

will mean more dollars for transportation priorities in fast-growth areas like Florida. In the short term, this will help improve safety on our roads and make long overdue improvements, which are obviously needed for those who have been using those infrastructure areas.

In the long term, we are going to be looking for a greater share. And in Florida we say our fair share is the formulas that we find in the upcoming ISTEA reauthorization process.

But today I am also pleased that the bill provides \$1.7 billion for the airport improvement program. Southwest Florida International Airport is the third fastest growing airport in the country, and other airports nearby, like Naples and Immokalee, are also feeling the pressure of increased trade and traffic. Without Federal support available through the AIP to supplement local and State funding, these airports simply cannot respond to the need for capacity expansion programs for upgraded air traffic systems and for the runway improvements that we need for safety.

The committee has wisely increased funding levels for this program despite the opposition of the Clinton administration, and I am grateful to the committee.

Another issue on the minds of my constituents is the drug war, and it should be on the minds of all Americans. A major component of that struggle, the war on drugs, must be increased funding for drug interdiction efforts by the U.S. Coast Guard. We all know that. Everybody who reads the newspaper, watches television, draws a breath in this country, and opens their eyes and listens a little bit understands what a valuable role the Coast Guard has in drug interdiction.

Last week, a hearing was held in the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on the increase in narcotics traffic just through the State of Florida, a serious issue for Florida, obviously, with consequences for the whole Nation. The good news from that hearing is that the different agencies in the war on drugs are increasing coordination so that in south Florida the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Customs Service, and the Coast Guard are all working together. That may sound like a simple thing to say, but it is a hard thing to accomplish. And it is good news when it happens, and it is very effective and it has positive results; and I hope it continues to happen. This legislation ought to help in that direction.

Hopefully, the director of the ONDCP, the so-called drug czar's office, will review the Coast Guard's activities and ensure that these funds that we are providing are being used for their intended purpose of drug interdiction. The Coast Guard must be able to respond on the basis of good intelligence with the interdiction efforts necessary

to fight the dangerous inflow of drugs on the high seas before they reach our shores.

I think most people know that the way we get most of these drug busts is through good intelligence, through good tips, through good information, and then we direct the Coast Guard and the other enforcement agencies to go make the bust.

The rest of the time, the random searches and checks just do not have the same kind of success record. I think it is very important that we understand the link between information and the Coast Guard and the money it takes to do enforcement.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, for the work he has done on this bill, and I urge the House to support this fair rule and the bill it makes in order, and I am most thankful for the time.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include, tables, charts, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 189 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2169.

□ 1416

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am pleased to present to the House today H.R. 2169, the fiscal year 1998 transportation appropriations bill.

This bill is the product of a bipartisan effort, and we have endeavored to involve the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member of the subcommittee. Like last year, I hope this bill will have the overwhelming support of the House today.

Again this year, the No. 1 priority in developing this bill was maintaining and improving safety. In addition, we have placed a high priority on funding for our Nation's infrastructure.

In total, the bill provides \$12.48 billion in discretionary budget authority, an increase of \$400 million over the 1997 level, and the bill is \$10 million over the President's budget request. Outlays mostly needed for transportation infrastructure are up over 4 percent compared to last year. These increases respond to the calls of many Members of this body that sought to increase transportation and infrastructure spending. The bill is \$31 million below the subcommittee's allocation for budget authority.

On the safety front, the bill raises funding for Federal Aviation Administration operations by over 8 percent, an increase of over \$400 million. This level will fund the requested increase of 500 air traffic controllers and 326 additional staff in certification and regulation. The bill also includes 18 initiatives to improve air safety. These initiatives total \$153 million and include additional funds for installing airport surface detection systems, automatic alerting systems to prevent runway collisions and approach lighting systems. Additional funds are provided for research into hazardous weather conditions, aircraft safety, and human factors.

In highway safety, the bill provides more funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration than the President requested. In fiscal year 1998, a total of \$333 million is allocated for NHTSA. This organization does critical work in research and public education to make our highways safer. Earlier advances in reducing highway fatalities in this country have flattened out in recent years, and in some States, Mr. Chairman, fatalities are going back up with the repeal of the national speed limit last year and increased alcohol use. These increases will allow the agency to aggressively work on solving the air bag problem and focus more resources on rising alcohol-related highway fatalities. In addition, the bill also includes \$9 million for a new occupant protection grant program.

Recognizing the importance of investing in the Nation's infrastructure,

the bill increases funding for the Federal-aid highways program to \$21.5 billion. This is an increase, Mr. Chairman, of over \$3.5 billion from the 1997 enacted level, or an increase of nearly 20 percent. It is a historic high and represents an increase of \$1.3 billion over the assumption in the congressional budget resolution. This answers those who say that the appropriations process and the current budgetary treatment of the trust funds cannot provide increases in highway spending.

Funding for transit capital grants is increased to \$2.5 billion, an increase of \$350 million, or 16 percent over the 1997 level. Section 3 discretionary capital grants total \$2 billion, an increase of 5 percent or \$100 million over the previous year. Funding for transit operating assistance, which the administration proposed to eliminate, is reduced to \$200 million but it is \$200 million above what the administration had requested. Like the highway program, funding for the transit programs is at an all-time high.

Funding for the AIP program is \$1.7 billion, an increase of \$240 million, or 16 percent. Mr. Chairman, this is 70 percent higher than the budget request of \$1 billion.

Funding for the Coast Guard totals \$3.9 billion, an increase of \$116 million over the 1997 enacted level and \$21 million above the President's request. The bill fully funds the Coast Guard's drug interdiction program, of which \$34.3 million requires the Office of National Drug Control Policy to certify that these expenditures represent the best investment relative to other possible alternatives.

Funding for Amtrak, Mr. Chairman, totals \$793 million, which is \$30 million more than in fiscal year 1997 and also \$3.5 million above the administration's request. While the bill increases funding above last year's level for Amtrak

and in doing so provides funding stability to the railroad, funding alone is not the panacea for Amtrak's financial problems. Comprehensive legislative reform, including unemployment, liability, contracting and labor reforms, must also occur if Amtrak is to address its financial and operating difficulties.

A railroad passenger system is a vital part of a balanced transportation network, and I think most Members of this body want to see Amtrak survive and prosper and thrive and have that opportunity, because with the large country that we have, I think a national rail system is fundamentally important. To that end, the bill establishes an independent commission to conduct an economic assessment of the entire Amtrak system. I regret that the rule does not protect the provisions establishing the commission, and it may be stricken on a point of order. The commission is necessary, since Amtrak's own restructuring efforts have not been as successful as planned and since Congress has mandated that Amtrak continue a number of unprofitable routes.

Modeled after the Base Closing Commission, which was set up to recommend which bases to close, this commission would make recommendations on route closings and realignments needed for the survival of a rail passenger system in the United States. Since these determinations would be made by the commission, painful route closure and realignment choices would be less politicized and the recommendations would then be considered by Congress on an expedited basis.

Finally, the bill is very clean of extraneous provisions. We have tried hard to work with the legislative committees to ensure their support for the bill. There are no major policy changes or time bombs in the bill. For the surface transportation programs author-

ized by ISTEA, the bill assumes current law and does not presuppose or prejudge the action of the appropriate legislative committees as they consider the reauthorization of ISTEA. In this way the bill can go forward without delay and without needless controversy.

I think it is a balanced bill, it is a bipartisan bill, it is a bill that puts emphasis on our higher responsibility of protecting and enhancing transportation safety. The bill also provides critical investments in our Nation's infrastructure which drives the Nation's economic engine.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for his cooperation. I would also like to thank the following individuals who assisted in developing the fiscal year 1998 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. They include John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Linda Muir, Ken Marx, and Cheryl Smith with the minority staff.

I wish to recognize and thank those associate staff members who supported the Members of this House in the preparation and passage of the fiscal year 1998 Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, H.R. 2169: David Whitestone of my office, Monica Vega-Kladakis of Majority Whip DELAY's office, Connie Veillette of Mr. REGULA's office, Steve Carey of Mr. ROGER's office, Eric Mondero of Mr. PACKARD's office, Todd Rich of Mr. CALLAHAN's office, Joe Cramer of Mr. TIAHRT's office, Mark Zeldon of Mr. ADERHOLT's office, Paul Cambon of Chairman LIVINGSTON's office, Marjorie Duske of Mr. SABO's office, Barbara Zylinski-Mizrahi of Mr. FOGLIETTA's office, Albert Jacques and Nancy Alcalde of Mr. TORRES' office, David Oliveira of Mr. OLVER's office, Blake Gable of Mr. PASTOR's office, and Paul Carver of Mr. OBEY's office.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material for the RECORD:

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2169)

| | FY 1997 Enacted | FY 1998 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 52,966,000 | 56,136,000 | 60,009,000 | + 7,043,000 | + 3,873,000 |
| Office of civil rights..... | 5,574,000 | 5,574,000 | 5,574,000 | | |
| Transportation planning, research, and development..... | 3,000,000 | 6,008,000 | 4,400,000 | +1,400,000 | -1,608,000 |
| Transportation Administrative Service Center | (124,812,000) | | (121,800,000) | (-3,012,000) | (+ 121,800,000) |
| Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (25,900,000) | | | (-25,900,000) | |
| (Limitation on obligations)..... | (25,900,000) | | | (-25,900,000) | |
| Rescission of contract authorization | (-12,700,000) | (-38,600,000) | (-38,600,000) | (-25,900,000) | |
| Rescission..... | (-1,133,000) | | | (+ 1,133,000) | |
| Rental payments..... | 127,447,000 | 10,567,000 | | -127,447,000 | -10,567,000 |
| Minority business resource center program..... | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | | |
| (Limitation on direct loans) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | | |
| Minority business outreach | 2,900,000 | 2,900,000 | 2,900,000 | | |
| Total, Office of the Secretary | 193,787,000 | 83,085,000 | 74,783,000 | -119,004,000 | -8,302,000 |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (25,900,000) | | | (-25,900,000) | |
| Total budgetary resources..... | (219,687,000) | (83,085,000) | (74,783,000) | (-144,904,000) | (-8,302,000) |
| Coast Guard | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | 2,319,725,000 | 2,440,000,000 | 2,408,000,000 | + 88,275,000 | -32,000,000 |
| Defense function (050) | | 300,000,000 | 300,000,000 | +300,000,000 | |
| (Transfer from DOD)..... | (300,000,000) | | | (-300,000,000) | |
| Supplemental (P.L. 105-18) | 1,800,000 | | | -1,800,000 | |
| Acquisition, construction, and improvements: | | | | | |
| Offsetting collections | | -9,000,000 | -9,000,000 | -9,000,000 | |
| Vessels | 216,500,000 | 186,900,000 | 191,650,000 | -24,850,000 | + 4,750,000 |
| Aircraft | 18,040,000 | 28,400,000 | 33,900,000 | + 15,860,000 | + 7,500,000 |
| Other equipment..... | 41,700,000 | 49,700,000 | 47,050,000 | + 5,350,000 | -2,650,000 |
| Shore facilities & aids to navigation facilities | 52,350,000 | 69,000,000 | 59,400,000 | + 7,050,000 | -9,600,000 |
| Personnel and related support..... | 46,250,000 | 47,000,000 | 47,000,000 | + 750,000 | |
| Subtotal, A C & I appropriations..... | 374,840,000 | 370,000,000 | 370,000,000 | -4,840,000 | |
| Environmental compliance and restoration | 22,000,000 | 21,000,000 | 21,000,000 | -1,000,000 | |
| Port Safety Development..... | 5,000,000 | | | -5,000,000 | |
| Alteration of bridges..... | 16,000,000 | | 16,000,000 | | + 16,000,000 |
| Retired pay..... | 808,084,000 | 645,696,000 | 645,696,000 | + 37,612,000 | |
| Supplemental (P.L. 105-18) | 9,200,000 | | | -9,200,000 | |
| Reserve training | 65,890,000 | 65,000,000 | 67,000,000 | + 1,110,000 | + 2,000,000 |
| Research, development, test, and evaluation | 19,200,000 | 19,000,000 | 19,000,000 | -200,000 | |
| Boat safety (Aquatic Resources Trust Fund)..... | 35,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 35,000,000 | | -15,000,000 |
| Total, Coast Guard..... | 3,476,539,000 | 3,910,696,000 | 3,881,696,000 | + 405,157,000 | -29,000,000 |
| Federal Aviation Administration | | | | | |
| Operations | 4,925,500,000 | 5,036,100,000 | 5,300,000,000 | + 374,500,000 | + 263,900,000 |
| Appropriation of user fees | | 300,000,000 | | | -300,000,000 |
| Offsetting Collections..... | -75,000,000 | | | + 75,000,000 | |
| Emergency appropriations | (32,400,000) | | | (-32,400,000) | |
| Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)..... | 1,793,500,000 | 1,875,000,000 | 1,875,000,000 | + 81,500,000 | |
| Emergency appropriations | (144,200,000) | | | (-144,200,000) | |
| Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)..... | 187,412,000 | 200,000,000 | 185,000,000 | -2,412,000 | -15,000,000 |
| Emergency appropriations | (21,000,000) | | | (-21,000,000) | |
| Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (1,500,000,000) | (1,500,000,000) | (1,800,000,000) | (+ 100,000,000) | (+ 100,000,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (1,460,000,000) | (1,000,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (+ 240,000,000) | (+ 700,000,000) |
| Rescission of contract authorization | (-800,000,000) | | | (+ 800,000,000) | |
| Total, Federal Aviation Administration..... | 6,831,412,000 | 7,411,100,000 | 7,360,000,000 | + 528,588,000 | -51,100,000 |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (1,460,000,000) | (1,000,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (+ 240,000,000) | (+ 700,000,000) |
| Total budgetary resources..... | (8,291,412,000) | (8,411,100,000) | (9,060,000,000) | (+ 768,588,000) | (+ 648,900,000) |
| Federal Highway Administration | | | | | |
| Limitation on general operating expenses..... | (521,114,000) | (494,376,000) | (510,313,000) | (-10,801,000) | (+ 15,937,000) |
| Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (2,049,000) | (4,000,000) | | (-2,049,000) | (-4,000,000) |
| Rescission of contract authority | (-9,100,000) | | | (+ 9,100,000) | |
| Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (18,000,000,000) | (20,170,000,000) | (21,500,000,000) | (+ 3,500,000,000) | (+ 1,330,000,000) |
| Supplemental obligation authority (P.L. 105-18) | (694,810,534) | | | (-694,810,534) | |
| (Exempt obligations) (sec. 310 a-d) | (1,783,237,000) | (1,510,571,000) | (1,390,570,000) | (-392,667,000) | (-120,001,000) |
| (Bonus program) (sec. 310 e)..... | (241,173,000) | | (269,656,000) | (+ 28,483,000) | (+ 269,656,000) |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (19,800,000,000) | (19,800,000,000) | (20,800,000,000) | (+ 1,000,000,000) | (+ 1,000,000,000) |
| Emergency appropriations | (82,000,000) | | | (-82,000,000) | |
| Emergency relief program (P.L. 105-18) | (650,000,000) | | | (-650,000,000) | |

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2169)—Continued

| | FY 1997 Enacted | FY 1998 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (74,000,000) | (90,000,000) | (85,000,000) | (+ 11,000,000) | (-5,000,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (78,225,000) | (100,000,000) | (85,325,000) | (+ 7,100,000) | (-14,675,000) |
| Rescission of contract authorization | (-12,300,000) | | | (+ 12,300,000) | |
| State infrastructure banks | 150,000,000 | | | -150,000,000 | |
| State infrastructure banks (Highway Trust Fund) | | 150,000,000 | | | -150,000,000 |
| Transportation infrastructure credit program (Highway Trust Fund) | | 100,000,000 | | | -100,000,000 |
| Total, Federal Highway Administration..... | 150,000,000 | 250,000,000 | | -150,000,000 | -250,000,000 |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (18,773,035,534) | (20,270,000,000) | (21,585,325,000) | (+ 2,812,289,466) | (+ 1,315,325,000) |
| (Sec. 310 obligations) | (2,024,410,000) | (1,510,571,000) | (1,660,226,000) | (-364,184,000) | (+ 149,655,000) |
| Total budgetary resources..... | (20,947,445,534) | (22,030,571,000) | (23,245,551,000) | (+ 2,298,105,466) | (+ 1,214,980,000) |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration | | | | | |
| Operations and research | 80,900,000 | | 74,492,000 | -8,408,000 | + 74,492,000 |
| Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund) | 51,712,000 | 147,500,000 | 72,415,000 | + 20,703,000 | - 75,085,000 |
| Subtotal, Operations and research..... | 132,612,000 | 147,500,000 | 146,907,000 | + 14,295,000 | -593,000 |
| Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (168,100,000) | (185,000,000) | (186,000,000) | (+ 17,900,000) | (+ 1,000,000) |
| State and community highway safety grants (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations) | (128,700,000) | (140,200,000) | (140,200,000) | (+ 11,500,000) | |
| National Driver Register (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations) | (2,400,000) | (2,300,000) | (2,300,000) | (-100,000) | |
| Contract authorization (P.L. 105-18) | 2,500,000 | | | -2,500,000 | |
| Highway safety grants (Sec. 1003(a)(7)) (limitation on obligations) | (11,500,000) | | | (-11,500,000) | |
| Occupant protection incentive grants (limitation on obligations) | | (9,000,000) | (9,000,000) | (+ 9,000,000) | |
| Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs (Sec. 410) (limitation on obligations) | (25,500,000) | (34,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (+ 9,500,000) | (+ 1,000,000) |
| Contract authorization (P.L. 105-18) | 500,000 | | | -500,000 | |
| Rescission of contract authorization | (-24,800,000) | | | (+ 24,800,000) | |
| Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin | 135,612,000 | 147,500,000 | 146,907,000 | + 11,295,000 | -593,000 |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (168,100,000) | (185,500,000) | (186,500,000) | (+ 18,400,000) | (+ 1,000,000) |
| Total budgetary resources..... | (303,712,000) | (333,000,000) | (333,407,000) | (+ 29,695,000) | (+ 407,000) |
| Federal Railroad Administration | | | | | |
| Office of the Administrator | 16,739,000 | 20,559,000 | 19,434,000 | + 2,695,000 | - 1,125,000 |
| Railroad safety | 51,407,000 | 57,067,000 | 56,967,000 | + 5,580,000 | - 100,000 |
| Railroad research and development | 20,100,000 | 21,638,000 | 21,038,000 | + 938,000 | - 600,000 |
| Northeast corridor improvement program | 175,000,000 | | 250,000,000 | + 75,000,000 | + 250,000,000 |
| High-speed rail trainsets and facilities | 80,000,000 | | | -80,000,000 | |
| Next generation high speed rail | 24,757,000 | 19,595,000 | 18,395,000 | -6,362,000 | - 1,200,000 |
| Trust fund share of next generation high-speed rail (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization) | (2,855,000) | | | (-2,855,000) | |
| Alaska Railroad rehabilitation | 10,000,000 | | | -10,000,000 | |
| Rhode Island Rail Development | 7,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | + 3,000,000 | |
| Direct loan financing program | 58,680,000 | | | -58,680,000 | |
| Direct loan financing program limitation | (400,000,000) | | | (-400,000,000) | |
| Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: | | | | | |
| Operations | 364,500,000 | | 283,000,000 | -81,500,000 | + 283,000,000 |
| Capital | 223,450,000 | | 260,000,000 | + 36,550,000 | + 260,000,000 |
| Subtotal, Grants to Amtrak..... | 587,950,000 | | 543,000,000 | -44,950,000 | + 543,000,000 |
| Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Highway Trust Fund) | | 445,450,000 | | | -445,450,000 |
| (Northeast corridor improvements) | | (200,000,000) | | | (-200,000,000) |
| (Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project) | | (23,450,000) | | | (-23,450,000) |
| Operating grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Highway Trust Fund) | | 344,000,000 | | | -344,000,000 |
| Emergency railroad rehabilitation and repair: Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18) | (18,900,000) | | | (-18,900,000) | |
| Total, Federal Railroad Administration | 1,031,633,000 | 918,309,000 | 918,834,000 | -112,799,000 | + 525,000 |
| Federal Transit Administration | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | 41,497,000 | | 45,738,000 | + 4,241,000 | + 45,738,000 |
| Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) | | 47,018,000 | | | -47,018,000 |
| Formula grants | 490,000,000 | | 290,000,000 | -200,000,000 | + 290,000,000 |
| Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund): | | | | | |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (1,659,185,000) | | (2,210,000,000) | (+ 550,815,000) | (+ 2,210,000,000) |
| Operating assistance grants | (400,000,000) | | (200,000,000) | (-200,000,000) | (+ 200,000,000) |
| Subtotal, Formula grants | (2,149,185,000) | | (2,500,000,000) | (+ 350,815,000) | (+ 2,500,000,000) |

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2169)—Continued

| | FY 1997 Enacted | FY 1998 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Formula programs (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account): | | | | | |
| (Limitation on obligations)..... | | (3,498,500,000) | | | (-3,498,500,000) |
| (Liquidation of contract authorization)..... | | (1,500,000,000) | | | (-1,500,000,000) |
| University transportation centers..... | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | | +6,000,000 |
| Transit planning and research..... | 85,500,000 | | 86,000,000 | +500,000 | +86,000,000 |
| Metropolitan planning..... | (39,500,000) | | (39,500,000) | | (+39,500,000) |
| Rural transit assistance..... | (4,500,000) | | (4,500,000) | | (+4,500,000) |
| Transit cooperative research..... | (8,250,000) | | (8,250,000) | | (+8,250,000) |
| National planning and research..... | (22,000,000) | | (22,500,000) | (+500,000) | (+22,500,000) |
| State planning and research..... | (8,250,000) | | (8,250,000) | | (+8,250,000) |
| National transit institute..... | (3,000,000) | | (3,000,000) | | (+3,000,000) |
| Subtotal, Transit planning and research..... | (85,500,000) | | (86,000,000) | (+500,000) | (+86,000,000) |
| Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account): | | | | | |
| Metropolitan planning..... | | 91,800,000 | | | -91,800,000 |
| Transit cooperative research..... | | (39,500,000) | | | (-39,500,000) |
| Statewide planning..... | | (8,250,000) | | | (-8,250,000) |
| National planning and research..... | | (8,250,000) | | | (-8,250,000) |
| National mass transportation institute..... | | (16,800,000) | | | (-16,800,000) |
| University transportation centers..... | | (3,000,000) | | | (-3,000,000) |
| Advanced Technology Transit Bus..... | | (6,000,000) | | | (-6,000,000) |
| Advanced Technology Transit Bus..... | | (10,000,000) | | | (-10,000,000) |
| Subtotal, Transit planning and research..... | | (91,800,000) | | | (-91,800,000) |
| Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization): | | | | | |
| Rescission of contract authorization..... | (1,920,000,000) | | (2,210,000,000) | (+290,000,000) | (+2,210,000,000) |
| Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations): | | | | | |
| Fixed guideway modernization..... | (760,000,000) | | (800,000,000) | (+40,000,000) | (+800,000,000) |
| Bus and bus-related facilities..... | (380,000,000) | | (400,000,000) | (+20,000,000) | (+400,000,000) |
| New starts..... | (760,000,000) | | (800,000,000) | (+40,000,000) | (+800,000,000) |
| Subtotal, Discretionary grants..... | (1,900,000,000) | | (2,000,000,000) | (+100,000,000) | (+2,000,000,000) |
| Rescission of contract authorization..... | (-588,000,000) | | | (+588,000,000) | |
| Major capital investments (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations): | | | | | |
| Mass capital investments (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (liquidation of contract authority)..... | | (650,000,000) | | | (-650,000,000) |
| Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)..... | (2,300,000,000) | | (2,350,000,000) | (+50,000,000) | (+2,350,000,000) |
| Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority..... | 200,000,000 | | 200,000,000 | | +200,000,000 |
| Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)..... | | 200,000,000 | | | -200,000,000 |
| Total, Federal Transit Administration..... | 822,997,000 | 338,818,000 | 627,738,000 | -195,259,000 | +288,920,000 |
| (Limitations on obligations)..... | (3,559,185,000) | (4,148,500,000) | (4,210,000,000) | (+650,815,000) | (+61,500,000) |
| Total budgetary resources..... | (4,382,182,000) | (4,487,318,000) | (4,837,738,000) | (+455,556,000) | (+350,420,000) |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)..... | 10,337,000 | | 11,200,000 | +863,000 | +11,200,000 |
| Research and Special Programs Administration | | | | | |
| Research and special programs..... | 26,886,000 | 30,102,000 | 27,934,000 | +1,048,000 | -2,168,000 |
| Hazardous materials safety..... | (15,472,000) | | (15,024,000) | (-448,000) | (+15,024,000) |
| Emergency transportation..... | (993,000) | | (993,000) | | (+993,000) |
| Research and technology..... | (3,580,000) | | (3,596,000) | (+16,000) | (+3,596,000) |
| Program and administrative support..... | (6,841,000) | | (8,321,000) | (+1,480,000) | (+8,321,000) |
| Subtotal, research and special programs..... | (26,886,000) | | (27,934,000) | (+1,048,000) | (+27,934,000) |
| Emergency appropriations..... | (3,000,000) | | | (-3,000,000) | |
| Pipeline safety (Pipeline Safety Fund)..... | 28,460,000 | 30,660,000 | 28,186,000 | -274,000 | -2,474,000 |
| Pipeline safety (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)..... | 2,528,000 | 2,328,000 | 3,300,000 | +772,000 | +972,000 |
| Subtotal, Pipeline safety..... | 30,988,000 | 32,988,000 | 31,486,000 | +498,000 | -1,502,000 |
| Emergency preparedness grants: Emergency preparedness fund..... | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | | |
| Total, Research and Special Programs Admin..... | 58,074,000 | 63,290,000 | 59,620,000 | +1,548,000 | -3,670,000 |
| Office of Inspector General | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 37,900,000 | 40,889,000 | 42,000,000 | +4,100,000 | +1,111,000 |
| Surface Transportation Board | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 12,344,000 | 14,300,000 | 15,853,000 | +3,509,000 | +1,553,000 |
| Offsetting collections..... | | (-14,300,000) | (-2,000,000) | (-2,000,000) | +12,300,000 |

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2169)—Continued

| | FY 1997 Enacted | FY 1998 Estimate | Bill | Bill compared with Enacted | Bill compared with Estimate |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Bureau of Transportation Statistics (transfer from Federal-aid Highways) | (25,000,000) | (31,000,000) | (25,000,000) | | (-6,000,000) |
| Transportation Administrative Service Center reduction | -10,000,000 | | -25,000,000 | -15,000,000 | -25,000,000 |
| Railroad safety offsetting collections | | -80,000,000 | | | +80,000,000 |
| Net total, title I, Department of Transportation | 11,983,102,000 | 13,065,087,000 | 13,073,031,000 | +1,089,929,000 | +7,944,000 |
| Appropriations | (12,750,835,000) | (13,103,687,000) | (13,111,631,000) | (+360,996,000) | (+7,944,000) |
| Rescissions | (-1,719,033,000) | (-38,600,000) | (-38,600,000) | (+1,680,433,000) | |
| Emergency appropriations | (951,500,000) | | | (-951,500,000) | |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (23,986,220,534) | (25,604,000,000) | (27,681,825,000) | (+3,695,604,466) | (+2,077,825,000) |
| (Sec. 310 obligations) | (2,024,410,000) | (1,510,571,000) | (1,660,226,000) | (-364,184,000) | (+149,655,000) |
| Net total budgetary resources | (37,993,732,534) | (40,179,658,000) | (42,415,082,000) | (+4,421,349,466) | (+2,235,424,000) |
| TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | |
| Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 3,540,000 | 3,640,000 | 3,640,000 | +100,000 | |
| National Transportation Safety Board | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 42,407,000 | 40,000,000 | 46,000,000 | +3,593,000 | +6,000,000 |
| Appropriation of user fees | | 6,000,000 | | | -6,000,000 |
| Emergency appropriations | (6,000,000) | | | (-6,000,000) | |
| Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18) | (29,859,000) | | | (-29,859,000) | |
| Emergency fund | | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | |
| Emergency fund (emergency appropriations) | (1,000,000) | | | (-1,000,000) | |
| Total, National Transportation Safety Board | 42,407,000 | 47,000,000 | 47,000,000 | +4,593,000 | |
| Total, title II, Related Agencies | 82,806,000 | 50,640,000 | 50,640,000 | -32,166,000 | |
| Appropriations | (45,947,000) | (50,640,000) | (50,640,000) | (+4,693,000) | |
| Emergency appropriations | (36,859,000) | | | (-36,859,000) | |
| TITLE III - GENERAL PROVISIONS | | | | | |
| National Civil Aviation Review Commission | 2,400,000 | | | -2,400,000 | |
| Amtrak route closure and realignment commission | | | 1,000,000 | +1,000,000 | +1,000,000 |
| Net total appropriations | 12,068,308,000 | 13,115,727,000 | 13,124,671,000 | +1,056,363,000 | +8,944,000 |
| Scorekeeping adjustments: | | | | | |
| Emergency appropriations | -289,600,000 | | | +289,600,000 | |
| Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18) | -698,759,000 | | | +698,759,000 | |
| General provision: Bonuses & awards | -513,604 | | | +513,604 | |
| Pipeline safety | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | +1,000,000 |
| Railroad Safety | -3,000,000 | | | +3,000,000 | |
| Total, adjustments | -990,872,604 | | 1,000,000 | +991,872,604 | +1,000,000 |
| Net grand total | 11,077,435,396 | 13,115,727,000 | 13,125,671,000 | +2,048,235,604 | +9,944,000 |
| Appropriations | (12,796,468,396) | (13,154,327,000) | (13,164,271,000) | (+367,802,604) | (+9,944,000) |
| Rescissions | (-1,719,033,000) | (-38,600,000) | (-38,600,000) | (+1,680,433,000) | |
| (Limitations on obligations) | (23,986,220,534) | (25,604,000,000) | (27,681,825,000) | (+3,695,604,466) | (+2,077,825,000) |
| (Sec. 310 obligations) | (2,024,410,000) | (1,510,571,000) | (1,660,226,000) | (-364,184,000) | (+149,655,000) |
| Net grand total budgetary resources | (37,088,065,930) | (40,230,298,000) | (42,467,722,000) | (+5,379,656,070) | (+2,237,424,000) |
| 602B SUMMARY | | | | | |
| Total mandatory and discretionary | 11,077,435,396 | 13,115,727,000 | 13,125,671,000 | +2,048,235,604 | +9,944,000 |
| Mandatory | 617,284,000 | 645,696,000 | 645,696,000 | +28,412,000 | |
| Discretionary: | | | | | |
| General purposes: | | | | | |
| Defense (050) | | 300,000,000 | 300,000,000 | +300,000,000 | |
| Nondefense | 10,460,151,396 | 12,170,031,000 | 12,179,975,000 | +1,719,823,604 | +9,944,000 |
| Total, Discretionary | 10,460,151,396 | 12,470,031,000 | 12,479,975,000 | +2,019,823,604 | +9,944,000 |

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Let me start by saying to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] that he has done an outstanding job chairing this committee. I think he ran very good hearings. They were fair, they were to the point, but they were also tough. At times he pushed the administration hard on certain issues. When he did, I thought it was appropriate. He has been fair in writing this bill, and we appreciate that fairness. He has conducted his year as chairman of this subcommittee this year as a real pro. We appreciate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. He has done great work. He mentioned all the staff, the majority and minority, who worked on this committee. I would share his sentiments toward them. They worked hard, they are knowledgeable, they are open and fair and worked well with each other. I simply say thank you to all of them for myself and for the minority. The majority staff has been very open and very good to work with.

Mr. Chairman, the bill itself is one I intend to vote for. It has important funding for whole hosts of transportation programs and projects throughout the country that make important investment in our country's infrastructure. I must say I have two reservations about the bill, one that I do not expect to change, one that I hope will change as we go through the legislative process.

I am concerned that we are reducing transit operating subsidies to \$200 million. That is a significant reduction from the current level of funding. The level of capital assistance has been going down over a period of years. On the other hand, the bill is \$200 million more than requested by the administration for operating assistance. The committee mark is significantly better than what the administration has recommended, and for that I am thankful, but I am concerned with what that reduction is going to do in very important marginal funding for many transit agencies around the country.

My one concern that I hope we can deal with before this bill comes back from conference is funding for Amtrak. In my judgment, that remains a very major problem in this bill. There is very significant funding for capital expenditures by Amtrak. That clearly will help their capacity to develop revenue and ridership in the years ahead. The problem, however, is that the level of operating assistance for Amtrak for the next year is so low that it brings into question whether Amtrak will survive the year. It is an issue and I know the chairman shares my concern that that is not what we want to have happen, and I am hopeful that before this

bill comes back to the House again in conference that we can make adjustments to make sure that Amtrak survives the year and goes on. They provide very important, crucial transportation services in this country. Ridership is going up, revenues are going up. It is not a system in decline. They have had problems in part because of what Congress has decided in the past as it relates to operating assistance and requirements on route structures they maintain, particularly what we did last year where we put some mandates on them and did not provide enough money to pay for those mandates.

□ 1430

But clearly our assistance to Amtrak for operations for the balance of this year, in my judgment it needs to be increased before the bill goes to the President for his signature. Other than that, I think it is a good bill and it is one that I hope the Members will vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for the job they have done here. They have been faced with some real budgetary constraints, and they have brought about a balance that I think is really very, very commendable. Indeed they have reached a historic high in the highway obligation ceiling, from 18.6 to 21.5 billion, raised the transit program, and indeed I want to assure them that as my committee proceeds with the reauthorization of ISTEA we will certainly take very seriously their actions where they have identified some transit programs subject to authorization. These new transit starts are important, and we will deal with them in a very, very serious and, I believe, positive way.

On the issue of Amtrak, I agree completely with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] that Amtrak is in very, very serious trouble. I believe it is on a steep curve to bankruptcy, and I want to see us save Amtrak. I disagree with him respectfully on the point on the Base Closure Commission, perhaps the most important reason being that I do not think we have time for that. Amtrak is going to be in bankruptcy in the next 6 to 12 to 10 months on the outside. But we must reform Amtrak. Our subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] is moving ahead with this, and I expect before we leave town this month, in committee we will attempt to move reform legislation.

I say attempt. Last year I emphasized that this House passed Amtrak reform legislation by a vote of 406 to 4, overwhelming, and now I understand

the same legislation that passed this House overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis may not have the same bipartisan support that it had last year. It pains me greatly to hear that, if indeed it is accurate, because if that is the case, then we will not have reform legislation, and if we do not have reform legislation, I do not believe the votes are going to exist to get the funding so necessary to save Amtrak.

So in closing I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for the outstanding job they have done, emphasize my commitment to trying to find a way to save Amtrak and look forward to the other important transportation legislation that we will be dealing with in this Congress in the weeks ahead.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH].

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. Chairman, in its committee report, the committee stated clearly its intention that the Coast Guard can, quote, "do more to lower its operating costs through greater energy conservation," unquote.

In 1994 the President issued Executive Order 12902, the goal of which was to encourage cost-effective uses of solar energy by all departments in the Government. Mr. Chairman, there are applications for which solar energy is the lowest-cost energy source and is a promising route towards energy savings. Would it not be consistent both with the Executive order and with the energy consciousness of this committee that the Coast Guard and the Department of Transportation and all agencies under its jurisdiction investigate the cost-effective utilization of solar technology to the maximum extent practical?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] is correct. The intent of the committee was to investigate energy saving possibilities, and solar technology is a promising route to saving energy. The Executive order the gentleman speaks of is relevant here. Therefore we agree that the Coast Guard and all agencies under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation should make every effort to uphold the letter and the spirit of Executive Order 12902 and investigate cost-saving utilization and solar technologies to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on

Appropriations for issues very important to the folks of Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, because of the merger between the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific Railroads, the city of Wichita would be faced with a significant increase in trains traveling through the center of town. These trains will cause significant health, safety and traffic congestion. The Surface Transportation Board has jurisdiction over the Union Pacific-Southern Pacific merger. The board has already required the merger company, Union Pacific, to pay all baseline mitigation costs of this merger. On April 15, 1997, the board stated that the Union Pacific will have to pay the full cost of baseline mitigation resulting from a merger. However, several weeks before this decision was rendered, Union Pacific downscaled the extent of the train traffic increase to 5½ trains and increased the speed of those trains to 30 miles per hour.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding too.

Mr. TIAHRT. There is justifiable fear, I believe, in my district that the Union Pacific will significantly increase the number of trains traveling through Wichita after the Surface Transportation's 5-year review period. The board has taken the Union Pacific at its word and adjusted, although not yet officially, the amount of mitigation necessary for Wichita. I am concerned that the Union Pacific will not be able to increase the speed of its trains to 30 miles per hour or will significantly increase the number of trains traveling through Wichita after the 5-year period of the Surface Transportation Board review. Increasing the speed of trains going through Wichita will be extremely difficult even under ideal conditions, and with the breakup of Conrail, train traffic going through Kansas City will probably increase. This will put further pressure on Union Pacific to route more trains through Wichita.

Mr. Chairman, the report language included in this bill is designed to give the citizens of Wichita an avenue to redress in case Union Pacific decides to significantly increase the number of trains traveling through Wichita or if the Union Pacific does not increase the speeds of its trains as they promised.

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman would yield, that is the purpose of including the language that we have in the report.

Mr. TIAHRT. I ask the committee pay close attention to the Surface Transportation Board and its environmental mitigation study for Wichita. The report language specifies that the committee is concerned with Surface Transportation Finance Docket Number 32760. The committee is instructing the board to use as the basis for its decision verifiable and appropriate as-

sumptions such as train speed and the number of trains. The committee is not telling the board what to base its decision on, but it is saying that the assumption it uses must be verifiable and appropriate. If there is any material change in the facts upon which the board bases its decision, then the committee expects the board to be proactive in exercising its jurisdiction by re-examining the final mitigation measures it would impose upon the Union Pacific Corp. or any of its subsidiaries.

For example, if Union Pacific decides to significantly increase the number of trains going through Wichita or fails to get their speed up to 30 miles per hour going through town, then the committee expects the board to exercise its jurisdiction and increase the mitigation necessary to remedy the situation. Of course the city of Wichita or an interested party must petition the board to reopen the docket. The board does not have to monitor the number of trains or the speed of the trains traveling through Wichita. Wichita will be monitoring this closely.

I appreciate the opportunity for this colloquy, and I want to comment on what a fine job the committee has done with the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I appreciate that, and I promise the gentleman from Kansas personally, too, we will stay with him throughout this issue to make sure that it does not get out of hand. I thank the gentleman very much for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I will be supporting it. The constraints that the committee has are well known and the attempts they have to fund infrastructure have been done under very difficult situations. I would like to comment, however, on one disappointment I have with our transportation funding, and that has to do with funding projects along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

I represent part of the city of San Diego. I represent the district which has much of the California-Mexico border. The attention that this Nation should pay to building up that infrastructure for our economic future has not been done. Federal mandates that deal with trade and immigration have placed a tremendous strain on our roads and bridges and highways and rail lines that simply cannot accommodate the increased traffic that results from Federal decisions in trade and in immigration.

It is critical, Mr. Chairman, that we find the Federal funding for these highway and rail projects without affecting California's Federal highway assistance. I have introduced legislation along with Senator BOXER in the other

body to establish a \$500 million border infrastructure fund to pay for these improvements to try to make sure that we realize the potential of the international trade that the passage of NAFTA and other actions have caused.

Let me just give my colleagues a couple of examples of what I am talking about. By Federal order, all of the commercial truck traffic between California and Mexico goes through what we call the Otay Mesa, a border crossing which is in my district. Something like 3,000 trucks a day now traverse across the border through the border crossing, and yet there is no highway of interstate standards that connects that highway, connects that border crossing with our interstate highway system. At first we only had a two-lane city street, it has been enlarged to four lanes and soon to six lanes, but it cannot handle the 3,000 trucks a day that NAFTA and other actions by this body have created.

It is time that the Federal Government address the infrastructure problems that have burdened the city and county of San Diego as we contribute our part to increasing international trade and growing the economy in this Nation.

Another example which I will have an amendment on later: If San Diego's port could establish a direct rail link with eastern railway systems, the whole economy of southern California would be transformed for the better. The transformation of our economy requires that we rehabilitate an old shortline railroad that was built in 1912 or so between San Diego and Arizona. It does not take a lot of money in the scheme of things to rehabilitate that railroad, and the Federal Government can contribute not through any grants, not through any loans, but through merely a loan guarantee that could leverage 20 times what we would appropriate. With the rehabilitation of that railroad, the port of San Diego becomes a working commercial port, thousands and thousands of jobs are created, San Diego finds a new way of economic growth that is not dependent on the defense budget, and southern California and all of America profits from that.

□ 1445

These are the examples that I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, that hopefully in the future the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations will include in their efforts.

We need on the international border, and I speak not just for California now, but for Texas and New Mexico and Arizona, we need attention paid to the infrastructure projects along the border. They are not local pork projects, they are not just provincial kinds of requests. The infrastructure that is required benefits the whole Nation, and as I said earlier, comes from the mandates that Federal trade policy has put on us.

While understanding the constraints we have, I would argue that in the future some attention be paid to these border infrastructure projects, and we begin to really grow the economy of this country in new ways.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] for a colloquy.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage the gentleman from Virginia in a colloquy related to something important for Louisville, KY.

In 1994 the Federal Aviation Administration advised Congress that they would reimburse the Standiford Field in Louisville, KY, for the airport's costs of installing a category III instrument landing system on runway 35 right. It is my understanding that the FAA has provided about \$700,000 out of a total estimated funding of \$2.4 million for this system. That leaves approximately \$1.7 million remaining to be paid. It is my understanding that those remaining funds are included in the FAA's budget request for fiscal year 1998 and that they are included in the committee's reported bill.

Is that the chairman's understanding, as well?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTHUP. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. The gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] is absolutely, positively correct. I have not thought of that airport for years, but I flew in there in 1962 when I went to basic training at Fort Knox, KY.

It was one of the most depressing days of my life. I remember when I landed at the airport I arrived into Fort Knox, KY, and they put me on KP right away. If I had only known the need then. But I do remember the airport well.

The FAA advises me that all the remaining funds needed to reimburse the local authorities for costs related to the ILS are included in the fiscal year 1998 budget, and the FAA intends to provide the final reimbursement by the end of that fiscal year.

I was just wondering, do they still march the men up Misery Hill the way they used to?

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, they do.

I thank the gentleman for this, and I thank him on behalf of all the young men as they come through that airport and they come through a new door, an open door to a change in their lives. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, and would appreciate being able to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the transportation appropriation measure before us today contains \$2 million for the Northern In-

diana South Shore commuter rail line. The House report states that this funding is to be used to complete a major investment study. However, previously appropriated funds will be sufficient to complete the major investment study and it will be completed later this year.

The critical problem facing the commuter rail line is the tremendous increase in ridership over the past several years and the lack of adequate car space to meet this growth. Would the chairman agree that this \$2 million could be used to allow the Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District to acquire additional rail cars to relieve overload on the commuter rail line?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes, I do.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with me in accommodating northern Indiana and the Chicago metropolitan transportation needs.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank Chairman WOLF for the excellent work he has done in putting this bill together. I know that he had a very difficult challenge, but he was able to balance the conflicting interests and needs in a way that everybody should be satisfied with.

I have to tell the Members, this is the first time that I have served on this appropriations subcommittee, and I have to tell the Members that I found the gentleman to be very fair and allowed us to give input, and this is why this bill is a bipartisan effort. I congratulate him and I congratulate the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO]. I also would like to thank the staff of the majority and of the minority for the fine work they have done.

Mr. Chairman, there are several items included in this bill that I would like to point out for special emphasis. I am pleased by the increased funding for the Airport Improvement Program. The bill increases funding by \$700 million over the President's budget request. As the Nation's airports continue to see tremendous increase in traffic, this additional funding is vital to the continued success and modernization of our Nation's airports.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that the committee was able to include a major increase in transit program spending. As cities and localities across the country struggle with increased automobile traffic, it is important that the Federal Government continue to devote its resources to alternative means of transportation. I believe the funding increase to the transit programs is vital to the continued improvement of our Nation's transportation systems, and I appreciate the chairman's inclusion of the additional funds.

The Federal Aviation Administration will also see an increase in funding as

a result of this bill. I believe that the continued work in aviation safety, research, and continued modernization of the FAA equipment is one of the most important aspects of this bill. I am pleased with the funding that has been made available to the FAA.

Mr. Chairman, I have made the chairman and the ranking member aware of a concern that I have. This deals with the controllers that we have. As we have more and more controllers reaching the age of retirement at basically a young age, due to the stress that they undertake in doing their job, I do not think we are doing enough in terms of recruiting and providing an adequate salary to retain the younger incoming flight controllers. It is an issue that I know that the chairman and the ranking member will continue to work with.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill. I thank Chairman WOLF, I thank his staff, and I also thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for making this truly a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill which makes the transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1998. It is not easy balancing funds for trains, for planes, for automobiles, for bridges, for asphalt and all the rest that goes into it, but the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] I think has perfected this as an art form.

One area that I would like to bring to the attention of this body is in transit, specifically buses and bus facilities. For the past two appropriation cycles the Michigan delegation came to the subcommittee somewhat fragmented in their request, each, of course, wanting the largest funding they could possibly get. That is not surprising. The approach, though, became more troublesome.

During this present cycle the delegation changed its course and decided to unify behind a single funding level. As the sole member of the Michigan delegation on the Committee on Appropriations I was glad, of course, to do my part, but it took a lot of effort, of course, from the chairman and members of the committee. We were able to receive commitments from the Michigan Department of Transportation and each of our members in the delegation that this approach was best.

I want to commend each member of our delegation for their willingness to try this approach. I would hope we continue this in the years to come. It certainly was easier.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Members again for their leadership and their extraordinary effort on this. I would also like to extend a huge thank

you and a salute to John Blazey on the staff, who worked with my staff to bring this to a closure, and I think it all came to a good end.

With that in mind, I want to thank the gentleman again.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to do is to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for again bringing a bill to the floor which is absolutely bipartisan. I think the gentleman from Virginia has demonstrated a great degree of fairness. He has tried to deal very openly with virtually every difference in judgment that we have had between the various parties and individuals on this bill.

I think it again demonstrates that within the Committee on Appropriations we are having a lot of success in producing bipartisan legislation. Unfortunately, that legislation often then winds up being blown up because of actions of the Committee on Rules which turn a bipartisan product into a partisan fight on the House floor. I am happy to say that that has not occurred on this bill. I want to congratulate both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for the fair way in which they have proceeded.

I would also like to simply take note of a couple of local projects which are important to my region of the country.

I am particularly pleased that the bill finally requires that the Coast Guard move forward on a replacement for the *Mackinaw* icebreaker on the Great Lakes. The *Mackinaw* is some 53 years old. It is going to cost a great deal to refurbish. For slightly more than the cost of refurbishing, a new icebreaker can be purchased which will last a whole lot longer, and I appreciate very much the fact that the committee has provided the \$2 million to facilitate final decision-making by the Coast Guard on this issue.

It is important to the economy of the region, not just Minnesota and Wisconsin, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and I represent, which is why we pushed this item, but to a number of other States as well, including Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York.

I would also like to take note that the bill does include \$970,000 within the FAA budget to continue the testing and evaluation of new infrared heating technology for deicing commercial aircraft. That technology promises to have very good environmental benefits, and it may be a more cost-effective way to deice airplanes than the existing chemical deicing methods. The additional testing will take place at the Rhinelander-Oneida Airport in Wisconsin,

to demonstrate the utility of new technology in an operational environment using commercial aircraft. I again appreciate the fact that the subcommittee on its merits supported the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is going to be a lot of controversy on this bill. There are some differences. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has already indicated, we have substantial concerns about the underfunding for Amtrak. I hope that can be addressed as we move towards conference, but I expect to see a good number of votes for this bill on our side of the aisle as well as the majority side of the aisle. It is good to see in the midst of all that has happened in the last week that at least on this bill, bipartisan comity has for the moment survived intact.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] so he and I may engage in a colloquy.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of support of this appropriation bill, and also to enter into a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation reduces transit operating assistance from \$400 million in fiscal year 1997 to \$200 million in fiscal year 1998. As a result, transit districts will need to look for ways to reduce their operating and overhead costs. Currently virtually all city and regional transit properties have excess material on hand. Maintaining the surplus is an operating cost which reduces needed resources without providing significant benefits.

□ 1500

Finding material and other properties available for purchase is time-consuming and costly, lacking any centralized means of identifying the materials. I believe that electronic redistribution center to distribute spare parts from transit authorities across the country may be one such opportunity to reduce overhead costs of many of the Nation's transit operators. With a computerized system through which to identify and dispose of surplus parts and materials, transit properties would benefit by not having to maintain large surpluses, and they would also benefit by having a simple, timely, and lower cost means through which to purchase surplus materials.

This proposal seems suited either for the Department's intelligent transportation systems program or the Federal Transit Administration's national research program.

I note that the committee has provided a total of \$94 million for continued research in intelligent transportation systems in which the Federal Transit Administration is involved. As for the FTA's research program, the committee's recommendation provides \$22.5 million. I believe the Department

should fully evaluate the potential of such a system as well as provide a cost-benefit assessment, timetable, and cost estimate of a limited pilot program of electronic redistribution center.

Earlier discussions with the Federal Transit Administration suggest the Department's enthusiasm for such a system.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observations and his ideas. I think it is a great idea. We never even thought of it in the committee. I will do everything I can, not only to encourage the Department to work with the various modes to further explore the potential of an electronic redistribution center but also to see if there is some way working together with the other side we can kind of bring it about, because car dealers and many other groups do that. You cannot maintain all of that inventory. And since everybody is electronically connected, you could do that and exchange with other systems. It is not just a good idea, I think it is a great idea. We will do everything we possibly can to see that that takes place, working with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and the Senate.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those comments and his support and appreciate the work that he and the minority side have done on this bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], a valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. This is a good bipartisan bill, I support it strongly. As with the gentleman from Arizona, who was speaking as I came in a few minutes ago, this is my first year on the subcommittee. I have enjoyed very much working on the subcommittee, working with the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and with the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

I want particularly to commend the chairman for his hard work, for his bipartisan work, his very fair work and work of the staff on both the majority and minority side. I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], for his help and leadership for all of us who are on the minority.

I must say that we have all benefited from the fact that the chairman worked very closely with the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], in making this a good bill. The strengths of the bill are many. Many have already been mentioned. I just want to add a couple of comments to this.

There is a strong thread of commitment, commitment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] as chairman,

to safety, airline safety, transportation safety in general that is reflected in this bill. I want to add my support to that commitment. Air travel is growing. In a good economy there is a great increase in air travel. I note that there is a large increase in the airport improvement fund which I think is very important. We also should shortly have a new FAA administrator, so I think there will be better days in the future for the FAA.

The bill also provides the beginning of funding that is necessary to modernize air traffic control systems in the airport management systems.

I want to thank the ranking member for eloquently stating some other needs. I would express that as a need for and a hope that we will be able to do better by the end of this cycle in operating assistance for transit in order to keep fares affordable and to keep routes available. There is also a need that I recognize for additional Amtrak operating assistance.

I do appreciate the increased funding for the capital funding of the Northeast corridor. And if we can get over the hump of operating assistance for Amtrak for the time that is necessary to get that Northeast corridor capital funding in place, then we should be able to see Amtrak's recovery. In the meantime, this bill continues our commitment to the capital needs for the electrification of the Northeast corridor, which I think is very important. I urge support for this legislation in its entirety.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time and for the opportunity to enter into a colloquy with him.

It is my understanding that there is in the report accompanying H.R. 2169 language relating to the Belford Ferry in Middletown Township, NJ. This language may condition the release of funds by the Secretary of Transportation for this project. The conditions set forth in the report would appear to prevent the Secretary of Transportation from releasing any funds for the Belford Ferry project until a demonstration of adequate ridership is made and the existence of a willing operator is found. Any delay in funding for the project, I believe, will have a negative impact upon my constituents who seek alternative means of travel to New York City.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAPPAS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. There is language relating to the Belford Ferry project in the report.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to certainly inform my colleagues that the county of Monmouth, which is the county that is host to this proposed ferry, is, in fact, a willing operator and will subcontract for the Belford Ferry

project and that a study on adequate demand and ridership has already been completed by the Monmouth County Department of Planning. Furthermore, with respect to adequate ridership, the Federal Highway Administration indicates that it will defer to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assessment. These conditions having been met Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why the Secretary of Transportation should withhold approval of Federal aid for the Belford Ferry project in Middletown.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would concur that these studies have been completed and we checked on them just the other day. Adequate demand for the ferry and ridership for the Belford Ferry has been established and the Federal Highway Administration considers the county of Monmouth the willing operator for the Belford Ferry project. Based on informal discussions that we have had, not in writing but discussions, I believe that the conditions in the report have been met; and if that is the case, there would be no reason for further delay of the project.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of clarification, I ask the gentleman if there is anything in the bill or report language that could further delay this project based upon the information that has been provided to the gentleman?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the bill which would require any other delays or studies.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman believes we are in agreement that the concerns expressed in the report have been addressed, may I have his commitment to clarify this issue in the conference report?

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman will continue to yield, before I answer, if I could defer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAPPAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I am not totally familiar with the project myself and with what the problems are, but there has been some concern over this project by Members on our side. I would just for my own point of view want to keep the reservation open to be able to visit with Members of our side who have had concerns.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would want to visit with the gentleman and the chairman of the committee before conference is finalized, see if we cannot work this out to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, if my memory serves me, the gentleman believes that the

concerns expressed in the report have been addressed and he sought my commitment to clarify this issue in the conference report. Based on talking to Mr. SABO, I can provide the gentleman my assurance, we will also talk to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, but I will work with the gentleman to resolve his concerns regarding the Belford Ferry project. I am aware of the traffic and the transportation and the need to get into New York.

The gentleman has approached me. I understand the gentleman was going to offer an amendment and that is not necessary so; yes, I will work with the gentleman with regard to that project. I appreciate him bringing it to our attention. I understand and I want to assure him after talking to the Federal Highway Administration what the gentleman said is accurate.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I spoke with my colleague from New Jersey earlier today. I certainly appreciate and understand his concerns. I happen to believe, by the information that I have received both by the county of Monmouth, the township of Middletown, the various correspondence, copies of correspondence that I have received from the various State and Federal agencies, that these specific concerns that were included in this report language have, in fact, been addressed, that there is adequate ridership that has been identified, there are in fact three or four willing, able operators that are able to fulfill this task, if given the opportunity. Harry Larrison, who is the freeholder director of Monmouth County, supports this. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of asking for anything in this bill but simply asking for the Members to take note of what is happening here.

At a time when all of our other bills have been so partisan, contentious, destructive of the comity of this House, we have a bill that sailed through committee, that is going to sail through this floor in just the way that our subcommittee chairman and ranking member and the Chairman and ranking member of the full Committee would like every appropriations bill to go through.

So I would hope that the members of the Committee on Rules and the Members of the majority leadership would take note of what is happening today, what happens when you treat every Member with respect and evenhandedness.

This bill deserves to be passed overwhelmingly. It is a fair bill. It is respectful of every Member in this body. The results are clear.

I would hope for the sake of the chairmen of the other subcommittees that we could have more bills like this.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 2169. I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman. He has been unfailingly kind to me, met with me. This is a wonderful project that I have in this bill. I just want to thank him for his kindness and to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] also.

This bill today continues the subcommittee's tradition of supporting West Side Hillsboro light rail project. I am very delighted to report to all of my colleagues that after this year only 1 year more of funding will be required to complete the West Side project. As the subcommittee is well aware, this light rail project has the greatest and the broadest support in Oregon.

Twice the voters have voted to tax themselves in order to support light rail. Voters support light rail because they are aware that it works so well there because we have these wonderful unique land use laws. Working together we have created viability and livability in this region. The West Side project is almost 75 percent complete. It is on time. It is on budget. It is thanks to this committee that it is those things.

Additionally I would very much like to thank the subcommittee for providing \$146,500 in Coast Guard funds for the maritime Fire and Safety Association in Washington and Oregon. This association is an excellent example of a partnership between the private and the public sector. It brings together the people of the Columbia River into this maritime and commercial center. It provides public safety, enhances environmental protection. It enhances fire, oil and toxic spill response, training, equipment, program, administration activities.

□ 1515

And this modest sum that the bill has for this project really makes the difference.

So on behalf of the citizens of the Portland area and all the folks in Oregon who will use this project, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the entire committee, and urge support.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to include my two distinguished colleagues from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW and Mr. STUPAK, as part of this colloquy with our other colleague from Michigan Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on

Transportation of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF.

Mr. Chairman, our State of Michigan and other donor States have been quite upset at our mistreatment under the funding allocation formulas as established by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, or ISTEA.

As a member of both the Michigan delegation and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am concerned that nothing in this bill lock our committee or State into using the funding allocation formulas in current law.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BARCIA, and, obviously, my other colleagues from Michigan Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. STABENOW, now that, as a member of the Michigan delegation, I share their concern for the funding equity in the upcoming reauthorization of our Nation's transportation program.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I also want to assure them that nothing in this bill prevent the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure from addressing the issue of funding equity within the reauthorization, and I thank the gentleman for inquiring.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan is correct, nothing in H.R. 2169 would prevent the authorizing committee from changing the funding allocation formulas for fiscal year 1998 or any year thereafter.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman that this bill in no way would affect the ability of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to address the funding formulas under ISTEA.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen for this colloquy.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. It has been a pleasure to serve as vice chairman with the gentleman from Virginia in crafting what I think is a responsible bill.

There are three elements I would mention. We have talked a lot about a balanced budget. A balanced budget depends on economic growth. That is the key to it. And the key to economic growth is transportation: air, highways, rail. This bill addresses those

very well because they are the arteries of a nation's economic well-being.

Second is safety. We are all concerned about safety; highway safety, air transport safety. This bill has a lot of good features that impact on highway safety; innovative programs, 18 of them to be exact, for increased air safety. So I think that, too, recommends it highly to Members.

And, third, it is a people bill. We have passed a welfare reform bill which envisions people going to work. To go to work they need mass transit, and this bill recognizes that need throughout the Nation by providing funds for mass transit.

Those are all three elements that make this bill responsible. I strongly urge the Members to support this legislation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], who serves on the committee.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to say that this is not a perfect bill but it is about as perfect as we can get it.

If it were perfect, it would have some of the 15 things I requested in it that I did not get. But this is a body compromise, a body trying to do what we can do with the limited amount of money that we have allocated to us.

There should be more money for the Coast Guard, there should be less money for Amtrak, there should be more money for my particular projects, there should be more money for FAA. But, nevertheless, the committee has done an outstanding job of crafting a bill that gives the best we can to all of these good agencies.

So I commend the gentleman. I still disagree with him on demonstration projects, but he is right and I am wrong. If it ever comes into being, however, I want to be first in that line to get my demonstration projects funded. I commend him and urge support of this bill.

I am extremely distressed about Amtrak. Amtrak is terminally ill and we have to recognize that. By continuing to feed the system morphine we are only prolonging the inevitable. Still, I suggest at this time that Members vote for the bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just like to refer Members to page 31, where the committee said the following in the report:

In following up on the work of the National Civil Aviation Review Commission over the coming months, and to help restore the credibility and effectiveness of the agency, the committee encourages the new administrator to establish an informal working group composed of former FAA administrators to advise her and the Secretary of Transportation regarding the future direction and the need of policies of the agency.

The committee believes the views of these former executives could be invaluable in helping shape the agency's future.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for his help and efforts, and all the committee staff.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend Chairman WOLF and the ranking Democrat Mr. SABO for brining a bill to the floor which will provide billions of dollars for vital transportation and infrastructure projects across the Nation. This measure will allow States and localities to begin much-needed construction and repair on highways, bridges, and mass transit systems.

Transportation has always been vital to our economic prosperity and quality of life since our Nation's founding. From colonial post roads and canals that expanded our frontiers, the railroads and interstate highways that linked a growing country to the mass transit systems that made possible the development of our great cities.

Transportation has opened new markets and enabled the quick economical movement of people and goods that has empowered our economy's growth. In fact, in my congressional district of Chicago, IL, the transportation arena has always been a vital segment of our lifestyle—with over 27 percent of one's income spent on transportation-related expenses.

Further, well-paying, much-needed jobs are created when our transportation systems are revitalized. Finally, mass transit, commuter rail, and other forms of public transportation provide a way to work for millions of Chicago residents.

So, Mr. Chairman, I must express my extreme concerns for the bill's funding levels for mass transit and the adverse effects they could have on my congressional district.

As many businesses relocate to Chicago's suburbs—taking with them well-paying jobs—it is imperative that we continue to provide adequate funding for our public transportation systems. With the recent welfare to work mandates taking effect, it is also important that sufficient transportation services are available for these individuals.

As a result of past actions by the Congress which cut transit funding by nearly 40 percent, the Chicago Transit Authority was recently forced to make draconian cutbacks in service. These service cuts affect the majority of all bus routes and significantly reduces CTA's late night owl service for both rail and bus routes. These service cuts were made in neighborhoods where many of the residents have no other transportation alternatives.

Further, as many of you know, Chicago's EL is one of the oldest public rail systems in the country and is the cornerstone of our public transportation system. As this system continues to age, it cannot afford to lose precious capital funds that will result because of this measure.

It is my hope that as this measure moves to the conference committee funding levels for mass transit will be increased thereby recognizing the transportation needs of our urban, low-income, senior, and disabled residents.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the increase for noise abatement programs for communities that are adversely affected by low flying airplane traffic. Last year, the Federal Government spent approxi-

mately \$143 million, and this year's proposal is to spend \$239 million. As airports continue to expand and air traffic continues to increase, it is clear we need to take steps to mitigate the resulting noise problems.

Airport noise can ruin neighborhoods by destroying the peace to which people are entitled. With the programs funded in this legislation, families that reside in the busiest flight patterns can receive new doors, acoustic window, wall and ceiling modifications, insulation, air condition and ductwork, and electrical wiring. These benefits can make the difference between a daily experience of frustration and anxiety, or a higher quality of life where people can eat dinner in peace, talk on the telephone uninterrupted, and enjoy the homes for which they have worked so hard.

Six communities in my district are in the flight pattern of Cleveland Hopkins International Airport. More needs to be done, therefore, it is important for the Federal Government to continue to fund noise abatement programs adequately. I urge my colleagues to support funding for noise abatement programs, and to work with a bipartisan coalition to support the highest funding possible coming out of the House-Senate conference committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my support for the fiscal year 1998 Transportation Act and to commend Chairman WOLF and ranking Member SABO for their fine work on this important legislation.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the conditions of my support for a small part of this legislation—Federal funding of the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky I-71 Corridor project.

My support for all past, present, and future funds allocated from the Federal Transit Administration section 3 program to study, select and construct the locally preferred transportation alternative for the congested I-71 Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky corridor is based on a 50-50 match between local/State sources and the Federal Government. In light of our Federal budget crisis and the inability of the Federal Government to fund the bulk of construction costs for major transportation projects, State and local jurisdictions should cover a substantial part of the cost of any new project. Even more importantly, I believe requiring a strong level of local participation will ensure that local communities select the most cost-effective solution to the region's transportation problems. A 50-50 match ensures that the project makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit into the RECORD the text of a letter I received from the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Council of Governments [OK], our regional transportation planning agency, which codifies the agreement reached between myself and OKI and clearly describes the intention of the local authorities to match the Federal money designated for this project.

The text of the letter follows.

On behalf of the I-71 Corridor Oversight Committee of the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI), and the local communities that constitute its membership, we thank you for your support of our funding requests for the Northeast Corridor Project.

This letter is provided in response to your request that we address two matters in connection with the Project. First, the issue of the local funding commitment is addressed.

We regret any past misunderstandings which may have contributed to some confusion on this issue. Second, this letter explains the method by which OKI's I-71 oversight Committee has arrived at the cost estimates for the Project.

The pending request to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation for \$500,000 in the Fiscal Year 1998 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act to reassess certain technologies in Northern Kentucky, and the projected \$600 million in federal funds (half of the estimated \$1.2 billion total project cost) needed for both phases of construction of the locally preferred alternative would be matched fifty percent by local funds. With respect to the Fiscal Year 1997 Transportation Appropriations Act approving \$3 million for the preliminary engineering and environmental impact statement, the local governments commit to a fifty percent local match, twenty percent of which will be put up at the time our funding is drawn down and the remaining thirty percent of which would be contributed to the Project during Fiscal Year 1999 when construction gets under way. Local funds are not currently available to match the Fiscal Year 1997 funds on a 50/50 basis, which is why we are proposing to spread the match as described. Had we understood that any of the funding for the study phase of the Project was to be a fifty, rather than twenty, percent match, we would have budgeted for that additional \$2.4 million.

The second issue on which you have requested clarification concerns the manner in which cost estimates for the Project are prepared. OKI has retained a nationally acclaimed team of consultants headed by Burgess & Niple Limited and includes BRW, Inc. to provide the technical assistance on the major investment analysis, engineering, and other phases of the Project. BRW has assisted other locales where similar transportation improvement projects have been implemented, including Portland Burnside LRT Line, Portland Westside LRT Line, Houston Busway, Salt Lake City LRT South Line, University of Minnesota Busway, I-10 HOV in Phoenix, Los Angeles Blue Line LRT, Calgary LRT System, and the Newark City Subway Extension and Vehicle Base Facility. OKI relies heavily upon the expertise of our consultants in arriving at the best available cost estimates, as each phase of the Project demands. In addition, you should be aware that all of the technologies we have considered are operating in other parts of the country, and, therefore, are "Known quantities" with respect to estimating their cost. We share your desire that our estimates be as precise as possible and will continue to make every effort to ensure such precision, despite certain unavoidable ambiguities that are inherent in planning and designing a project of this magnitude.

Again, we appreciate your support and assistance, without which we would not have progressed this far. Please feel free to forward this letter to the relevant Committees for inclusion in their official record of the Project funding requests, and call us or the OKI staff if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

LARRY CRISENBERY,

President.

BERNARD J. MOORMAN,

Chairman.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2169, fiscal year 1998 Transportation appropriations. I want to thank Mr. WOLF, Mr. SABO, and every member of the Transportation Subcommittee for their hard work in crafting an excellent bill.

I am delighted that the bill before the House today continues the subcommittee's tradition

of supporting the Westside-Hillsboro Light Rail project. H.R. 2169 provides \$63.4 million for this vital project, the full amount recommended by the administration in the Federal Transit Administration's 3(j) report earlier this year. I am ever more delighted to report that, after this year, only 1 year of funding will be required to complete the Westside project on time and on budget.

As the subcommittee is well aware, the Westside-Hillsboro Light Rail project continues to enjoy broad support. Voters in the metropolitan area have demonstrated their support by voting to tax themselves twice to support light rail, once in 1990 and again in 1994. In each instance, these votes occurred while voters were approving antitax ballot measures. Voters support light rail in the Portland area because they realize that it works in conjunction with Oregon's unique land-use laws and is critical to the future vitality and livability of the region. In addition, there is already more than \$90 million in investment along the westside corridor as major corporations, such as INTEL, anticipate the project's opening.

The Westside project is over 75 percent complete and 10 miles of track are in place. Seven of the Nation's first low floor light rail cars are in testing and the first segment of the line is expected to open for service this year. Oregonians are clearly excited about the progress of the project, and are anxious to reap the benefits of this public investment through reduced congestion, improved air quality, economic development, and maintaining the quality of life that we treasure.

Additionally, I am also delighted that the subcommittee's bill provides \$146,500 in Coast Guard funds for the Maritime Fire and Safety Association [MFSA] in Washington and Oregon. The MFSA has been an excellent example of partnership between public and private interests, bringing together all of the people who use the Columbia River as a maritime and commercial center. The MFSA facilitates maritime commerce while protecting public safety and enhancing environmental protection of the lower Columbia River. Among other initiatives, the MFSA enhances fire, oil and toxic spill response communication, training, equipment, and program administration activities. The modest funds provided to the MFSA by this bill yield enormous dividends for the entire lower Columbia basin.

On behalf of the citizens of the Portland area, I want to thank Mr. WOLF and the entire subcommittee for their support, and urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2169.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendments specified in section 2 of House Resolution 189 are adopted and the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed

question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my concern that the bill we have before us does not have adequate funding for Amtrak in the coming year.

Amtrak is in an extremely tenuous position in the short term. The railroad has invested heavily in developing high-speed rail for the Northeast corridor, and once these new trains are in place, the high-speed trains, we have to make sure that there is significant revenue in order for the system to operate efficiently.

Amtrak has borrowed heavily to make the investment in high-speed rail, and the railroad, without support from Congress over the next 2 years and an adequate amount of money, will be overwhelmed by that debt. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, has recognized this bind but has left the railroad \$61 million short from what the President has requested to support the program.

Let me just quote from the statement of the administration policy for the transportation appropriations bill:

The administration is deeply concerned about the level of funding provided for Amtrak. The Federal operating subsidy supports Amtrak's day-to-day operations. Even at the funding levels proposed by the President, Amtrak will be able to remain solvent only by further increasing revenues and reducing costs. If Congress appropriates an amount for operating grants that is less than the \$344 million requested by the President, it is questionable whether Amtrak would have cash reserves sufficient to meet its obligations. In light of these considerations, we strongly urge the House to provide Amtrak with operating grants of \$344 million in fiscal year 1998.

Mr. Chairman, we have fallen short of this hurdle for Amtrak, and I am concerned that because of the relatively small shortfall this year, we are jeopardizing a realistically promising plan for Amtrak's self-sufficiency by the year 2002.

All this occurs at a time when Amtrak has begun to see the benefits of its reengineering and cost-cutting efforts of the past 3 years. To date, Amtrak has made nearly \$400 million in bottom line improvements on an annualized basis to increase the efficiency of its rolling stock, eliminated poorly performing routes, reduced head counts, retired old equipment, reinvested in new equipment, including high-speed rail, and improved its operating ratio. This was done at a time of declining Federal support.

For fiscal year 1995, passenger related revenues were \$874 million, last year they climbed to \$901 million, and they are expected to be \$977 million in the current year. In addition, despite operating fewer trains, ridership is moving up for the first time in several years. Travel industry projections indicate that the economy and travel expect to remain strong through 1998. This is fairly remarkable. Amtrak's ridership is up nearly 2.5 percent at a time when airline travel is up 0.2 percent to 1.2 percent for the Nation's four largest airlines. And revenue is up this year over the previous year by 9 percent.

In late 1999, Amtrak will introduce North America's first high-speed rail service, which will generate nearly \$150 million in net bottom line improvements. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on to tell my colleagues the good things that are happening with Amtrak, but it needs the Federal operating subsidies.

Next week the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will mark up a sweeping Amtrak reform and reauthorization bill which should generate further cost savings for Amtrak. At a time when things seem to be turning around for Amtrak, we would be unwise to underfund their operating needs.

I would hope that we could work with the Senate to restore the funding so that Amtrak can continue to reduce its dependency on Federal support, strengthen its infrastructure, and retain a viable national route structure.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman from Maryland that I am really committed to Amtrak; I want Amtrak to do very well.

I think people should understand, so when they think about this bill, that the committee mark has provided \$30 million more for Amtrak than enacted in fiscal year 1997. This bill is actually \$3.5 million above what the administration requested.

The subcommittee has provided \$202 million for operating expenses in fiscal year 1998, which is the same amount as requested by the administration. Funding for capital improvements is \$260 million, which is \$14.55 million more than requested by the administration and \$36.55 million more than last year.

Also, too, the gentleman, both of us have a strong interest in the Amtrak corridor because that is, in essence, the flagship for Amtrak. By making this work very well, it will help the entire system. And the subcommittee provided \$250 million for the Northeast corridor, which is \$50 million more than requested and \$75 million more than was in 1975.

So for Amtrak, the Northeast corridor, we are actually putting more on it. We hope to see that high-speed rail moving up and down there as quickly as possible.

I can assure the gentleman, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota

[Mr. SABO], having sat through all the hearings, knows that I want to do everything we can to protect it. The problem is, though, last year the Congress provided a significant amount of money to keep open a number of routes that Amtrak wanted to close down. We lost that money because four of those six routes are now gone. They are gone.

In addition, Amtrak actually lost more money because they could have taken the train sets from those routes and use them on more productive routes. But I want the gentleman to know that many areas were actually significantly higher.

I believe the opportunity for Amtrak, with monopolies in the Northeast corridor, aggressive mail delivery, and a lot of other opportunities, that that can be the flagship. I am committed to maintaining and having a national rail system because I just think it is important for a first class country to have a first class system.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership in this area. I know of the gentleman's commitment to rail service in this country and the importance to the Northeast corridor as well as to other regions of our Nation.

The gentleman has provided some significant help for Amtrak, and that is appreciated. I think the area of major concern right now is the operating issue and whether there are adequate operating subsidies in this budget in order to meet the transition until the high-speed trains are on line.

As the gentleman knows, Amtrak has incurred some additional capital debt obligations through its borrowing that now must be met through Amtrak, and I hope that we can continue to work together to make sure that there are adequate resources during this transitional period.

□ 1530

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I hope we can. And I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and I will be able to work something out. I hope the gentleman will take a look at that, and I am going to ask the staff to show how retirement payments were being paid by Amtrak. And there are some problems, but I am committed to working with Amtrak and I am doubly committed to making the Northeast corridor the flagship which will help bring Amtrak a lot more money.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$60,009,000, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the De-

partment 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: *Provided further*, That no more than \$606,000 shall be available for the Office of Acquisition and Grants Management, solely for department-wide grants management activities: *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, \$4,400,000.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Transportation Administrative Service Center, not to exceed \$121,800,000, 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

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for "Small Community Air Service" in Public Law 101-508 for fiscal year 1998, \$38,600,000 are rescinded.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against page 4, line 1, through line 6. This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it rescinds \$38.6 million in airport and airway trust fund contract authority, not general fund appropriations, for small community air service.

Airport and airway trust fund contract authority, while a form of direct spending, is legislative in nature, and rescinding such authority is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. This rescission constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. No, Mr. Chairman. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$2,900,000, of which \$2,635,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999: *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

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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; \$2,708,000,000, of which \$300,000,000 shall be available for defense-related activities and \$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 twelve, 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: *Provided further*, That \$34,300,000 of the funds provided under this heading for increased drug interdiction activities are not available for obligation until the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy: (1) reviews the specific activities and associated costs and benefits proposed by the Coast Guard; (2) compares those activities to other drug interdiction efforts government-wide; and (3) certifies, in writing, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that such expenditures represent the best investment relative to other options: *Provided further*, That should the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy decline to make such certification, after notification in writing to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Director may transfer, at his discretion, up to \$34,300,000 of funds provided herein for Coast Guard drug interdiction activities to any other entity of the Federal

Government for drug interdiction activities: *Provided further*, That up to \$615,000 in user fees collected pursuant to section 1111 of Public Law 104-324 shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections in fiscal year 1998.

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, \$379,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which \$191,650,000 shall be available to acquire, repair, renovate or improve vessels, small boats and related equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2002; \$33,900,000 shall be available to acquire new aircraft and increase aviation capability, to remain available until September 30, 2000; \$47,050,000 shall be available for other equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2000; \$59,400,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities, to remain available until September 30, 2000; and \$47,000,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That funds received from the sale of 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 shall be credited to this appropriation, of which not more than \$9,000,000 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account, to be available for the purposes of this account: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced by such amount so as to result in a final fiscal year 1998 appropriation from the General Fund of \$370,000,000: *Provided further*, That any proceeds from the sale or lease of Coast Guard surplus real property in excess of \$9,000,000 shall be retained and remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1998.

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, to remain available until expended.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, \$16,000,000, 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); \$645,696,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For all necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; \$67,000,000: *Provided*, That no more than \$20,000,000 of funds made available under this heading may be transferred to Coast Guard "Operating expenses" or otherwise made available to reimburse the Coast Guard for financial support of the Coast Guard Reserve.

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, to remain available until expended, of which \$3,500,000 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, 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, \$5,300,000,000, of which notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 48104(c), \$3,425,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to plan, finalize, or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of enactment of this Act: *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 test 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.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against page 10, line 20, beginning with "of which" through "fund" on line 22. This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it alters the funding formula established under the airport improvement program by appropriating \$3.425 billion out of the airport and airway fund for FAA.

The correct figure should be approximately \$1.88 billion if the formula under existing law is followed. The added funding for operations has the effect of changing existing law and it, therefore, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the point of order can extend only to the specific part of the paragraph left unprotected and, as such, it is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolf:

On page 10, line 20 of the bill, insert the following after the sum "\$5,300,000,000.": of which \$1,880,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the point of order just sustained by the Chair eliminates all aviation trust fund support for FAA operations. I believe it is the intent of the authorizing committee to ensure only that the legislative cap on trust fund spending for FAA operations is upheld and not to totally eliminate the trust fund contribution.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the subcommittee, and I support this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more to say, then, because it is a technical amendment and is supported, I think, by the majority and minority.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the Members' attention on page 6, line 12, through line 18, this is an area of the appropriations bill of which I have talked to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, about

that I have some strong reservations on. What I would like to do is to read the three areas of the bill that I have strong reservations and then speak directly as to what they are.

No. 1, line 5, first of all, the Committee on Appropriations has taken \$34 million that was directed to the Coast Guard interdiction program and has effectively given it to the drug czar to determine the best area where this money should be spent.

The authority given to the drug czar is the following, that is the director's office of the National Drug Control Policy. This is the authority given to Mr. McCaffrey. No. 1, Mr. McCaffrey will review the specific activities and associated costs and benefit proposed by the Coast Guard.

I think those reviews of those activities and the cost and benefits have already been reviewed by the authorizing committee, the Coast Guard committee and the transportation. No. 2 compares those activities to other drug interdiction efforts government-wide. This was always done with various other authorizing committees.

But within that, what I have the most disagreement with is No. 3. No. 3 certifies that the drug czar will certify in writing to the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations, not to the authorizing committee, but to the Committee on Appropriations, that such expenditures represent the best investment relative to other options provided further that, should the director, Office of National Drug Control Policy decline to make such certification after notification in writing to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the director may transfer, at his discretion, up to \$34 million of funds provided to the Coast Guard to any other government entity to use this amount of money.

I have some reservations about reporting to the Committee on Appropriations, as opposed to the authorizing committees, this waiver. This part of the bill could have been struck in a point of order, but it was protected by waiver by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCaffrey, in a letter to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to Mr. Peña wanted, this is the drug czar now, wanted \$34 million sent to the Coast Guard for this interdiction part. The Coast Guard, in the whole area of the Nation's drug problem, in the last few years, in my judgment, has been engaged in a very positive way to drastically reduce the number of drugs coming into the United States.

Now, lastly, Mr. Chairman, I think when we begin to pick apart in the various levels of the appropriations process and the authorizing process an agency such as the Coast Guard, I think we lose sight of the rather large responsibility, increasing responsibility that we give to the Coast Guard every single year.

If the Members will just consider this particular fact: On any 1 day, any one

point in time on any given day, every Coast Guard jet that is assigned an area, every Coast Guard helicopter, every Coast Guard cutter, every Coast Guard buoy tender, every Coast Guard boat has the following responsibilities: Drug interdiction, determining who are illegal immigrants, boarding hostile steamship lines with hostile immigrants prepared to wreak havoc, finding boats where people have had accidents, determining the difference between shad, salmon, yellowfin tuna, bluefin tuna, striped bass, when the regulations for fishing are the international standards for boaters' safety, for vessel safety, for oil pollution. Every single Coast Guard person has this and more as their responsibility.

Drug interdiction is just one of these things. And what the Coast Guard is doing now as far as drug interdiction is concerned, they are working in the international arena and they have international cooperation, and the U.S. Coast Guard is seen as a leader in this area.

So I would just request, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and myself have had some very good discussions on this prior to this statement, but I think it is important for us to realize the increasing responsibility of the Coast Guard.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST]. I admire him about as much as I do anybody in the body. And we will talk, and if we are able to keep this language in, I will change it to make sure that the report goes to the authorizing committee too at the same time.

We just want to make sure that the money is wisely spent. I am very concerned about the drug problem coming into the country. I have very strong views about it. We have had a number of drug conferences in my district. I just want to make sure that it is really wisely and well spent.

Second, by doing this, we put a great responsibility on the drug czar and also on the Coast Guard. But I think I understand what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] says. And again, if we can, we will make sure that the report goes to the gentleman's committee and the Coast Guard.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. First, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and I think he knows that. I do look forward to working with him on this particular issue on page 6, but I look forward to working with him on this issue in a very comprehensive way so that we can ensure a reduction in the drug problem in the United States. And all the Federal agencies are working very closely together to do a better job.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 65, line 6, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 65, line 6, is as follows:

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, \$1,875,000,000, of which \$1,655,890,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000, and of which \$219,110,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: *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, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2000: *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: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for the "Flight 2000" Program.

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, \$1,600,000,000, 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 \$1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 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 1998.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FRANCHISE FUND

None of the funds in this Act shall be available to establish new activities under the Administrative Services Franchise Fund during fiscal year 1998.

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 \$510,313,000 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 \$202,226,000 of the amount provided herein shall remain available until September 30, 2000.

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 \$21,500,000,000 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1998.

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, \$20,800,000,000 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 obligations for right-of-way acquisition during fiscal year 1998.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 31102, \$85,000,000, 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 \$85,325,000 for "Motor Carrier Safety Grants".

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, \$74,492,000, of which \$40,674,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *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, \$72,415,000, of which \$49,520,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000.

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

For payment of obligations incurred carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 153, 402, 408, and 410, and chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, to remain available until expended, \$186,000,000, 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 1998, are in excess of \$186,500,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402, 410, and chapter 303 of title 49, U.S.C., of which \$140,200,000 shall be for "State and community highway safety grants", \$2,300,000 shall be for the "National Driver Register", \$9,000,000 shall be for "Occupant Protection Incentive Grants", subject to authorization, and \$35,000,000 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 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 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, \$19,434,000, of which \$1,389,000 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: *Provided further*, That none of the funds for rental payments to the General Services Administration provided herein shall be used to pay the expenses of headquarters' employees outside of the Nassif building after January 1, 1998.

RAILROAD SAFETY

For necessary expenses in connection with railroad safety, not otherwise provided for, \$56,967,000, of which \$5,511,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of 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, \$21,038,000, 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, \$250,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

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 1998.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

For necessary expenses for Next Generation High-Speed Rail studies, corridor planning, development, demonstration, and implementation, \$18,395,000, 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 improvements.

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, \$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 \$23,000,000 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.

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, \$543,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$202,000,000 shall be available for operating losses, \$81,000,000 shall be available for mandatory passenger rail service payments, and \$260,000,000 shall be for capital improvements: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated for mandatory railroad retirement payments shall be used for payments for National Railroad Passenger Corporation employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for operating losses in excess of the amounts specifically provided herein: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided for capital improvements may be transferred to operating losses to pay for debt service interest unless specifically authorized by law after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the incurring of any obligation or commitment by the Corporation for the purchase of capital improvements prohibited by this Act or not expressly provided for in an appropriations Act shall be deemed a violation of 31 U.S.C. 1341: *Provided further*, That funding under this head for capital improvements shall not be made available before July 1, 1998: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration shall submit a quarterly report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing the financial status of, and future business forecasts for, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation as well as recommendations for reducing operating losses in the near-term and Federal financial support in the long-term: *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, \$45,738,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the execution of contracts under section 5327(c) of title 49, United States Code, in an aggregate amount that exceeds \$15,000,000.

FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5307, 5310(a)(2), 5311, and 5336, to remain available until expended, \$290,000,000: *Provided*, That no more than \$2,500,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this head for formula grants, no more than \$200,000,000 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, \$86,000,000, 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)); \$22,500,000 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), \$2,210,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That \$2,210,000,000 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 execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 for grants under the contract authority in 49 U.S.C. 5338(b): *Provided*, That there shall be available for fixed guideway modernization, \$800,000,000; there shall be available for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities, \$400,000,000; and there shall be available for new fixed guideway systems \$800,000,000, to be available as follows:

\$44,600,000 for the Atlanta-North Springs project (subject to authorization);

\$46,300,000 for the Boston Piers MOS-2 project (subject to authorization);

\$2,300,000 for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Charlotte South corridor transitway project (subject to authorization);

\$500,000 for the Cincinnati Northeast/Northern Kentucky rail line project (subject to authorization);

\$5,000,000 for the Clark County, Nevada fixed guideway project (subject to authorization);

\$800,000 for the Cleveland Blue Line extension to Highland Hills project (subject to authorization);

\$700,000 for the Cleveland Berea Red Line extension to Hopkins International Airport (subject to authorization);

\$1,200,000 for the Cleveland Waterfront Line extension project (subject to authorization);

\$14,000,000 for the Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN project (subject to authorization);

\$8,000,000 for the DART North Central light rail extension project (subject to authorization);

\$1,500,000 for the DeKalb County, Georgia light rail project (subject to authorization);

\$21,400,000 for the Denver Southwest Corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$7,000,000 for the Florida Tri-County commuter rail project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Galveston, Texas rail trolley system project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Houston Advanced Regional Bus Plan project (subject to authorization);

\$51,100,000 for the Houston Regional Bus project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Indianapolis Northeast corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$4,000,000 for the Jackson, Mississippi intermodal corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$76,000,000 for the Los Angeles MOS-3 project (subject to authorization);

\$27,000,000 for MARC commuter rail improvements (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Memphis, Tennessee regional rail project (subject to authorization);

\$9,000,000 for the Metro-Dade Transit east-west corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$9,000,000 for the Miami-North 27th Avenue project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Mission Valley East corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$54,800,000 for the New Jersey-Hudson-Bergen project (subject to authorization);

\$27,000,000 for the New Jersey Secaucus project (subject to authorization);

\$8,000,000 for the New Orleans Canal Street corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$2,000,000 for the New Orleans Desire Streetcar project (subject to authorization);

\$6,000,000 for the North Carolina Research Triangle Park project (subject to authorization);

\$2,000,000 for the Northern Indiana South Shore commuter rail project (subject to authorization);

\$5,000,000 for the Oceanside-Escondido light rail project (subject to authorization);

\$1,600,000 for the Oklahoma City MAPS corridor transit project (subject to authorization);

\$4,000,000 for the Orange County transitway project (subject to authorization);

\$31,800,000 for the Orlando Lynx light rail project (subject to authorization);

\$500,000 for the Pennsylvania Strawberry Hill/Diamond Branch rail project (subject to authorization);

\$8,000,000 for the Phoenix metropolitan area transit project (subject to authorization);

\$3,000,000 for the Pittsburgh airport busway project (subject to authorization);

\$63,400,000 for the Portland-Westside/Hillsboro project (subject to authorization);

\$20,300,000 for the Sacramento LRT project (subject to authorization);

\$42,800,000 for the Salt Lake City South LRT project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the San Bernardino Metrolink project (subject to authorization);

\$3,000,000 for the San Diego Mid-Coast corridor project (subject to authorization);

\$54,800,000 for the San Francisco BART extension to the airport project (subject to authorization);

\$25,700,000 for the San Juan Tren Urbano (subject to authorization);

\$21,400,000 for the San Jose Tasman LRT project (subject to authorization);

\$4,000,000 for the Seattle-Tacoma commuter rail project (subject to authorization); \$2,000,000 for the Seattle-Tacoma light rail project (subject to authorization);

\$30,000,000 for the St. Louis-St. Clair LRT extension project (subject to authorization);

\$5,000,000 for the St. George Ferry terminal project (subject to authorization);

\$2,000,000 for the Tampa Bay regional rail project (subject to authorization);

\$2,000,000 for the Tidewater, Virginia rail project (subject to authorization);

\$1,000,000 for the Toledo, Ohio rail project (subject to authorization);

\$20,000,000 for the Twin Cities transitways projects (subject to authorization);

\$2,500,000 for the Virginia Rail Express Fredericksburg to Washington commuter rail project (subject to authorization);

\$5,000,000 for the Whitehall ferry terminal project (subject to authorization); and

\$5,000,000 for the Wisconsin central commuter rail project (subject to authorization).

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, \$2,350,000,000, 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

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, \$11,200,000, 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, \$27,934,000, of which \$574,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and of which \$4,950,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *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, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses

incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

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, \$31,486,000, of which \$3,300,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2000; and of which \$28,186,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$14,839,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000: *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, 2000: *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, \$42,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading 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, \$15,853,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$2,000,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board 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 for the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar for dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1998, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$13,853,000: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$2,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1998.

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, \$3,640,000: *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) \$46,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

EMERGENCY FUND

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board for accident investigations, 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), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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 1998 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 1998 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, 1997, 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, 1998, 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) of title 23, United States Code, the Federal lands highway program, the intelligent transportation systems program, and 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: *Provided*, 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, 1997, 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, 1998, 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 1998 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, 1998, has the amount distributed to such State under paragraph (a) for fiscal year 1998 reduced under paragraph (c)(2).

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. 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, 2000, shall be made available for other projects under 49 U.S.C. 5309.

SEC. 317. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 1993, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure may be trans-

ferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 318. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 350 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 1998.

SEC. 319. Funds provided in this Act for the Transportation Administrative Service Center (TASC) shall be reduced by \$25,000,000, which limits fiscal year 1998 TASC obligational authority for elements of the Department of Transportation funded in this Act to no more than \$96,800,000: *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. 320. 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. 321. 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. 322. None of the funds in this Act may be used for planning, engineering, design, or construction of a sixth runway at the 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: *Provided further*, That funds may be used for activities related to planning or analysis of airport noise issues related to the sixth runway project.

SEC. 323. 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.

SEC. 324. 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. 325. 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. 326. 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. 327. 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. 328. No funds other than those appropriated to the Surface Transportation Board shall be used for conducting the activities of the Board.

SEC. 329. (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. 330. 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. 331. Notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 41742, no essential air service shall be provided to communities in the forty-eight contiguous States that are located fewer than seventy highway miles from the nearest large and 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.

SEC. 332. 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. 333. 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.

TITLE IV

AMTRAK ROUTE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Amtrak Route Closure and Realignment Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. THE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an independent commission to be known as the "Total Realignment of Amtrak Commission" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(1) Three individuals appointed by the President, including—

- (A) the Secretary of Transportation;
- (B) one representative of a rail labor union; and

(C) one representative of a rail management.

(2) Four individuals who collectively have expertise in rail finance, economic analysis, legal issues, and other relevant areas, of which three shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate and one shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(3) Four individuals who collectively have expertise in rail finance, economic analysis, legal issues, and other relevant areas, of which three shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and one shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

Appointments under this subsection shall be made within 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Individuals appointed under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall not be employees of the Department of Transportation or representatives of a rail labor union or rail management.

(c) CHAIRMAN.—Within 10 days after the 15-day period described in subsection (b), or the appointment of the last member of the Commission under such subsection, whichever occurs first, a majority of the members of the Commission may elect a chairman from among its membership. If a chairman is not

elected within such 10-day period, the President shall select a chairman for the Commission from among its membership.

(d) MEETINGS.—(1) Each meeting of the Commission shall be open to the public.

(2) All the proceedings, information, and deliberations of the Commission shall be open or available, upon request, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) PAY AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—(1)(A) Each member, other than the Chairman, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(B) The Chairman shall be paid for each day referred to in subparagraph (A) at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), officers and employees of the Federal Government shall not be paid under this paragraph for service on the Commission.

(2) Members shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) DIRECTOR OF STAFF.—The Commission shall appoint a Director, who shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) STAFF.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Director, with the approval of the Commission, may appoint and fix the pay of not more than 5 additional employees.

(2) The Director may make such appointments without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and any personnel so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(i) INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission to the extent otherwise permitted by law.

(j) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(l) EXPERTS OR CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or

intermittent services of experts or consultants pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(m) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall terminate 30 days after transmitting a report under section 3(e).

SEC. 3. DUTIES.

(a) **ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE RANKINGS.**—The Commission shall examine economic data for Amtrak's system and develop system-wide performance rankings of all routes based on long-term economic loss.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE ROUTES FOR CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT.**—(1) The Commission shall identify routes which are candidates for closure or realignment, based on the performance rankings developed under subsection (a) and on the following principles:

(A) The system which remains after closure and realignment of routes shall not be required to be a national, interconnected system.

(B) Federal operating subsidies for Amtrak shall be assumed to decline over the 4-year period to the point of zero Federal operating subsidy by the year 2002.

(C) The rail labor protection costs of Amtrak shall be calculated both—

(i) at the level required under rail labor laws as in effect when the Commission is identifying routes under this subsection; and

(ii) at the level which would be required if amendments to rail labor laws were enacted that—

(I) limit to a maximum of 6 months any wage continuation or severance benefit for an employee of Amtrak whose employment is terminated as a result of a discontinuance of intercity rail passenger service; and

(II) permit Amtrak to require any employee whose position is eliminated as a result of such a discontinuance to transfer to another part of Amtrak's system.

(2) The Commission shall specifically examine ridership forecasts and other assumptions supporting continued service on the Northeast Corridor, particularly with respect to the continuation of the electrification of the Northeast Corridor between New Haven, Connecticut, and Boston, Massachusetts.

(c) **CONSIDERATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE FACTORS.**—(1) Each route identified under subsection (b) as a candidate for closure or realignment shall be reviewed to determine whether there are important social, environmental, or other quality of life factors which should be considered in determining whether to close or realign the route. The commission shall also consider the effect on airport congestion and the availability of alternative modes of transportation, especially in rural areas, before recommending any closure or realignment.

(2) The Commission shall hold public hearings to obtain testimony from State and local officials, and other interested parties, with respect to factors described in paragraph (1).

(d) **OPTIONAL USES FOR ABANDONED RAIL LINES.**—The Commission shall also examine optional uses for abandoned rail lines.

(e) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The Commission shall, within 120 days after the election or selection of its chairman under section 2(c), transmit to the Congress and the President a report on its activities under this Act, including recommendations developed under this section for the closure and realignment of routes in Amtrak's passenger rail system.

SEC. 4. MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMISSION.

There are appropriated \$1,000,000 for carrying out this title.

POINTS OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remaining portions of the bill?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 331.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 331. This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it establishes criteria involving distance from a hub and subsidy for passengers that have the effect of excluding some small communities from eligibility for subsidized air service under the essential air service program.

□ 1545

The communities excluded are those that are eligible for service under subchapter 2 of chapter 417 of title 49. Changing the eligibility rules constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair would rule. Section 331 of the bill explicitly waives existing law and therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and section 331 is stricken from the bill.

Are there further points of order?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against page 53, line 3 through page 65, line 6.

This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it establishes an independent commission called the Total Realignment of Amtrak Commission to renew Amtrak's route system and identify candidates for closure or realignment similar to the commission established to close military facilities. This constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. I understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doing it. I appreciate the concern.

I would urge the Congress to work and support the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] to reform and change Amtrak, because as we are putting all of the money into Amtrak, if there is no reform and GAO and IG has looked at it, it has continued getting worse and it is, in essence, perhaps this is not an apt example, but putting money down a rathole.

I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] is doing with regard to the restructuring is very, very important. I would have hoped that this language could have stayed in, but it is important that the

Congress pass legislation, because I think we are going to see dwindling support if some restructuring is not done.

I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order and the matter included in the bill as title IV is, in fact, entirely legislative. The point of order is sustained, and that matter is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER: Page 22, line 1, strike "loan guarantee" and all that follows before the period on line 2 and insert the following:

loan guarantee subsidy shall be made in excess of \$490,000 during fiscal year 1998.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to introduce an amendment that is critical to the economic development not only of San Diego, my own district, but other communities throughout this Nation.

My amendment will appropriate \$490,000 for the section 511 railroad loan guarantee program in order to leverage approximately \$10 million in private sector loan guarantees necessary to help reestablish and rehabilitate small regional freight railroads like the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railroad.

I repeat, this is a loan guarantee which leverages approximately 20 times that amount of private sector funding. Reestablishment of this railroad is on the top of everyone's priority list in San Diego and enjoys wide bipartisan support. Several colleagues from San Diego County on the other side of the aisle support this, as do the city of San Diego, the County Board of Supervisors, the San Diego Association of Governments, the Port of San Diego, the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce and the San Diego Economic Development Corporation. All agree that reestablishing this rail link is the area's highest priority for economic development.

Many of our Nation's regional and short line railroads find it difficult to obtain private financing because of high interest rates and short terms. Government assistance in the form of loan guarantees often becomes the only viable means to rehabilitate these vital links in our transportation infrastructure. I believe that the section 511 program, because it is not a grant program, it is not even a loan program but a loan guarantee to leverage private sector loans, is precisely the type of public-private partnership this Congress ought to encourage. Unfortunately, this program does not receive any funding in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, the economies of communities like San Diego and others would be greatly helped by rehabilitation of these small freight railroad

lines, and they need help now. I hope my colleagues can support this investment in economic growth.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FILNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is important for all of us in Congress to understand what the loan guarantee program is and what it provides assistance to. What it provides assistance to are the short line railroads in our country.

Most of us in this Congress do not know what those short line railroads are. They have no appreciation for them. They do not know of their importance to the community. If they did, we would be providing funding for or we would be providing these loan guarantees.

In this bill, we have provided assistance for our airlines, for aviation, we have provided assistance for highways, for our motor freight carriers, we have provided assistance for our waterways and for passenger railroad. The one area that we have not addressed is our railroad system. We heavily subsidize all forms of transportation and transport except our freight railroads. Today within the freight railroads, there is definitely a segment that needs some assistance and recognition from the Federal Government. That is our short line railroads.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my colleagues about one short line railroad in my district. A short line railroad in my district is 52 miles long. Over 4,000 employees work for small plants on that railroad. That railroad has not turned a profit for 4 years. It has had two washouts. If that short line railroad goes defunct, it will result in over 2,000 blue-collar workers being laid off in my district. That is only one of over 300 short line railroads. Most of them are minimally profitable or marginally profitable or not profitable at all.

I would simply appeal to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Transportation chairman and to this subcommittee to learn more about this important segment. These are the have-nots of the freight railroads. These companies, they are sort of the grassroots, they are the fingers and the toes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FILNER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks to the entire body and specifically about the short line railroads.

The short line railroads are the result of the Class I railroads. There used to be over 30 Class I railroads. In certain areas, the density of the track, the

amount of freight over those lines was insufficient for them to operate. So what those large railroads did is they tried to abandon that track in most cases. But State and local governments came in and Federal agencies and said that you cannot abandon that track because it is necessary for the economic vitality of a certain region. These short line railroads came in and are now operating those tracks.

As I have said, people's jobs, people's welfares, communities' existence depend on these railroads. Wherever we have large agricultural areas, grain roads, the farmers depend on those roads to get their crops out. In high industrial areas, they depend on those small railroads. Those railroads may not be known, they may not be appreciated by Members of this body, but they are absolutely critical to those communities, and they are absolutely critical to the economic welfare of our country. To me it is a sad day that probably because of simply a lack of understanding, a lack of knowledge about where these railroads are, what factories they serve, what they mean to the people they serve and the fact that if we do not continue these loan guarantee programs, these railroads will go out of existence, and with them factories and jobs.

I do plan to have some conversations with members of the Committee on Appropriations. I plan to ask them, among other questions, do they know how many factories are served by short line railroads? How many of those short line railroads are profitable? How many employees work for those plants that are served by those short line railroads? And whether or not they feel that this minuscule amount of money that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure had authorized and urged the Committee on Appropriations to set aside, if they think that that was too much money for the livelihood of over 2 million American workers that depend on these short line railroads for a paycheck every Friday. It is something that we ought to ask ourselves. These workers are blue-collar workers, they are in industries that sometimes are competing fiercely with foreign companies, and by jerking this loan program, we will put people out of business, we will cause people to lose their jobs, we will cause some of these 16,000 small businesses, not the railroads, but the 16,000 small businesses to declare bankruptcy and go out of business to foreign competition. I am just sad that we have made this decision.

I am going to vote for the bill on the whole, and I know that this was not willfully done, I know it was not intentionally done, but when we vote through this bill and it does not have these loan guarantees in, we are putting at jeopardy over 2 million jobs, over 16,000 factories in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia continue his reservation?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. Let me take a little different tack. On a bipartisan nature, both Republicans and Democrats in the California area, when the Federal Government induces or causes a problem or at least contributes to it, then it should have that responsibility to take care of those problems.

With the advent of the border States and NAFTA, especially along the Mexican border, the infrastructure and our highway and transportation system have been beaten to death by trucks, cars, and additional travel. The gentleman's amendment would ease that problem.

Second, that the interstate transportation along a border State with a major port like San Diego actually enhances the economy of this great country with the Asian markets in which we have a current deficit, so it helps reduce that deficit. The gentleman has given a lot of thought to this amendment. We have not received the support that we think that it should receive.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, there was a lot of discussion here about the problems and the opportunities of NAFTA on this floor, but this is a situation where we need to recognize that with all the hand-wringing and the complaints about NAFTA not creating enough jobs in the United States or pulling jobs away from the American worker, here is a project that has the opportunity to make NAFTA, at least in some part, a major positive in job generation. Here is a possibility of bringing jobs into the United States by having the proper infrastructure to be able to capitalize on the opportunity of the United States to be part of the export network from Mexico into Asia. This gives the capability to creating jobs in the Southwest that would not exist without this infrastructure and without NAFTA, frankly.

I would just ask that all my colleagues who feel that NAFTA has not gotten the job done for the workers of America to recognize that though there are problems, there are also opportunities, and with those opportunities comes Federal obligations to take advantage of those opportunities and create the jobs, not just sit here in the House and say, well, the jobs just are not there, it is not working out, and complain.

□ 1600

But then look at these opportunities, as my colleague from California has pointed out, to build the infrastructure, to create the jobs, to make the opportunities so that the private sector can do what it does all too well, and that is to create the opportunities for those jobs.

And I want to point out about border control, Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone who sat on the House floor in the last 2 years has been more vocal than I have about border control. I think those of us who want to see border control need to recognize that there are rights and responsibilities of the Federal Government along this border. We need to control the border, but we also need to encourage the good things. We need to stop the illegal activity but also encourage the legal commerce that will make the border a prosperous opportunity for America rather than the problem that we have seen for all too long.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, before I yield back the time, I mention just one more benefit from this, not only the Federal Government's responsibility for helping create jobs in NAFTA, not only in our rail but other rails, but to take a look at the environmental concerns when we put trains on and take heavy trucks and transportation off of our highways, the environmental and the pollution with EPA and so on is also benefited.

Mr. Chairman, with that I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] wish to continue his reservation of objection?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak on this because it is clear that the committee is and the chairman of the committee is prepared to execute his reservation against any of these loans, loan guarantees for short-track rail, and therefore it is not necessary to take a vote on this, on this issue. But I do want to, since my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] have spoken about the prospects for this guaranteed program with respect to a San Diego to points east rail line, I thought it was important to come out and just say a few things about that specifically.

First, there is a broken down railway between San Diego and points east that goes mainly and starts out in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], goes mainly through in terms of mileage, through my district going east, but I do not think that is really relevant, whose district it goes through.

I think what probably is more relevant is the commentary that was elicited recently from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] who is one of our esteemed Members of Congress, former Border Patrol chief in El Paso. And if my colleagues walk through this problem with him with respect to border control problems, that is, having a short-track rail line that actually goes into Mexico. This is the area in Mexico

where we are now having fire fights between border patrolmen and smuggling elements on the other side of the border; goes into Mexico, goes through about 50, 60 miles of rugged country, comes back along a series of precarious canyons, and then comes back into the United States. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] has made a couple of statements with respect to that railroad that I think should be considered by any Member of Congress before they pass this thing.

First, he said that this railroad will be vulnerable to robberies, just like the railroad in El Paso which was robbed 600 times last year. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] himself in an interview, a television show that I did with him, mentioned he himself was in a gunfight between train robbers on the other side of the border and American Border Patrol agents on our side. In recent weeks we have had a series of fire fights, very brief fire fights, across the border where Border Patrol agents were shot at in some cases; in the first case, actually shot by drug agents on the other or by drug operatives on the other side, forced to return fire, and we have actually had more fire back and forth across the southwest border in the San Diego region than we have had in Bosnia in the same period of time. It is a very dangerous area.

I would suggest that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] should be listened to when he says, "First you should get the guarantee of the government of Mexico that they will, in fact, patrol that area on the Mexican side. Otherwise," he said, "you're not going to have control." He said we should do that before we rehabilitate that rail line.

Second, he showed several areas where in remote areas we are going to have problems. Now we had over 600 robberies in 1 year with the rail line in El Paso. We had it with the rail line that comes into Laredo, we had over 36,000 illegal aliens pulled off that rail line last year, and the President of Southern Pacific in that area asking the President of the United States for the entire increase in border patrol for the Nation. That is 500 new border patrolmen going just to protect his railroad.

Now the happy talkers in San Diego say that will never happen to us, and that is all they say. They do not offer any experience that is any better than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] who was chief of the Border Patrol for some 20 years, who was in fire fights on the border, who understands across-border crime problems. They just say it will not happen, and I would just suggest to my colleagues we have had a vote on this thing before. It was overwhelmingly defeated because we do not have that guarantee of security for Mexico, we do not have that guarantee from the Clinton administration that they have an extra thousand Border Patrol agents to put 500 in south Texas just to guard one railroad and to put

another contingent similar to that in southern California.

Right now, our eyes should be on the ball. The ball is border control. We are building fences, we are building roads, we are building lights, and we are putting more border patrolmen at the border, and the last thing we need to do is complicate the security situation by weaving a railroad in between this situation on rickety tracks across precipitous canyons and inviting at least in the words of, in the opinion of probably the best expert on border control in this Congress, and that is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES], at least the complexity in border patrol.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] wish to continue his reservation of objection?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a point of order raised against this amendment and the amendment may be withdrawn. I would like to speak from the perspective of my congressional district in somewhat reference to the reservations of the gentleman from California [Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER] about precipitous railroad tax and dangerous canyons for the shortline railroads to run across the border to Mexico and to be used or abused, and I recognize the problems that he has in his congressional district.

In my congressional district the shortline railroads are absolutely indispensable, and I think that the Federal Government, when we subsidize the automobile industry, the airport industry, and just name it, I think if we target with these loan guarantees, and this is not a direct subsidy, it is not a direct appropriation; this is a loan guarantee program. The shortline railroads in my district haul stone for roads, they haul grain for livestock, they haul manufactured goods. They are an absolutely indispensable, very important part, a critical part of the infrastructure of the economic base of my congressional district, and I am sure that they are a critical part of a whole range of congressional districts around this country.

This is not a subsidy that we want to prop up an industry that has no value. This is an interest in an industry that is virtually, in my judgment, indispensable for the economic health of this country via those small areas, whether they be urban areas, suburban areas or rural areas, to provide the important link between the major rail systems in this country.

So I am not sure what is going to happen in the next few minutes, but I strongly urge this Congress today or tomorrow to deal very effectively with this vital link, this vital part of our infrastructure, this vital link of our economic base.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia wish to be heard upon his reservation of objection?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] first.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for the support from people from both sides of the aisle and different parts of the country. I hope the chairman and the ranking member would seriously consider these aspects in coming years. I understand the pressures they are under, the debate that we see here, especially with the San Diego situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GILCHREST] having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 2169), making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 189, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that rule, back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 424, nays 5, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—424

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Baldacci | Becerra |
| Ackerman | Ballenger | Bentsen |
| Aderholt | Barcia | Bereuter |
| Allen | Barr | Berman |
| Andrews | Barrett (NE) | Berry |
| Archer | Barrett (WI) | Bilbray |
| Armey | Bartlett | Bilirakis |
| Bachus | Barton | Bishop |
| Baesler | Bass | Blagojevich |
| Baker | Bateman | Biley |

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Blumenauer | Fowler | Lewis (KY) |
| Blunt | Fox | Linder |
| Boehkert | Frank (MA) | Lipinski |
| Boehner | Franks (NJ) | Livingston |
| Bonilla | Frelinghuysen | LoBiondo |
| Bonior | Frost | Lofgren |
| Bono | Furse | Lowe |
| Borski | Galleghy | Lucas |
| Boswell | Ganske | Luther |
| Boucher | Gejdenson | Maloney (CT) |
| Boyd | Gekas | Maloney (NY) |
| Brady | Gephardt | Manton |
| Brown (CA) | Gibbons | Manzullo |
| Brown (FL) | Gilchrest | Markey |
| Brown (OH) | Gillmor | Martinez |
| Bryant | Gilman | Mascara |
| Bunning | Gonzalez | Matsui |
| Burr | Goode | McCarthy (MO) |
| Burton | Goodlatte | McCarthy (NY) |
| Buyer | Goodling | McCollum |
| Callahan | Gordon | McCrery |
| Calvert | Calvert | McDade |
| Camp | Granger | McDermott |
| Canady | Green | McGovern |
| Cannon | Greenwood | McHale |
| Capps | Gutierrez | McHugh |
| Cardin | Gutknecht | McInnis |
| Carson | Hall (OH) | McIntosh |
| Castle | Hall (TX) | McIntyre |
| Chabot | Hamilton | McKeon |
| Chambliss | Hansen | McKinney |
| Chenoweth | Harman | McNulty |
| Christensen | Hastert | Meehan |
| Clay | Hastings (FL) | Meek |
| Clayton | Hastings (WA) | Menendez |
| Clement | Hayworth | Metcalfe |
| Clyburn | Hefley | Mica |
| Coble | Hefner | Millender- |
| Coburn | Herger | McDonald |
| Collins | Hill | Miller (CA) |
| Combest | Hillery | Miller (FL) |
| Condit | Hilliard | Minge |
| Conyers | Hinchee | Mink |
| Cook | Hinojosa | Moakley |
| Cooksey | Hobson | Molinari |
| Costello | Hoekstra | Mollohan |
| Cox | Holden | Moran (KS) |
| Coyne | Hooley | Moran (VA) |
| Cramer | Horn | Morella |
| Crane | Houghton | Murtha |
| Crapo | Hoyer | Myrick |
| Cubin | Hulshof | Nadler |
| Cummings | Hunter | Neal |
| Cunningham | Hutchinson | Nethercutt |
| Danner | Hyde | Neumann |
| Davis (FL) | Inglis | Ney |
| Davis (IL) | Istook | Northup |
| Davis (VA) | Jackson (IL) | Norwood |
| Deal | Jackson-Lee | Nussle |
| DeFazio | (TX) | Oberstar |
| DeGette | Jefferson | Obey |
| Delahunt | Jenkins | Olver |
| DeLauro | John | Ortiz |
| DeLay | Johnson (CT) | Owens |
| Dellums | Johnson (WI) | Oxley |
| Deutsch | Johnson, E. B. | Packard |
| Diaz-Balart | Johnson, Sam | Pappas |
| Dickey | Jones | Parker |
| Dicks | Kanjorski | Pascrell |
| Dixon | Kaptur | Pastor |
| Doggett | Kasich | Paxon |
| Dooley | Kelly | Payne |
| Doolittle | Kennedy (MA) | Pease |
| Doyle | Kennedy (RI) | Pelosi |
| Dreier | Kennelly | Peterson (MN) |
| Duncan | Kildee | Peterson (PA) |
| Dunn | Kilpatrick | Petri |
| Edwards | Kim | Pickering |
| Ehlers | Kind (WI) | Pickett |
| Ehrlich | King (NY) | Pitts |
| Emerson | Kingston | Pombo |
| Engel | Klecicka | Pomeroy |
| English | Klink | Porter |
| Ensign | Klug | Portman |
| Eshoo | Knollenberg | Poshard |
| Etheridge | Kolbe | Price (NC) |
| Evans | Kucinich | Pryce (OH) |
| Everett | LaFalce | Quinn |
| Ewing | LaHood | Radanovich |
| Farr | Lampson | Rahall |
| Fattah | Lantos | Ramstad |
| Fawell | Largent | Rangel |
| Fazio | Latham | Redmond |
| Filner | LaTourette | Regula |
| Flake | King (NY) | Royce |
| Foglietta | Leach | Riggs |
| Foley | Levin | Riley |
| Forbes | Lewis (CA) | Rivers |
| Ford | Lewis (GA) | Rodriguez |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Roemer | Skaggs | Thune |
| Rogan | Skeen | Thurman |
| Rogers | Skelton | Tiahrt |
| Rohrabacher | Slaughter | Tierney |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Smith (MI) | Torres |
| Rothman | Smith (NJ) | Towns |
| Roukema | Smith (OR) | Trafigant |
| Roybal-Allard | Smith (TX) | Turner |
| Royce | Smith, Adam | Upton |
| Rush | Smith, Linda | Velazquez |
| Ryun | Snowbarger | Vento |
| Sabo | Snyder | Visclosky |
| Salmon | Solomon | Walsh |
| Sanchez | Souder | Wamp |
| Sanders | Spence | Waters |
| Sandlin | Spratt | Watkins |
| Sawyer | Stabenow | Watt (NC) |
| Saxton | Stearns | Watts (OK) |
| Scarborough | Stenholm | Waxman |
| Schaefer, Dan | Stokes | Weldon (FL) |
| Schaffer, Bob | Strickland | Weldon (PA) |
| Shumer | Stump | Weller |
| Scott | Stupak | Wexler |
| Sensenbrenner | Sununu | Weygand |
| Serrano | Talent | White |
| Sessions | Tanner | Whitfield |
| Shadegg | Tauscher | Wicker |
| Shaw | Tauzin | Wise |
| Shays | Taylor (MS) | Wolf |
| Sherman | Taylor (NC) | Woolsey |
| Shimkus | Thomas | Wynn |
| Shuster | Thompson | Yates |
| Sisisky | Thornberry | Young (FL) |

NAYS—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Campbell | Hostettler | Sanford |
| Dingell | Paul | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---------|--------|------------|
| Graham | Schiff | Young (AK) |
| Pallone | Stark | |

□ 1639

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 279, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—122

| | | |
|--------------|------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie | Cummings | Gonzalez |
| Ackerman | Davis (IL) | Gutierrez |
| Andrews | DeFazio | Hall (OH) |
| Barrett (WI) | DeGette | Harman |
| Becerra | Delahunt | Hastings (FL) |
| Berman | DeLauro | Hefner |
| Berry | Dellums | Hinchee |
| Bishop | Deutsch | Hoyer |
| Bonior | Dingell | Jackson-Lee |
| Boswell | Doggett | (TX) |
| Boucher | Engel | Jefferson |
| Brown (CA) | John | John |
| Brown (FL) | Eshoo | Johnson (WI) |
| Brown (OH) | Evans | Johnson, E. B. |
| Capps | Farr | Johnson, E. B. |
| Carson | Fazio | Kaptur |
| Clay | Filner | Kennedy (MA) |
| Clayton | Flake | Kennedy (RI) |
| Clyburn | Frost | Kennelly |
| Costello | Furse | Kilpatrick |
| Coyne | Gejdenson | Klink |
| | Gephardt | Lampson |