Los Angeles-MOS-3 project;
[\$1,500,000 for the Los Angeles-San Diego commuter rail project;
[\$27,000,000] \$50,000,000 for the MARC Commuter Rail Improvements project;
\$5,000,000 for the Metro-Dade Transit east-west corridor, Florida project;
[\$1,000,000 for the Miami-North 27th Avenue project;
[\$2,000,000] \$6,400,000 for the Memphis, Tennessee Regional Rail Plan;
\$4,240,000 for the Morgantown, West Virginia Personal Rapid Transit System;
\$10,000,000 for the New Jersey Urban Core/Hudson-Bergen LRT project;

\$105,530,000 for the New Jersey Urban Core/Secaucus project;

[\$1,000,000 for the New Jersey West Trenton commuter rail project;]

[\$8,000,000] \$10,000,000 for the New Orleans Canal Street Corridor project;

[\$2,000,000 for the New Orleans Desire Streetcar project;]

\$35,020,000 for the New York-Queens Connection project;

[\$500,000 for the Northern Indiana commuter rail project;]

\$10,000,000 for the Oklahoma City, MAPS corridor transit system;

[\$5,000,000 for the Orange County transitway project;]

\$2,000,000 for the Orlando Lynx light rail project;

\$15,100,000 for the Pittsburgh Airport busway project;

\$6,000,000 for the Portland South/North light rail transit project;

[\$90,000,000] \$138,000,000 for the Portland-Westside/Hillsboro Extension project;

\$5,000,000 for the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina regional transit plan;

[\$6,000,000] \$7,000,000 for the Sacramento LRT Extension project;

[\$20,000,000] \$58,000,000 for the Salt Lake City-South LRT project, of which not less than \$10,000,000 shall be available only for high-occupancy vehicle lane and corridor design costs;]

\$30,000,000 for St. Louis Metrolink;

[\$20,000,000] \$45,000,000 for the St. Louis-St. Clair Extension project;

[\$35,000,000] \$20,000,000 for the San Francisco Area-BART airport extension/San Jose Tasman West LRT projects;

[\$3,000,000 for the San Diego-Mid-Coast Corridor project;]

[\$9,500,000 for the San Juan Tren Urbano project;]

\$5,000,000 for the Seattle-Renton-Tacoma light rail project;

[\$375,000 for the Staten Island-Midtown Ferry service project;]

\$2,000,000 for the Tampa to Lakeland commuter rail project; and]

\$8,000,000 for the Virginia Rail Express Richmond to Washington commuter rail project; and

[\$2,500,000] \$5,000,000 for the Whitehall ferry terminal, New York, New York.

MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL FUND

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5338(b) administered by the Federal Transit Administration, **[\$2,000,000,000] \$2,300,000,000**, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 96-184 and Public Law 101-551, \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE (HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for operation and maintenance of those portions of the Saint

Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, including the Great Lakes Pilotage functions delegated by the Secretary of Transportation, **[\$10,037,000] \$10,337,000**, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Research and Special Programs Administration, **[\$23,929,000] \$27,675,000**, of which \$574,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and of which \$7,101,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That up to \$1,200,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination.

PIPELINE SAFETY (PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, **[\$30,988,000] \$31,278,000**, of which \$2,528,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 1999; and of which **[\$28,460,000] \$28,750,000** shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$15,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts made available for the Pipeline Safety Fund, \$1,000,000 shall be available for grants to States for the development and establishment of one-call notification systems and shall be derived from amounts previously collected under section 7005 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS (EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5127(c), \$200,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i) and 5127(d) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, **[\$39,450,000] \$39,700,000**: *Provided*, That **[none of the funds under this heading shall be for the conduct of contract audits]** of which **\$1,900,000 shall be for the conduct of contract audits**.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$12,344,000: *Provided*, That \$3,000,000 in fees collected in fiscal year 1997 by the Surface Transportation Board pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 shall be made available to this appropriation in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1997.

TITLE II

RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$3,540,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for publications and training expenses.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-18; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$42,407,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 302. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1997 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previous appropriations Acts.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditures by the Federal Aviation Administration shall be available (1) except as otherwise authorized by title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. 7701, et seq., for expenses of primary and secondary schooling for dependents of Federal Aviation Administration personnel stationed outside the continental United States at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and (2) for transportation of said dependents between schools serving the area that they attend and their places of residence when the Secretary, under such regulations as may be prescribed, determines that such schools are not accessible by public means of transportation on a regular basis.

SEC. 304. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 305. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than one hundred seven political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 306. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise

compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 307. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 308. The Secretary of Transportation may enter into grants, cooperative agreements, and other transactions with any person, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any unit of State or local government, any educational institution, and any other entity in execution of the Technology Reinvestment Project authorized under the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 and related legislation: *Provided*, That the authority provided in this section may be exercised without regard to section 3324 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 309. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 310. (a) For fiscal year 1997 the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways by allocation in the ratio which sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways that are apportioned or allocated to each State for such fiscal year bear to the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways that are apportioned or allocated to all the States for such fiscal year.

(b) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1996, no State shall obligate more than 25 per centum of the amount distributed to such State under subsection (a), and the total of all State obligations during such period shall not exceed 12 per centum of the total amount distributed to all States under such subsection.

(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide all States with authority sufficient to prevent lapses of sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways that have been apportioned to a State;

(2) after August 1, 1997, revise a distribution of the funds made available under subsection (a) if a State will not obligate the amount distributed during that fiscal year and redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 103(e)(4), 104, and 144 of title 23, United States Code, and under sections 1013(c) and 1015 of Public Law 102-240; and

(3) not distribute amounts authorized for administrative expenses and funded from the administrative takedown authorized by section 104(a), title 23 U.S.C., the Federal lands highway **[program.] program**; the intelligent transportation systems **[program, and] program**; amounts made available under sections 1040, 1047, 1064, 6001, 6005, 6006, 6023, and 6024 of Public Law 102-240, and 49 U.S.C. 5316, 5317, and 5338; **\$5,000,000 for activities authorized by section 140(b) of title 23, United States Code; \$5,000,000 for activities authorized by section 1012(b) of Public Law 102-240; and \$50,000,000 of the obligation limitation established by this Act for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction: Provided, That \$15,000,000 of such undistributed obligation limitation shall be available for administrative costs and allocation**

to States under section 104(I) of title 23, United States Code; \$30,000,000 shall be available for allocation to States authorized by section 1069(y) of Public Law 102-240; and \$5,000,000 shall be available for administrative costs and allocation to States under section 1302(d) of the Symms National Recreational Trails Act of 1991: **[Provided]** *Provided further*, That amounts made available under section 6005 of Public Law 102-240 shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs under the head "Federal-Aid Highways" in this Act.

(d) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1996, the aggregate amount of obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code, for projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, sections 131(b), 131(j), and 404 of Public Law 97-424, sections 1061, 1103 through 1108, 4008, and 6023(b)(8) and 6023(b)(10) of Public Law 102-240, and for projects authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 100-17, shall not exceed \$277,431,840.

(e) During the period August 2 through September 30, 1997, the aggregate amount which may be obligated by all States shall not exceed 2.5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds apportioned or allocated to all States—

(1) under sections 104 and 144 of title 23, United States Code, and 1013(c) and 1015 of Public Law 102-240, and

(2) for highway assistance projects under section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code,

which would not be obligated in fiscal year 1997 if the total amount of the obligation limitation provided for such fiscal year in this Act were utilized.

(f) Paragraph (e) shall not apply to any State which on or after August 1, 1997, has the amount distributed to such State under paragraph (a) for fiscal year 1997 reduced under paragraph (c)(2).

(g) **INCREASE IN ADMINISTRATIVE TAKEDOWN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 1997 only, whenever an allocation is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the Federal lands highways program, and whenever an apportionment is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the National Highway System, the Interstate maintenance program, the Interstate reimbursement program, the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program, and the donor State bonus program, the Secretary of Transportation shall deduct a sum in such amount not to exceed 4¼ per centum of all sums to be authorized as the Secretary may determine necessary for administering the provisions of law to be financed from appropriations for the Federal-Aid Highway Program and for carrying on the research authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of section 307 of title 23, United States Code. In making such determination, the Secretary shall take into account the unobligated balance of any sums deducted for such purposes in prior years. The sum so deducted shall remain available until expended.

(2) **EFFECT.**—Any deduction by the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with this Act shall be deemed to be a deduction under 23 U.S.C. § 104(a).

SEC. 311. The limitation on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation under the discretionary grants program.

SEC. 312. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 313. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to plan, finalize, or implement regulations that would establish a vessel traffic safety fairway less than five miles wide between the Santa Barbara Traffic Separation Scheme and the San Francisco Traffic Separation Scheme.

SEC. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, airports may transfer, without consideration, to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) instrument landing systems (along with associated approach lighting equipment and runway visual range equipment) which conform to FAA design and performance specifications, the purchase of which was assisted by a Federal airport aid program, airport development aid program or airport improvement program grant. The FAA shall accept such equipment, which shall thereafter be operated and maintained by the FAA in accordance with agency criteria.

SEC. 315. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to award a multiyear contract for production end items that (1) includes economic order quantity or long lead time material procurement in excess of \$10,000,000 in any one year of the contract or (2) includes a cancellation charge greater than \$10,000,000 which at the time of obligation has not been appropriated to the limits of the government's liability or (3) includes a requirement that permits performance under the contract during the second and subsequent years of the contract without conditioning such performance upon the appropriation of funds: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply to a contract in which the Federal Government incurs no financial liability from not buying additional systems, subsystems, or components beyond the basic contract requirements.

SEC. 316. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be made available for planning and executing a passenger manifest program by the Department of Transportation that only applies to United States flag carriers.

SEC. 317. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except for fixed guideway modernization projects, funds made available by this Act under "Federal Transit Administration, Discretionary grants" for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 1999, shall be made available for other projects under 49 U.S.C. 5309.

SEC. 318. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 1993, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49 U.S.C., that remain available for expenditure may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 319. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to implement or enforce regulations that would result in the withdrawal of a slot from an air carrier at O'Hare International Airport under section 93.223 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations in excess of the total slots withdrawn from that air carrier as of October 31, 1993 if such additional slot is to be allocated to an air carrier or foreign air carrier under section 93.217 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 320. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 335 technical staff years under the federally-funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 321. Funds provided in this Act for the Transportation Administrative Service Center (TASC) shall be reduced by \$10,000,000, which limits fiscal year 1997 TASC obligational authority for elements of the Department of Transportation funded in this

Act to no more than \$114,812,000: *Provided*, That such reductions from the budget request shall be allocated by the Department of Transportation to each appropriations account in proportion to the amount included in each account for the transportation administrative service center.

SEC. 322. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's "Limitation on General Operating Expenses" account, the Federal Transit Administration's "Transit Planning and Research" account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's "Railroad Safety" account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 323. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulations pursuant to title V of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (49 U.S.C. 32901, et seq.) prescribing corporate average fuel economy standards for automobiles, as defined in such title, in any model year that differs from standards promulgated for such automobiles prior to enactment of this section.

SEC. 324. None of the funds in this Act may be used for planning, engineering, design, or construction of a sixth runway at the new Denver International Airport, Denver, Colorado: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply in any case where the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration determines, in writing, that safety conditions warrant obligation of such funds.

SEC. 325. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to the provisions of section 6006 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction: *Provided further*, [That in addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, not to exceed \$3,100,000 in expenses of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics necessary to conduct activities related to airline statistics may be incurred, but only to the extent such expenses are offset by user fees charged for those activities and credited as offsetting collections.] *That of the funds provided by section 6006(b) of Public Law 102-240, not to exceed \$3,100,000 may be incurred to conduct activities related to airline statistics.*

SEC. 326. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated in this Act to "Rental payments" for any expense authorized by that appropriation in excess of the amounts provided in this Act: *Provided*, That prior to any such transfer, notification shall be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 327. None of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for employee training which: (a) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties; (b) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants; (c) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluations; (d) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated

September 2, 1988; (e) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace; or (f) includes content related to human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) other than that necessary to make employees more aware of the medical ramifications of HIV/AIDS and the workplace rights of HIV-positive employees.

SEC. 328. None of the funds in this Act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation: *Provided*, That this shall not prevent officers or employees of the Department of Transportation or related agencies funded in this Act from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

SEC. 329. None of the funds in this Act may be used to support Federal Transit Administration's field operations and oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority in any location other than from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

SEC. 330. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for improvements to the Miller Highway in New York City, New York.

SEC. 331. Not to exceed [\$850,000] *\$1,050,000* of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for the necessary expenses of advisory committees.

SEC. 332. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may use funds appropriated under this Act, or any subsequent Act, to administer and implement the exemption provisions of 49 CFR 580.6 and to adopt or amend exemptions from the disclosure requirements of 49 CFR part 580 for any class or category of vehicles that the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 333. No funds other than those appropriated to the Surface Transportation Board shall be used for conducting the activities of the Board.

SEC. 333. Section 24902 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(m) *APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.*—No State or local building, zoning, subdivision, or similar or related law, nor any other State or local law from which a project would be exempt if undertaken by the Federal Government or an agency thereof within a Federal enclave wherein Federal jurisdiction is exclusive, including without limitation with respect to all such laws referenced herein above requirements for permits, actions, approvals or filings, shall apply in connection with the construction, ownership, use, operation, financing, leasing, conveying, mortgaging or enforcing a mortgage of (i) any improvement undertaken by or for the benefit of Amtrak as part of, or in furtherance of, the Northeast Corridor Improvement Project (including without limitation maintenance, service, inspection or similar facilities acquired, constructed or used for high speed trainsets) or chapter 241, 243, or 247 of this title or (ii) any land (and right, title or interest created with respect thereto) on which such improvement is located and adjoining, surrounding or any related land. These exemptions shall remain in effect and be applicable with respect to such land and improvements for the benefit of any mortgagee

before, upon and after coming into possession of such improvements or land, any third party purchasers thereof in foreclosure (or through a deed in lieu of foreclosure), and their respective successors and assigns, in each case to the extent the land or improvements are used, or held for use, for railroad purposes or purposes accessory thereto. This subsection (m) shall not apply to any improvement or related land unless Amtrak receives a Federal operating subsidy in the fiscal year in which Amtrak commits to or initiates such improvement."

SEC. 334. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to construct, or to pay the salaries or expenses of Department of Transportation personnel who approve or facilitate the construction of, a third track on the Metro-North Railroad Harlem Line in the vicinity of Bronxville, New York, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that a final environmental impact statement has not been completed for such construction project.

SEC. 335. Section 5328(c)(1)(E) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Westside" the first place it appears;

(2) by striking "and" after "101-584,"; and (3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and the locally preferred alternative for the South/North Corridor Project".

SEC. 335a. Section 3035(b) of Public Law 102-240 is hereby amended by striking "\$515,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$555,000,000".

SEC. 336. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available to Cleveland for the "Cleveland Dual Hub Corridor Project" or "Cleveland Dual Hub Rail Project," \$4,023,030 in funds made available in fiscal years 1991, 1992, and 1994, under Public Laws 101-516, 102-143, 102-240, 103-122, and accompanying reports, shall be made available for the Berea Red Line Extension and the Euclid Corridor Improvement projects.

SEC. 337. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under section 3035(kk) of Public Law 102-240 for fiscal year 1997 to the State of Michigan shall be for the purchase of buses and bus-related equipment and facilities.

SEC. 338. In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$2,400,000 for activities of the National Civil Aviation Review Commission, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 338. Of the amounts made available under the Federal Transit Administration's Discretionary Grants program for Kauai, Hawaii, in Public Law 103-122 and Public Law 103-311, \$3,250,000 shall be transferred to and administered in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5307 and made available to Kauai, Hawaii.

SEC. 339. Section 423 of H.R. 1361, as passed the House of Representatives on May 9, 1995, is hereby enacted into law.

SEC. 339. Improvements identified as highest priority by section 1069(t) of Public Law 102-240 and funded pursuant to section 118(c)(2) of title 23, United States Code, shall not be treated as an allocation for Interstate maintenance for such fiscal year under section 157(a)(4) of title 23, United States Code, and sections 1013(c), 1015(a)(1), and 1015(b)(1) of Public Law 102-240: *Provided*, That any discretionary grant made pursuant to Public Law 99-663 shall not be subject to section 1015 of Public Law 102-240.

SEC. 340. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment

or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products to the greatest extent practicable.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 341. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipts, in amounts determined by the Secretary, collected from users of fitness centers operated by or for the Department of Transportation shall be available to support the operation and maintenance of those facilities.

SEC. 342. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Transportation Safety Board to plan, conduct, or enter into any contract for a study to determine the feasibility of allowing individuals who are more than 60 years of age to pilot commercial aircraft.

SEC. 343. Funds provided in this Act for bonuses and cash awards for employees of the Department of Transportation shall be reduced by \$513,604 which limits fiscal year 1997 obligation authority to no more than \$25,448,300: *Provided*, That this provision shall be applied to funds for Senior Executive Service bonuses, merit pay, and other bonuses and cash awards.

SEC. 344. Hereinafter, the National Passenger Railroad Corporation shall be exempted from any State or local law relating to the payment or delivery of abandoned or unclaimed personal property to any government authority, including any provision for the enforcement thereof, with respect to passenger rail tickets for which no refund has been or may be claimed, and such law shall not apply to funds held by Amtrak as a result of the purchase of tickets after April 30, 1972 for which no refund has been claimed.

SEC. 345. Notwithstanding any other provision in law, of the amounts made available under the Federal Aviation Administration's operations account, the FAA shall provide personnel at Dutch Harbor, Arkansas to provide real-time weather and runway observation and other such functions to help ensure the safety of aviation operations.

SEC. 346. VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVES FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to avoid or minimize the need for involuntary separations due to a reduction in force, reorganization, transfer of function, or other similar action, the Secretary of Transportation may pay, or authorize the payment of, voluntary separation incentive payments to employees of the United States Coast Guard, Research and Special Programs Administration, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Office of the Secretary, Federal Railroad Administration, and employees of the Department in positions targeted for reduction under the National Performance Review who separate from Federal service voluntarily through September 30, 2000 (whether by retirement or resignation).

(b) *AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN.*—The Secretary shall submit, for review and approval, a strategic plan to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget prior to obligating any resources for voluntary separation incentive payments allowed under this Act.

(1) The plan shall—

(A) include the number and amounts of voluntary separation incentive payments to be offered;

(B) specify how the voluntary separation incentives will achieve downsizing goals;

(C) include a proposed time period for the payment of such incentives; and

(D) include the positions and functions to be reduced or eliminated identified by organizational unit, geographic location or occupational category and grade level.

(2) A voluntary separation incentive payment under this section may be paid to any eligible employee only to the extent necessary to eliminate the positions and functions identified by the strategic plan.

(c) *CONDITIONS AND AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.*—In order to receive a voluntary separation incentive payment, an employee must separate from service with the Department (whether by retirement or resignation) within the applicable period of time specified in the agency plan. An employee's agreement to separate with an incentive payment is binding upon the employee and the Department, unless the employee and the Department mutually agree otherwise.

(1) A voluntary separation incentive payment shall be paid in a lump sum after the employee's separation and be equal to the lesser of—

(A) an amount equal to the amount the employee would have been entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5, United States Code (without adjustment for any previous payment made under such section), if the employee were entitled to payment under such section; or

(B) if the employee separates during—

(i) fiscal year 1997, \$25,000;

(ii) fiscal year 1998, \$20,000;

(iii) fiscal year 1999, \$15,000;

(iv) fiscal year 2000, \$10,000;

(3) not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation of any other type of benefit;

(4) not be taken into account in determining the amount of any severance pay to which the employee may be entitled under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, based on any other separation;

(5) be available from appropriations or funds available for the payment of the basic pay of the employee.

(d) *EFFECT OF SUBSEQUENT EMPLOYMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT.*—An employee who has received a voluntary separation incentive payment under this section and accepts employment with, or enters into a personal services contract with, any Federal agency or instrumentality of the United States within 5 years after the date of the separation on which the payment is based shall be required to repay the entire amount of the incentive payment to the Department.

(1) The repayment required under this subsection may be waived only by the Secretary.

(e) *ADDITIONAL AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RETIREMENT FUND.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In addition to any other payments which it is required to make under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, the Department shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 15 percent of the final basic pay of each employee of the Department covered by chapters 83 or 84 of title 5, United States Code, to whom a voluntary separation incentive payment has been made.

(2) *DEFINITION.*—For the purpose of this section, the term "final basic pay," with respect to an employee, means the total amount of basic pay which would be payable for a year of serv-

ice by such employee, computed using the employee's final rate of basic pay, and, if last serving on other than a full-time basis, with appropriate adjustment therefor.

(f) *VOLUNTARY RELEASE PROGRAM.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department shall implement regulations that shall permit its employees, who are not scheduled for separation by RIF, to volunteer for RIF separation in place of other employees who are scheduled for RIF separation until September 30, 2000.

(g) *CONTINUANCE OF GOVERNMENT SHARE OF HEALTH BENEFITS COVERAGE.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department shall pay the Government share of the health benefits coverage of any of its employees separated by RIF for up to 18 months following the employee's separation from Federal service, provided that the employee pays his requisite share of such costs over the same 18 month period.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS HIGHWAY PROVISIONS

【SEC. 401. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, semitrailer units operating in a truck tractor-semi-trailer combination whose semitrailer unit is more than forty-eight feet in length and truck tractor-semi-trailer-trailer combinations specified in section 3111(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, may not operate on United States Route 15 in Virginia between the Maryland border and the intersection with United States Route 29.

【SEC. 402. Item 30 of the table contained in section 1107(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2050), relating to Mobile, Alabama, is amended in the second column by inserting after "Alabama" the following: "and for feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, and construction of a new bridge and approaches over the Mobile River".

【SEC. 403. Item 94 of the table contained in section 1107(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2052), relating to St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, is amended—

【(1) by striking "St. Thomas,"; and

【(2) by inserting after "the island" the following: "of St. Thomas and improvements to the VIPA Molasses Dock intermodal port facility on the island of St. Croix to make the facility capable of handling multiple cargo tasks".】

SEC. 403. The funds authorized to be appropriated for highway-railroad grade crossing separations in Mineola, New York, under the head "Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Demonstration Project (Highway Trust Fund)" in House Report 99-976 and section 302(l) of Public Law 99-591 are hereby also authorized to be appropriated for other grade crossing improvements in Nassau and Suffolk Counties in New York and shall be available in accordance with the terms of the original authorization in House Report 99-976.

SEC. 404. The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement modifying the agreement entered into pursuant to section 336 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103-331) and section 356 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104-50) to provide an additional line of credit not to exceed \$25,000,000, which may be used to replace otherwise required contingency reserves; provided, however, that the Secretary may only enter into such modification if it is supported by the amount of the original appropriation (provided by section 336 of Public Law 103-331). No additional appropriation is made by this section. In implementing this section, the Secretary may enter into an agreement requiring an interest rate, on

both the original line of credit and the additional amount provided for herein, higher than that currently in force and higher than that specified in the original appropriation. An agreement entered into pursuant to this section may not obligate the Secretary to make any funds available until all remaining contingency reserves are exhausted, and in no event shall any funds be made available before October 1, 1998.

【SEC. 405. Public Law 100-202 is amended in the item relating to "Traffic Improvement Demonstration Project" by inserting after "project" the following: "or upgrade existing local roads".】

SEC. 406. The amount appropriated for the Lake Shore Drive extension study, Whiting, Indiana, under the matter under the heading "SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS" under the heading "FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION" in title I of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103-331; 108 Stat. 2478), shall be made available to carry out the congestion relief project for the construction of a 4-lane road and overpass at Merrillville, Indiana, authorized by item 35 of section 1104(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2030).

【TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

【SEC. 501. (a) *LIMITATION ON NEW LOAN GUARANTEES FOR CERTAIN RAILROAD PROJECTS.*—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the cost of any new loan guarantee commitment for any railroad project, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such railroad project is an international railroad project of the United States and another country, or a railroad project in the United States in the vicinity of the United States border with another country.

【(b) *EXCEPTION.*—Subsection (a) shall not apply when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

【(1) a comprehensive study has been conducted after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding criminal activities that have occurred on existing railroads of such type, including—

【(A) the use of such railroads to facilitate the smuggling of illegal aliens and illegal drugs into the United States, and the impact of such smuggling on the total number of illegal aliens, and the total amount of illegal drugs, entering the United States; and

【(B) the commission of robberies against such railroads; and

【(2) a detailed report setting forth the results of such study has been issued and made available to the public.

【SEC. 502. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Transportation Safety Board to plan, conduct, or enter into any contract for a study to determine the feasibility of allowing individuals who are more than 60 years of age to pilot commercial aircraft.】

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able to present the fiscal 1997 appropriations bill dealing with the Department of Transportation and related agencies. The subcommittee allocation was \$11.95 billion in budget authority and \$35.453 billion in outlays. This allocation is \$240 million lower in budget authority than the House's allocation when they passed the bill on June 28.

In spite of this limitation, I am proud of this bill because it addresses a number of concerns of not only the administration and my colleagues but also the American people. I should point out, however, that the bill is right at its allocation for both budget authority and outlays. So any amendments that increased spending would have to be offset with the necessary cuts to other parts of the bill.

This bill provides funding above that requested by the administration and above that provided by the House in two areas of critical importance: Safety and infrastructure development.

In the safety area, this bill provides the Federal Aviation Administration funding for 250 additional air traffic controllers.

In the FAA's regulation and certification area, the bill provides for more than 250 additional staff, including airworthiness inspectors, airline operations inspectors, certification inspectors of engineers and pilots, and manufacturing inspectors. However, in light of and in response to the ValuJet crash, there is also funding for an additional 130 hazardous materials inspectors in the aviation area. These inspectors were not originally requested by the administration, nor were they funded in the House appropriations bill. And the bill also provides 20 new inspectors for the Research and Special Programs Administration, the lead agency within the Department of Transportation regarding hazardous materials.

Global air transportation of hazardous materials has been growing at a steady rate of approximately 7 percent per year. The majority of these goods—60 percent—are transported on passenger-carrying equipment. And, according to the FAA, the reported incidence in air transportation associated with this type of cargo has increased 122 percent since 1991.

Although the FAA with its given resources monitors the compliance of such carriers to the extent possible, it is estimated that almost 80 percent of the problems associated with this type of cargo originates with shippers. I believe that the traveling public needs an acceptable level of safety that can be achieved, not only with air carrier inspections but also with targeted inspections of freight forwarders, repair stations, and commercial shippers.

Therefore, this bill has funding of approximately \$12 million above the administration's request to address these safety problems. I believe that this is important to point out in light of the TWA Flight 800 tragedy.

This bill fully funds the administration's request for operational security of \$71.9 million which funds approximately 780 security personnel. This is a 6.6 percent increase over what was provided in fiscal year 1996.

The bill also provides the full amount requested at research funding for explosives and weapons detection. That is \$27.3 million.

In addition to increasing a number of positions in the aviation control, regulation, safety, and security areas, the bill provides an airport improvement program grant funding level of \$1.46 billion, \$160 million above the House's level, and \$110 million above the administration's level.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. President, that this bill is still under the House allocation.

In the Coast Guard area, the subcommittee has provided funding for very critical maintenance activities, and is \$14.3 million above the House level. The House cut was appealed directly to me by the Commandant of the Coast Guard who felt that a continued level was necessary in maintenance in the aircraft and boat area, which severely hamper the operational effectiveness of the Coast Guard in 1997.

I should also point out that the committee has not rescinded previous years' funds for the vessel traffic service systems, known as the VTS, and has provided the requested \$6 million for these VTS systems in 1997. However, there is report language directing the Coast Guard to tone down their ambitious plans and to develop a common platform and common architecture for a vessel traffic system before proceeding in the future.

In the highway area, the committee rejected the administration's request that would have made some previously exempt highway programs part of the overall obligation ceiling, and would have rescinded \$300 million of previously authorized ISTEA highway projects. Despite the budget constraints, there is an increase of \$100 million over the House level for the Federal aid highway program of \$17.6 billion. And there is \$250 million for the State Infrastructure Bank Program, which was not funded in the House bill.

In the rail area, the committee has increased funding for the House bill by providing \$200 million as requested for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, and provides \$130 million above the House mark for the Amtrak Capital Program. We have also fully funded, as has the House, the \$80 million requested for high-speed transits. In the transit area, we are slightly less than \$100 million above the House in the formula grants program, and are \$235 million above the House in the discretionary grants program. These funds are for rail modernization projects, transit new starts, and bus and bus related projects.

So you can see, despite having a lower 602(b) allocation in budget authority than the House, we have provided significant funding increases for areas that I feel very strongly about; namely, infrastructure improvement and safety related activities.

I believe that summarizes the bill. This year we received 770 separate requests from Senators, totaling \$16.3 billion in earmarks and specific requests. It is difficult to balance these varied

and sometimes conflicting needs, but I think this bill does a good job performing that balancing act while providing needed funds for safety improvement and infrastructure investments.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my colleague and former chairman of the subcommittee, a man who has been very supportive and helpful in crafting this bipartisan bill that we bring to the floor today, Senator LAUTENBERG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I thank my colleague and friend, Senator HATFIELD, for his ever constructive work and comments. This may be the last bill on transportation that Senator HATFIELD will manage. Long after his actions as a Senator, as a leader in the Senate, and as someone whom we all admire and respect, I hope we will continue our friendship and contact, but I will say a little bit more about that in a couple moments, if I may.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 3675, the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal 1997. The bill, as we know, was reported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee on Thursday, July 18. It would be my hope we could get a similarly unanimous vote for Senate passage of the bill.

Given the overall funding limitations that we face in this year's appropriations process, I think the bill before us does an excellent job in distributing scarce resources among the Nation's critical transportation needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this moment that Michael Brennan, a legislative fellow from the Department of Transportation who works with us, be granted privileges of the floor during the Senate consideration of H.R. 3675 and the conference report that will accompany this bill.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this transportation bill comes before the Senate and before the Congress at a very sensitive moment in our discussions and deliberations here. The image of TWA Flight 800 is fresh in our mind. We all now grieve with those who lost loved ones, horrified at the shock that families, in some cases, lost two or three members of the family. One man lost his wife and two children. We can hardly comprehend the pain and the anguish that must go with something like that.

What an odd coincidence that at the moment we are considering how much money we spend on transportation, including safety in the air and safety in other modes of transportation, we face a time when, again, we wish that we could have done more, if it was possible, to prevent something like that.

I think it is important as we consider what the investment is going to be in transportation infrastructure in our society we not lose sight of what took

place on that fateful day when TWA 800 went down. But we also cannot easily forget the ValuJet crash, the problem with the Delta Air Lines airplane as it was taking off and the mother and child were killed even though the airplane never got into the air; the engine disintegrated and tore into the fuselage.

We, unfortunately, can recall an accident in New Jersey and an accident in Maryland on the rails when Amtrak, in the Maryland instance, and, in New Jersey, the New Jersey Transit Co. lost people as a result of a crash. We are all too familiar with what happens on our highways each day in each State; that when we invest in transportation, it is not simply another way to spend money; that it has a real life-and-death effect on the way people move between work and home or recreation and home or shopping and home; and that when we look at what happens with our air quality—and everybody is concerned about what we leave to future generations—we try to improve it the best way we can. And the significant way to do that is through effective investments in transportation.

For the knowledge of the body—and I think everyone is aware of it, but I remind you even though it may be redundant—the United States, among the most advanced nations in the world, spends the least as a percentage of GDP on transportation infrastructure. When we look at the per capita spending in the United States on transportation infrastructure spending, we are the equivalent of some of the more primitive or more backward nations of the world, those on the African Continent, poor, poverty-stricken nations. I hope this year we recognize this is one area in which we cannot afford to skimp.

This is an excellent bill considering the appropriations we had to work with. It is a much more balanced approach than the House-passed bill. The bill does an excellent job of addressing to the maximum degree possible—and I emphasize the maximum degree possible—the priorities of all Members as well as the priorities of the administration. It is a testament to Chairman HATFIELD's cooperative effort that there is not even a hint of a veto overshadowing this bill. The administration has seen that the chairman has worked almost magic in terms of getting the appropriate balance with resources still too little, in my view.

For the Federal Aviation Administration, the bill includes additional funds requested by the administration to address the specific problems associated with the transportation of hazardous materials. These materials have been implicated as the possible cause of the recent tragic ValuJet crash.

Moreover, as we await answers to the many questions surrounding the tragedy on TWA flight 800, I think it is important to point out that the bill before us fully funds the administration's requested increase for civil aviation security.

For the Coast Guard, the bill comes close to fully funding the Commandant's request for operations and acquisition. The Coast Guard has implemented its own well-designed streamlining plan to reduce costs, and I am pleased that they will not be required to endure further reductions as part of this bill.

We depend on the Coast Guard to be ever ready and at their post in the event of all kinds of national contingencies, whether it is for emergency response to marine accidents and oil spills, search and rescue, national security, or, as we have seen most recently, the collection of evidence and debris from the TWA tragedy.

We depend on the Coast Guard to be ready to serve on a moment's notice. I was in East Moriches, Long Island, a week ago Saturday shortly after the crash occurred, and I couldn't have been more proud of the Coast Guard, who was there as quickly as possible. I flew with the helicopter pilot who was the first Coast Guard pilot on the scene. He said when the sea was still burning, it looked like an inferno. And I saw the loyalty, despite the terrible stress, and the commitment of each of them, their having counseling and review of their own emotions, because in each case, they see themselves and they see their own families.

The Coast Guard is a fantastic branch of service, Mr. President. Again, I do not want to leave out the NTSB and the FBI and the Navy and the others who are working so diligently to try to provide the answers that we hope will come soon. But a branch of service like the Coast Guard often does not get the credit that it deserves as we give them ever-more assignments. As one coastal State Senator, I assure you that they have served us well over last year, over the many years in the past.

Within the Federal Highway Administration, the Appropriations Committee has been able to find sufficient resources to allow full funding for prior-year highway projects. The bill before us provides an overall increase in the obligation ceiling for highway formula funds.

Within the Federal Transit Administration, the bill before us achieves a new high in the funding of transit discretionary capital grants, and while the bill freezes operations assistance at the fiscal 1996 level, it provides an increase for transit formula capital assistance.

I am especially pleased with the committee's recommendations for the Federal Railroad Administration. The House-passed bill singled out Amtrak for some truly destructive funding cuts. The bill before us takes a much more balanced approach, and it provides full funding for the President's request for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program and the special one-time appropriations for new high-speed train assists.

The bill also provides an increase for Amtrak's capital account, permitting

them to invest in capital equipment, in trackage, in signs, in electrification. The only way Amtrak can hope to become self-sufficient is if it has adequate funds to invest in its deteriorating capital plant. The bill before us makes a sizable investment toward that goal.

While there are some questions raised about Amtrak and its service in the highly populated Northeast Corridor, I remind our colleagues that were it not for Amtrak, and if we want to provide the same level of transportation facility to those who travel between Boston, New York, and Washington, we need something like 10,000 DC-9's a year to pick up that slack. Imagine, 10,000 extra airplane flights a year over our skies with all the noise and all the congestion and everything else.

So, once again, the funds that we are investing are funds that have a significant effect on the quality of life of our citizens.

Mr. President, it is with some pain that I must make note of the fact—and I have made note of the fact—that this will be the last appropriations bill that Senator HATFIELD will manage in his capacity as subcommittee chairman. In many ways, I hope it is the last and hope that it will get to the President and get signed and we don't have to do this one over again. We shouldn't have to. But as always, his openness and fair mindedness has brought an ability to get things through the maze and bring it to this point and we hope soon to the President's desk.

In his 2 years as chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee, Senator HATFIELD has certainly distinguished himself as an informed and wise policymaker in the transportation arena. I have always admired his leadership, and I will always treasure his friendship. Mr. President, it is obvious there is only one person I would rather see as chairman of that subcommittee than Senator HATFIELD. I will not go any further. Just a joke.

Once again, I commend this bill to all my colleagues, and I hope that they will work with us to support the passage of the bill and that it does not become a forum for other discussions. It is late in the year; it is late in the week. We will soon be departing this place for other activities back home, and it would be too bad if this bill became a forum for debate that is unrelated particularly to transportation matters.

With that, I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 3675, the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation for many years, and was once chairman of the subcommittee. I have long been an advocate for increased and sustained funding for our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

The transportation appropriations bill is the preeminent contributor to our Nation's annual investment in infrastructure. Our Nation's economic prosperity depends heavily on the adequacy of our highways, our airports, our railroads, and our transit systems. As such, this is a critically important bill for the overall economic health of the Nation.

This bill also finances our entire Federal effort in the area of transportation safety, including the safety and security of our aviation and rail systems. The recent explosion on TWA Flight 800, which has been alluded to here already, and the associated loss of life, serve as a cruel reminder of the critical safety mission executed by our Department of Transportation.

I congratulate Senator HATFIELD, the Transportation Subcommittee chairman, and I congratulate the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee, Senator LAUTENBERG, for their expeditious action, their skillful and dedicated work on this bill.

Given the overall limitations we face for this year's appropriations bills, I believe that this bill represents a fair and balanced approach to the transportation needs of cities and communities throughout the Nation.

And I am particularly pleased that the committee rejected what I believe to be an ill-considered proposal by the administration that would have placed a cap on previously funded obligations for highway projects. Indeed, the bill before us provides an overall increase in the Federal aid highway obligation ceiling which provides critically needed highway funding for all 50 States.

So I commend Chairman HATFIELD and Senator LAUTENBERG for presenting to the Senate a bill that is free of controversial authorizing legislation. On balance, although I would support substantially more funding for the Nation's infrastructure than we are able to provide in this bill, I believe that H.R. 3675 deserves the support of all Senators.

Finally, Mr. President, I congratulate the efforts of the subcommittee staff—Pat McCann, Anne Miano, and Joyce Rose for the majority, and Peter Rogoff and Carole Geagley for the minority—for their outstanding work on this very important measure.

This is the last time that Senator HATFIELD will manage this transportation bill on the floor of the Senate.

I thank him for his long and illustrious service to the Senate, to his State, and to the Nation. I thank him for his steadfast friendship over the years. I thank him for his bipartisanism, his true bipartisanship, that he has demonstrated not only on this bill but on many other bills and which has been a hallmark of his service in this body. He has tremendous courage. As far as I am concerned, he is one of those few men and women in the history of the Senate who is truly a profile in courage.

I thank both the chairman and the ranking member again, as I say, for

their services to the Senate and to the people of this country and to the country itself.

Emerson must have had men like these in mind when he said:

Not gold, but only men can make a nation great and strong;

Men who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and labor long;

Real men who work while others sleep, Who dare while others fly.

They build a nation's pillars deep

And lift them to the sky.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, first I thank my colleague and ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator LAUTENBERG, for his kind personal remarks. It has been a great pleasure and honor to work with Senator LAUTENBERG in this role. I am grateful to him for his many suggestions and recommendations.

I think, I say to Senator LAUTENBERG, if you and I were to really put the focus on the hard work and the effort and the accomplishment of this subcommittee, we would have to really look to our staff—your staff, Peter Rogoff, and my staff, Pat McCann and Anne Miano—who worked so well, beautifully together, meshing our common interests, crafting a bill that we are able to stand here and defend before the Senate.

I say, of Senator BYRD's very generous and kind remarks, that he has been a mentor. I should be thanking him for those remarks because I am sure that, like many, if not most of the Senate who have watched and listened to Senator BYRD over the years, we have learned a great deal not only about the Senate's history, but about the way legislation proceeds and the cooperation, collaboration that must be achieved on both sides of the aisle to pass legislation. I am very grateful for his most generous remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that they be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment and that no points of order be waived thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to, en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 5123 THROUGH 5125, EN BLOC

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have three technical amendments that I offer on behalf of the committee. They have been cleared on both sides, correcting the spelling, other such technical matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] proposes amendments numbered 5123 through 5125, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 5123 through 5125) are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 5123

Strike section 346 and insert the following:

SEC. 346. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "agency" means the following agencies of the Department of Transportation:

(A) the United States Coast Guard;

(B) the Research and Special Programs Administration;

(C) the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;

(D) the Office of the Secretary;

(E) the Federal Railroad Administration;

and

(F) any other agency of the Department with respect to employees of such agency in positions targeted for reduction under the National Performance Review;

(2) the term "employee" means an employee (as defined by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) who is employed by the agency serving under an appointment without time limitation, and has been currently employed for a continuous period of at least 3 years, but does not include—

(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, or another retirement system for employees of the agency;

(B) an employee having a disability on the basis of which such employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under the applicable retirement system referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) an employee who is in receipt of a specific notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance;

(D) an employee who, upon completing an additional period of service as referred to in section 3(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (5 U.S.C. 5597 note), would qualify for a voluntary separation incentive payment under section 3 of such Act;

(E) an employee who has previously received any voluntary separation incentive payment by the Federal Government under this section or any other authority and has not repaid such payment;

(F) an employee covered by statutory reemployment rights who is on transfer to another organization; or

(G) any employee who, during the twenty four month period preceding the date of separation, has received a recruitment or relocation bonus under section 5753 of title 5, United States Code, or who, within the twelve month period preceding the date of separation, received a retention allowance under section 5754 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency, prior to obligating any resources for voluntary separation incentive payments, shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House of Representatives a strategic plan outlining the intended use of such incentive payments and a proposed organizational chart for the agency once such incentive payments have been completed.

(2) CONTENTS.—The agency's plan shall include—

(A) the positions and functions to be reduced or eliminated, identified by organizational unit, geographic location, occupational category and grade level;

(B) the number and amounts of voluntary separation incentive payments to be offered; and

(C) a description of how the agency will operate without the eliminated positions and functions.

(C) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A voluntary separation incentive payment under this section may be paid by an agency to any employee only to the extent necessary to eliminate the positions and functions identified by the strategic plan.

(2) AMOUNT AND TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—A voluntary separation incentive payment—

(A) shall be paid in a lump sum after the employee's separation;

(B) shall be paid from appropriations or funds available for the payment of the basic pay of the employees;

(C) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(i) an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5, United States Code; or

(ii) an amount determined by an agency head not to exceed \$25,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$20,000 in fiscal year 1998, \$15,000 in fiscal year 1999, or \$10,000 in fiscal year 2000;

(D) shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit; and

(E) shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of any severance pay to which the employee may be entitled under section 5595 of title 5, United States Code, based on any other separation.

(3) LIMITATION.—No amount shall be payable under this section based on any separation occurring before the date of the enactment of this Act, or after September 30, 2000.

(d) ADDITIONAL AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RETIREMENT FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other payments which it is required to make under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, an agency shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 15 percent of the final basic pay of each employee of the agency who is covered under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to whom a voluntary separation incentive has been paid under this section.

(2) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of paragraph (1), the term "final basic pay", with respect to an employee, means the total amount of basic pay which would be payable for a year of service by such employee, computed using the employee's final rate of basic pay, and, if last serving on other than a full-time basis, with appropriate adjustment therefor.

(e) EFFECT OF SUBSEQUENT EMPLOYMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT.—An individual who has received a voluntary separation incentive payment under this section and accepts any employment for compensation with the Government of the United States, or who works for any agency of the United States Government through a personal services contract, within 5 years after the date of the separation on which the payment is based shall be required to pay, prior to the individual's first day of employment, the entire amount of the incentive payment to the agency that paid the incentive payment.

(f) REDUCTION OF AGENCY EMPLOYMENT LEVELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The total number of funded employee positions in an agency shall be reduced by one position for each vacancy created by the separation of any employee who has received, or is due to receive, a vol-

untary separation incentive payment under this section. For the purposes of this subsection, positions shall be counted on a full-time-equivalent basis.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The President, through the Office of Management and Budget, shall monitor each agency and take any action necessary to ensure that the requirements of this subsection are met.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect October 1, 1996.

AMENDMENT NO. 5124

On page 63 of the bill, line 24, strike "Arkansas" and insert "Alaska".

AMENDMENT NO. 5125

On page 60 of the bill, line 21, strike "5307" and insert "5311".

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered and agreed to, en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 5123 through 5125) were agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the parliamentary situation is the bill is open for further amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATFIELD. Perhaps there are none, and we could go to third reading, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5126

(Purpose: To fully fund the President's request for Aviation Security Research)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] proposes amendment numbered 5126.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 17, strike "\$132,500,000" and insert "\$132,499,000".

On page 14, line 22, strike "\$187,000,000" and insert "\$188,490,000".

On page 38, line 5, strike "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$198,510,000".

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this fully funds the President's request for aviation security research. It is off-set in budget authority as well as outlays.

Mr. HATFIELD. It is cleared on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 5126) was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table, Mr. President.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear that this is "human factors research for security." That is the title under which this legislation is proposed.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, would the chairman yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. I would be happy to yield for a question from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I understand the committee has included \$6 million in the transportation appropriations bill for the development of vessel traffic service systems or VTS systems by the Coast Guard. I wanted to briefly ask the chairman whether it is the intent of the committee's report language that the Coast Guard undertake a review of this system, including the costs associated with implementing the program, before proceeding with their plans to install these systems in various ports around the country, including Mobile, AL.

The GAO report that the committee refers to in its report identified serious underestimations of the cost of the VTS 2000 program. I continue to have serious reservations about this system and the Coast Guard's current plan for its implementation and use. It would appear that the GAO has raised many important issues that need to be resolved before the Coast Guard proceeds in the implementation of this program. It is the intent of the committee that such a review take place by the Coast Guard before it proceeds with the VTS program?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. The report language directs the Coast Guard to tone down their ambitious plans, and to develop a common platform and common architecture for vessel traffic systems before proceeding in the future.

Mr. SHELBY. I appreciate the chairman's assurances on this matter.

Mr. HATFIELD. 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. HATFIELD. 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. REID. Mr. President, I am concerned that the committee report does not contain bus and bus facility funds for the Regional Transportation Commission of Clark County, NV. The RTC's CAT System has witnessed phenomenal growth and has seen an annual increase of ridership of over 36

percent. Its service hours and service miles per bus is more than double that of any other transit system in the United States.

The RTC has requested \$5 million to complete its integrated bus maintenance facilities project to properly maintain and store its equipment fleet, and \$5 million for new rolling stock to initiate express bus commuter service. Past transportation appropriations bills have provided funding for this project, recognizing its need and significance.

While I appreciate the many demands on the Senate for bus discretionary funds, I urge the chairman to give full consideration to the needs of Clark County, NV for this important funding.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada is correct that the RTC of Clark County is certainly a worthy candidate for discretionary bus and bus facility funds. In fiscal year 1996, nearly \$17 million was provided for the project. I look forward to working with the Senator to make every effort to assist in advancing its project.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his efforts during the appropriation process. I appreciate the fact that the Senate transportation appropriation report includes \$30 million for bus and bus-related facilities in the State of Ohio. I would, however, like to make sure that this \$30 million will be made available to the Ohio Department of Transportation to be used for bus and bus-related facilities in a manner determined by the Ohio Department of Transportation.

Mr. HATFIELD. I say to Senator DEWINE that it is the intent of the Appropriations Committee that the \$30 million earmarked in Senate Report 104-325 for Ohio bus and bus-related facilities be available to the Ohio Department of Transportation to be used for bus and bus-related facilities in a manner determined by the Ohio Department of Transportation.

Mr. President, we have a list of notifications of Members that indicated they wished to present an amendment—about a dozen. I invite Members to the floor to present those amendments. We are going to have to finish this bill tonight, as the leader indicated earlier, and I hope the Senators would see fit, if they are interested in pursuing these amendments, to appear on the floor and make their presentation.

At some point in time I think the courtesy of waiting for those amendments will expire, and I will suggest we might go to a third reading of the bill and pass the bill. My patience is growing less at this point in time. I think every Senator is busy. I have many things I can do rather than stand here waiting for other Senators.

I make a very strong appeal to Senators, and if their staffs are present, to alert those Senators that we are here to do business. If not, we will go to third reading.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 5127 AND 5128, EN BLOC

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk, en bloc, on behalf of Senator KOHL and Senator BOND, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] proposes amendments numbered 5127 and 5128, en bloc.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 5127

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a performance-based organization)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . It is the Sense of the Senate that Congress should actively consider legislation to establish the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a performance-based organization on a pilot basis beginning in fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 5128

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Congress concerning the use of full and open competition in procurement for the Federal Aviation Administration and to require an independent assessment of the acquisition management system of the Federal Aviation Administration)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION PROCUREMENT.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration should promote and encourage the use of full and open competition as the preferred method of procurement for the Federal Aviation Administration.

(b) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 1997, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(1) take such action as may be necessary to provide for an independent assessment of the acquisition management system of the Federal Aviation Administration that includes a review of any efforts of the Administrator in promoting and encouraging the use of full and open competition as the preferred method of procurement with respect to any contract that involves an amount greater than \$50,000,000; and

(2) submit to the Congress a report on the findings of that independent assessment.

(c) FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “full and open competition” has the meaning provided that term in section 4(6) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(6)).

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, these two amendments have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (No. 5127 and 5128), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I make an observation that the amendments on the list that we have are all legislation—matters relating to legislation on an appropriations bill. We have indicated that in cases of emergency and timeframe problems, if they are cleared by the authorizing chairman and the authorizing committee ranking member, we would accept them. But we will not accept legislation on this appropriations bill.

Our leadership, both Republican and Democratic, has already stated that we would try to resist all riders on appropriations bills, which held us up a great deal in the last fiscal year and caused us to go, in part, into that situation where we had five appropriation bills that we had to incorporate in an omnibus package 7 months into the fiscal year. We are very desperately trying to avoid that this year. I am proud to say that by the end of this week we will have passed nine appropriation bills here in the Senate. I have already signed, today, the conference report on the agricultural appropriations bill. We are hoping to have five bills passed in the conference, ready for floor action, at the end of this week.

So we are making very significant progress. We will report out the number 12 appropriation bill from our committee, State, Justice, Commerce, on Thursday of this week. We will report the last bill on the first week in September, Labor-HHS. That would give us a schedule that the Republican leader has put together, by which we would be able to meet that October deadline a week to 10 days before the expiration of this fiscal year. What a contrast to last year, and one that I would like to be able to achieve.

So, again, I want to say that we have been here now for about a half-hour waiting for amendments. I informed the Republican leader about 15 minutes ago that we were in this situation, waiting for some kind of action, and that I wanted to consider third reading at an appropriate time, which, to me, would be right now. But I am not the leader and, consequently, I will confer with the leadership on that kind of a decision. But I have to, again, assure our colleagues that we want to do business with them. We want to consider their amendments that have been cleared by both the chairman and the ranking member of authorizing committees, because most all of them are authorization actions. And that is a bipartisan policy that our leadership has

established and which this committee leadership has also agreed to.

I do not know what more we can say to require some action.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, to lend some further impetus to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I would plead with my colleagues on the Democratic side to get down here if you want to do business. I think it is a very poor reflection on what has to be done to set the stage for transportation investments in the year beginning October 1, a chance to establish the fact that things are happening, that we are responding to the need for transportation investment. For us to stand here while little, if anything, takes place, I think, reflects very poorly on the commitment to getting the job done.

I urge my colleagues, as we heard from Senator HATFIELD, to come on down, present your amendments, present the argument, and see if you can win the case. If the amendments are important, then I fail to see that there is no urgency to getting them down here, get them on the floor, and let us discuss them.

This is the transportation bill. We are talking about billions of dollars. We are talking about safety. We are talking about the way our Nation competes with other countries. We are talking about quality of air. We are talking about the consumption of fuel. We are talking about so many things here in this bill, and to permit it to languish while we sit here kind of staring at one another is, I think, unacceptable.

So I hope that we can encourage leadership on both sides, and the Senators on both sides, to get with it, get done, get going so we can get on to the next piece of business, or the next pieces of business which are very important.

With that, I note the absence of interest and the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5129

(Purpose: To respond to the tragic explosion of a sugar beet processing plant in Western Nebraska and to provide for the safe and efficient interstate transportation of sugar beets)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment on behalf of Senators KERREY and EXON to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. KERREY, for himself and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 5129.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

49 U.S.C. App. 2311 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

(D) NEBRASKA—In addition to vehicles which the State of Nebraska may continue to allow to be operated under paragraphs (1)(a) and (1)(B) of this section, the State of Nebraska may allow longer combination vehicles that were not in actual operation on June 1, 1991 to be operated within its boundaries to transport sugar beets and from the field where such sugar beets are harvested to storage, market, factory or stockpile or from stockpile to storage, market or factory. This provision shall expire on September 30, 1997.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is one of those examples of a legislative action that has been cleared by the ranking member and the chairman of the Commerce Committee, so under the exigencies of the situation in Nebraska, it has been cleared on both sides to be adopted here today on our bill.

I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5129) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5130

(Purpose: To allow funds previously appropriated for a highway safety improvement project in Michigan to be used for construction of a highway that is part of the project)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of Senator LEVIN of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 5130.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, MICHIGAN.

Of the amount appropriated for the highway safety improvement project, Michigan, under the matter under the heading "SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS" under the heading "FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION" in title I of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103-331; 108 Stat. 2478), for the purposes of right-of-way acquisition for Baldwin Road, and engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction between Walton Boulevard and Dixie Highway, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for construction of Baldwin Road.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is an amendment by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, that would move some money from one account to another account to handle a situation in

Michigan. This is not legislation on an appropriations bill, and there is a zero budget impact.

I believe it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. So, therefore, I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5130) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we are now approaching 50 minutes that we have waited here for Senators to arrive to offer amendments—50 wasted minutes. I really think we have approached the time for calling of third reading on this bill and vote this bill out, since we have not had response from Senators.

Is the Senator from North Dakota awaiting to present an amendment? I refrain from asking for third reading at this point.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5131

(Purpose: To require investigation of anti-competitive practices in air transportation)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 5131.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 6 after "\$53,376,000," insert the following: "of which such sums as necessary shall be used to investigate anti-competitive practices in air transportation, enforce Section 41712 of Title 49, and report to Congress by the end of the fiscal year on its progress to address anticompetitive practices, and".

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have a couple of amendments. The amendment I have just offered is an amendment that talks about the issue of anticompetitive practices in the airline industry. I know there are some in Congress who think that the deregulation of the airline industry has been a wonderful bonanza for our country. But there are some of us who live in the more sparsely populated areas of our

country who do not believe it has been such a bonanza. The sparsely populated States like North Dakota, for example, have less airline service now and pay more for it than prior to deregulation.

I am not a big fan of airline deregulation. I think I would be a big fan if I lived in Chicago and traveled to New York and Los Angeles, because then I would have far more carriers competing, lower prices, and a wide variety of flights to take. I suppose for folks who live in those markets, this has been a wonderful bonanza. For folks who live elsewhere, it has not worked out so well.

One of the interesting things about deregulation is that even when you deregulate an industry like the airlines you must also continue to have some kind of referee so that when someone does something that distorts the market or injures the market, that someone can step in, an authority can step in and say, "No, this is a practice that is anticompetitive."

The whole notion of deregulation is to set free the competitive forces by which, through competition, you have more service and lower prices. But there are practices that are or can be inherently anticompetitive, even under deregulation. That is especially the case in rural areas.

Let me give you a couple of instances. Last week, in North Dakota we learned that a jet carrier that had started up a couple of years ago to provide regional jet service to our State and some other rural areas was going to discontinue service in North Dakota. Now, that is not so unusual. We have lost Continental Airlines from North Dakota. We have lost Delta Airlines. We have lost American Airlines. Now we lose Frontier Airlines. We are getting accustomed to losing airlines under deregulation. We have one large dominant carrier left in North Dakota. It is a good carrier. I think it is a good company. I speak well of it. I admire its service. I think it does well. But we do not do well when we do not have competition. When you do not have competition, you have less service and pay higher prices.

Now, a regional jet carrier starts up to provide some regional jet service competition. What happens under today's deregulation environment when they try to do that? The large carriers squash them like bugs. They say, "We do not want competition. We do not want a new carrier to start up."

So what do they do? Well, first of all, under deregulation, the large carriers have no requirement at all to have any sort of code-sharing with any new carrier. Take the airline that started in North Dakota to fly to the Denver hub. The Denver hub is dominated by one carrier, one of the largest airline companies in the country. That carrier says to a new jet service, "We have no interest in cooperating with you in any way. We are not interested in offering you code-sharing in any circumstance." And if you want to make

money you make money hauling people from point A to point B, and that is it—from Bismarck, ND, to Denver, CO. Of course most people are not traveling from Bismarck to Denver. They are traveling from Bismarck to Denver and then to Los Angeles, to Chicago, to Phoenix, to San Francisco, or elsewhere.

The result is, because a large carrier prohibits or simply refuses to cooperate in any way—especially with code-sharing—with a startup carrier, the startup carrier is severely disadvantaged.

In addition to that, the large carrier will go to the travel agents in those communities and say, "I tell you what, we do not want you to ticket on this new competitive airline. We want you to ticket with us. Go a more circuitous route, travel more miles, but travel with us. What we will do is pay the travel agents' override commissions." They effectively say to travel agents, "If you keep people off this new airline, we will pay you to do it." Of course, when the new airline leaves that community and no longer serves, all these overrides, the payments to the travel agents, will be gone. But that is the way this practice works.

Fundamentally, anticompetitive practices by airlines who have gotten big enough to wield the economic clout, the sheer muscle power, injure the startup companies. If I dominate a hub, say in Minneapolis, Denver, or some other hub, I will describe the kind of competition I have in and out of that hub, because I can enforce that competition. I can enforce it by keeping people out and by letting in only those who I choose to let in. Now, that is the circumstance under deregulation without a referee.

Now, I happen to think we do not have a very aggressive effort in the Department of Transportation dealing with these issues of anticompetitive behavior or anticompetitive practices. Am I critical of DOT? Yes, I have been after them for 2 years on these issues. If I am a new carrier that starts up to provide jet service from North Dakota to Denver, for example, I do not even show up on the first one or two computer screens when a travel agent in Los Angeles decides it will book a flight from Los Angeles to North Dakota and back. I do not show up on the screen as providing jet service. That is anticompetitive. It is a computer reservation system, controlled by a dominant carrier that is anticompetitive.

There are a number of anticompetitive practices that occur and not much is done about it. For 2 years I have been after the Department of Transportation to do something about it. They drag their feet for a year and a half, and now there is some work, maybe they are starting to do some things—probably too late, maybe not aggressive enough. My hope is that perhaps in the near future we will see the Department of Transportation do what it ought to do—become the referee, the

arbiter of fairness, in what is competitive and what is anticompetitive in this industry.

The amendment I have offered simply says that the Secretary of Transportation shall use such funds as is necessary to investigate anticompetitive practices in air transportation, to enforce section 41712 of title 49, and to report to Congress by the end of the fiscal year on its progress to address anticompetitive practices.

I hope if this is accepted, and I understand it will be, that the Secretary of Transportation will take this seriously and do aggressively what it should have been doing the last couple of years.

I understand some people would like there to be no discussion on amendments that are offered that are being accepted. I am sorry about that, but the fact is I have also been waiting here for an hour, and when I offer an amendment, I intend to be able to speak on it as I wish.

I have a couple of other amendments that I will offer. But I ask that this amendment be accepted, if it is acceptable to the majority and minority.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Dakota makes a very good case. Despite the fact that I come from one of the most active transportation centers of the country, New Jersey, and we are the most densely populated State, we need access to aviation and so forth. I agree that the problems that have developed since deregulation have not always been things that we anticipated.

I talked with the Secretary of Transportation, and I made the point that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota made so eloquently just now on the floor. He tells me—and I am sure this is nothing new to the Senator from North Dakota—about the fact that United Airlines has agreed with the cooperative baggage arrangements and cooperative ticketing, though code sharing has not yet become part of the picture.

Unfortunately, in the deregulated mode, the contracts are between airlines. But I am assured that the Secretary will be looking at the anticompetitive situation of small rural airports around the country, whether jet service is available and why it is discontinued. I have that commitment to him. I pass that on to the Senator from North Dakota, so he has a basis for review as time goes by.

We continue to subsidize essential air service in the hope that we will be of some help. Meanwhile, I think the Senator has a good point. We accept his amendment from this side. I assume that the other side also is agreeable.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, has there been a modification of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator sent up a modified version of the amendment, which is before us at this time.

Mr. STEVENS. Has the Senator modified his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not technically.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator makes a good point. The clerk did not fully read the amendment by our request. I wonder if we could just have a reminder about what is an item to item 1 and 2, where it starts—

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I merely want to find out, is the Senator going to modify the amendment in the form I have before me? This is amendment No. 5131, is that correct?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I can clear that up. I only offered one amendment. It is at the desk. It is the amendment that I had cleared through the manager.

Mr. STEVENS. I misunderstood the situation. I thought it was being modified from its original form.

Mr. DORGAN. The original amendment was never offered.

Mr. STEVENS. Very well. Really, as an original sponsor of the whole concept of the essential air service, I am pleased to see this amendment come forth in this form. We would have had to oppose the creation of a new office. But this does not do that, so we are prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 5131) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5132

(Purpose: To reduce the level of funding for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 5132.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following.

On page 25, strike lines 9 through 14, provided that the \$200,000,000 thus saved be made available to the Secretary for high priority rail, aviation and highway safety purposes.

On page 29, line 6, strike "\$592,000,000" and insert "\$462,000,000".

On page 29, line 9, strike "\$250,000,000" and insert "\$120,000,000, provided that the \$130,000,000 thus saved be made available to the Secretary for high priority rail, aviation and highway safety purposes."

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask if the managers would like to agree to a time agreement. I would be more than happy to discuss that.

Mr. STEVENS. I am interested in a time agreement if the Senator would indicate how long he might want.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the managers are agreeable, 15 minutes on a side. Senator BIDEN asked to be notified at the time of the presentation of the amendment. He also said he would agree to a time agreement, but he would like to have time to debate this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator wishes time to contact the Senator from Delaware. If the Senator will proceed, we will try to get a time agreement.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I fully intend to enter into a time agreement with the managers of the bill at the appropriate time when they come up with a proposal.

Mr. President, this amendment would restore Amtrak's funding to the House passed level and provide the savings to the Secretary of Transportation for high priority rail, highway, and aviation safety purposes.

The House overwhelmingly passed the fiscal 1997 Transportation appropriations bill by a vote of 403 to 2 and appropriated a total of \$462 million for Amtrak's operating expenses and capital improvements.

The Senate has added \$330 million to this bill for Amtrak's capital accounts, adding \$200 million for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program which the House did not fund at all. This amounts to at least a 61-percent increase in Amtrak funding over the House appropriated levels. While I understand that some of my colleagues believe that if we continue to throw additional money at Amtrak, its financial problems will disappear, I believe the House-passed funding levels are more than sufficient and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I also know that some will come to the floor to argue that unless we give Amtrak this massive increase in capital grants over and above the House-passed level, Amtrak will find it even harder to reach self-sufficiency. While their intentions may be good, we have been repeatedly promised that with increased expenditures Amtrak will become self-sufficient. That has never been the case before. I do not believe that will be the case today.

Amtrak began in 1971 as a 2-year experiment. Since its creation in 1971, Amtrak has cost the American taxpayer about 418 billion. This \$18 billion has gone to subsidizing rail transportation for less than one-half of 1 percent of America's intercity rail passengers. In addition, a recent study by economists Wendell Cox and Jean Love found that the vast majority of Amtrak riders earn more than \$40,000 a year.

Let me just show my colleagues Amtrak funding from 1995. In 1995, there will be allotted to the State of New York \$215.862 million; to the State of California, \$119.531 million; the State of Pennsylvania, \$11.945 million; the State of Washington \$108.787 million. Those four States will receive \$556.125 million. A percentage of the funding—

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. Let me finish my statement, I say to the Senator.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would appreciate it if the Senator from New Jersey would observe the regular order. I said to him I do not wish to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator from New Jersey does not need a lesson on protocol.

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator from New Jersey obviously needs a lesson on the rules of the Senate because he interrupted me again as I have the floor.

I ask the Chair for the floor again. I hope that the Senator from New Jersey will not interrupt again as long as I choose not to yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on chart No. 2, I would like to show Amtrak revenues and expenses for fiscal years 1988 through 1994. As we can see, the expenses continue to go up and the revenues are basically flat.

This second chart reveals how, over the years, Amtrak's expenses have steadily grown at an accelerated pace while revenue have remained virtually the same. I believe this shows that Amtrak's problems are fundamental and the only question is whether the Federal Government will, at a minimum, put some limits on the amount of taxpayer dollars we are willing to lose to a failed experiment.

The point made by this third chart is basic. Amtrak appropriations have grown over its 25-year existence, and despite this fact, Amtrak still never seems to have enough Federal subsidization to cover its losses.

Mr. President, I remember with great clarity in 1983 when I came to the House of Representatives of the United States when I was visited by a man that I admired as much as any man I have ever known in my life, the former Secretary of the Navy who I had known on my tour in the Navy, Mr. Graham Claytor, Secretary Graham Claytor. Secretary Claytor was then President of Amtrak, and Secretary Claytor assured me that Amtrak funding would no longer be needed after 5 years; absolutely that would be the end because Secretary Claytor, and the other people who ran Amtrak and other Members of Congress, said that after 5 years there would be no need for any more Federal funding because Amtrak would be self-sufficient.

I would be glad to include for the RECORD how time after time after time over many previous years since 1971 that the assurances were given to this body and to the American taxpayers. "Do not worry. Four or 5 years from now the funding required for Amtrak will be finished."

Mr. President, on October 8, 1995, George Will wrote a very interesting and entertaining article that I would like to quote. He says:

Long ago, before Washington decided it did everything so well it should start running a passenger railroad, American slang included a phrase used to express dismay about mismanagement of organizations. The phrase is "Helluva way to run a railroad." Speaking of Amtrak . . .

Congress is speaking of it because conservatives are in a Margaret Thatcher mood. It was said she could not see an institution without swatting it with her handbag. Republicans, who praise governmental minimalism, can hardly close their year of glory without asking why the government is in the railroad business.

In a sense it has been for more than a century. The word "cordial" hardly suggests the intimacy between government—federal and state—and railroads in the 19th century, when 10 percent of the public domain was given in land grants to the transcontinental railroads. The Union Pacific was given one-tenth of Nebraska—4,845,997 acres.

Amtrak began, as did so much that makes today's conservatives cross, under Richard Nixon, during whose administration there occurred the largest peacetime expansion of government power in American history (wage and price controls) and the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, forced busing and racial set-asides. He failed to get Congress to enact a new entitlement, a guaranteed annual income, and to embark on what is now called "industrial policy" by funding development of a super-sonic transport aircraft.

"All through grade school," said Nixon, "my ambition was to become a railroad engineer." Would that he had. In March 1970, the largest operator of passenger trains, Penn Central, on the verge of bankruptcy, sought permission to end passenger service west of Harrisburg and Buffalo. For that, government deserved a portion of blame, the Interstate Commerce Commission having resisted rate increases commensurate with wage increases unions were winning. In a textbook example of how bad government begets more government, Amtrak was born.

It began operations in 1971, ostensibly as a two-year experiment. It has lost money since 1971, partly because it has been a mini-welfare state appended to the welfare state: It has been forbidden to contract out union jobs, and laid-off workers have been entitled to six years of severance pay. So, having helped make private railroads anemic (jet aircraft, better highways and inept railroad management contributed mightily to the anemia), the government piled on Amtrak its mandates that would keep it running in the red.

Helluva way to run a railroad? What do you expect from something created in defiance of market forces and regarded by its creators, the political class, as several varieties of pork, including an entitlement for small communities that want the government to guarantee continuing rail service for which there is weak demand?

Recently a full-page magazine ad by Amtrak bore this message at the bottom of the page: "No federal funds were used to pay for this message." What mendacity. Money is fungible, so taxpayers paid for as large a portion of the cost of that ad as they pay of the overall costs of Amtrak—about 20 percent. And Amtrak's ads are not producing congestion down at the old railroad depot. Amtrak carries less than one percent of the people who travel between cities, and half of its passengers are in the Northeast Corridor. Most

passengers are middle class, many of them business travelers. Almost all have air or long-haul bus transportation alternatives.

Defenders of the subsidies say, as defenders of subsidies do, that we are all benefiting so much that the subsidies "pay for themselves." Their argument is that because of passenger trains, highways are less congested, air is less polluted, we are delaying the evil day when federal money will have to help build another airport for Boston, and so on. There is some truth in all these arguments and a lot in this one: Government even more heavily subsidizes air and road passengers. United Airlines is not expected to build airports, and Greyhound is not responsible for maintaining the highways.

However, Congress is poised to shrink Amtrak subsidies from more than \$700 million next year to zero by 2002 at the latest, when Amtrak is scheduled to be privatized.

That obviously, has not been the case since Mr. Will wrote this article.

Mr. Will continues:

Its roadbed needs work, especially in the Northeast, and its rolling stock is old (the average car is 23 years old), so even with more reasonable work rules and more latitude to rationalize routes, privatization may not be possible. But trying to get the government out of railroading is not optional if the conservatives' determination to rationalize government is real.

Mr. President, this money that I am asking to be reduced would go to much needed rail, air, and road safety. We all realize how much safety is important; indeed, uppermost in the minds of many people as a result of some of the aircraft accidents that have taken place, some of the rail accidents that have taken place in America, and also some of the continued terrible tragedies that afflict the highways day in and day out.

So, Mr. President, I wonder if the managers of the bill are ready to enter into a time agreement?

In the meantime, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment there be a time agreement with 30 minutes on the side of those who oppose Senator MCCAIN's amendment and another 5 minutes for Senator MCCAIN.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If we can modify that, and that is that there be no second-degree amendments prior to a motion to table.

Mr. STEVENS. That time is on or in relation to this amendment and that there be no second-degree amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment by the Senator from Arizona. Cutting funding for Amtrak back to the inadequate level set by the House would be a big mistake and very bad public policy, in my view. It would be a formula for failure for the only intercity passenger rail service we have in America. The amendment would frustrate Amtrak's ongoing attempts to become self-sufficient. Instead of saving any money, it would waste funds already provided for passenger rail by virtually guaranteeing the demise of Amtrak.

It is a formula for failure, Mr. President, because it prevents Amtrak from completing the comprehensive reforms it needs to eventually become self-sufficient in its day-to-day operations.

I know my friends have heard me over the last 20 years make this same point. But no passenger rail service in the world—and passenger rail plays an important role all over the world—no passenger rail service in the world is, in fact, operated without public support for its capital needs. Whether it is in Europe or Japan, the most advanced industrialized economies in the world, not one passenger rail system in the world operates without support for its capital needs. It is these capital investments, the improvements to the Northeast corridor to carry high-speed trains and funds to purchase new locomotives and passenger cars for the western part of the United States as well as the Northeast corridor, that the McCain amendment hits the hardest.

Without upgrades to the bridges, without straightening out the curves, without completion of the electrification of the rail connections between Washington and Boston, Amtrak would be unable to attract the additional passengers it needs to earn more operating income.

Mr. President, we have put Amtrak on a very strict diet. We have cut service. We have cut subsidies. We have gotten a commitment that they will be self-sufficient by the year 2001. Amtrak on the east coast works on an electrification system, overhead electrical wires, and we have spent millions of dollars to upgrade the system from New York to Boston to allow high-speed Metroliner runs from Boston all the way to Washington. We have had to upgrade the bridges. We are well beyond New Haven and working our way up. This amendment would stop that project cold, absolutely cold.

The Senate is on record in support of providing a half cent from the Federal gasoline tax to provide for Amtrak's

capital budget. This is a step that I believe has to be taken as soon as possible. But until then, Amtrak will continue to require adequate funding through the appropriations process. I have been working here along with my colleague, Senator ROTH, and others for years and years to get a dedicated source of funding for Amtrak. We are on the verge of doing that. Once that is done, one-half cent would provide \$600 million a year in capital costs.

That dedicated capital fund would be able to underwrite the capital cost of the entire Amtrak system coast to coast. But, in the meantime, absent that funding source, to eliminate the Northeast corridor improvements and decimate the remainder of their capital budget nationwide would literally be the end of the railroad. It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. We say we want this outfit to be self-sufficient, and the very things needed to make it self-sufficient are the things we are going to deny it before we get to that point.

My friend from Arizona said, I am told, that the average Amtrak passenger makes \$40,000 a year and does not need a subsidy, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I would like to put this thing in focus. My Western colleagues come to us in the East, and they say, "An integral part of our economy is water." They point out to us, time and again, that we need to vote to subsidize their farmers, to subsidize their cities, to subsidize their drinking water. And we do. We spend tens of billions of dollars a year—tens of billions of dollars a year.

I will never forget the first time, as a young man, I flew from the east coast to the west coast. I will never forget flying over the foothills of the Rocky Mountains and then on the other side, seeing all these concentric circles on the ground. I wondered what they were, these concentric circles. I had been in an airplane before, but I had never flown coast to coast.

All of a sudden, I realized that is my mother's tax dollars, on Social Security. That is my tax dollars. It is my dad's tax dollars, on Social Security. Subsidizing what? Subsidizing western farm areas, subsidizing Senator MCCAIN's in-laws and himself and others' drinking water. That is OK with me. We are one nation. The purpose of one nation is for each part of the country to work together. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. All the parts of the Nation need different things. I do not hear Senator MCCAIN or other Western Senators coming here and saying: You know, let us do away with subsidizing those farmers. Let us do away with subsidizing the water John Doe drinks in Phoenix, AZ. And I am not here doing that.

But rail passenger service is critical to my section of the country and to the west coast. It is critical. If we eliminate Amtrak, how many more lanes of interstate highway are we going to be able to put in? What is it going to do to

the environment? What is it going to do to the air? All Amtrak wants is a shot, a chance, a shot to make themselves self-sufficient.

I will not be on the floor trying to restore Amtrak money for operating costs if we get the half-cent gas tax, a measly half cent. But the fact of the matter is, the House Transportation Committee and Congressman WOLF cut this significantly, the same amount that my friend and colleague from Arizona wants to cut it. Senator HATFIELD and Senator LAUTENBERG and their colleagues in the Appropriations Committee have repaired the damage done by the House bill. And, as the chairman of the House Transportation Committee, Congressman WOLF, admitted, the House levels were wholly inadequate and were intended to force the adoption of the half-cent proposal.

I am not sure what I think of that strategy, but I certainly agree that Amtrak funding levels in the House bill, the levels called for in Senator MCCAIN's amendment, would be totally inadequate. The McCain amendment is a proposal to kill Amtrak; let there be no mistake about that. As a small State in the Northeast corridor, Delaware would be hard hit by the loss of a major part of its transportation system. As a major center for the repair and maintenance of railroads for more than a century, Delaware also faces the loss of important jobs under the severe cuts in the Northeast corridor and the capital budget of Amtrak. But as Senator LAUTENBERG forcefully argued, Amtrak plays a key role in the whole country's transportation system. As Senator HATFIELD, the distinguished departing chair of the Appropriations Committee, well knows, the west coast is a major beneficiary of passenger rail as well.

I acknowledge that, because of all the cuts we made in Amtrak over the past, not every State or region benefits equally from Amtrak. I acknowledge that. But I do not benefit from the water subsidies either. Delaware farmers do not benefit like the farmers from Arizona. My mother does not benefit, like the Senator's family does. I understand that. That is America.

Senator MCCAIN comes from a desert. I come from a place where there is a lot of water. I come from a place where we are overgrown with highways, where we have trouble breathing the air. Passenger rail is needed to relieve traffic congestion and air pollution. It is needed badly.

I will leave Senator MCCAIN's water alone if he leaves my railroad alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BIDEN. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. I want to stress that Amtrak is not important to just one part of the country or to just a few cus-

tomers. I understand the distinguished majority leader has been assured by his constituents of the importance of Amtrak to the State of Mississippi. If Amtrak were an airline, it would be the largest air carrier in the country. Amtrak is the single largest individual passenger carrier on the east coast, and to replace Amtrak's service in the East, as well as around the country, would require more lanes of interstate highway and more air pollution, more airport construction, additional safety concerns and increased congestion for all parts of the Nation. So let us not kid ourselves that Amtrak is not important to all parts of our country. But I agree, it is of particular importance to my State and the east coast.

I thank the chairman and ranking member, and I yield back the 12 second I may have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate Appropriations Committee has approved full funding for Amtrak operations, capital support, and the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program. I regret this amendment to cut funding for Amtrak by \$173 million is being offered.

Amtrak, as has been pointed out, provides service for millions of Americans, a competitive service at a competitive price. Through a modern nationwide passenger rail system, traffic congestion, and air pollution are reduced by this fuel-efficient alternative to highway and air travel. I certainly recognize that Amtrak cannot survive much longer as a viable entity in its current financial condition. Many of us are familiar with the oft-cited GAO report documenting the widening gap between Amtrak's revenues and expenses since the beginning of this decade. For the past 2 years, the question facing Congress is, what should we do about Amtrak? I do not think anyone believes that simply increasing or even continuing in perpetuity Amtrak's annual subsidy are wise solutions. Instead, a better solution has been proposed. This solution, partially embodied within the Amtrak authorization bill, will enable Amtrak to operate as much like a private business as possible.

Separate legislation, which constitutes the second part of this proposal, would redirect one-half cent of the Federal gas tax to a new passenger rail trust fund similar to those existing for highway and air travel.

I will just say this. Transporting people has never been a profitable business for railroads. At least it certainly has not been in the past 50 years. So, I believe it is unfortunate that prospects for passage of this Amtrak authorization bill and legislation to redirect the half cent of the Federal gas tax, is being proposed. I think if there is no

Amtrak authorization bill and no steady revenue source to allow Amtrak to modernize and privatize, there is going to be trouble. That is the situation we have today. Funding for Amtrak operations and capital support in the Northeast corridor are urgently required for the short-term survival of intercity passenger rail service. Amtrak does want to end its dependence on Federal subsidies. However, until such a plan is in place, Amtrak simply must have the yearly support needed to continue at a minimal level.

I am a user of Amtrak, Mr. President. It is very important to the section of the country I have, and, therefore, I urge the opposition and, indeed, the defeat of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I just heard the statement by Senator CHAFEE and agree with his comments. I would like to find a way for Amtrak to become more self-sufficient. I would like to find an additional revenue source for Amtrak. But the fact is, until that occurs, if we do not provide adequate funding, there will not be an Amtrak that represents a national rail system providing service across the country.

If this amendment is adopted, we will be left only with a Northeast corridor service for Amtrak, period. There will be no other Amtrak in the rest of the country. We will have service in the Northeast corridor, and we will have no other service anywhere else. I don't think that advances the interest of a country that does need a mix of transportation services, including rail passenger service.

In fact, the committee cut the Amtrak funding by about \$40 million from last year. This amendment would then reduce it another couple hundred million dollars. This does not, in my judgment, move us in the right direction. It moves us exactly in the wrong direction, if you believe that we ought to have some kind of rail passenger system as a national system.

If you believe it only ought to be regional, then you probably will end up all right with this, although I don't think it provides sufficient funding. But if you believe we ought to have a national rail passenger system, then this amendment would severely injure the opportunity to do that, because we would not have a national rail passenger system if this amendment is adopted.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for the time, and I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 13 minutes, 43 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. How many?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes, 40 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The other side has?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself so much time as I will use between now and the 13 minutes plus.

Mr. President, I indicate my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. It almost sounds like a vendetta. Talk about \$18 billion worth of spending on Amtrak—my gosh, we spend over \$8 billion a year on aviation; we spend over \$20 billion a year on highways. Amtrak is the only serious railroad opportunity we have for passengers, and it has continued to prove its merit and its worth as time has gone by. Amtrak's farebox comes closer to its revenues than any other major passenger rail service in the world.

It is ridiculous for the United States of America not to have a significant passenger rail service. Just look at what would happen in the Northeast corridor where it is believed that we service almost 100 million people. The Northeast corridor would need 10,000 full DC-9's a year to carry the traffic. Well, perhaps that's not true. Maybe we could push them onto the highways. We could put some 11 million people in their cars and tell them to drive between New York and Washington or Boston and Washington or Boston and New York or Boston and New Haven or Boston and Hartford or Boston and Providence. Get in your cars, use more gas, take up more time, that will mean more congestion, more foul air. That is what the alternative is.

I have never seen anything so shortsighted in my life, but the speech sounds good—throw out statistics that have no merit in fact. One says we allocate by State, as I saw the chart displayed by the Senator from Arizona, at which time when I had a question, he refused to answer it. That is his privilege. He had the floor, and he is right, he did have the floor. But there is also something around here called common courtesy. But we pass on that these days.

Mr. President, I have a letter in hand from no fewer than 19 of the Nation's Governors, both Republican and Democratic Governors, urging adequate capital funding for Amtrak. Among the Governors that have urged the committee to provide adequate capital funding of Amtrak are several who are mentioned as the potential Vice President to the nominee—the likely nominee—of the Republican Party: Gov. Tom Ridge from the State of Pennsylvania; my own Governor, very popular, very thoughtful, very well thought of, Gov. Christine Todd Whitman; Governor Pataki of New York; Governor Weld of Massachusetts; and Governor Rowland of Connecticut. I dare say, probably six Vice Presidential candidates there.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter sent to Senator HATFIELD and

myself from 19 of the Nation's Governors be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 25, 1996.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,

Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK LAUTENBERG,

Ranking Member, Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HATFIELD and LAUTENBERG: As you consider various options for the FY 1997 Transportation Appropriations bill, we urge you to provide adequate capital funding for the National Passenger Rail Corporation (Amtrak). The General Accounting Office (GAO) estimated that in order to keep Amtrak running and to reduce its dependence on federal operating assistance, Amtrak requires an annual capital subsidy of \$500 to \$600 million. Amtrak, the Administration and GAO agree that the future reduction of Amtrak's federal operating subsidy is dependent on continued capital investment in Amtrak's infrastructure.

Specifically, we urge you to support, at an absolute minimum, last year's level of funding for general capital—\$230 million—and the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program—\$115 million. These funding levels are consistent with the assumptions made in the recently-adopted budget resolution and with the authorizations levels which have passed the House and are pending in the Senate.

As you are aware, the Amtrak Board of Directors is strongly committed to eliminating its dependence on federal operating assistance over the next six years. Amtrak's ability to continue to reduce its operating costs, however, is dependent on adequate federal capital support.

While we realize the complex and difficult decisions you face this year with respect to funding transportation programs, we urge you to carefully consider the productivity improvements that have been made at Amtrak and to support an ongoing federal role in maintaining this nation's rail system, even as the federal operating subsidy is phased out.

Sincerely,

Tom Carper, Governor, State of Delaware; Gaston Caperton Governor, State of West Virginia; Howard Dean, Governor, State of Vermont; George Pataki, Governor, State of New York; Ben Nelson, Governor, State of Nebraska; Bill Weld, Governor, State of Massachusetts; Zell Miller, Governor, State of Georgia; John Rowland, Governor, State of Connecticut; Roy Romer, Governor, State of Colorado; Parris Glendening, Governor, State of Maryland; Tom Ridge, Governor, State of Pennsylvania; Mike Lowry, Governor, State of Washington; Christine Whitman, Governor, State of New Jersey; Bob Miller, Governor, State of Nevada; Mel Carnahan, Governor, State of Missouri; Evan Bayh, Governor, State of Indiana; Lawton Chiles, Governor, State of Florida; Jim Guy Tucker, Governor, State of Arkansas; Angus King, Governor, State of Maine.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, in recent years, as Amtrak has been required to reduce service and, in some cases, eliminate service to several States, I have noticed that some of the loudest complaints have come from some of our States in the West and in the Midwest. I appreciate the fact the

Senator from North Dakota had comments to make in favor of Amtrak service.

A lot of people are complaining that we have reduced or eliminated Amtrak service. Well, they just don't have the income, and when you think of what it takes to put this system in shape, it is de minimis compared to the service that is being offered. We can dress it up in various terms: high-income people ride the train. See what it looks like and see people getting on there with tattered luggage and not able to figure out another way to get there. It is easy to stand on a high horse and criticize those who ride Amtrak. Try it; you may like it.

The fact of the matter is, while Amtrak's funding levels, as contained in this bill, are higher than the House-passed level, they still remain far lower than the level requested by the administration. The Senator from Arizona wants to take the funding down by almost \$400 million, when we worked like the devil, skimped and saved and moved and changed to try and get a balanced funding bill, a balanced transportation bill. And the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], worked very hard to do that.

So, Mr. President, the House Appropriations Committee made a calculated judgment to extract the vast majority of its transportation cuts from Amtrak's budget. I do not agree with those priorities, and neither does the chairman of the committee itself.

The one thing that we ought to be aware of is that if we eliminate Amtrak, we eliminate a serious asset that this country of ours requires. We are the only country in the world, the only country of the more developed countries in the world that does not recognize that you have to invest and you have to subsidize its national passenger rail system. Get on the TGV in France or get on the bullet trains in Japan; the Government pays an awful lot more on a proportionate basis than we are willing to put in Amtrak at our most generous moments.

Mr. President, I yield for a minute or so to my friend from Delaware who has asked to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I see my friend from Arizona is still on the floor. In terms of subsidies, I point out again, because the argument was made, there is a little thing called the central Arizona water project. That is 3.5 billion bucks that my mom is helping to pay for. She will never drink a drop of the water, but Arizona needs it. It is \$3.5 billion needed, badly needed—\$3.5 billion.

But our country needs Amtrak as well, on the west coast and on the east coast. I yield whatever time I have left.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator from Arizona asked for the floor. It is all right with me.

Mr. McCAIN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCAIN. Sure.

Mr. STEVENS. There is an indication that the chairman will not be able to get back in the time we thought he would get back. I think there are going to be others that seek time on this bill. Will the Senator agree we would extend time on each side for another 10 minutes? I ask unanimous consent that the current time agreement be extended for 10 additional minutes for Senator McCAIN and 10 additional minutes for Senator LAUTENBERG.

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCAIN. While my friend from Delaware is still on the floor, I will say there is no one obviously that knows Amtrak better than the Senator from Delaware, who every evening travels and takes advantage of that opportunity to be back in Delaware with his family and with his friends and his constituents. And I, for one, respect and admire that dedication that the Senator from Delaware has displayed to both his family and the people that he represents. It is obvious why they keep sending him back here.

The Senator from Delaware also mentioned to me that if we did cut Amtrak, we would probably get a lot more speeches from the Senator from Delaware, which I would find enlightening, but others may not.

I understand the commitment that the Senator from Delaware has. I point out, the central Arizona project, as the Senator from Delaware knows, was completed, and the State of Arizona will be repaying the Federal Government for the cost of that.

It is obvious that your then-dollars are not the same as now-dollars. I know the Senator from Delaware appreciates that. My problem is, I say to the Senator from Delaware, this is an unending subsidy, apparently, when the Amtrak authorities themselves maintain every few years that there is only a few more years of subsidy.

My question to the Senator from Delaware is, as they cut more and more service, and basically you are left with the Northeast Corridor and the San Diego-LA route, which is basically what is left, and it is no longer a national rail system for any intents and purposes, how long would this system, which originally was conceived in 1971 to last for 2 years—2 years of subsidies was the deal when it began in 1971—how long will be the requirement to have these subsidies provided by the

taxpayers for which one-half of 1 percent of all of the users of transportation, rail transportation, in America, make use of? That is, I think, a legitimate question.

Mr. BIDEN. I would be happy to take 30 seconds to answer the question.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time. I yield time to the Senator from Delaware from my time to respond.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I think it is a mistake, but in fact the Congress has agreed—any subsidy would end by the year 2001. The only reasonable way for that to occur, Mr. President, is in fact we are able to get that half-cent trust fund set up. But whether we get that or not, in the year 2001 this is gone. I think Amtrak made a mistake agreeing to that, to be completely honest with my friend. But that is the answer to the question.

The drop-dead date is the year 2001. In my view, they will not make it—to be completely candid with my friend—they will not make it unless they get that half-cent trust fund.

Mr. McCAIN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I say with all due respect to the Senator from Delaware, wasn't that what they said in 1971 when they said it will only be 2 more years? And wasn't that what they said in 1983 when Graham Claytor, a man I respect more than almost any other man I have ever known, said, "In 4 years we'll be done"? They said, "In 4 years we'll be done." It is always, always, always 4 or 5 years out, I say to the Senator from Delaware. Really what it has proved is that once you start a system on the Federal dole, it is going to continue forever. And that is the case here, unfortunately, with Amtrak, and why this amendment will not prevail again.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, will the manager yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Absolutely. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, my friend from Arizona makes at least two valid points—and many more—but two valid points. One is that if Amtrak is out of business, I will be here. I will have to be in Washington; and it means I will not be running out of here after the last vote to get the train home, which means I will get to speak more. That may be inducement enough for my colleagues to vote to continue to subsidize Amtrak, so I am not here late at night debating.

But another truism that the Senator stated is that this has been a subsidy. It is an ongoing subsidy. But when he puts it in the context of being on the dole, you have to put it in the context of all other transportation systems. We subsidize airline tickets more. The average income of people flying in airlines, I suspect, is as high or higher

than anyone getting on an Amtrak train.

We subsidize those airline tickets a number of ways. They are tax deductible for business expenses. We build the airports. We build the towers and pay the air traffic controllers, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. We also subsidize the highways beyond what we collect in the highway trust fund moneys.

So, Mr. President, all modes of transportation in the United States are subsidized. It seems to me rational public policy would dictate us to look at what makes sense. Different regions have different requirements. I see my friend from North Dakota is here. Amtrak is useful to him, but he does not need Amtrak as much as he needs highways. In Delaware we do not need any more highways. We cannot afford any more highways in my State or the State of Rhode Island or the State of New Jersey or the State of New York and so on and so forth.

So every region of the country has different needs. It is true. They are all subsidized. And the question here is, it seems to me, the appropriate question is, What is an appropriate amount of subsidy? And it seems to me when Amtrak, having its budget cut by a third over the last couple years, having trimmed down significantly, this is not an appropriate cut. I thank the Chair for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Chair and the Senator from New Jersey.

I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

Before I outline my reasons for opposing this amendment, I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Senator HATFIELD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, and Senator LAUTENBERG, a very strong supporter of passenger rail, for their work on this bill. I believe this bill is a tremendous and necessary improvement over the one passed by the House, and we have these two gentlemen to thank for that.

Regarding the amendment offered by my colleague from Arizona, I think the point made by the Senator from Delaware is very valid. All of the modes of transportation are subsidized to a degree. We hear much about the much vaunted Swiss railroad system. They are subsidized. The one in France is subsidized. The one in Japan is subsidized. But in return for that subsidization, the people of the area get a service and a greater degree of safety and comfort that they would not get otherwise.

As some of my colleagues are aware, I wrote a book on this subject some 30 years ago, "Megalopolis Unbound." And the book remains current today

because so little has been done in those 30 years.

I hope that we will sustain the effort of the Transportation subcommittee and keep the money in for Amtrak. I am hopeful that, by doing so, we can really make progress in enhancing intercity high speed passenger rail. In so doing, perhaps we can avoid having a future Member of Congress come along 30 years from now, as I am now, lamenting that much more needs to be done, and how very little has changed in the intervening years.

We should also recognize that modernizing and enhancing, not short-changing, passenger rail is the current trend in Europe and Asia. These various nations are providing their people a form of efficient and safe transportation.

Mr. President, as one who helped shepherd through Congress the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, it has been my long-held belief that passenger rail service is the most fuel-efficient; the least environmentally disruptive; and ultimately, will be the least expensive mode of transportation.

Finally, there is another thought here. We accept the idea that elevated vertical transportation should be free but not horizontal transportation like the subway because it is horizontal. I can remember when I was a boy there were buildings in Europe—still some in Europe—buildings in New York where you put a nickel in order to be transported up or down. I think this also should be kept in mind.

So for all these reasons, I believe that the money—the subsidy, if you want to call it that—for Amtrak should be preserved because it is giving our people service that the citizenry should expect. I thank the managers of this bill for their very fine efforts, efforts I am pleased to support. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, it is all very enjoyable to debate and discuss issues with the Senator from Delaware. And I believe that he makes valid points. I also hope that we do not spend too much time on this amendment and others so he will be able to take his taxpayer-subsidized trip back to Delaware tonight.

Mr. President, I point out that less than one-half of 1 percent of America's inner-city rail passengers are subsidized by this program. It has been long recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike that we need to curtail this ever-increasing subsidy.

As early as 1979, President Carter's Secretary of Transportation, Brock Adams, acknowledged that. I quote back in 1979.

We can no longer afford to provide disproportionately large and continually in-

creasing amounts of Federal funds for a passenger service that is used by less than one-half of 1 percent of the inner city traveling public.

Again, in 1988, the President's Commission on Privatization, established by President Reagan, recommended, as part of a multiyear plan to move to privatize Amtrak, that "Federal subsidies should be incrementally reduced and a deadline should be set for the Department of Transportation to decide whether Amtrak or portions of its operation should be continued."

Mr. President, again, I would like to see a deadline that is adhered to. I think when we have a program that began initially in 1971, that was only supposed to be there for 2 years, and now in the year 1996 we have a policy of some 4 or 5 years from now, it is time we really got realistic. If there is some cynicism on the part of some of us about these dates that continue to slide every 4 or 5 years, I think it is justified.

Mr. President, the money that is cut out of this appropriation, I point out again, will be used for aviation safety, rail safety, and highway safety, which, obviously, have a great claim to limited taxpayers' funds, greater, I think, than the rail service has been, which has not been able to obtain self-sufficiency in the last 25 years.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey would yield 1 minute to respond to a point?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Arizona made a point that I think probably will mischaracterize something. The implication was that the folks in the inner cities really do not get any subsidy in this area.

My understanding is that in this bill there is \$4.4 billion in subsidy for mass transit systems. Obviously, virtually all of the cities that have mass transit systems are getting subsidized on an ongoing basis, and part of this is paid for by folks in Bismarck and Fargo. That is fine. I support that. But I do not want people listening to this debate to understand there is not a subsidy for mass transit because there is a \$4.4 billion subsidy.

The point I was making before was that I do not object to deciding as a public investment we want to retain an Amtrak system that is a national system. In fact, it still is a national system, but will not be under the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. I personally make the observation that I think it is a good investment to make.

I respect the Senator from Arizona, but we disagree on this, because I happen to think this represents a good investment as part of our transportation system.

I did want to clear up the point on whether or not mass transit is subsidized. Of course it is. It is subsidized substantially—by \$4.4 billion in this bill alone.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the McCain amendment. It is clear what he is trying to do is kill Amtrak. This is wrong.

Amtrak is integral in transporting people across this great country of ours—not just in the Northeast, although the Northeast, which has horrible problems with traffic and air pollution and everything connected with it, needs to go to railroads, needs to utilize the railroads more than it does now for personal transportation.

In addition to that, with the overload on our airplanes, trying to shuttle back and forth to New York and to Boston, the fast trains, which this would essentially eliminate, will resolve that horrible problem, much to the benefit of the people in this Nation.

Amtrak can survive on its own. We are working toward that goal. Over the last 2 years, Amtrak has restructured itself and is working to be free of Federal support in 5 years. I think they will make it.

Mr. President, do not kill our national railroad now. Give Amtrak time to build up the business and let Congress be responsible and pass the Amtrak authorization bill and move the half-cent gas tax to Amtrak. We must not eliminate Federal support until these plans are in place, until they have been given a chance to demonstrate they can work. I am confident they can.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senator MCCAIN's amendment that would cut capital funding for Amtrak. This funding cut will cripple the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program and threaten the viability of passenger rail in this country. It is my understanding that if the Senate votes in favor of these cuts, it will have far-reaching effects nationwide.

The reduction in capital could mean the termination of the High Speed Rail Program that has the potential to revive passenger rail as an important component of our national transportation system. It will also impair Amtrak's heavy overhaul and maintenance capabilities—much of which is done in Delaware's Amtrak shops. Shortchanging maintenance will contribute to further decline of rolling stock and locomotives, reducing the quality of service, and discouraging potential passengers from choosing Amtrak.

This is a formula for failure, not a plan to make Amtrak self-sufficient or to secure the place of passenger in our country's transportation system.

Mr. President, we are all working toward an Amtrak which operates without a Federal operating subsidy, which provides quality service, and which is financially stable. Amtrak now covers approximately 80 percent of its operating costs with self-generated revenue, up from 48 percent in 1981. Yet we also

know that no intercity rail passenger service anywhere in the world operates without some degree of public sector financial support.

Investment in all modes of transportation is important, but we have gone about it in a lopsided way. Purchasing power for Federal highway programs has increased by 48 percent from 1982 to 1996. It has increased 78 percent for aviation, but has decreased 46 percent for passenger rail. In fact, Amtrak currently receives less than 3 percent of all Federal transportation spending. To attain balance, we must balance our financial support to all transportation components, including passenger rail service.

Capital funding is necessary for Amtrak's future. New capital investments will allow Amtrak to operate more efficiently. With new equipment, Amtrak will attract substantial new ridership with increased revenues. It currently costs Amtrak \$60 million per year to operate and maintain its old equipment, which frequently breaks down and often requires parts to be specially made.

As many Members in the Senate are aware, I am working to provide a dedicated source of capital funding for Amtrak. The Senate has overwhelmingly supported my legislation that would give Amtrak one-half cent for capital expenditures. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to pass this legislation into law. However, I will continue to work hard and make these speeches until this legislation is passed.

Amtrak cannot survive without capital funding. If we do not provide funding for Amtrak, we will have no other option but to watch Amtrak collapse. This amendment does not move us in the right direction. If this Congress wants a national passenger rail system, it will continue to vote for capital funding for Amtrak.

I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I note the return of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the subcommittee. I really do not have anything more to add to this debate. I would be glad to discuss it further if the Senator from Oregon desires.

However, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time at any time that is convenient for the distinguished manager of the bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the side of the Senator from New Jersey, 7 minutes 32 seconds; and on the other side, 7 minutes 48 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thought I heard the Senator from Arizona yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He made an offer to the Senator from Oregon that was not responded to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will take such time as remains out of the time that I have to make a couple of points.

We hear that the subsidy for passenger rail service is an egregious pur-

pose, something that ought not be done, and we talk about the subsidy per passenger.

However, we neglect to talk about the fact that there is over \$2 billion a year that goes into maintaining FAA's services. That has nothing to do with the trust fund. That is out of the taxpayers' pocket—\$2 billion a year. Those who are paying into the trust fund by virtue of a ticket tax, when that is operating, pay into the fund when, in fact, they may not use a particular routing or particular region when they pay that tax.

If we start to cut up the country into how much did you pay for how much service—I think the Senator from Delaware made the point very clearly when he described the need to subsidize water projects, irrigation projects, and flood control projects out West. It is a very divisive approach, I think, to what this country of ours is supposed to be as a single nation.

Just to remind those who are concerned about what would happen if we did not have the Amtrak service that is now available—those services would not be available, I assure you, if we further diminish the assistance that the Federal Government gives to Amtrak. Yes, the needs have been miscalculated over the years. Yes, they have grown substantially. But so has the population. The population of the country has grown significantly. To no one's surprise, much of that population growth is in the urban areas where rail is an essential factor.

Here we fail to recognize that passenger rail service is part of a balanced transportation structure that we need in a society in a country as large as ours.

Commuter lines in States like Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey all use Northeast corridor lines that are owned by Amtrak. They have to function; otherwise, the costs for commuting would increase substantially, or maybe they would not be able to function altogether.

Mr. President, I hope we will defeat this amendment. I think it is very short-sighted and neglects to recognize what the needs of this country are, at a time when we are straining with every mode of transportation, including aviation, including highways, and including rail. We are underinvested in transportation infrastructure and we have to continue to plow ahead, whether we like it or not, if we are to be a mobile society, operating with as much efficiency as we can.

Mr. President, I note Chairman HATFIELD is here on the floor, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator from Arizona indicated to me he would be willing to yield back his time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am willing to yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, has the Senator from Arizona yielded back his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. All time is yielded back.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to table the McCain amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 5132 offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. FRAHM] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 255 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	McConnell
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Bennett	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nunn
Bradley	Harkin	Pell
Breaux	Hatch	Pressler
Bryan	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burns	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Campbell	Inouye	Roth
Chafee	Jeffords	Santorum
Coats	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kassebaum	Simon
Cohen	Kempthorne	Simpson
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Craig	Kerrey	Specter
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
Daschle	Kohl	Thomas
DeWine	Lautenberg	Warner
Dodd	Leahy	Wellstone
Domenici	Levin	Wyden
Dorgan	Lieberman	
Exon	Lott	

NAYS—17

Ashcroft	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Faircloth	Kyl	Thompson
Gramm	Mack	Thurmond
Grams	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Frahm

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 5132) was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate be in order.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would just like to report to the Senate we have a few amendments yet, perhaps about 20, that we have to dispose of tonight. We will have rollcalls on some of them. There is no window. We are going to complete them. We had the window this afternoon for an hour and 10 minutes when Senator LAUTENBERG and I were ready to do business

and nobody appeared. That was our window. So we will continue straight through now until we finish.

Mr. President, I would ask now that I may yield to Senator MCCAIN for 2 minutes and then the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. DEWINE], has an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for setting a date certain for us to bring up the important and compelling issues concerning aviation safety and strengthening airport security.

We know how important this issue is to the American people. I had intended earlier to bring up some of the provisions of that bill as an amendment on this appropriations bill, something I do not like to do. The majority leader has assured us he will bring this up on a date certain in September, and I believe that is a very important. I know my colleagues are in agreement with me as to how important it is to bring up these issues. We have to strengthen airport security. We have to improve aviation safety in America. It is an obligation we have to all of our citizens.

I hope in September, when we bring up this issue, we will be able to act on it quickly. I intend to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop a set of amendments under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator PRESSLER, who has played a key and vital role in all of this legislation.

Finally, I thank the 17 brave souls who voted with me on the last amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 5133

(Purpose: To provide funds and incentives for closures of rail-highway crossings)

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], for himself, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 5133.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. . (a) Section 120(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "rail-highway crossing closure," after "carpooling and vanpooling."

(b) Section 130 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR AT-GRADE CROSSING CLOSURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), a State may, from sums available to the State under this sec-

tion, make incentive payments to local governments in the State upon the permanent closure by such governments of public at-grade rail-way-highway crossings under the jurisdiction of such governments.

"(2) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS BY RAILROADS.—A State may not make an incentive payment under paragraph (1) to a local government with respect to the closure of a crossing unless the railroad owning the tracks on which the crossing is located makes an incentive payment to the government with respect to the closure.

"(3) AMOUNT OF STATE PAYMENT.—The amount of the incentive payment payable to a local government by a State under paragraph (1) with respect to a crossing may not exceed the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the incentive payment paid to the government with respect to the crossing by the railroad concerned under paragraph (2); or

"(B) \$7,500.

"(4) USE OF STATE PAYMENTS.—A local government receiving an incentive payment from a State under paragraph (1) shall use the amount of the incentive payment for transportation safety improvements."

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this amendment is being offered by myself, Senator LUGAR, and Senator BIDEN, and it really is a fairly simple amendment.

First of all, it costs no money.

Second, it gives States more tools, more flexibility to deal with a very serious problem in this country, and that problem is that each year we lose over 500 people who are killed in collisions between automobiles and trains. In fact, the figure last year was 559 people—559 people died last year in auto-train accidents, 36 of them in my home State of Ohio.

In preparing this amendment, and having some understanding of the problem going back to my time as Lieutenant Governor in Ohio when I worked on this problem, I put together a meeting in my office where we brought together all the experts in this field. They sat down for 2, 2½ hours and discussed this. Then they got together again. One of the ideas they came up with is contained in this amendment.

Mr. President, my amendment is a simple one. It would make America's railroad crossings a lot safer—500 people are killed each year in these train-vehicle collisions. Fifty percent of these accidents occur at crossings that are already equipped with active warning devices—50 percent. So simply adding more warning devices, therefore, is not a complete solution to the problem.

Some of these railroad crossings are just simply too dangerous. They are life-threatening. They are not needed, and they ought to be closed. We all know though from our own experience that people do become accustomed to taking certain routes and communities get used to certain traffic patterns. That is why it is sometimes very difficult for localities to close these crossings, for local officials to make this decision, even when it is clear on safety grounds that a particular crossing simply needs to be closed.

Clearly, the local communities need some help, and that is the purpose of

this amendment. Again, this idea did not come from me. This idea came from the safety experts who have looked at this, both in government and outside of government.

Currently, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of closing a railroad highway grade crossing, but other grade crossing safety projects, such as traffic signs, guard rails and traffic lights, are eligible for 100 percent Federal funding.

My amendment will make grade crossing closure projects eligible for that same 100 percent Federal funding. This will help remove the current incentive against closure projects. Let me emphasize, this is a State decision that will be made by the State, and that is out of the same pot of money. No additional funds will be utilized. If the safest thing to do is to close a very dangerous railroad crossing, localities should have an incentive to do that.

Let me again point out this amendment does not involve new Federal money. The CBO says no additional contract authority would be necessary. The money for this amendment is already allocated for crossing safety purposes, for the very purpose we are talking about. All we are trying to do in this amendment, Senator LUGAR, Senator BIDEN and myself, is to deploy that money in the most rational and effective way. Again, that decision is being made by the local authorities.

The second part of my amendment provides up to \$7,500—again, out of the same pot of money—to a local highway authority for each crossing closed. Mr. President, \$7,500 is an incentive to that local community if the State decides that is the best way to spend this money.

Furthermore, the railroad itself that is operating the crossing under this amendment has to match the money. This means up to \$15,000 for a local community to close a railroad crossing. In other words, it creates an incentive to get the job done.

Safety does not come about by accident. It comes about when concerned people exercise the necessary level of prudence and the necessary level of vigilance. I have been working with the railroads, with the Federal Railroad Administration and with the Federal Highway Administration on these issues for some time now, and I believe this amendment embodies a common-sense approach to this very real issue of railroad safety. Mr. President, we have worked with the Federal Railroad Administration to develop this amendment, and the amendment has been endorsed by the Association of American Railroads.

In conclusion, let me summarize again, this costs no additional Federal dollars. Every safety expert that we have consulted says this is the thing to do. It is the most cost-effective way to preserve lives. We can close these railroad crossings, frankly, at a fraction of the cost to install the gates and the flashers. They cost anywhere between

\$130,00 and \$135,000, and it takes some time to get them installed.

This amendment will provide more flexibility to the States to deal with this hazard. It has the endorsement of all the safety experts, as well as Senator BIDEN, Senator LUGAR and myself. And, Mr. President, if we needed any other incentive to pass this amendment, let me just hold this chart up. This is a listing for the most immediate year available. This is 1995: "Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Statistics by State." I did not have time to have this blown up, but I am going to read a couple of these, if I could. It has every State. If any Members want to see how many fatalities occurred in their home States, they can do that. South Carolina, just last year, 111 accidents, 61 injuries, 6 fatalities. Looking at the State of California, 191 accidents last year, 69 injuries, 28 fatalities. We go on and on and on.

This is a very simple amendment. It is no cost to taxpayers and gives more flexibility to States, to people who have to make the decisions to spend the finite dollars to try to save lives. I believe this amendment will save lives, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will yield for a question?

Mr. DEWINE. I certainly will.

Mr. HATFIELD. As the Senator knows, we have a strict position, known here, that we do not accept legislation on appropriations unless it is cleared by the authorizing committee chairman and ranking member. We have accommodated Senators where they have cleared that with the authorizing committee, but this is not in our jurisdiction. I am asking the question as to whether or not the Senator has had clearance from the Environment and Public Works chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. DEWINE. We do not have any direct clearance. If I could finish my answer? The reality is, this is the only train that is moving. If we do not have the opportunity to put it in now, the Senator is well aware it is not going to happen for months and months and months. It is such a simple amendment. I have found no one who, on the substance, is opposed to it. I cannot find anyone opposed to it. That is why we are looking at this as the opportunity to, frankly, save some lives and give the local communities the flexibility they need. It is of such a non-controversial nature, that is why I am here.

Mr. HATFIELD. I agree the amendment is very meritorious, but it does not comply with our rules. I will have to move to table this and reject it as such. I would prefer to have, maybe, the amendment temporarily set aside until you can confer with our two colleagues who are the authorizers. If they clear it, we will accept the amendment.

Mr. DEWINE. I will be more than happy to temporarily set aside the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Has the Senator made the request to temporarily lay aside his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was distracted for a moment. I would like to be recognized in my own right to make a few comments about the amendment being offered by the Senator from Ohio. I ask that I be added as a cosponsor.

What was the suggestion of the managers of the bill? What was the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATFIELD. The request was to temporarily lay aside the amendment until the Senator from Ohio conferred with the authorizing leadership, and then to turn to the next amendment to be offered once it is temporarily laid aside, which is the Exon-Dorgan amendment.

Mr. EXON. The Senator from Ohio has agreed to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. DEWINE. I have agreed to temporarily lay it aside with the understanding the amendment will continue to pend.

Mr. EXON. I simply ask the Senator from Ohio, I would like to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

I remind the Senate, and the managers of the bill, this Senator offered a five-point program last year with regard to grade crossings. Three of the five were accepted and are now part of the law. The two things that were not agreed to, basically on that side of the aisle, last year are now incorporated in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

So I congratulate him for his leadership in this area. I simply remind all we should have done this last year. I hope we can do it this year in some form. So I thank my friend from Ohio. I am very pleased to be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is to set the amendment aside. Is there objection?

Without objection, the Senator from Nebraska is added as a cosponsor.

The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 5134

(Purpose: To prohibit the Surface Transportation Board from increasing user fees)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator CONRAD, Senator HARKIN, and Senator EXON. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. EXON, and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 5134.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On line 12 on page 41 after the semicolon, insert the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to increase fees for services in connection with licensing and related service fees, pursuant to 49 CFR Part 1002, STB Ex Parte No. 542, for services in connection with rail maximum rate complaints."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the amendment that I have offered on behalf of myself, Senator CONRAD and Senator EXON is an amendment that deals with the fees charged by the Surface Transportation Board for the filing of a complaint by a shipper, a farmer or a grain elevator that might feel is necessary to file against a railroad company that is overcharging.

We have largely deregulated the railroad companies in this country. We have abolished the Interstate Commerce Commission and established the Surface Transportation Board. The question is, Where does a farmer or a grain elevator or some other small shipper go when they feel that the railroad is overcharging them? They file a complaint, under the current circumstances, with the new Surface Transportation Board.

Previously, when a shipper was to file a complaint, they would be required to pay a \$1,000 fee in order to file a complaint against a railroad company saying, "This railroad company is overcharging. I am complaining and want a hearing and want some facts to be developed, and I want a judgment about my complaint." So they would file a complaint and pay a \$1,000 fee.

The Surface Transportation Board issued a proposal, under the administration's directive to increase user fees.

The Surface Transportation Board proposed to increase the fees from \$1,000 to \$23,000, roughly, for those who file a complaint against a railroad company.

They are saying that if you are a family farmer or you are a small grain elevator or machinery and equipment dealer and you have a complaint against a big railroad company—and most of them are big—in order to file that complaint, instead of paying a \$1,000 fee, we are going to increase it to a \$23,000 fee.

Some of us happen to think that that is way out of line—not just out of line but way out of line—and we do not believe the Surface Transportation Board ought to do that.

I have talked to the Chair of the Surface Transportation Board, someone for whom I have great respect. I think she is doing a good job. She said, "Well, we were told that we were going to have to find our money from fees, so we had to put out a schedule."

My expectation is they will not come up with those kind of fees in their final determination. But what we want to

make sure of today is, in an era of deregulation of railroads where you have very large significant concentrations of economic power, that that economic power is not wielded against small shippers in a punitive way.

We believe small shippers ought to be able to make a complaint against a predatory pricing practice on the part of a railroad company without having to fork over \$23,000. All that means is a lot of small shippers are told, "You don't have the ability to file a complaint anymore. There is no way for you to complain against a railroad because we are pricing you out of existence. You can't afford to complain."

What this amendment that I have offered on behalf of myself and my colleagues does is it says:

... none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to increase fees for services in connection with licensing and related service fees pursuant to 49 CFR Part 102, STB Ex Parte No. 542, for services in connection with rail maximum rate complaints.

Very simply, we are saying you cannot increase the fees for small shippers who are going to make a complaint against the railway companies. You cannot increase them from \$1,000 to \$23,000, not from \$1,000 to \$13,000. You cannot increase them.

We happen to think in this age where we have deregulated the railroad companies, where we have a significant concentration of economic power that it is fundamentally unfair to small shippers, especially as I mentioned to farmers and grain elevators, to say to them, We have allowed them to concentrate economic power, and when they overcharge you, you are going to have to fork over \$23,000 if you feel like you need to complain about it.

Some of us say it is fundamentally unfair. We will not stand for it. We want the Senate to be on record to say none of those funds will be used for those fees. There are other fees they can charge. They can increase them. I am not here complaining about that. That is a decision they can make, but at least with respect to these fees, with respect to small shippers who make complaints about these railways, I say let's freeze these fees and let's not price those folks out of the ability to make complaints against railway companies who overcharge.

Let me make a final point. I come from a part of the country that has had some experience with railroads. I come from North Dakota where a so-called "prairie fire," which was a political fire, began in the early 1900's. The controversy was about banks and railroads and big grain millers taking advantage of our farmers. Big interests with large concentrations of economic power that were taking money from the pockets of our farmers.

That created a populist prairie fire out in my part of the country that said, "We're not going to stand for it." Those folks in the early 1900's would not have stood for this, and we should not stand for it in 1996 either.

Mr. President, let me yield the floor and have the Senator from Nebraska speak on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] be added as a cosponsor to the amendment just offered by my friend and colleague from North Dakota.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota for a very thoughtful amendment that is vitally important if you understand the peril, or the potential peril, maybe is a better word for it, that small shippers find themselves in today.

There probably has been no one in the U.S. Senate today who has spent more time and effort in committee and on the floor with regard to railroad matters generally, including grade crossing safety. I fought very hard for the Interstate Commerce Commission. When it was obvious that was not going to prevail for long, I was one of the leading proponents of the Surface Transportation Board that was created under the Department of Transportation.

I simply say, from experience and looking into the future, myself and others as original cosponsors have had firsthand experience with the situation that could affect particularly small carriers.

The most important work of the Surface Transportation Board is to protect consumers from unfair, unjust, and unreasonable rates or actions by the railroads. I mention specifically captive shippers. Captive shippers are those who are captive because they have no other way to move their products or their goods or their livestock or their grain.

So simply put, what this amendment does is to say that if you are a small shipper, you cannot be charged as originally suggested in a preliminary announcement of fees by the Surface Transportation Board.

The Senator from North Dakota touched on this, Mr. President. I emphasize it a little bit more. If somebody files a complaint against a railroad, the railroad has a whole stable of attorneys who are willing, ready, and able to act in their behalf.

Actually, unless we adopt an amendment like this, for all practicable purposes, if the fees are set too high, that small shipper, that captive shipper, that grain elevator, that small company out there could not afford to file a complaint even if he had full justification for doing so.

So I simply say that railroads need some supervision. There needs to be, especially for small and captive shippers, the right to appeal when they think they are being unfairly treated by the railroads. The Surface Transportation Board is the successor in this area to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I think the Senate and the House should be very careful that when we talk about increasing fees, we do not allow the Surface Transportation Board arbitrarily to set fees so high that the small businessmen—captive shipper, grain elevator, farmer, call it what you will—would be discouraged from even making a legitimate complaint.

At a time when there is consolidation in the rail sector, rate oversight by the Surface Transportation Board is the best primary means to protect rural shippers, and urban shippers, as well, from a possible loss of competition for the captive shippers. It is time to stop the annual threat to the consumers of rail transportation.

The Surface Transportation Board is all that stands between small shippers and captive shippers and the big railroads. I applaud the Appropriations Committee for rejecting the user-fee-only proposition to finance the Surface Transportation Board. The Dorgan-Exon, and others, amendment assures that the rights of rural and urban shippers are not compromised by unfair, high user fees if they file a complaint with the Surface Transportation Board.

I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for offering this amendment. I urge its adoption. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment by my colleague from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON. This amendment addresses a very serious concern that was first raised earlier this year when a fee schedule was proposed by the Surface Transportation Board.

These fees that were announced earlier this year by that agency indicate that sometimes people completely take leave of their senses here in Washington when they have responsibility over an administrative function. If there was ever an example of an agency going off a cliff with respect to a proposal, these fees by the Surface Transportation Board are a perfect example.

Under the proposed fee schedule from earlier this year, the minimum filing fee charged rail users complaining of unlawful railroad actions would have been increased from the current \$1,000 to \$23,000. Let's think about a small elevator in my home State of North Dakota. They have a grievance. Just to be able to file, they would have been expected to come up with \$23,000. Where is the rationale for that? If you are going to ask people to pony up \$23,000 just to file a complaint, there are not going to be many complaints filed. That is for sure.

The unfortunate thing about this is people do not have an alternative. If they have not gone through the administrative process, they cannot go to the

courts. And to go through the administrative process, they are told you have to come up with a \$23,000 filing fee.

Let me just go through some of the other filing fees that the Surface Transportation Board proposed earlier this year. The fee for filing a formal rate complaint under the so-called stand-alone cost methodology, guidelines alleging unlawful rate practices by rail carriers, would have been increased from the current \$1,000 to \$233,000.

Mr. EXON. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I would be happy to.

Mr. EXON. With that fee schedule that you just outlined right from the Surface Transportation Board paper, how many complaints do you think small businessmen, small elevators, would file out of North Dakota?

Mr. CONRAD. The Senator asks a very good question. I think we could be quite assured that virtually no one would file, probably no one would file. I mean, who is going to pony up \$23,000 for an unlawful railroad action case? Who could afford to pay, in the case of a formal rate complaint alleging unlawful rates under practices by rail carriers, an increase from \$1,000 to—it makes me laugh every time I say it—an increase from \$1,000 to \$233,000?

The cost for seeking a regulatory exemption to construct connecting rail lines would have been increased from the current \$3,000 to \$41,700.

I am glad this amendment is being offered. Hopefully, it will send a message.

I do commend the Appropriations Committee for providing some funding for the Surface Transportation Board. That is an important provision in this transportation appropriations bill. The Dorgan amendment simply ensures that there is no possibility the Surface Transportation Board will even consider user fees on the scale of those which were discussed earlier this year.

Mr. EXON. If I might add a comment.

It seems to me that if there is that much money out there to get this job done, we might seize on that as a means of balancing the Federal budget in 2 years. I thank my friend from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. He makes a very good point. Unfortunately, earlier this year the Surface Transportation Board looked at the budget and the current fee schedule, and somehow believed the agency could become self-sufficient by just raising fees. Unfortunately, this proposed fee schedule did not recognize that agricultural shippers, with legitimate complaints that they need to get adjudicated, could be completely left out of the process because of the steep fees which were being proposed.

Nobody would be coming before the Surface Transportation Board, or virtually no one, because who could afford, just to have a complaint adjudicated, to pay \$23,000, much less \$233,000, or to deal with the question of

construction of connecting rail lines, \$41,000? I mean, these are not reasonable.

Hopefully, this amendment will pass and there will be no possibility of these particular fee increases taking place. I want to thank my colleague from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, for offering this amendment with the Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON. I am pleased to join them in this effort. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I was just asked a series of questions by the manager of the bill and the ranking member. I thought maybe I could address those because I think there are some misunderstandings about this.

It is true that the Surface Transportation Board produced a schedule that said, where as we used to charge \$1,000 as a fee in order to make complaint against a railroad for unfair pricing, if we are required to raise all of our funds from fees, we will now charge \$23,100 instead of \$1,000. If you are complaining about the coal rates, we will go from \$1,000 to \$233,000 as a filing fee and so on and so on.

The ranking member made the point to me just now, well, we have increased appropriations or actually produced appropriations of some \$12 million in this bill for the Surface Transportation Board and, therefore, they will not have to raise all of this money from fees. It is absolutely correct.

That \$12 million has been appropriated. They will not have to raise that from fees. They will have to raise several millions of dollars from fees. The question is, how will they get that several million dollars? There are a wide range of fees from which to choose. Will they decide, with respect to those who want to file a complaint against a railroad company for unfair pricing, that that fee should go from \$1,000 to \$2,000, \$1,000 to \$5,000, \$1,000 to \$15,000, \$1,000 to \$23,000? I do not have the foggiest idea.

My amendment says, it shall go from \$1,000 to \$1,000. The fee is now \$1,000 and the fee will be \$1,000 if you feel like you need to file a complaint against a railroad company for unfair pricing.

Mr. President, we do not have an Interstate Commerce Commission in America anymore. I never thought I would mourn its passing, and I am not sure I do now, because I used to think it was one of the few agencies in Washington, DC, that had died from the neck up. However, despite the fact the ICC, in my judgment, was relatively worthless as an agency, sat around with a giant ink pad and a giant rubber stamp, and whatever the railroads wanted, they stamped OK. There was a guy named "OK Alan" that was talked about down in a Southern State, the Governor of a Southern State, because he said OK to everything. It was the "OK-ICC Commission."

I never thought I would mourn its passage, but when we deregulated the

railroad industry and people said get rid of the ICC, there was a discussion that maybe there should be some referee deciding when and if there are predatory or unfair pricing practices by the railroads, that maybe the folks who are having their pockets picked by that have some opportunity to file a complaint.

So the Surface Transportation Board was created. As I mentioned, I have a fair amount of confidence in the chair of that board, and I do not believe they would increase rates, as they published, from \$1,000 to \$23,000. But I will make sure with my amendment that they do not with respect to complaints against the rails.

I am joined with the Senator from Nebraska and my colleague from North Dakota and others to say to those who need to file a complaint against the railroads, they ought to be able to file that complaint with a filing of \$1,000, and it ought not to be doubled, tripled, or increased 23 times. This amendment says, "Freeze it where it is."

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the minority leader, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] be added as a cosponsor to the amendment.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I 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. HATFIELD. 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. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the Dorgan amendment so we can clear the DeWine amendment that is being cleared by the authorizers.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5133

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the DeWine amendment, which has now been cleared by the authorizers, both the chairman and the ranking member, now be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 5133) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5134, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To prohibit the Surface Transportation Board from increasing user fees)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a modification to my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 5134), as modified, is as follows:

On line 12 on page 41 after the semicolon, insert the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to increase fees for services in connection with rail maximum rate complaint pursuant to 49 CFR Part 1002, STB Ex Parte No. 5424.

Mr. DORGAN. The modification was made necessary in order to reach an agreement with the authorizing committee. Both the majority and the minority have agreed with the amendment as it is modified, and I am told it will be acceptable, then, to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I urge adoption.

Mr. EXON. It would be the same cosponsors?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, might I say that the modification is purely technical. The amendment is identical to the amendment I offered previously, but we rearranged the words because there needed to be a technical change.

The modification is offered with the same cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment (No. 5134), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5135

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following: "SEC. . (a) APPLICABLE LAWS.—Section 24301 of Title 49, United States Code, as amended by Section 504 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(q) POWER PURCHASES.—The sale of power to Amtrak for its own use, including operating its electric traction system, does not constitute a direct sale of electric energy to an ultimate consumer under section 212(h)(1) of the Federal Power Act."

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212(h)(2)(A) of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting 'Amtrak;' after 'a State or any political subdivision';."

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 5135.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this amendment was a consequence of discussions held in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee among the

staff of the majority with regard to the dilemma surrounding Amtrak and the high cost of power that Amtrak is subjected to in the Northeast corridor where most of the rail line is electrified. As a consequence of the efforts to try and help Amtrak to reduce its costs, this amendment was suggested by Amtrak.

Mr. President, it is an extraordinary set of circumstances here when we consider that the potential cost of power wheeled in for the availability of Amtrak could be as low as 3 cents, yet Amtrak is currently paying in many cases 6 cents and, in extreme cases, up to 12 cents from a power-producing facility in New York State that is in bankruptcy. These are the result of State public utility commissions and the overall regulatory complexity associated with the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as compared to State public utility commissions. These need to be examined.

What this amendment does, Mr. President, is to allow the FERC to order retail wheeling for Amtrak only, something which is currently prohibited under Federal law. It would exempt, therefore, Amtrak from the prohibition which prevents them from taking advantage of cheaper sources of power that would be transmitted from potential out-of-State power suppliers.

The purpose, again, of this amendment is simply to allow Amtrak to acquire electric power at a cheaper rate than it is currently paying. As we all know, Amtrak is not a private company but a quasi-governmental entity created by an act of Congress in 1970. Its stock is owned by the Federal Government. Congress mandated its mission and likewise imposes by Federal law a host of obligations and costs on Amtrak, costs that no regular private company is burdened with. Yet, each year Amtrak's losses are made up through a Federal subsidy.

In fiscal year 1996, Amtrak's Federal subsidy was \$285 million, thus, this amendment would result in a savings to Amtrak that translates into about \$20 million a year. That is a savings to the U.S. taxpayer that subsidizes Amtrak.

What we have done, Mr. President, in Congress is put Amtrak between the proverbial rock and a hard place. Congress has given Amtrak a mandate to decrease its reliance on Federal operating support. The House and Senate Amtrak authorization bills and the budget resolution proposed to end all operating support of Amtrak in the year 2001. What are we going to do with that? Are we going to adhere to that? Are we going to extend it and try and find ways to help Amtrak reduce its cost? The point is, we have not relieved Amtrak from its statutory obligation and, at the same time, we are taking away its Federal operating subsidy.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment not in the expectation that it is going to be adopted. I offer this amendment to point out the need to move the

electric power industry from its current highly regulated, highly inefficient situation into a fully competitive, deregulated marketplace so that Amtrak, along with industrial and residential consumers, can purchase electricity at the lowest possible price. That is what deregulation is all about.

How we get there from here is a very difficult and complex problem. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I recognize it, and I have had some conversations, as late as this evening, with Senator JOHNSTON, who is concerned about the issue as well. And to the question of how we address it, of course, is an issue within the jurisdiction of our committee.

The Energy Committee has held three hearings this year on the issue of competitive change in the electric power industry. We intend to hold more. We want to assure everybody that we recognize that the electric industry in this country—a very, very important and significant industry—is not broke by any means. So it is not a question of fixing it in the sense of fixing what is not wrong with it. It is more an effort to try and recognize that by directing more attention to local and State control, with the assurance that we have the availability of wheeling coming in to address cost and efficient producers and somehow try and address that narrow area of what we are going to do to protect those that have stranded costs. That is the challenge before us.

We have an inequity associated with Amtrak. While there is no consensus as to the means for how to make the electric power industry competitive, there is a consensus as to the need for making it competitive.

So what we have to do is address the inconsistencies associated with the industry. We want to have competition, which will benefit consumers—residential consumers, commercial consumers, industrial consumers and, yes, Amtrak. This amendment is but a small piece of a much larger puzzle. The Amtrak issue, along with a host of other electric power issues, such as the privatization of the Federal Power Marketing Administration, will be the subject of our legislative interests in the 105th Congress.

Mr. President, while it is my expectation that we will undertake comprehensive electric deregulation legislation next year, it should not be taken to mean that we should not proceed this year with Senator D'AMATO's PUHCA reform legislation, of which I am a cosponsor. It has been ordered reported by the Banking Committee, and the Senate should take this legislation up at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, I am going to withdraw the amendment as a consequence of the recognition that, clearly, this is not the time or the place to resolve the wheeling issue for Amtrak. But I hope there is now attention to the inequity associated with Amtrak, and a realiza-

tion that we are forcing this entity to purchase power far beyond the competitive marketplace that exists, which puts an unfair and unrealistic burden and a responsibility right back with us in the realization that it is the taxpayers that are subsidizing this quasi-government entity, or its shortfall, when indeed there are opportunities out there for Amtrak to buy power at a competitive rate and reduce the Federal subsidy by as much as \$20 million a year. And current savings can easily be identified as a consequence of prevailing rates that are in existence at this time. Unless anybody cares to talk on the amendment, or ask me questions, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment at this time. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. HATFIELD. There was a Senator who was planning to be here, but he is not able to be here. I yield to the Senator to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am checking on some other matters here. But I believe that it is now the Democratic side of the aisle that is going to offer an amendment. We are alternating back and forth.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what we are attempting to do is to get to that finite list, and that is in the process now.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5136

(Purpose: To provide for loan guarantees under the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator PRESSLER and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. PRESSLER, for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. EXON, Mr. HARKIN, and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 5136.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 2, strike "\$4,158,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike "\$132,499,000" and insert "\$129,500,000".

On page 26, line 8, strike "1997." and insert "1997, except for up to \$75,000,000 in loan guarantee commitments during such fiscal year (and \$4,158,000 is hereby made available for the cost of such loan guarantee commitments).".

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple and straight forward. It would provide funding for the section 511 railroad loan guarantee program to enable needed rail infrastructure and safety improvements. I am pleased to be joined in this bipartisan effort by Senators LOTT, SNOWE, EXON, and WYDEN.

Over the years, Congress has often recognized the importance of Federal funding assistance for rail infrastructure projects. Federal appropriations through such programs as the section 511 program and the Local Rail Freight Assistance [LRFA] Program have enabled the continuation of rail service for many communities that have been on the brink of losing service. I strongly support initiatives to promote rail infrastructure rehabilitation.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, which I chair, has reported legislation to permanently authorize the LRFA Program. To date, this authorizing legislation, S. 1318, the Amtrak and Local Rail Revitalization Act, has not been considered by the full Senate. Because I recognize the concerns of some of my colleagues about funding certain expired programs, my amendment only proposes funding for the permanently authorized section 511 program. However, I will continue to support LRFA reauthorization and funding in future years.

Mr. President, I want to point out the House-passed Department of Transportation appropriations bill includes \$58.86 million for title V—section 505—railroad loans. At first glance, I am pleased the House recognizes the importance of funding assistance for freight rail infrastructure. Yet, I am concerned because the entire amount has been earmarked for only one project in California. Many equally important projects would be shut out of the process by the House-passed bill. This clearly ignores the national need for rail rehabilitation on light density rail projects throughout our country. It also is important to note the House approved funding has been allocated to an expired Federal loan program.

My amendment would provide \$4.158 million for section 511 loan guarantees. This would permit a loan level of up to \$75 million for many legitimate rail projects across our Nation. Further, my amendment includes offsets for this funding from certain administrative functions. I believe basic infrastructure investment would be a better use of scarce Federal dollars.

Mr. President, Federal involvement, while limited, would advance track and bridge projects planned in Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, and South Dakota, just to name a few. In turn, rail safety and economic opportunity for these and hundreds of other communities would be promoted. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this amendment offsets \$4.1 million for the

Federal Rail Administration. There is a loan program where \$4.1 million can, in effect, leverage \$75 million in guaranteed loans. This is basically geared for some of the rail problems in the smaller areas, or the less populated areas.

It has been cleared on both sides. It is budget neutral. As I say, it has been offset for that transfer of moneys.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, will the manager yield for a moment?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. There seems to be a question about clearance on our side, if we can review that for a couple of minutes. I would be happy to then discuss it.

Mr. HATFIELD. I ask that we temporarily set aside Senator Pressler's amendment, and I 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. HATFIELD. 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. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I now call up again the Pressler amendment and ask unanimous consent that Senators WYDEN, EXON, HARKIN, and BOXER be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5136) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5137

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send on behalf of Senator KEMPTHORNE an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. KEMPTHORNE, proposes an amendment numbered 5137.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 47 line 13 of H.R. 3675, strike "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is an amendment by Senator KEMPTHORNE that is budget neutral. It moves \$5 million up to \$15 million for

national trail rehabilitation, which particularly suffered great damage in the Pacific Northwest during the floods of recent times. It has been cleared on both sides.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5137) was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5138

(Purpose: To prohibit the issuance, implementation, or enforcement of certain regulations relating to fats, oils, and greases)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment on behalf of Senator PRESSLER to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. PRESSLER, for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BOND, and Mr. LUGAR, proposes an amendment numbered 5138.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . LIMITATION ON FUNDS USED TO ENFORCE REGULATIONS REGARDING ANIMAL FATS AND VEGETABLE OILS.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Coast Guard to issue, implement, or enforce a regulation or to establish an interpretation or guideline under the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act (Public Law 104-55) or the amendments made by that Act does not recognize and provide for, with respect to fats, oils, and greases (as described in that Act or the amendments made by that Act) differences in—

- (1) physical, chemical, biological, and other relevant properties; and
- (2) environmental effects.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, earlier this year Congress passed the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act. That measure which became Public Law 104-55 was long overdue.

The Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act addresses how Federal agencies regulate the shipment of edible oils, as compared with toxic oils. They require that agencies make a distinction between these two kinds of oils. This is extremely important to U.S. agricultural exports. Without Public Law 104-55, farmers faced a potential loss in agricultural exports and diminished farm income.

The law is simple and very straightforward. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard continues to issue regulations that do not comply with Public Law 104-55. The Coast Guard has issued regulations that do not provide relief to

the oilseed industry due to the differentiation between shipments of edible oilseeds and shipments of toxic oils, such as petroleum.

Mr. President, the kind of enforcement found in the Coast Guard regulations was never congressional intent. The amendment that I, and Senators HARKIN, GRASSLEY, LOTT, and BOND are offering today would prevent the Coast Guard from using funds to issue, implement, or enforce regulations or establish an interpretation or guideline that do not differentiate animal fats and vegetable oils from toxic oils. This amendment does not change the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 as it relates to toxic oils.

Without action, the Coast Guard regulations could inadvertently diminish U.S. agricultural exports. In addition, existing regulations could have a chilling effect on the development of new crops and new uses of crop production.

Farm exports are at all time highs. Future exports are expected to stay at record levels. The future for oilseeds is equally bright. However, current Coast Guard regulations could work against this progress. It has become clearly evident that existing regulations would seriously impact exports of U.S. agricultural commodities, especially vegetable oils and animal fats.

Unless we pass this amendment, U.S. animal fat and vegetable oil industries would be faced with lost export sales. Public Law 104-55 put common sense into Federal regulations regarding the shipment of animal fats and vegetable oils. The winners out of all this are our farmers and ranchers. Unfortunately, we have to pass this amendment to make sure that the Coast Guard abides by Federal law and congressional intent on this matter. I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this is an amendment, too, that has been cleared on both sides. It is an instruction, in effect, to the Coast Guard that as it continues its work on regulations of toxic materials, it make a differentiation between shipments of edible oilseeds and shipments of toxic oils, such as petroleum.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5138) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5139

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send on behalf of Senators GORTON and BAUCUS an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], for Mr. GORTON, for himself and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 5139.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following:

SEC. . (a) In cases where an emergency ocean condition causes erosion of a bank protecting a scenic highway or byway, FY 1996 or FY 1997 Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds can be used to halt the erosion and stabilize the bank if such action is necessary to protect the highway from imminent failure and is less expensive than highway relocation;

(b) In cases where an emergency condition causes inundation of a roadway or saturation of the subgrade with further erosion due to abnormal freeze/thaw cycles and damage caused by traffic, FY 1996 or FY 1997 Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds can be used to repair such roadway.

(c) Not more than \$8 million in Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds may be used for each of the conditions referenced in paragraphs (a) and (b).

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, along the southwest coast of Washington State, Highway 105 runs adjacent to Willapa Bay from Raymond to Aberdeen and provides an alternative route to Highway 101. While this route serves as the only direct access for residents of the Tokeland Peninsula and the Shoalwater Indian Reservation, it also acts as a dike protecting several cranberry bogs, a vital local industry, from saltwater inundation.

Unfortunately, the embankment supporting Highway 105 has eroded away under the pressure of the unstable forces in Willapa Bay. Unless something is done, preliminary engineering studies indicate that under existing conditions, the road will be washed into Willapa Bay, sometime within the next 2 years. This timeline would obviously be moved up if any type of storm hits the Washington coast later this winter. Water, telecommunications, and power utilities located within the highway right-of-way would also be severed if the highway is destroyed.

If no action is taken to remedy this problem, the estimated loss of public facilities, cranberry bogs, jobs and economic impacts is \$82 million, not including additional socioeconomic impacts. An additional \$40 million from the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief funds would also be required to relocate a new Highway 105.

A more appropriate and financially efficient alternative, in my opinion, would be to correct this problem before it becomes a reality. While diagnosing the problem, preliminary engineering studies also indicated that the erosion could be slowed considerably by dredging a relief channel in Willapa Bay, which would alter the flow of water that is currently undercutting the highway embankment.

Officials from the Washington State Department of Transportation are cur-

rently working with representatives from the affected communities to resolve this matter, however, funding continues to be the major obstacle. This prevention project, including both engineering and actual construction costs, would cost \$10 million—\$8 million from the Federal Highway Administration and \$2 million in State and local matching funds.

I am aware that Congress no longer earmarks money in the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) account of the Transportation appropriations bill, and therefore, I believe that the only appropriate funding available is possibly the FHWA Emergency Relief (ER) fund. While I recognize that this fund is traditionally dedicated to repairing Federal highways once a disaster has occurred, it seems that common sense dictates using \$8 million to prevent a washout rather than spending \$40 million to replace the road in less than 2 years.

I have been working with officials from the Federal Highway Administration, and they are aware of the pending road failure. While they support participating in this prevention project, they believe that legislative authority must be given to allow ER funds to be used in this manner. For that reason, my amendment provides legislative language in this bill that authorizes the Federal Highway Administration to use up to \$8 million in Emergency Relief funds in order to prevent complete loss of the existing Highway 105.

By allowing these funds to be used in this manner, I estimate that the Federal Government will save approximately \$30 million in future highway relocation funds, while also protecting the fragile environment and economy of Pacific County in Washington State.

In closing, let me thank Chairman HATFIELD for his consideration of this matter. Let me also applaud the efforts of the officials in Pacific County, as well as other individuals in the Washington State who have worked so carefully to ensure that this potential disaster is averted.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, this provides for definition of emergency funding that can be used to relieve the situation in both Montana and Washington State. It has been cleared on both sides. It is budget neutral.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this is an amendment that, as the distinguished chairman has said, has been cleared by both sides. It is an important amendment to the State of Washington and, indeed, to Senator BAUCUS as well. It is a good amendment.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, essentially following up, I thank the managers for the amendment. There was a natural catastrophe in the State of Montana due to abnormal weather. This amendment helps that situation.

I thank the Senators.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have to reserve the right to object

until we clear a matter here that, frankly, raises concerns. So I am sorry to say it, but we do have to take a couple of minutes to check this. Therefore, unless there is somebody else who we are going to go to, I would note the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATFIELD. I apologize. I was told that it was cleared on both sides, I say to my comanager.

I 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. HATFIELD. 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. HATFIELD. Mr. President, let me return to the Gorton-Baucus amendment we were discussing a little bit earlier. We now have the clearance on the Democratic side, so I urge the adoption of that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5139) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I have an inquiry of the committee chairman, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair. If the chairman will recall, the committee, at its meeting of July 16, included language in the Committee Report offered by the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY]. This language concerned significant costs incurred by the mid-Columbia hydroelectric projects associated with fish and wildlife mitigation due to water releases from upstream Federal facilities and how the impacts of such costs to the mid-Columbia projects could be offset. My question is this: Should no all upstream project owners incurring the same costs, from the same water releases, be treated the same as the mid-Columbia project owners? For example, the Montana Power Co. incurs the same costs at their Kerr project at Flathead Lake and Thompson Falls project on the Clark Fork River due to the large releases from the Federal Hungry Horse project. The Washington Water Power Co. incurs the same costs at their Noxon Rapids and Cabinet Gorge projects on the Clark Fork River due to these same releases from the federally owned Hungry Horse project. Does the committee also urge the BPA to enter into the same equitable energy exchange with the Montana Power Co. and the Washington Water Power Co.? Their problems with these Federal water releases are the same as those of the mid-Columbia project owners.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Montana. My answer is that, "yes", all projects incurring the same impacts from the Federal water releases associated with fish and wildlife mitigation should be treated the same. That provision in the report urges BPA to enter into equitable energy exchange agreements. Moreover, such agreements should not increase costs for BPA.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Senator from Oregon, my constituents will be very pleased. Let us hope that Bonneville will faithfully follow the committee's urging on this matter.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think we are in sight of the goal line on this bill. If Members have amendments yet pending or have registered in their respective Cloakrooms an intention to offer an amendment by the terms relevant or whatever else, we would like to have them come now because we are down to the last handful of amendments and then final passage.

I do not anticipate any votes on the remaining amendments. I do not think they are that controversial, but I am just making a judgment. We are inquiring as to the leadership's view about putting the final passage vote over until tomorrow to relieve other Senators who are not involved in the amendment process. As soon as we get that information, I will relay it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5140

(Purpose: To provide funding for the Institute of Railroad Safety)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 5140.

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following new section:

SEC. . THE RAILROAD SAFETY INSTITUTE.

Of the money available to the Federal Rail Administration up to \$500,000 shall be made available to establish and operate the Institute for Railroad Safety as authorized by the Swift Rail Development Act of 1994.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, this is something that the Senate approved last year. It is a very important matter with regard to railroad safety. The matter has been cleared on both sides, I believe. I urge its adoption.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I urge its adoption.

The amendment (No. 5140) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair and I thank the managers of the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think we are down now to the last three or four amendments. I hope the Senators who have those amendments—I could enumerate the Senators by name, but I do not think I want to do that at this point—at least will have the courtesy to call the floor and tell us whether they are going to offer their amendments or not. Is that asking too much? Please, please, make it a little easier to complete our business here.

To the Senators who put a place hold on amendments to the respective cloakrooms, at least let us know whether you plan to do it or not. We have contacted some Senators. They say, "Oh, I'm not going to offer that after all," but we have not been informed. I think everybody's mother taught them better manners. So much for my lecture. 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. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF DAVID BRODY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, just moments ago I left a reception for a friend, David Brody. I am very pleased to just rise briefly and commemorate the 80th birthday of one of the most remarkable men who it has been my privilege to know, Mr. David Brody.

He is perhaps best known to all of us in the Senate as the "101st Senator," which was a characterization appropriately applied to him in 1989 in a Senate resolution which passed unanimously.

That resolution was passed on the occasion of David Brody's so-called "retirement" from the Anti-Defamation League of the B'Nai B'rith. As I have previously noted in other remarks, it was most carefully phrased so as to avoid any mention of the word "retirement."

There is nothing "retiring" about David Brody—nothing. He remains the essence and embodiment of energy, spirit, enthusiasm, and good will which he has always been.

It has been my personal pleasure on occasion to pay tribute to David Brody on the Senate floor, to participate in a retirement ceremony on his behalf several years ago, and most recently on March 11, 1993, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the wedding of Bea and David Brody. I have informed David that he and I have one thing in common for very certain above all oth-

ers, and it is that we both "severely overmarried." The marriage and partnership of Bea and David enriches our lives in so many ways, a monument to their boundless love to each other, and to the innumerable good works of each of them individually.

So on David's 80th birthday, I am certain he will have cause to reflect on his good fortune in spending evermore time and more than the 50 years of life wedded to that fine lady. And all of us will have cause to reflect upon our own good fortune in having David with us for now 80 years.

And our wish for him is that he may have many more years of life to savor. My wife Ann and I wish him Godspeed and all our love. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO DAVID BRODY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming, just a few minutes ago, addressed the celebration of the 80th birthday of a friend of the U.S. Senate, a friend of most every U.S. Senator, David Brody. There was a celebration of that on the Hill this evening.

It is most appropriate that Senators help David Brody celebrate his 80th birthday because he is so well known, he has been so active on the Hill, and he has been, in the truest sense of the word, a public-spirited person, a person who has been civic-minded about his responsibilities to Government. He has represented a lot of good causes, as he has interacted with Members of the U.S. Senate throughout his career on the Hill.

A few years ago, you could have read a newspaper article that stated it better than any of us could have. It was about how David Brody is respected. In that newspaper article he was referred to as the 101st Senator.

So I wish David Brody a happy birthday. I wish him and his wife well in the future. Happy birthday.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have the following unanimous consent agreement that has been cleared with the two leaders, Republican Senator TRENT LOTT and Democratic leader TOM DASCHLE.