

Prohibition on relocating NASA aircraft based east of the Mississippi River (at the Wallops Island flight facility) to the Dryden Flight Research Center in California.

Earmarks \$1 million of National Science Foundation funds for the U.S./Mexico Foundation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this is not an exhaustive list of all the earmarks the conferees endorsed. As with previously submitted conference agreements, the conferees explicitly state in the report that they endorse all the provisions of the Senate and House reports on the bill, unless they are explicitly contradicted or addressed in the conference report. So there are a lot more earmarks that the conferees intend that the agencies will adhere to in allocating appropriated funds.

Again, Mr. President, I hesitate to say that all of these earmarks and set-asides are wasteful, or unnecessary. I want to stress that these projects may very well have merit and may very well be worthy of inclusion in this bill.

But the process the Congress established for itself, which involves both authorization and appropriation of spending items, is routinely ignored in the appropriations bills. These unauthorized and locality specific earmarks and add-ons have bypassed the normal agency review process and have bypassed the authorization process. They have simply been included in the appropriations bill because a small segment of the Senate or House, those who serve on Appropriations Committee, decided to include them.

Mr. President, the American people deserve to know how their money is spent, and why. Millions of dollars will be spent for the projects on the attached list, and I doubt that most Senators know why these projects were chosen for earmarks or set-asides. The American people certainly don't have access to that information.

I intend to send a letter to the President asking that he consider using his line-item veto authority to eliminate these spending items from this bill. That is why we gave him a line-item veto—to eliminate wasteful, unnecessary, and low-priority spending. He has already demonstrated his willingness to use the line-item veto, and I hope he continues to exercise that authority when clearly necessary.

Mr. President, as I said, I support the majority of the provisions of this bill, and I intend to vote for it. I am thankful, however, that a mechanism now exists that could, if utilized, eliminate the earmarks and set-asides in this bill to which I must object.

PARTICULATE MATTER RESEARCH

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to mention one issue of concern in the conference report on appropriations for the Environmental Protection Agency. It is in regard to report language on the Particulate Matter Research Program.

I agree that we need more research on the sources and the health effects of particulate matter and strongly support this bill's appropriation of funds

for new research. However, I would like to make it clear, for the record, that I do not agree with the conference report language that says that "we do not yet have available sufficient facts necessary to proceed with future regulations for a new particulate matter standard."

The EPA standards are based on the best available science regarding the health effects of exposure to particulate matter. Some argue that we should not proceed until we have scientific proof of the exact relationship between exposures to particulate matter, and health effects.

If we applied that principle in the late 1970's, we would not be enjoying the benefits of our current standards which have led to, for example, air pollution from carbon monoxide being reduced by 28 percent, from sulphur dioxide 41 percent, and from lead 98 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the conference report to accompany H.R. 2158 is agreed to.

The conference agreement was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues and the leadership for allowing us to proceed in a timely fashion on this matter.

I have mentioned only briefly my appreciation for the work of my ranking member, Senator MIKULSKI. Truly, there is no better person to have in a very complicated matter like this than to have someone of Senator MIKULSKI's ability, perspicacity, and dedication to right and justice to carry through on this.

I am deeply grateful for her cooperation, the cooperation of the leadership on her side, and particularly the leadership of both sides of the aisle on the Banking Committee which authorizes housing programs without which we would not have been able to accomplish mark-to-market. Senator MACK and his staff, in particular, Senator D'AMATO, Senator SARBANES, Senator KERRY have been helpful.

I express my thanks to Andy Givens, Stacy Closson, and David Bowers on the minority. We could not have done this on our side without the dedicated work of John Kamarek, Carrie Apostolou, and of Sarah Horrigan, who assisted us as representatives on loan from the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. President, again, I express my appreciation to my ranking member.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, now that we have concluded our bill, I too want to express my appreciation to Senator BOND and his very able staff—I am sorry Sarah Horrigan is not with us, her able cooperation—and, to my own staff, Andy Givens, David Bowers, and Stacy Closson.

I wish all bills could move as quickly and as rigorously and thoroughly as ours did. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to the following detailee to my staff: Mr. Peter Neffinger.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. BUMPERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1283 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference 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 ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2169) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 7, 1997.)

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered read, and that there be 20 minutes equally divided; that, following the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the conference report be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the conference report on the fiscal year 1998 Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill. This bill is very similar to the transportation appropriations bill that the Senate approved 98 to 1 on July 30. It provides the highest level of funding for Federal-aid highways in history—\$22.9 billion. That's slightly less than the amount we had included in the Senate bill because, in conference, we agreed to fund some other House priorities, but it's still a record level.

The actual distribution of those funds among the States will depend on reauthorization of ISTEA—the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991—which has provided authorization for Federal surface transportation programs for the past 6 years and which expired at the end of fiscal year 1997. But this increase of almost \$3 billion over fiscal year 1997 will almost certainly mean more Federal highway spending for each State.

The conference report also includes \$300 million for the Appalachian Development Highway System as proposed

by the Senate. This is a downpayment toward meeting the Federal Government's commitment to completing that System.

The bill includes \$4.7 billion for transit grants, including \$200 million for Washington Metro. I ask unanimous consent that a table which shows the distribution of these funds under current law be printed in the RECORD.

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

FISCAL YEAR 1998 DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATED TRANSIT FORMULA AND DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FUNDS BY STATE—ILLUSTRATIVE

State	Section 5307, urban area formula apportionment	Section 5311, nonurbanized area formula apportionment	Section 5310, elderly and persons with disabilities apportionments	Section 5309, fixed guideway modernization apportionment	Section 5338, discretionary grants—bus and bus facilities	Section 5338, discretionary grants—new starts	Total	Percent of total
Alabama	\$11,185,758	\$3,186,673	\$1,077,887	0	\$25,600,000	0	\$41,050,318	0.92
Alaska	1,804,936	475,202	181,007	0	0	0	2,461,144	.05
American Samoa	0	67,731	52,205	0	0	0	119,936	0
Arizona	25,641,598	1,395,042	951,941	\$753,784	5,500,000	\$4,000,000	38,242,365	0.85
Arkansas	3,979,267	2,547,613	757,178	0	0	0	7,284,057	0.16
California	359,319,983	6,217,892	5,780,115	73,004,558	38,400,000	141,600,000	624,322,548	13.93
Colorado	26,861,907	1,327,272	741,382	872,588	5,500,000	25,000,000	60,303,148	1.35
Connecticut	36,082,253	1,203,960	847,581	33,127,313	6,950,000	0	78,211,107	1.74
Delaware	4,544,322	300,359	266,380	371,459	1,500,000	0	6,982,520	.16
District of Columbia	21,487,762	0	264,504	20,304,678	0	0	42,056,943	.94
Florida	110,965,452	3,997,135	3,904,781	6,261,059	20,000,000	50,800,000	195,928,427	4.37
Georgia	40,275,089	4,659,255	1,393,706	8,377,647	9,000,000	45,600,000	109,305,697	2.44
Guam	0	192,815	132,335	0	0	0	325,149	.01
Hawaii	19,104,500	522,930	335,201	302,560	5,000,000	0	25,265,191	.56
Idaho	2,361,119	1,054,997	342,719	0	0	0	3,758,834	.08
Illinois	162,182,847	4,274,606	2,528,911	108,300,140	4,500,000	3,000,000	284,786,504	6.35
Indiana	25,432,292	4,129,173	1,333,234	0	4,000,000	5,250,000	40,144,699	.90
Iowa	6,711,334	2,655,925	812,986	0	4,000,000	0	14,180,245	.32
Kansas	6,233,630	2,112,704	683,737	0	1,000,000	0	10,030,071	.22
Kentucky	12,693,258	3,487,613	1,033,565	0	0	0	17,214,437	.38
Louisiana	21,173,354	2,884,508	1,036,865	2,192,506	13,900,000	8,000,000	49,187,234	1.10
Maine	1,693,773	1,391,888	425,143	0	0	0	3,510,805	.08
Maryland	59,427,457	1,737,705	1,041,705	16,644,799	8,000,000	31,000,000	117,851,667	2.63
Massachusetts	87,078,919	1,862,292	1,494,500	54,823,484	6,200,000	47,250,000	198,709,196	4.43
Michigan	47,254,939	5,043,404	2,165,608	152,149	7,500,000	0	62,116,100	1.39
Minnesota	22,554,929	2,902,188	1,056,203	2,156,921	10,500,000	12,000,000	51,170,241	1.14
Mississippi	3,639,708	2,832,159	735,995	0	2,000,000	3,000,000	12,207,861	.27
Missouri	26,095,820	3,380,302	1,351,855	1,484,601	16,000,000	30,500,000	78,812,577	1.76
Montana	1,786,660	854,630	315,546	0	0	0	2,956,836	.07
Nebraska	6,471,591	1,289,529	486,039	0	0	0	8,247,158	.18
Nevada	11,496,750	421,012	365,038	0	9,500,000	5,000,000	26,782,800	.60
New Hampshire	2,503,259	1,114,728	345,598	0	0	0	3,963,585	.09
New Jersey	136,678,638	1,593,825	1,791,542	69,082,137	6,000,000	87,000,000	302,146,143	6.74
New Mexico	5,357,480	1,252,988	429,081	0	7,750,000	0	14,789,549	.33
New York	410,451,112	5,610,456	4,133,626	276,062,566	34,325,000	25,500,000	756,082,760	16.87
North Carolina	20,069,428	5,959,962	1,583,185	0	6,000,000	13,000,000	46,612,575	1.04
North Dakota	1,741,653	632,037	270,610	0	0	0	2,644,300	.06
Northern Marianas	0	62,767	52,014	0	0	0	114,781	0
Ohio	65,501,156	6,067,655	2,638,627	12,722,165	12,500,000	6,000,000	105,429,604	2.35
Oklahoma	8,527,934	2,593,860	893,771	0	0	0	13,615,566	.30
Oregon	19,592,547	2,059,548	831,880	1,292,018	3,000,000	63,400,000	90,175,992	2.01
Pennsylvania	112,985,990	6,768,533	3,160,912	92,157,105	27,350,000	5,500,000	247,922,540	5.53
Puerto Rico	36,532,549	2,022,651	789,842	775,726	0	15,000,000	55,120,768	1.23
Rhode Island	7,598,014	259,105	379,890	1,062,810	0	0	9,299,820	.21
South Carolina	9,080,065	2,982,991	864,379	0	6,000,000	1,500,000	20,427,434	.46
South Dakota	1,256,376	770,404	291,151	0	2,250,000	0	4,567,931	.10
Tennessee	16,849,421	3,850,700	1,270,291	32,983	8,000,000	1,000,000	31,003,395	.69
Texas	119,735,859	8,129,898	3,264,108	3,046,639	14,950,000	74,100,000	223,226,504	4.98
Utah	15,889,161	584,009	400,773	0	8,900,000	6,000,000	93,173,843	2.08
Vermont	631,418	688,808	243,018	0	2,500,000	5,000,000	9,063,244	.20
Virgin Islands	0	147,427	134,313	0	0	0	281,740	.01
Virginia	45,207,104	3,414,019	1,320,940	517,018	5,650,000	4,000,000	60,109,081	1.34
Washington	60,260,229	2,392,160	1,186,078	7,835,369	21,000,000	18,000,000	110,673,835	2.47
West Virginia	3,044,128	2,034,025	635,242	0	16,250,000	0	21,963,396	.49
Wisconsin	26,270,709	3,514,557	1,210,642	283,218	14,000,000	0	45,279,126	1.01
Wyoming	872,428	491,550	208,724	0	0	0	1,572,702	.04
Total Apportioned	2,292,177,864	133,407,177	62,226,089	794,000,000	400,975,000	800,000,000	4,482,786,130	100.00
Agency Oversight	11,518,482	670,388	0	6,000,000	0	0	18,188,870	
Total Program	2,303,696,346	134,077,565	62,226,089	800,000,000	400,000,000	800,000,000	4,500,000,000	

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, the bill also provides \$1.7 billion for airport improvement grants, which is \$700 million more than the administration requested. In total, this bill contains \$30.1 billion for investment in infrastructure that the public uses, that is, highways, transit, airports, and railroads. That represents an 8-percent increase over the administration's request.

This legislation will improve safety: It provides an 11-percent increase in funds to improve highway safety and

will permit FAA to hire an additional 235 aviation safety inspectors and 500 air traffic controllers.

Major changes in the bill as a result of conference deliberations include the addition of \$150 million in transit operating assistance and reductions of less than 1 percent in the multi-billion dollar FAA and Coast Guard operating accounts.

The Senate accommodated requests we received from Senators as fully as we could. In conference, of course, we had to accommodate requests from

Members of both the Senate and House with no increase in funds over the Senate bill to cover these requests. That was a very difficult process. We tried to be fair and balanced in our treatment of Members' requests.

I want to reiterate a point I made when I brought the Senate bill to the floor in July. Many Senators wanted funds for highway projects of special interest to them and their States. This year, ISTEA reauthorization is providing a vehicle for special project funding, especially in the House where

there is very active consideration of such funding. I assure my colleagues that I believe that the Congress has at least as legitimate a role in designating funding for specific highway projects as it does in designating which transit projects will be funded. I intend to review the situation after enactment of ISTEA reauthorization legislation and to work with my Senate and House colleagues in the year ahead to ensure that we have an opportunity to designate funding for highway projects of special interest to our States and communities.

There are a great number of people to thank for getting this bill completed. I want to single out a few for special thanks for all their efforts.

First, the chairman, my good friend from Alaska. I know he wanted to move this bill along promptly, but he was patient and allowed me to work out the issues that were holding up conference and was always willing to lend his compelling voice to support the Senate position in our discussions with the House.

The majority leader as well played a critical role in the negotiations with the House. I want to thank him for his leadership, advice, and guidance, as well as for his personal involvement on this bill.

I want to thank my distinguished ranking member on the subcommittee, Senator LAUTENBERG, for his part in moving the process forward. We don't always take the same position on transportation issues or funding priorities, but he is always a strong advocate for meeting the transportation priorities of the Northeast and presents a perspective on this bill that comes from a great deal of hands-on experience with transportation issues. In addition, this bill has provided an opportunity for me to work closely with the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, Senator BYRD. One of the common priorities Senator BYRD and I share in the Transportation appropriations bill is the completion of the Appalachian Development Highway System. Through his leadership and support, we have been able to provide substantial support for meeting that priority.

I also want to thank the other members of the subcommittee for their efforts and the efforts of their staffs in support of the Senate's position during the conference. This subcommittee works well together, and I am blessed with the luxury of having subcommittee members who take transportation issues very seriously and are quick to let me know of their positions on issues. In particular, I want to commend the senior Senator from Missouri, my good friend, Senator KIT BOND. Senator BOND has been a major force in transportation funding issues this year as he has the uncommon responsibilities of sitting on the Budget Committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, and on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation. He was a primary advocate for higher highway funding during the

budget process; he is a major force in the Senate consideration of reauthorization legislation, and is one of the most thoughtful and effective members of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. Senator BOND can be a dogged advocate for issues of interest to the Show Me State. He was in a position to put passage of the Transportation appropriations bill in jeopardy if his legitimate interest in a matter before the conference was not met. In a display of the statesmanship that shows me why he is such an effective Senator, he refused to hold the bill up—instead, he sought a creative way of meeting both the interests of his State and the needs of the Congress to move this legislation along. I pledge to him here that I will work with him to ensure the satisfactory resolution of this issue.

In addition, I want to thank a few staff members who worked hard to put this bill together. The staff director of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Steve Cortese played a critical role in resolving issues between the House and the Senate so that we could have this conference report before the Senate today. His counterpart on the House side, Jim Dyer, as well, deserves note and a word of thanks for his efforts to that end. Although they work in different bodies, these two professionals work together well and are a credit to the appropriations process and the Congress. Further, the subcommittee staff, Joyce Rose, Reid Cavnar, Wally Burnett, and for a short time, George McDonald, as well as my legislative director Kathy Casey and Chief of Staff Tom Young, worked long and hard to put this bill together and I thank them. In addition, Jim English, Peter Rogoff, Peter Neffenger, Carole Geagley, and Mike Brennan have helped make this a truly bipartisan bill, and I thank them.

I am proud of what we have been able to accomplish in this bill. It will benefit all Americans as it helps improve transportation services in this country so that the economy and personal mobility are better served.

I now turn to my distinguished ranking member from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, who has worked with me in a bipartisan spirit to produce this bill.

Mr. President, I believe overall that this is a good transportation appropriations bill. It is not perfect. Nothing is perfect. But Senator LAUTENBERG, my colleague from New Jersey, former chairman, now the ranking member of the committee, worked diligently together with our staffs to put this bill together. We had protracted discussions with the House, and at the end of the day we are here with a completed conference report, one which I believe that most people in this body can support.

I want to take a minute and thank my staff director, Wally Burnett, for all the work that he has put into this night and day. He knows the subject. He has been very, very diligent and the bill reflects that diligence.

I also want to thank my colleague, Senator LAUTENBERG, for the work and the knowledge that he has of these transportation issues. Knowledge that he is beginning to share with me as time goes on. And, to his staff director, Peter Rogoff, I thank you for cooperating with us on so many of the issues. And, at the end of the day, at the end of the week, and at the end of this conference we are here.

At this point, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I, too, view this report as does my friend and colleague and chairman of the subcommittee. It reflects what I think is a good outcome after being forced to work with less resources than I would like to see devoted to transportation. But that is life in the present fiscal climate and consistent with our determination to have a balanced budget by 2002. As a matter of fact, the news is fairly good on that front. We may actually achieve that balance before then. But, meanwhile, we are taking the appropriate steps to our transportation bill to conform with the responsibility that we have undertaken as a result of the budget agreement. We spent a lot of time and energy trying to ensure that transportation would be treated as the appropriate priority, as we see it. And it has some very positive results.

The Coast Guard is going to get a 12.7 percent boost so that it can continue to execute its many essential missions.

Funding for FAA will increase by almost 10 percent. Within that amount, we have rejected the proposal by the administration to cut airport improvement grants by more than 33 percent. Instead, we have provided an increase for airport grants of more than 16 percent.

Funding for Federal-aid highways went to a historically high level of \$21.5 billion. This increased funding will be especially critical as we address the many vexing challenges that currently surround the reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, or ISTEA, or ISTEA II, or whatever the name is that we are going to give the next 6-year or 5-year program.

Funding for formula assistance for the Nation's transit systems will increase by 16.3 percent. I want to point out that in my view this includes a balanced approach in addressing the needs of all of our States in all transportation modes.

When the bill was first marked up, I voiced concern that while we were providing a much needed increase in funding for highways, the needs of the transit agencies were not getting appropriate attention.

I am pleased to say that between the amendment I offered during full committee consideration of the bill and the

final deliberations of the conference committee, the increase in formula funding for transit was brought to a level comparable with the increases in formula funding provided for other infrastructure investment programs in the bill.

Moreover, I am pleased that the conference agreement includes my amendment to provide greater flexibility to all transit agencies, large and small, in the use of the Federal transit formula funds.

Mr. President, all in all, as I said, I think it is a good outcome.

The funding level for Amtrak is one that concerns me because Amtrak plays such an important part in the transportation of people throughout the Northeast corridor—and other parts of the country as well but predominantly in the Northeast corridor, and were we not to have Amtrak, which could be the outcome if we failed to fund it properly, we would need 10,000 additional flights of 737's a year between Boston and Washington and New York to accommodate the requirements for transportation. So that certainly does not look to be an outcome we can tolerate. But nevertheless the Congress has insisted on cutting Amtrak's operating subsidy at a much faster rate than they say they can absorb.

Almost 3 years ago, the leadership of Amtrak developed an operating plan to reduce its dependency on Federal operating support. Their plan called for reduced appropriations in each and every year for 6 years. Unfortunately, for the last 2 years, the Congress has insisted on cutting Amtrak's operating subsidy at a much faster rate than Amtrak said it could absorb. Their financial status, therefore, is in dire straits.

The bill initially laid down proposed some truly severe cuts, some of which could certainly put Amtrak into bankruptcy. But the subcommittee amended the funding level for Amtrak's operations account in the subcommittee and the full committee to get that level up to \$344 million, which was the level requested by the administration.

Also, Chairman SHELBY agreed to hold a special hearing of the subcommittee to take a fresh look at Amtrak's operating needs. I am pleased to say that the final conference agreement includes the full \$344 million for Amtrak's operations as passed by the Senate. It also includes needed boosts in Amtrak's critical capital accounts, and it will only be through this kind of capital investment that Amtrak can one day become free of Federal operating subsidies, which I, and I am sure all of us here, would like to see.

However, we are not, I warn all Members, "out of the woods" with Amtrak. Amtrak has to gain access to more than \$2 billion which was provided in the recently enacted tax bill so it can make the kind of capital investments that will bring us a real first-class passenger railroad, and we need to find a mechanism to do that without exacting

punitive measures against the hard-working employees at Amtrak.

On another issue, more parochial perhaps, Mr. President, I call attention to that portion of the conference agreement which pertains to the closure of Bader Field Airport in Atlantic City, NJ. The conferees carefully reviewed the statutory provisions pertaining to Bader Field as well as another airport that deserves to be closed. And after careful review, it was determined that statutory language was not necessary for the FAA to make the necessary findings. So I am pleased that the conference agreement continues our progress toward the closure of these airports as soon as possible.

I want to take a minute, Mr. President, to thank my friend and colleague, Senator SHELBY, for his ability to work closely with others to try to resolve disputes and see if we could do the best possible job with the resources that were available to us, and I think he has done just that. It was a pleasure working with him. As Senator SHELBY noted, I was once the chairman of the committee, and I promised that should I become chairman again I would work with Senator SHELBY just as carefully and courteously as he has worked with me.

He has been consistently fair-minded in the distribution of funds between transportation modes and between projects. He has sought to accommodate the priorities of all Members of the Senate. That has been the longstanding tradition in the Transportation Subcommittee and it continues to be the tradition under Senator SHELBY's leadership.

I close by thanking my staff also, Peter Rogoff, and thank Senator SHELBY's chief of staff, Tom Young, and Wally Burnett. It is a pleasure getting this done, and I am pleased to see that we have come fairly close to the beginning of the fiscal year in having a transportation bill which can take care of our needs for next year.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference agreement accompanying H.R. 2169, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator SHELBY, for completing his first bill as chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. I commend the chairman for bringing the Senate a balanced bill.

As all members know, transportation spending was a priority area within the bipartisan budget agreement. With passage of this bill, we begin to increase funding for our Nation's infrastructure as we promised during negotiations on the balanced budget agreement.

The conference agreement provides \$13.1 billion budget authority [BA] and \$13.5 billion in new outlays to fund the programs of the Department of Transportation, including Federal-aid highways, mass transit, aviation activities,

the U.S. Coast Guard, and transportation safety agencies.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals \$13.1 billion in budget authority and \$37.9 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1998.

The reported bill is \$0.1 billion in budget authority below the subcommittee's revised section 302(b) allocation, and at the subcommittee's allocation for outlays.

The spending is less than \$0.1 billion in budget authority below the President's fiscal year 1998 budget request for the subcommittee, and \$0.4 billion in outlays above the President's request.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to serve on the subcommittee and to be a part of the Conference Committee.

I support the conference agreement, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 2169, TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1998,
SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT
(Fiscal Year 1998, in millions of dollars)

	De- fense	Non- defense	Crime	Manda- tory	Total
Conference report:					
Budget authority	300	12,111	698	13,109
Outlays	299	36,905	665	37,869
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	300	12,211	698	13,209
Outlays	299	36,905	665	37,869
President's request:					
Budget authority	300	12,173	698	13,171
Outlays	299	36,502	665	37,466
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	300	12,217	698	13,215
Outlays	299	36,855	665	37,819
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority	12,157	698	12,855
Outlays	59	36,892	665	37,616
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO:					
Senate 302(b) allocation:					
Budget authority	- 100	- 100
Outlays
President's request:					
Budget authority	- 62	- 62
Outlays	403	403
House-passed bill:					
Budget authority	- 106	- 106
Outlays	50	50
Senate-passed bill:					
Budget authority	300	- 46	254
Outlays	240	13	253

Note: Details may not add to total due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the fiscal year 1998 Department of Transportation conference report. Due to a provision added in conference, the Treasury Department will be forced to reduce the Amtrak tax refund by \$200 million. This conference report violates the budget agreement, amends the recently enacted tax bill, and unnecessarily straps Amtrak as it is facing a possible strike in the next few weeks.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and a strong Amtrak supporter, I find this action by the Appropriations Committee to be outrageous.

As my colleagues in the Senate know, one of my top priorities has been

to create a dedicated source of capital funding for Amtrak. Congress has voted time and time again that capital funding is critical to Amtrak's survival. For that reason, a tax provision was included in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 to provide Amtrak with a tax refund of \$2.3 billion for capital expenses.

The bottom line is Amtrak desperately needs capital. According to GAO, Amtrak must have the capital funding that was provided in the Taxpayer Relief Act as well as what is provided through the normal appropriation's process. Without both Amtrak faces bankruptcy.

The language the conferees included in the fiscal year 1998 Department of Transportation conference report would undermine the efforts Congress has already taken to give Amtrak the capital funding it needs to survive.

Mr. President, I fully intend to reverse this provision as soon as the next opportunity arises. It is a clear violation of the spirit and intent of the budget agreement and of the tax bill signed into law in August. If this is not reversed, I believe this provision may be the final straw that finally breaks the financial back of Amtrak.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate will vote today to adopt the conference agreement on the fiscal year 1998 transportation appropriations bill. As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I intend to support the measure, because it contains the funding for vitally important transportation programs.

However, once again, I am compelled to note the various earmarks and set-aside and low priority spending that is included in this package.

This conference agreement contains legislation mandating specific actions and spending that the Administration either does not support or did not request. For instance:

The bill directs the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the USNS EDENTON (ATS-1), which is currently in inactive status, to the Coast Guard.

The legislation earmarks Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] Operations funds and mandates that the FAA provide personnel at Dutch Harbor, AK, to provide weather and runway observations.

The conference report goes on to highlight millions of dollars that exceed the Administration's request, and that are targeted for specific projects.

\$8.4 million, for instance, is set aside for the relocation of Coast Guard Station New Orleans, with \$3 million of that amount directed to improve the adjacent waterway. Incidentally, I understand that the adjacent waterway improvements are aimed primarily at benefitting private users of the waterway, not the Coast Guard.

The conference report earmarks all intelligent transportation operational test funds—nearly \$84 million—for 41 specific projects, even though the Administration requested zero funds for

intelligent transportation operational tests.

The report earmarks all but \$3 million of the \$400 million provided for the discretionary bus and bus-related facilities program.

It earmarks all of the \$800 million provided for the discretionary fixed guide way modernization program.

Although the legislation does not mandate certain airport grants, the conference report and the Senate report, in particular, urge priority consideration for funding for several specific airport development projects. I urge the Administration to adhere to its own established safety and capacity-enhancement criteria in allocating discretionary airport grants and letters of intent.

The FAA is bound to receive a great deal of guidance in this respect. However, if it becomes evident that discretionary grants are being used to satisfy political whims rather than the national interest, I pledge to review the FAA's discretionary authority in the context of the FAA reauthorization bill next year.

As I have said many times before, my criticism of this earmarking process should not be interpreted as a criticism of each of these projects. I recognize that these projects may be beneficial, and that several would merit full funding in an objective, competitive allocation process. Nevertheless, Congress needs to give that process a chance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire list of earmarked transportation projects be printed in the RECORD. As on prior occasions, I plan to write to the President with a list of projects for him to consider in exercising his line item veto authority.

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

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 2169, CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON FISCAL YEAR 1998 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

COAST GUARD

Bill language

Withholds \$34.3 million in Coast Guard operating expenses unless the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) approves the Coast Guard's planned drug interdiction activities to be funded by that \$34.3 million. Allows ONDCP to transfer some or all of those funds to other agencies. The Administration request included no such restriction on Coast Guard.

Directs the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the USNS EDENTON (ATS-1), which is currently in inactive status, to the Coast Guard. The Administration request did not include this provision.

Conference Report

Earmarks \$10.0 million to convert the USNS EDENTON (ATS-1) to a flight deck equipped Coast Guard cutter. This provision was not included in the Administration's budget request.

Earmarks \$4.0 million to renovate a hanger at the Coast Guard Kodiak, AK facility. This provision was not included in the Administration's budget request.

Provides \$8.4 million in FY 1998 for the relocation of Coast Guard Station New Orleans and directs that \$3.0 million of that amount

be used to improve the adjacent waterway (including dredging, bulkhead repair, and bulkhead replacement). The Administration requested \$4.2 million in FY 1998 to start the relocation project. However, the adjacent waterway improvements funded by the Conference Report were not included in the Administration's request for this project and are primarily aimed at benefitting private users of the waterway, not the Coast Guard.

Encourages the Coast Guard to maintain a seasonal (April 15, 1998 to October 15, 1998) air facility at the Hampton, NY Air National Guard facility at Coast Guard expense. The Administration request did not include this provision. The Coast Guard previously announced plans to close its air stations in Cape May, NJ and Brooklyn, NY and replace them with an air station in Atlantic City, NJ as a cost-savings measure.

AVIATION

Bill Language

The bill includes legislative language reauthorizing the Aviation Insurance Program. The authorizing committees in both the House of Representatives and the Senate have approved reauthorization bills that make minor modifications to the program. Floor action in the House and Senate is imminent. (Title I)

The legislation earmarks Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Operations funds and mandates that the FAA provide personnel at Dutch Harbor (AK) to provide real-time weather and runway observation and other such functions to help ensure the safety of aviation operations. (Title III, Sec. 335)

Conference Report

The conference report earmarks \$400,000 from the FAA Operations account for satellite communications in Anchorage (AK), per Senate direction.

The conference report earmarks \$400,000 from the FAA Operations account for a human intervention and motivation study, per Senate direction.

The conference report directs the FAA to study air traffic in New Bern (NC), Hickory (NC) and Salisbury/Wicomico County Airport (MD), and to open contract towers at those airports in FY 1998 if the studies show that these airports (1) meet the existing benefit-cost criteria for contract air traffic control towers, or (2) are justified after consideration of cost-sharing agreements with non-federal parties.

The report adopts the House recommendation of \$15,000,000 for aeronautical data link applications. The Administration requested no funds for this category.

Per the House direction, the conference report earmarked \$45,440,000 for air traffic management, \$27,200,000 above the Administration request.

The conference report included \$24,400,000 for the weather and radar processor program, in line with the House recommendation. The Administration did not request funds for this program.

Like the House recommendation, the conference report earmarks \$970,000 for innovative infrared deicing technology. There was no Administration request for these funds.

The conference report provides \$152,830,000 for continued development of the GPS wide area augmentation system, as proposed by the Senate. This amount is \$51,300,000 above the Administration request.

The conference report earmarks \$3,140,000 for the expansion and relocation of remote communications facilities. The Senate proposed this amount, which is \$1,700,000 above the Administration recommendation.

The conference report incorporates the House recommendation of \$6,700,000 for the Omega termination cost. There was no budget request for this item.

The conference report includes \$67,000,000 for the replacement of terminal air traffic control facilities. Both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees recommended more than the \$62,000,000 budget request.

As did the House, the conference report allocates \$27,600,000 for construction of the Potomac Metroplex, instead of the budget request of \$2,600,000.

The conference report sets aside \$20,000,000 for the Atlanta Metroplex, \$4,400,000 more than the Administration requested, but \$5,400,000 less than the House proposed.

The conference report earmarks \$7,500,000 for airport surface detection equipment (ASDE-3). The Administration made no budget request, although the House recommended \$8,600,000.

The conference report earmarks \$11,600,000 for the airport movement area safety system (AMASS), which is below the House recommendation, but well above the Administration budget request of zero.

The conference agreement includes funds of \$10,000,000 above the budget request, per the Senate, for the acquisition of additional automated surface observing systems.

At the direction of the House, the conference report earmarks \$3,000,000 for LORAN-C upgrades, although the Administration did not make a request for this budget item.

The Administration requested no funds for precision approach path indicators. The conference agreement earmarks \$3,000,000, which is less than both the House and Senate recommendations.

Per Senate direction, the conference report earmarks \$3,500,000 for anemometers and related equipment in Juneau (AK). The Administration did not include a budget request for this item.

The conference agreement allocated \$19,200,000 for sustaining and supporting electrical power systems, \$3,000,000 above the Administration request, but less than the Senate recommendation.

In line with the House recommendation, the report earmarks \$4,000,000 for a display system replacement simulator at the Mid-America Aviation Resource Consortium (MN).

The conference report sets aside \$12,100,000 of the "ARTCC building/plant improvements" funds for relocation of the Honolulu center/radar approach control, as proposed by the Senate.

The conference report directs the FAA to conduct a study to determine if the air traffic control tower at the Tucson International Airport needs to be relocated to ensure the continued safety of flight operations at this airport.

In the Research, Engineering, and Development account, the conference report sets aside \$21,258,000 for capacity and air traffic management technology, above the Administration request of \$9,108,000.

The conference report provides \$15,300,000 for weather research, above the Administration request of \$3,982,000. The conferees further directed that \$500,000 of these funds be allocated to the Center for Wind, Ice and Fog (NH), \$3,000,000 to Project SOCRATES, and \$11,000,000 to the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

The conference report earmarks \$49,202,000 for aircraft safety technology, in excess of the Administration request of \$26,625,000. The conferees further directed that of the

\$21,540,000 provided for "aging aircraft," \$3,000,000 is to go for direct support of the Aging Aircraft Nondestructive Inspection Validation Center; \$1,000,000 for aging aircraft-related activities at the Center for Aviation Systems Reliability; \$6,000,000 for the Airworthiness Assurance Center of Excellence; \$1,500,000 to conduct research at the Center for Intelligent Aviation Technologies; and \$4,400,000 to further engine titanium component inspection.

The conference report earmarks \$26,550,000, above the Administration request of \$10,737,000, for human factors and aviation medicine. Of that amount, \$500,000 is available only for additional research into assessment, evaluation and development of training methodologies related to the English language proficiency problem.

Of the "explosives and weapons detection" account, \$1,250,000 is earmarked for the continued development of pulsed fast neutron transmission spectroscopy technology.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

The conference report reminds the Executive Branch that the best evidence of Congressional intent can be found in reports. The conference report specifically states that earmarks and instructions in the House and Senate reports that accompany the Transportation Appropriations Act of 1998 remain the intent of the conferees. Unless otherwise discussed in the statement of managers, the House and Senate earmarks and instructions stand.

Earmarks all intelligent transportation operational test funds (\$83,900,000) for 41 specific projects, including a convention center passenger information system to an emergency weather system. The Senate version originally had 24 earmarks. Specific dollar amounts are established for each and every project listed. The Administration requested ZERO for intelligent transportation operational tests.

Earmarks all but \$3 million of the \$400,978,000 provided for the discretionary bus and bus-related facilities program. The Senate version originally had 87 earmarks, the conference report now has 118. The Administration did not request any earmarked projects for the discretionary bus and bus-related facilities program.

Earmarks all of the \$800 million provided for the discretionary fixed guide way modernization program. The Senate version originally had 40 projects, the conference report now lists 65 projects. The Administration requested \$634,000,000, all of which was earmarked to fund the federal share of 15 authorized projects or projects with regional transit operator systems having Full Funding Grant Agreements with the Federal Transit Administration.

Conferees "encourage" FHWA's central federal lands highway division to conduct an engineering study of a landslide affecting parts of a highway within the boundaries of Badlands National Park.

Directs the Federal Railroad Administration to support the implementation of short term railroad operating and long term relocations between railroads and local communities, including Metairie, Louisiana.

Earmarks \$17 million for life and safety improvements for the Pennsylvania station redevelopment project in New York City.

Directs NHTSA to provide \$100,000 to develop a biofidelic child crash test dummy.

Earmarks \$700,000 for a new state pilot program for States experiment with alternative safety restraint bar devices on school buses.

The Intelligent Transportation System Operational Testing Earmarks are:

\$775,000 for an advanced transportation weather information system at the University of North Dakota; \$1 million for the Arizona National Center for Traffic and Logistics Management; \$1.5 million for commercial vehicle operations on I-5 in California; \$1.55 million for the Cumberland Gap tunnel in Kentucky; \$1 million for a toll collection system in Dade County, Florida; \$875,000 for a traveler information system in Franklin County, Massachusetts; \$5.5 million for a freeway traffic management system in Milwaukee; \$1.5 million for Houston, Texas; \$1.7 million for a rural intelligent transportation system corridor in Wisconsin; \$500,000 for Inglewood, California.

\$5.5 million for intelligent transportation systems in Louisiana; \$325,000 for a passenger information center at a convention center in Philadelphia; \$6 million for Minnesota Guidestar; \$750,000 for a traffic guidance system in Nashville, Tennessee; \$6 million for National capital regional congestion mitigation; \$1 million for an organization called National Institute for Environmental Renewal; \$1.25 million for the I-90 connector at Rensselaer County, New York; \$1 million for I-275 at St. Petersburg, Florida; \$1 million for an advanced transportation management system in Syracuse, New York; and \$1 million for the Texas Transportation Institute.

\$500,000 for intelligent transportation systems at Rte. 236/I-495 in Northern Virginia; \$1 million for the Western Transportation Institute in Montana; \$1.150 million for the Southeast Michigan snow and ice management system; \$3.5 for intelligent transportation systems in Utah; \$1 million for an intermodal common communications technology project in Kansas City, Missouri; \$1.875 million for intelligent transportation systems in Reno, Nevada; \$8 million for traffic management new Barboursville, West Virginia; \$600,000 for an advanced traffic analysis center at North Dakota State University; \$1 million for an emergency weather system in Sullivan County, New York; \$250,000 for the Urban Transportation Safety Systems Center in Philadelphia; and \$1.1 for toll plaza scanners in New York City.

\$1 million for the computer integrated transit maintenance environment project at Cleveland, Ohio; \$1 million to the ATR Institute to conduct an intermodal technology demo project at Santa Teresa, New Mexico; \$1 million for hazardous materials emergency response software for Operation Respond; \$750,000 for radio communication emergency call boxes in Washington State; \$1.250 million for a statewide roadway weather information system in Washington; \$1 million for an I-95 multi-state corridor coalition; \$9 million for truck safety improvements on I-25 in Colorado; \$2.2 million for traffic integration and flow control in Tuscaloosa, Alabama; \$6 million for intelligent transportation systems for the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission; and \$1 million for cold weather intelligent transportation system sensing in Alaska.

The Bus and bus-related facilities discretionary program earmarks:

\$25.5 million for Alabama projects (10 projects); \$5.5 million for Arizona

projects (2 projects); \$38.4 million for California projects (23 projects); \$5.5 million for Colorado; \$5.750 million for Connecticut (3 projects); \$1.5 million for Delaware; \$20 million for Florida (10 projects); \$9 million for Georgia (2 projects); \$5 million for Hawaii; \$4.5 million for Illinois; \$4 million for Indiana (2 projects); \$4 million for Iowa (2 projects); \$1 million for Kansas; \$13.9 million for Louisiana; \$8 million for Maryland; \$6 million for Massachusetts (5 projects); \$7.5 million for Michigan; \$10.5 million for Minnesota (2 projects); and \$2 million for Mississippi.

\$16 million for Missouri (3 projects); \$9.5 million for Nevada (2 projects); \$6 million for New Jersey; \$7.750 million for New Mexico (5 projects); \$34.325 million for New York (12 projects); \$6 million for North Carolina (2 projects); \$12.5 million for Ohio; \$3 million for Oregon (3 projects); \$27.350 million for Pennsylvania (20 projects); \$6 million for South Carolina (3 projects); \$2.250 million for South Dakota; \$8 million for Tennessee; \$14.950 million for Texas (7 projects); \$8.9 million for Utah (5 projects); \$2.5 million for Vermont (2 projects); \$6.050 million for Virginia (4 projects); \$19.5 million for Washington (12 projects); \$16.250 million for West Virginia (2 projects); and \$14 million for Wisconsin (2 projects).

The Discretionary Fixed Guide way Earmarks are as follows: Projects marked with an asterisk were requested by the Administration

*\$44.6 million for the Atlanta-North Springs Project; \$1 million for the Austin Capital metro; *\$46.250 million for Boston Piers MOS-2 project; \$1 million for the Boston urban ring; \$5 million for commuter rail in Vermont; \$2 million for a commuter rail project in Canton-Akron-Cleveland, Ohio; \$1.5 million for the Charleston monobeam rail project in South Carolina; \$1 million for the Charlotte South corridor transitway project; \$500,000 for the Cincinnati Northeast/Northern Kentucky rail line project; \$5 million for a fixed rail line project in Clark County, Nevada; \$800,000 for a rail line extension to Highland Hills in Ohio; \$700,000 for a Cleveland rail line extension to Hopkins International Airport; \$1 million for a waterfront line extension project in Cleveland; \$8 million for the RAILTRAN project in Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas; \$11 million for the DART North central light rail extension project; \$1 million for a light rail project in DeKalb County, Georgia; *\$23 million for the Denver Southwest corridor project; \$20 million for an East Side access project in New York; \$8 million for the commuter rail project in Florida's Tri-County area; \$2 million for the Galveston rail trolley system project; \$1 million for Houston's advanced regional bus plan project; \$51.1 million for Houston's regional bus project; and \$1.250 million for Indianapolis' Northeast corridor project;

\$3 million for an intermodal corridor project in Jackson, Mississippi; *\$61.5 million for Los Angeles' MOS-3 project; *\$31 million for MARC commuter rail improvements in Maryland; \$1 million for a regional rail project in Memphis, Tennessee; \$5 million for a transit east-west corridor project in Florida; \$5 million for Miami's North 27th Avenue project; \$1 million for a corridor project called Mission Valley East; \$500,000 for a Nassau hub rail link EIS; *\$60 million for New Jersey-Hudson-Bergen project; *\$27 million for New Jersey Secaucus project; \$6 million for New Orleans Canal Street corridor project; \$2 million for New Orleans streetcar Desire project; \$12 million for North Carolina Research Triangle Park project; \$4 million for Northern Indiana South Short commuter rail project; \$3 million for Oceanside-Escondido light rail; \$1.6 million for Oklahoma City's MAPS corridor

transit project; \$2 million for a transitway project in Orange County; and \$31.8 million for Orlando's Lynx light rail project.

\$500,000 for Pennsylvania's Strawberry Hill/Diamond Branch rail project; \$4 million for Phoenix's metropolitan area transit project; \$5 million for Pittsburgh's airport busway project; *\$63.4 million for Portland-Westside/Hillsboro project; \$2 million for a project called Roaring Fork Valley rail; *\$20.3 million for Sacramento's light rail transit project; *\$63.4 million for Salt Lake City's South light rail transit project; \$4 million for regional commuter rail in Salt Lake City; \$1 million for San Bernardino's Metrolink project; \$1.5 million for San Diego's Mid-Coast corridor project; *\$29.9 million for San Francisco's BART extension to the airport; *\$15 million for San Juan Tren Urbano; *\$21.4 million for San Jose Tasman light rail transit project; \$18 million Seattle-Tacoma commuter and light rail projects; *\$30 million for St. Louis-St. Clair light rail transit project; \$2.5 million for a St. George ferry terminal project; \$500,000 for commuter rail between Springfield & Branson, Missouri; \$1 million for a regional rail project in Tampa Bay; \$2 million for a rail project in Tidewater, Virginia; \$1 million for a rail project in Toledo, Ohio; \$12 million for transitways projects in the Twin Cities; \$2 million for commuter rail projects at Virginia Railway Express; \$2.5 million for the Whitehall ferry terminal project; and \$3 million for the central commuter rail project in Wisconsin.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for the conference agreement on H.R. 2169, the Transportation Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. I would like to express particular gratitude to the diligent efforts of Senator LAUTENBERG of New Jersey who has a keen understanding of the need to modernize and upgrade the aging transportation infrastructure of the congested Northeast. I also want to thank Senator SHELBY of Alabama for his leadership this year on transportation matters.

This bill is very important for Massachusetts and for the Nation. For Massachusetts, it contains funding for several important projects. I am very pleased that the conference report provides \$3 million for the Worcester Union Station Intermodal Center. This facility, which has been recognized as a model for both urban revitalization and transportation planning, will be situated in a newly renovated Union Station and will provide convenient regional access to commuter rail, Amtrak, inter-city and intra-city buses, taxis, airport shuttles, bikes and private passenger vehicles for Worcester County's 710,000 residents.

I am also pleased that the report provides continued funding—\$1 million in fiscal year 1998—for the restoration of historic Union Station in Springfield, MA, as an active intermodal center. Once restored, Springfield Union Station will provide an essential gateway to the Pioneer Valley to alleviate congestion and better serve the local and interstate bus and Amtrak passenger traffic which is growing by 9 percent annually. This facility will also help connect the city's two largest job districts which are currently divided by disjointed traffic and development pat-

terns. With the Federal funds provided last year and over \$1 million in local funds, the city has quickly moved forward on project planning, land assembly and demolition of a deteriorated adjacent building. Indeed, the State legislature has approved \$10 million to date for this important project.

I welcome the Conference Committee's support in the form of \$2 million in funding for the Urban Ring transit system in the Boston region. The need for such a system arises from the strongly radial structure of Greater Boston's existing transit system. It consists of spokes emanating from the downtown core to neighborhoods of Boston and cities and towns throughout eastern Massachusetts. With an Urban Ring transit route, Massachusetts will begin to link these spokes in an arc around downtown, providing easier access to centers of economic growth outside the core and reducing congestion in the subway system by allowing commuters the opportunity to travel between home and workplace without the necessity of traveling into the downtown area and back out again.

I appreciate the Conference Committee's continued strong support for the South Boston Piers Transitway project, a vital element in the Commonwealth's State Implementation Plan required under the Clean Air Act. The Transitway, expected to carry approximately 6.4 million riders annually, will be integrated with the extensive network of transit, commuter rail, and bus services now available at Boston's South Station and will catalyze the development of the South Boston Piers area which has the highest potential for development and job creation in the City of Boston.

I'm also pleased that the conference report includes \$875,000 for the Franklin County Visitors Information System. In western Massachusetts, many small, renowned cultural and historical museums and attractions are spread over distances where the lack of an effective road system hinders potential visitors. The Franklin County Chamber of Commerce, in conjunction with the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, hopes to develop a guidance system that makes use of the latest interactive kiosk technologies and mapping capabilities simultaneously to improve the road network for western Massachusetts and enhance access to the multiplicity of community resources.

I support the Conference Committee's decision to provide greater funding for Amtrak than the amount of funding in the Senate bill. However, it is my hope that the Senate and the House will devote extraordinary efforts over the next few weeks to enact Amtrak reauthorization legislation so that the capital funding set aside during budget reconciliation can be released and spent. Only then will Amtrak receive sufficient capital funding over the next several years. It is no secret that the year-to-year battles over

capital funding for Amtrak have greatly inhibited Amtrak's ability to operate an efficient, and financially stable national passenger rail service. Congress must act on this matter as soon as possible.

I also support the Conference Committee's decision to provide \$4.8 billion in Federal transit assistance. Though ISTEA has not yet been reauthorized, I strongly believe that making investment in public transportation a top priority will bear rich economic, social and environmental dividends for the Nation.

The Conference Committee is to be commended for the fiscal year 1998 Coast Guard budget. This budget represents a significant increase from fiscal year 1997 funding and certainly represents Federal dollars well spent. But I must add that my enthusiasm is somewhat tempered by my deep concern regarding the current state of resource allocation and usage within the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard's responsibilities have grown with the many new fisheries enforcement requirements that came with the passage of the Sustainable Fisheries Act last year and continuing pressure in the constant battle in the war on drugs. I am concerned that, in the effort to cover all of these responsibilities, we may be making tradeoffs that may come back to haunt us later.

As you well know, I represent a coastal State that has a 200-year-plus history of reliance on the Coast Guard. For that reason, I probably have a better understanding than many Senators of the value of the Coast Guard to the citizens of our Nation that make a living in the coastal regions or on the high seas. In fact, the Massachusetts coastal zone contributes 53.3 percent, or \$70.7 billion, to the state economy. Further, there are over 10,000 fishing families in New England that depend on the Coast Guard for their safety and are in fact viewed as their "real" guardian angels. One of many concerns that I have for these families is that with the recent catastrophic failure of the New England groundfish fishery that our fishermen are traveling further, in rougher weather, to catch fewer fish. Additionally, because of the personal financial hardship that has resulted from the collapse of the fishery, I fear that they are cutting corners to save a dollar such as not outfitting their boats and crews with the vital safety equipment that are required by law. I am concerned that we may be cutting corners at their expense.

We may be at a point where we need to stop and reassess the current condition of the Coast Guard. As we continue to examine the Federal budget for those areas where cost savings can be achieved, we need to realize that there exists a point beyond which most Americans are not willing to go in order to save a dollar, and I believe we are at a point where we need to take a strategic look at the ability of the Coast Guard to continue to meet the

demands of the American public into the 21st century.

In sum, taking the concerns I have voiced into account, I support this bill because it approaches transportation spending from a national perspective, and it strives to maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure that is so vital to the economic well-being of our Nation. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I have an agreement we have worked on which basically says that on some appropriate vehicle in the future I will work with Chairman STEVENS and other members to include a technical correction to this conference report to accomplish the following:

At section 337(c) we will insert, after the words: "House and Senate Committees on Appropriations," "and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation."

I am doing this at the suggestion of Senator HUTCHISON from Texas, and we have agreed to this.

Mr. President, at this time I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from New Jersey will.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. SHELBY. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the conference report accompanying H.R. 2169 is agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 12 minutes as if we were in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1284 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

THE ABM TREATY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 10 days ago was the 25th anniversary of a policy in this country that was articulated in a treaty called the ABM Treaty. It was a treaty that many of us at that time did not think was in the best interests of this country. It was a treaty that came from the Nixon administration, a Republican administration. Of course, Henry Kissinger was the architect of that treaty in 1972.

Essentially what it did was say to any adversaries out there that we will agree to disarm and not to be prepared to defend ourselves if you agree to do the same thing. Some people refer to it as mutual assured destruction, a policy I certainly did not adhere to at the time, did not feel was good policy for this country. However, there was an argument at that time, because we had

two superpowers—we had the then Soviet Union and of course the United States—and at that time we had pretty good intelligence on them, they had pretty good intelligence on us, so I suppose we would be overly critical if we said there was just no justification for that program, even though I personally disagreed with it at that time.

Since that time, starting in 1983 in the Reagan administration, we have elevated the debate that there is a great threat out there and that threat is from the many countries that now have weapons of mass destruction. Over 25 nations now have those weapons, either chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. The critics, those who would take that money and apply it to social programs as opposed to defending our Nation, use such titles as "star wars," and they talk about the billions of dollars that have been invested.

Anyway, we are at a point right now where something very interesting has happened just recently. That is, on this 25th anniversary, we have found that the Clinton administration, just about 10 days ago, agreed to create new parties to the ABM Treaty. That would be Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Russia. This is going to have to come before this body. I think this is an opportunity that we need to be looking for, because all it would take is 34 Senators to reject this multilateralization of the ABM Treaty.

Right now we have a number of systems that we are putting into place to defend the United States of America, both the national missile defense as well as a theater defense. Certainly, with what is going on right now in Russia and Iran, the need for such a system has been elevated in the minds of most Americans.

We have right now, as we speak, 22 Aegis ships that are floating out there in the ocean, already deployed. They have the capability of knocking down missiles when they are coming in. All we have to do is take them to the upper tier, and we will have in place a national missile defense system. Certainly that is something that could take care of our theater missile needs. So several of us feel that we should go ahead and conclude that is the system that we need. However, that does violate, probably violates, the ABM Treaty, as it is in place today. So I believe we should take this opportunity that is there, when it comes before this body for ratification, to reject this and thereby kill the ABM Treaty, which certainly is outdated.

By the way, it is interesting, the very architect of that treaty, Dr. Henry Kissinger, someone whose credentials no one will question, even though they may question some of his previous policy decisions, Dr. Kissinger, who is the architect of the 1972 ABM Treaty, now says it is nuts to make a virtue out of your vulnerability. He is opposed to continuing the ABM Treaty at this time.

So I hope we will take this opportunity to get out from under a treaty