

Additionally, I am pleased that the underlying bill makes available \$2 million in continuing appropriations for the Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority bus terminal project. This type of project reinforces our commitment to safe and adequate public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, safety should remain the Federal Government's highest responsibility in the transportation area, and, clearly, this bill addresses those needs and concerns.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for bringing this measure before the House today.

I would also like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their hard work and leadership on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this completely fair and open rule and the underlying measure.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the time. This is an open rule. It will allow for the bill that makes appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.

As my colleague from New York has explained, this rule provides for one hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Under this rule, amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have their chance, their opportunity, to offer amendments which are germane and which follow the rules for appropriation bills.

This bill funds construction of highways and airport facilities and transit systems. It supports Amtrak, Federal rail programs, the air traffic control system, and transportation safety and research for all modes.

It is no exaggeration to say that the transportation appropriation bill keeps the country moving. I am very pleased with the generous amounts of funding for public transit provided in this bill. This demonstrates the commitment of the Federal Government to provide transportation options for all Americans, including those in the urban core.

I am also pleased with the bill's support for the Centennial of Flight Commission. This is a national commission assisting the country's celebration of the centennial of the Wright Brothers' first flight, an anniversary which will take place in the year 2003.

I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their work in crafting this bill and bringing it to the floor. The bill was approved by the Committee on Appropriations by a voice vote and it has support on both sides of the aisle.

Finally, I draw to the attention of my colleagues that this is the last transportation appropriation bill under the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman will be stepping down from the position in the next Congress. He has been an outstanding chairman, who led his committee in a bipartisan fashion. During his tenure, he has successfully guided it through dramatic changes in our Federal transportation laws. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has balanced his role as chairman of the subcommittee with his other roles as a protector of his Virginia constituents and as fighter for humanitarian rights around the world. It is a difficult balancing act, but he has carried it off with grace and ability.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an open rule, and it was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee on Rules. I support the rule and the bill. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 on the table.

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 H.R. 4475, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 505 and rule XVIII, 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. 4475.

0921

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. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska 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, today the Committee on Appropriations presents the second fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill to the House. H.R. 4475 provides appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations.

The bill that the committee presents to the House is a good and balanced bill. The committee has increased funding for some agencies which have been hard hit over the past few years, like the Coast Guard, while cutting out areas of unnecessary spending.

The bill meets fully the Congressional commitment to highway, transit and aviation spending in TEA-21 and AIR-21, and fully funds Amtrak's Congressionally-mandated glidepath to operational self-sufficiency.

Briefly, the bill includes \$30.7 billion for highways, an increase of nearly \$2 billion; \$12 billion for the FAA, an increase of 25 percent, including \$3.2 billion for airport grants programs; \$6.3 billion for transit programs, an increase of almost \$500 million; \$521 million for Amtrak; and \$4.6 billion for the Coast Guard, an increase of almost \$600 million over last year, including almost \$560 million for drug interdiction.

I might just say, this is an opportunity for the Coast Guard with this money to really deal with the issue of drug interdiction and open fire on the drug runners coming out of South America. When we see a fast boat coming, heading out, and we know it is containing drugs, the opportunity is for the Coast Guard to hover over and give a warning, and, if it does not stop, to fire on the boat and to sink the boat, because there is basically a war on drugs, if you want to call it that. Now the Coast Guard has the capability to do this, and next year we will see how successful they have been.

This bill has been developed in consultation with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the minority staff, and was passed in subcommittee and full committee unanimously with only a few amendments. The committee has worked carefully with all Members on both sides of the aisle to

address specific concerns, and I believe we have achieved strong bipartisan support.

Let me just say a word with regard to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO). We could not have worked in a better way. I have great respect for the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and his knowledge of budgetary matters, having been chairman of the Committee on the Budget and then ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. I think it is an indication that the two parties can sit down and work together.

So I just want to publicly thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for that effort, and look forward to working with him for many, many

more years to come on these and other issues.

Correspondence from the Department of Transportation and the Office of Management and Budget suggest this bill, as reported by the committee, is acceptable to the administration. The bill deserves the House's widespread support.

I want to close by thanking the following staff for their help in preparing the bill. From the committee staff, John Blazey, who would make a great administrator of the Federal Transit Administration in the next administration; Rich Efford, who would make a great FAA deputy administrator; Stephanie Gupta, who would do a great job on the Safety Board; Linda Muir, who could run the whole agency down

there; Chris Porter and Ken Marx have done a great job; Jeff Gleason from my staff; Cheryl Smith, who could run the whole process if she were given the opportunity; and Marjorie Duske of the staff of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), who would, again, do a great job.

The point I am trying to make is the staff, and I know sometimes this is a pro forma comment, has done a remarkable job over the past 6 years, and this year, and I want to personally thank them. Everything I said about what they could be doing in the next year is true and valid, and I do not want anyone to strike it, because I want it to stand.

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

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4475)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	1,867	2,031	1,756	-111	-275
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	600	587	587	-13	
Office of the General Counsel.....	9,000	11,172	9,760	+760	-1,412
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy.....	2,824	3,132	3,132	+308	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.....	7,650	7,702	7,182	-468	-520
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	6,870	7,241	7,241	+371	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	2,039	2,176	2,000	-39	-176
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	17,767	20,139	18,359	+592	-1,780
Office of Public Affairs.....	1,800	1,714	1,454	-346	-260
Executive Secretariat.....	1,102	1,181	1,181	+79	
Board of Contract Appeals.....	520	496	496	-24	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	1,222	1,192	1,192	-30	
Office of Intelligence and Security.....	1,454	3,494	1,490	+36	-2,004
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	5,075	6,929	6,279	+1,204	-650
Office of Intermodalism.....	1,062			-1,062	
Subtotal.....	60,852	69,186	62,109	+1,257	-7,077
Office of civil rights.....	7,200	8,726	8,140	+940	-586
Transportation planning, research, and development.....	3,300	5,258	3,300		-1,958
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-10			+10	
Net subtotal.....	3,290	5,258	3,300	+10	-1,958
Transportation Administrative Service Center.....	(148,673)	(163,811)	(119,387)	(-29,286)	(-44,424)
Minority business resource center program.....	1,900	1,900	1,900		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)		
Minority business outreach.....	2,900	3,000	3,000	+100	
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-18			+18	
Net subtotal.....	2,882	3,000	3,000	+118	
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	76,152	88,070	78,449	+2,297	-9,621
ATB rescissions.....	-28			+28	
Net total.....	76,124	88,070	78,449	+2,325	-9,621
Coast Guard					
Operating expenses.....	2,481,000	2,858,000	2,851,000	+370,000	-7,000
Defense function.....	300,000	341,000	341,000	+41,000	
Subtotal.....	2,781,000	3,199,000	3,192,000	+411,000	-7,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels.....	134,560	257,180	252,640	+118,080	-4,540
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-1,478			+1,478	
Net subtotal.....	133,082	257,180	252,640	+119,558	-4,540
Integrated Deepwater Systems.....	44,200	42,300	42,300	-1,900	
Aircraft.....	44,210	43,650	43,650	-560	
Other equipment.....	51,626	60,313	60,113	+8,487	-200
Shore facilities & aids to navigation facilities.....	63,800	61,606	61,606	-2,194	
Personnel and related support.....	50,930	55,151	54,691	+3,761	-460
Subtotal, A C & I (excluding rescissions).....	389,326	520,200	515,000	+125,674	-5,200
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	17,000	16,700	16,700	-300	
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-65			+65	
Net subtotal.....	16,935	16,700	16,700	-235	
Alteration of bridges.....	15,000		14,740	-260	+14,740
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-57			+57	
Net subtotal.....	14,943		14,740	-203	+14,740
Retired pay.....	730,327	778,000	778,000	+47,673	
Reserve training.....	72,000	73,371	80,375	+8,375	+7,004
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	19,000	21,320	19,691	+691	-1,629
Total, Coast Guard.....	4,023,653	4,608,591	4,616,506	+592,853	+7,915
ATB rescissions.....	-1,600			+1,600	
Net total.....	4,022,053	4,608,591	4,616,506	+594,453	+7,915
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	5,900,000	6,592,235	6,544,235	+644,235	-48,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	2,075,000	2,495,000	2,656,765	+581,765	+161,765
Rescission.....	(30,000)			(+30,000)	
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	156,495	184,366	184,366	+27,871	
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(1,750,000)	(1,960,000)	(3,200,000)	(+1,450,000)	(+1,240,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(1,950,000)	(1,950,000)	(3,200,000)	(+1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	(54,362)			(+54,362)	
Rescission of contract authority.....			-579,000	-579,000	-579,000
Net subtotal.....	(1,895,638)	(1,950,000)	(2,621,000)	(+725,362)	(+671,000)

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4475)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	8,131,495	9,271,601	9,385,366	+ 1,253,871	+ 113,765
(Limitations on obligations).....	(1,950,000)	(1,950,000)	(3,200,000)	(+ 1,250,000)	(+ 1,250,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(10,081,495)	(11,221,601)	(12,585,366)	(+ 2,503,871)	(+ 1,363,765)
ATB rescissions	(-54,362)			(+ 54,362)	
Rescission.....	-30,000		-579,000	-549,000	-579,000
Net total	(9,997,133)	(11,221,601)	(12,006,366)	(+ 2,009,233)	(+ 784,765)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses 1/	(376,072)	(315,834)	(290,115)	(-85,957)	(-25,719)
Limitation on transportation research			(437,250)	(+ 437,250)	(+ 437,250)
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Limitation on obligations).....	(26,245,000)	(26,603,806)	(26,603,806)	(+ 358,806)	
Across the board (0.38%) rescission	(-105,260)			(+ 105,260)	
Net subtotal	(26,139,740)	(26,603,806)	(26,603,806)	(+ 464,066)	
(Revenue aligned budget authority) (RABA)	(1,456,350)	(3,058,000)	(3,058,000)	(+ 1,601,650)	
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(-598,000)			(+ 598,000)
(Adjustment)		(255,000)			(-255,000)
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(27,701,350)	(29,318,806)	(29,661,806)	(+ 1,960,456)	(+ 343,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,576)	(1,039,576)	(-167,126)	
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(26,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(+ 2,000,000)	
Total, Federal Highway Administration					
(Limitations on obligations).....	(27,701,350)	(29,318,806)	(29,661,806)	(+ 1,960,456)	(+ 343,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,576)	(1,039,576)	(-167,126)	
Total budgetary resources.....	(28,908,052)	(30,358,382)	(30,701,382)	(+ 1,793,330)	(+ 343,000)
ATB rescissions	(-105,260)			(+ 105,260)	
Net total	(28,802,792)	(30,358,382)	(30,701,382)	(+ 1,898,590)	(+ 343,000)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety (limitation on administrative expenses) 2/.....		(92,194)	(92,194)	(+ 92,194)	
National motor carrier safety program (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(105,000)	(187,000)	(177,000)	(+ 72,000)	(-10,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(105,000)	(177,000)	(177,000)	(+ 72,000)	
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(10,000)			(-10,000)
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(105,000)	(187,000)	(177,000)	(+ 72,000)	(-10,000)
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.....					
(Limitations on obligations).....	(105,000)	(279,194)	(269,194)	(+ 164,194)	(-10,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(105,000)	(279,194)	(269,194)	(+ 164,194)	(-10,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research	87,400	142,475	107,876	+ 20,476	-34,599
Operations and research (Highway trust fund):					
(Limitation on obligations).....	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)		
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(70,000)			(-70,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(72,000)	(142,000)	(72,000)		(-70,000)
National Driver Register (Highway trust fund)	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Subtotal, Operations and research	(161,400)	(286,475)	(181,876)	(+ 20,476)	(-104,599)
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(206,800)	(213,000)	(213,000)	(+ 6,200)	
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(152,800)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(+ 2,200)	
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405).....	(10,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(+ 3,000)	
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410).....	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)		
State Highway safety data grants (Sec. 411)	(8,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(+ 1,000)	
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	89,400	144,475	109,876	+ 20,476	-34,599
(Limitations on obligations).....	(278,800)	(355,000)	(285,000)	(+ 6,200)	(-70,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(368,200)	(499,475)	(394,876)	(+ 26,676)	(-104,599)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations	94,288	103,211	102,487	+ 8,199	-724
Offsetting collections (user fees)		-77,300			+ 77,300
Railroad research and development	22,464	26,800	26,300	+ 3,836	-500
Offsetting collections (user fees)		-25,500			+ 25,500
Rhode Island Rail Development.....	10,000	17,000	17,000	+ 7,000	
Across the board (0.38%) rescission	-38			+ 38	
Net subtotal	9,962	17,000	17,000	+ 7,038	
Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment project (advance appropriation, FY 2001, 2002, 2003) 3/	(60,000)			(-60,000)	

1/ FY 2000 enacted includes \$76,058 for motor carrier safety, limitation on administrative expenses.

2/ Provided under FHWA limitation on administrative expenses in FY 2000.

3/ Provided in Title II - Other Appropriations Matters in P.L. 106-113.

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4475)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Next generation high-speed rail.....	27,200	22,000	22,000	-5,200
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-103	+ 103
Net subtotal.....	27,097	22,000	22,000	-5,097
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation.....	10,000	-10,000
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	-38	+ 38
Net subtotal.....	9,962	-9,962
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	571,000	521,476	521,476	-49,524
Expanded intercity rail passenger service fund (RABA transfer under Title III):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(468,000)	(-468,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(468,000)	(-468,000)
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	734,952	587,687	689,263	-45,689	+ 101,576
(Limitations on obligations).....	(468,000)	(-468,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(734,952)	(1,055,687)	(689,263)	(-45,689)	(-366,424)
ATB rescissions.....	-179	+ 179
Net total.....	(734,773)	(1,055,687)	(689,263)	(-45,510)	(-366,424)
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses.....	12,000	12,800	12,800	+ 800
Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations).....	(48,000)	(51,200)	(51,200)	(+ 3,200)
Subtotal, Administrative expenses.....	(60,000)	(64,000)	(64,000)	(+ 4,000)
Formula grants.....	619,600	669,000	669,000	+ 49,400
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Limitation on obligations).....	(2,478,400)	(2,676,000)	(2,676,000)	(+ 197,600)
Subtotal, Formula grants.....	(3,098,000)	(3,345,000)	(3,345,000)	(+ 247,000)
University transportation research.....	1,200	1,200	1,200
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations).....	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)
Subtotal, University transportation research.....	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)
Transit planning and research (general fund).....	21,000	22,200	22,200	+ 1,200
Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account): (Limitation on obligations).....	(86,000)	(87,800)	(87,800)	(+ 1,800)
Subtotal, Transit planning and research.....	(107,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+ 3,000)
Rural transportation assistance.....	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)
National transit institute.....	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)
Transit cooperative research.....	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)
Metropolitan planning.....	(49,632)	(52,114)	(52,114)	(+ 2,482)
State planning and research.....	(10,368)	(10,886)	(10,886)	(+ 518)
National planning and research.....	(29,500)	(29,500)	(29,500)
Subtotal.....	(107,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+ 3,000)
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	(-243)	(+ 243)
Net subtotal.....	(106,757)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+ 3,243)
Capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations) 1/.....	(1,966,800)	(2,116,800)	(2,116,800)	(+ 150,000)
Subtotal, Capital investment grants.....	(2,457,000)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+ 189,000)
Fixed guideway modernization.....	(980,400)	(1,058,400)	(1,058,400)	(+ 78,000)
Buses and bus-related facilities 1/.....	(496,200)	(529,200)	(529,200)	(+ 33,000)
New starts.....	(980,400)	(1,058,400)	(1,058,400)	(+ 78,000)
Subtotal.....	(2,457,000)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+ 189,000)
Across the board (0.38%) rescission.....	(-17,404)	(+ 17,404)
Net subtotal.....	(2,439,596)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+ 206,404)
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (liquidation of contract authorization).....	(1,500,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	(-1,150,000)
Job access and reverse commute grants (general fund).....	15,000	20,000	20,000	+ 5,000
(Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations).....	(60,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(+ 20,000)
(RABA transfer under Title III).....	(50,000)	(-50,000)
Subtotal, Job access and reverse commute grants.....	(75,000)	(150,000)	(100,000)	(+ 25,000)	(-50,000)
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	1,159,000	1,254,400	1,254,400	+ 95,400
(Limitations on obligations).....	(4,644,000)	(5,066,600)	(5,016,600)	(+ 372,600)	(-50,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(5,803,000)	(6,321,000)	(6,271,000)	(+ 468,000)	(-50,000)
ATB rescissions.....	(-17,647)	(+ 17,647)
Net total.....	(5,785,353)	(6,321,000)	(6,271,000)	(+ 485,647)	(-50,000)

1/ \$6 million provided in Title II - Other Appropriations Matters in P.L. 106-113.

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4475)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	12,042		13,004	+962	+13,004
Across the board (0.38%) rescission	-46			+46	
Mandatory proposal		(13,004)			(-13,004)
Net total	11,996	(13,004)	13,004	+1,008	
Research and Special Programs Administration					
Research and special programs:					
Hazardous materials safety	17,710	18,773	18,773	+1,063	
Emergency transportation	1,378	2,375	1,866	+488	-509
Research and technology	3,397	9,416	4,516	+1,119	-4,900
Program and administrative support	9,576	11,967	11,297	+1,721	-670
Subtotal, research and special programs	32,061	42,531	36,452	+4,391	-6,079
Offsetting collections (user fees)		-4,722			+4,722
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	30,000	42,874	35,874	+5,874	-7,000
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	5,479	4,263	4,263	-1,216	
Pipeline safety reserve	(1,400)		(2,500)	(+1,100)	(+2,500)
Subtotal, Pipeline safety program (including reserve)	(36,879)	(47,137)	(42,637)	(+5,758)	(-4,500)
Emergency preparedness grants: Emergency preparedness fund	200	200	200		
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration	67,740	85,146	76,789	+9,049	-8,357
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	44,840	48,050	48,050	+3,210	
Across the board (0.38%) rescission	-170			+170	
Net total	44,670	48,050	48,050	+3,380	
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	17,000	17,954	17,954	+954	
Offsetting collections	-1,600	-17,954	-900	+700	+17,054
Across the board (0.38%) rescission	-58			+58	
Net total	15,342		17,054	+1,712	+17,054
General Provisions					
Transportation Administrative Service Center reduction (Sec. 323)	-15,000		-4,000	+11,000	-4,000
Amtrak Reform Council (Sec. 326)	750	980	980	+230	
Net total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,368,343	16,089,000	15,706,737	+1,338,394	-382,263
Current year, FY 2001	(14,308,343)	(16,089,000)	(15,706,737)	(+1,398,394)	(-382,263)
Appropriations	(14,340,424)	(16,089,000)	(16,285,737)	(+1,945,313)	(+196,737)
Rescissions	(-32,081)		(-579,000)	(-546,919)	(-579,000)
Advance appropriations	(60,000)			(-60,000)	
(Limitations on obligations)	(34,679,150)	(37,437,600)	(38,432,600)	(+3,753,450)	(+995,000)
(Rescissions of limitations on obligations)	(-177,269)			(+177,269)	
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,576)	(1,039,576)	(-167,126)	
Net total budgetary resources	(50,076,926)	(54,566,176)	(55,178,913)	(+5,101,987)	(+612,737)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board					
Salaries and expenses	4,633	4,795	4,795	+162	
National Transportation Safety Board					
Salaries and expenses	57,000	62,942	62,942	+5,942	
Offsetting collections		10,000			+10,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	61,633	57,737	67,737	+6,104	+10,000
Grand total	14,429,976	16,146,737	15,774,474	+1,344,498	-372,263
Current year, FY 2001	(14,369,976)	(16,146,737)	(15,774,474)	(+1,404,498)	(-372,263)
Appropriations	(14,402,057)	(16,146,737)	(16,353,474)	(+1,951,417)	(+206,737)
Rescissions	(-32,081)		(-579,000)	(-546,919)	(-579,000)
Advance appropriations	(60,000)			(-60,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(34,679,150)	(37,437,600)	(38,432,600)	(+3,753,450)	(+995,000)
(Rescissions of limitation on obligations)	(-177,269)			(+177,269)	
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,576)	(1,039,576)	(-167,126)	
Net total budgetary resources	(64,508,535)	(70,770,650)	(71,021,124)	(+6,512,589)	(+250,474)

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4475)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Pipeline safety (OSLTF)	-3,000	-13,000	-10,000	-7,000	+3,000
Advance appropriations	-60,000	20,000	20,000	+80,000
Rescission of advance	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
FTA: Capital invest grants (Title II PL 106-113)	6,000	-6,000
FTA: Capital investment grants (limitation on obligations)	(-6,000)	(+6,000)
Across the board cut (0.38%)	-50,000	+50,000
CBO/OMB adjustment	2,081	-2,081
Total, adjustments	-104,919	7,000	-10,000	+94,919	-17,000
Net grand total (including scorekeeping).....	14,325,057	16,153,737	15,764,474	+1,439,417	-389,263
Appropriations	(14,357,138)	(16,133,737)	(16,343,474)	(+1,986,336)	(+209,737)
Rescissions	(-32,081)	(-599,000)	(-566,919)	(-599,000)
Advance appropriations	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)
(Limitations on obligations)	(34,673,150)	(37,437,600)	(38,432,600)	(+3,759,450)	(+995,000)
(Rescissions of limitations on obligations)	(-177,269)	(+177,269)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,576)	(1,039,576)	(-167,126)
Net grand total budgetary resources	(50,027,640)	(54,630,913)	(55,236,650)	(+5,209,010)	(+605,737)
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory.....	730,327	778,000	778,000	+47,673
Discretionary:					
Highway category: (Limitation on obligations)	(28,085,150)	(29,953,000)	(30,216,000)	(+2,130,850)	(+263,000)
Mass Transit category.....	1,159,000	1,254,400	1,254,400	+95,400
(Limitation on obligations)	(4,638,000)	(5,066,600)	(5,016,600)	(+378,600)	(-50,000)
General purpose discretionary:					
Defense discretionary.....	300,000	341,000	341,000	+41,000
Nondefense discretionary	12,135,730	13,780,337	13,391,074	+1,255,344	-389,263
Total, General purpose discretionary.....	12,435,730	14,121,337	13,732,074	+1,296,344	-389,263
Total, Discretionary.....	13,594,730	15,375,737	14,986,474	+1,391,744	-389,263
Total, mandatory and discretionary	14,325,057	16,153,737	15,764,474	+1,439,417	-389,263

NOTE: FY00 rescissions included in Net total lines.

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, this is a good bill and it should be passed. Let me commend the Chair, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on his 6 years of chairing this subcommittee. He has done an outstanding job in that role, and I have enjoyed working with him these last 4 years as ranking member. He has been fair. On the other hand, he has been thoughtful and tough when he needs to be, he asks appropriate tough questions, and it has been a privilege to work with the gentleman these last 4 years as ranking member, and as a member of the subcommittee for the 6 years he has chaired as subcommittee chair. This is the last bill he brings to the House floor, and it is another good, fair bill, and we should pass it.

Let me join my friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) in thanking all the staff that has worked on this bill. It is a complicated bill, many decisions to be made, and both majority and minority staff do an outstanding job. I thank them for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise along with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) to engage the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the transportation appropriations report includes language that I offered during the full committee markup. This language urges the FAA to expeditiously conclude negotiations with state aviation officials regarding forecasts for a proposed third airport in the Chicago metropolitan area and initiate promptly an environmental impact statement on the proposal.

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. HYDE. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I would ask the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), is it his understanding that the intent of the language is to urge the FAA, which has delayed action for approximately 2 years, to begin promptly to process an environmental impact statement which will finally review Illinois' proposal to build a third airport on 23,845 acres in Peotone, Illinois, not in a piecemeal or partial fashion, but rather in a comprehensive and thorough manner?

Mr. WOLF. That is correct.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his efforts and responsiveness on this very important issue to the residents of my district and throughout the State of Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman too for his support and his leadership on this issue. I look forward to working with the gentleman and our colleagues on the committee to ensure that the FAA fulfills its obligations to meet the national aviation needs of our country.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

0930

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), ranking member, for their very good work on this bill which I fully support, and I would be remiss if I did not also thank all of the staff involved for their professional work, consideration and hard work.

Mr. Chairman, there is report language that accompanies the bill, and just previous to my statement there was a colloquy on the floor. Singular pronouns were used in terms of the word "State," and the word "Illinois" as far as reference to a State was used, and I must indicate that I do take exception to the report language. There is no question that in the Chicago metropolitan area, in the Midwest portion of the United States of America, there is a problem as far as capacity. I would agree with all of my colleagues, and I think it is a regional concern, that that issue be studied on a regional basis and that the State of Indiana, as well as the State of Illinois, be consulted and considered.

The second thing that I would point out to my colleagues in the House, if a commitment has been made by an agency of this government, in this case the Federal Aviation Administration, that particular commitment should be made but again in consultation with all interested parties. In this case, the State of Illinois that apparently asked for the study, the State of Indiana, the citizens in the community affected, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) referred to a site near the community of Peotone, but I would also suggest the City of Chicago and the City of Gary because where I disagree with my colleagues and where I disagree with the report language is the solution to the problem, which site, which combinations of actions, is best suited to solve the problem asked to be studied. So I did want to make sure that my perspective was heard.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate both the chairman of the committee and the ranking mem-

ber for bringing forth to this House a fair bill, a bipartisan bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

I would like to take a few minutes to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for the leadership he has taken and the advocacy he has taken in terms of safety. I know that he started with truck safety and he worked very hard to ensure that we had a reasonable and sensible solution in the manner in which we had oversight over truck safety, and I want to congratulate him and thank him for the leadership.

Lately he has been concerned and been an advocate to increase the safety at our airports and, again, he has found a reasonable and sensible solution and I want to thank him. I know that this is the last bill that he will bring to the floor on transportation. I want to commend him for the fine work he has done.

I also want to congratulate the ranking member for the work he has done on behalf of the minority.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is a good bill and I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for their work on this bill. I think it is very significant to note that this legislation honors the funding guarantees in TEA-21 and AIR-21 and still sufficiently funds other important transportation programs such as the Coast Guard and Amtrak.

I have long believed that we could honor the principle of dedicated trust fund revenues for their intended purposes while maintaining sufficient funding for other important transportation programs, and this bill proves that point.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for, with only a very few exceptions, reporting a bill with fewer authorizing provisions than in past years. While there are many technical violations of the rules, we have no problem with that at all; there are about 30 substantive violations of the rules. Had we been consulted on them, we perhaps might have been able to work out more of them but as it is we have only decided to reserve the right to object to nine of them and, indeed, I believe in colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on two of those rules it is my hope that while I will reserve the right to object that I may well withdraw that right.

So I think this is a good piece of legislation. It shows that we can make the increased investments so crucial to transportation, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation for bringing this appropriation to the floor.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), who is serving her first term on this subcommittee and doing a great job.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, to our chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), I want to thank him for his leadership. What a joy it has been to work with him over this first term as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I commend him for his leadership; and I want to also thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), who is also our ranking member and a fine gentleman, for the bipartisan way that this bill was put together.

It is a wonderful bill. I urge my colleagues to support it. It has funding levels that meet the needs of the citizens of this country, both in highway, transit, airport, Coast Guard.

It has really been a joy to work on this committee in the bipartisan fashion that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) let the committee operate. I commend them. I have been on other committees in this House and this transportation bill is head and shoulders above those other processes I have been involved in.

The funding levels, as I mentioned, will meet the needs of our country; the first of the 21st century this bill is. I just want to say as a new member in this appropriations process, if all the bills could be worked together in a bipartisan fashion as this transportation bill has been with the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), this Congress and the country would be a better one.

As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) leaves to his next assignment, may God be with him and take his leadership skills and abilities forward as we rebuild and shape America for all of its citizens.

Mrs. CAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, the Transportation Appropriations bill will make critical investments that are needed throughout our country to improve our transportation infrastructure, promote economic development and ensure safe travel. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight two vital projects contained in the legislation for which I was able to obtain funding.

The bill contains \$250,000 to help the county of Santa Barbara to build a bicycle/pedestrian bridge in Goleta, CA. This will provide safe passage for pedestrians and bicyclists over a major county road, U.S. Highway 101 and a railroad, connecting a large residential community with a major shopping center, a 25-acre community park and coastal access.

The bill also contains \$240,000 to allow the Santa Maria Organization of Transportation Helpers, Inc. [SMOOTH] to purchase a second set of three new 21-passenger, wheelchair-lift-equipped minibuses. SMOOTH is a nonprofit organization that for 23 years has been providing transportation services for seniors, disabled, economically disadvantaged and geographically isolated persons. In response to

my request last year for \$480,000 for six new minibuses, Congress appropriated \$240,000 in fiscal year 2000. These new funds would allow SMOOTH to complete their bus expansion and replacement program.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, today I support H.R. 4475, the Transportation Appropriations bill and commend Chairman WOLF and ranking member SABO for their hard work on bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor so quickly. I am especially pleased today to support the bill because it includes a common sense project for Washington and Clackamas Counties in Oregon to assist Oregonians in their commute. The Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail line is an innovative project that utilizes existing infrastructure to create a commuter rail line. This line will run from Wilsonville, which is to the south of Portland to Beaverton, which is to the west of Portland.

I had the opportunity to participate in a demonstration ride last spring. I look forward to riding the full length of the track when this project is complete and working with the committee to fulfill that goal.

The million dollars that is included in this bill is important to complete preliminary engineering and builds upon the Federal commitment last year of \$500,000 for alternative analysis. Computer rail is a regional priority and will make the Portland area, a long-time leader in smart transportation, even a better place to live.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking forward to working with Senators SMITH and WYDEN in ensuring that this funding is included in the other body's bill. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. WOLF and Mr. SABO for their hard work and urge my colleagues to support this important and responsible bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4475, the fiscal year 2001 Transportation Appropriations bill. This bill contains a rider which prevents the Department of Transportation from examining the need to increase CAFE standards. This CAFE Freeze rider allows sports utility vehicles and light trucks to meet lower fuel economy standards than cars. The result is vehicles that use more gasoline and produce more emissions harmful to our environment.

This rider will prevent the CAFE standard of sports utility vehicles, currently set a 20.7 miles per gallon, from being raised to that of passenger cars. Current passenger car standards are set at 27.5 miles per gallon. This difference results in millions of greenhouse gases being needlessly released into the atmosphere. By improving fuel efficiency standards we can reduce the threat of global warming while saving consumers money at the gas pump.

By slipping this damaging provision into H.R. 4475, we are preventing one of the most effective laws Congress has ever passed from achieving further reductions in greenhouse gases. This will result in millions of inefficient vehicles on our roads that get lower gas mileage, thereby leading to increased pollution. CAFE standards reduce oil consumption, keeping 500,000 tons of hydrocarbon emissions each year from being released into our atmosphere. In addition, CAFE standards reduce the amount of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere by 600 million tons.

CAFE standards helps local and State governments to achieve Clean Air Act requirements for reducing hydrocarbon air pollution.

These emissions, which can be reduced by increased CAFE standards, not only contribute to smog and global warming they are potentially carcinogenic. This rider places not only the future of our planet at risk, it places the health of all Americans at risk.

With sports utility vehicles now commanding such a significant market share, we must reduce their disproportionate contribution to global warming. By including this harmful rider Congress has taken a step backward in protecting the long-term health of our planet. This rider is bad environmental policy and for that reason I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 4475, the Transportation Appropriations bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 4475, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, which is now under consideration by the House.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my dear friend, Congressman FRANK WOLF, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who is the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, for his truly outstanding leadership in crafting a transportation spending bill that deals effectively with critically needed infrastructure improvements for our Nation's highways and airports, as well as dealing with important transportation safety concerns.

In particular, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for including in this bill the full administration request of \$80 million for the BART San Francisco International Airport [SFO] extension in fiscal year 2001. This amount is commensurate with the full funding grant agreement reached between the Department of Transportation and BART. This critical funding will enable BART to meet its current substantial construction cash flow needs and minimize unplanned financing costs.

The BART SFO Extension has been a top transit priority in the San Francisco Bay Area for more than a decade because people have long recognized the value of bringing reliable and convenient train service directly to the San Francisco International Airport, which is now the fifth busiest airport in the entire country. The extension will provide an additional 8.7 miles of track and four additional stations. The project will link the existing 95-mile, 39-station BART system, which serves four counties on both sides of San Francisco Bay, with the expanding San Francisco International Airport.

At present, Mr. Chairman, the Bay area is beset with growing traffic congestion, which threatens the economic health of our area, which is one of the fastest growing and strongest regional economies in the United States. The BART SFO Extension is a major step toward alleviating this traffic congestion. Forecasts regarding usage of the future BART line support this finding. Ridership is projected to reach nearly 70,000 passenger trips per week day by the year 2010, and it is estimated that some 18,000 to 20,000 of these riders will be going to or from the airport. This will make this new line one of the most heavily used lines in the entire BART system.

I am delighted to report, Mr. Chairman, that 60 percent of the construction of this project has already been completed along the main line of the extension, and construction is more

than 85 percent complete inside the airport. More than 4 miles of subway have already been completed and construction is moving ahead rapidly at each of the four stations on this line.

Mr. Chairman, it is truly gratifying to see this important rail-airport link take shape. Again, I sincerely thank Chairman WOLF for his continued support of this worthy project. Thanks to the timely and appropriate Federal funding for this project included in this bill, we can all look forward soon to celebrating the historic opening of the long-awaited BART SFO Extension.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4475, the fiscal year 2001 Transportation Appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation addresses key transportation priorities including two projects critical to my district: Metra expansion and the EJ&E Railroad bridge. This legislation funds Metra at \$35 million for fiscal year 2001, allowing Metra to continue work on the North Central Service Line, the Union Pacific West Line, and the South West Service to Manhattan. One of my top legislative priorities continues to be the expansion of the South West Service line which greatly benefits the residents of the 11th Congressional District. These funds ensure that the South West Service line will continue to be developed to meet the region's growing needs. I continue to support a further extension of the Metra system to the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie and the planned Deer Run Industrial Park.

Metra operates over 12 rail lines in the Chicago Metropolitan Area and serves more than 120 communities with 240 stations and a stop at O'Hare International Airport. The Metra system covers a territory the size of Connecticut with a population of 7.5 million, providing 4,000 revenue trains and carrying 1.5 million riders. On-time performance continues to be well above 96 percent since every year of Metra's existence.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation also provides \$3 million for completion of design and engineering work of the EJ&E Railroad bridge. The EJ&E Railroad bridge crosses over the Illinois River near my hometown of Morris, IL. Unfortunately, it is the most hit bridge throughout the inland river system, being hit over 200 times in 2 years. This project will ultimately widen the width between the piers of the bridge. Funding for this project will make the Illinois River safer for maritime traffic by reducing accidents while helping the flow of commerce. In addition, this is a cost-effective project; according to the Coast Guard, modifications made to this bridge will save \$1.1 million in damage each year.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman WOLF and Chairman YOUNG for their hard work on this good piece of legislation. I ask all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member SABO for including critical funding in this legislation for the Long Island Railroad's East Side access project.

The LIRR's East Side access project is critical to the future of New York City and the surrounding region's economy and mobility, particularly for Manhattan, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

East Side access is one of the most important transportation "new start" projects in the country today. It will benefit 50,000 customers the very day it opens in 2010, saving each

commuter who uses it nearly 40 minutes a day roundtrip. That's 3 hours a week and about 18 days of productive work time a year.

Ultimately, the project will serve about 179,000 commuters daily.

Over the past 3 years the project has received some \$46 million in Federal "new start" earmarks and over \$150 million in local funding. This year's \$10 million appropriation will help move the project forward toward initial construction elements late this fall.

The project also includes a new station in Sunnyside Queens, in my district, which will allow my constituents to travel more quickly in to and out of Penn Station in Manhattan. It will also provide a link from other parts of Queens and Long Island to the growing Long Island City business district.

In addition, East Side access will bring with it many thousands of direct construction jobs to the district over the life of the project as well as many thousands of additional supporting jobs throughout the borough's and the region's economy.

I would also like to thank Senators MOYNIHAN and SCHUMER and Representatives KING, MCCARTHY and MEEKS, as well as former Congressman Thomas Manton, for helping to navigate this critical project.

Although we are a long way from our goal, this funding will help keep this important project on track for 2010. I look forward to working with the subcommittee on the future of this project.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the fiscal year 2001 House transportation budget. Among the myriad of budget priorities supported in the measure, one is especially beneficial to my constituents in Indian River County. This bill will provide much needed funding for a state-of-the-art air traffic control tower at the Vero Beach Airport.

The need for a new air traffic control tower at the Vero Beach Municipal Airport has been recognized as a safety-related need since 1988 by the FAA. A combination of factors, including traffic growth, line of sight problems, and tower structural and technical obsolescence problems, as well as a lack of radar at the airport, all point to an urgent need to replace the original tower, which was completed in 1973.

I am pleased that the FAA is a partner in moving this project forward. It was first included in an FAA budget request in 1995, funding began in 1996, and construction was supposed to start in 1998 with completion in early 2001. All tasks, including the engineering, design, site work and environmental review phase, have been completed. Since then, however, the agency has repeatedly delayed funding the \$5.2 million construction project. Most recently Vero Beach was informed that construction would not begin until 2002 with a completion date of 2005.

This is unacceptable for an airport that is the second busiest general aviation airport in Florida and ranked in about the top 15 percent of towered airports in the country. Traffic has grown to nearly 240,000 operations annually and we'll see in only a few years that number increase to 270,000. And, in addition to regular airport operations, Flight Safety International operates a fleet of more than 90 aircraft and conducts about 90,000 hours of flight training annually.

I have fought for the air traffic control tower at the Vero Beach Airport since my election to

this office. I appreciate the dedication of former Vero Beach Mayor Arthur Neuberger, who has diligently worked and lobbied these very halls in search of the funds necessary for the upgrades at the facility.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia Mr. FRANK WOLF, and Chairman YOUNG on their leadership on the transportation budget, and his understanding of the importance of this air traffic control tower to the people who fly in and out of Vero Beach Airport.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to extend my most sincere thanks to Chairman WOLF and the Ranking Member, Mr. SABO, and the members of the committee, for their willingness to provide funding for Sacramento's transportation priorities contained in the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

Funding in this legislation will allow Sacramento to make significant advancements on projects that are urgently needed to address the population growth and transportation inadequacies confronting the region. Specifically, I am grateful for \$35.2 million for the Sacramento light rail extension project and the \$2 million allocation for the Sacramento compressed natural gas bus and bus facilities program. Both projects are needed to assist efforts to ease traffic congestion and provide efficient, affordable, and environmentally sound modes of transportation to our region.

I also thank the committee for the \$2.75 million in funds for Sacramento Transportation Intelligent Transportation Systems allocated between the city and County of Sacramento. The Regional ITS Program will maximize efficiency of existing infrastructure and rolling stock through improved system information gathering capabilities, coordinated facilities operations, and facilities maintenance by employing new technologies. Local agencies have committed \$4.3 million to this program. The Regional ITS Program is composed of the Smart Corridor projects on the Sunrise/Greenback and Watt Avenue Corridors, the Transit Management Center Project for Sacramento Regional Transit, and the North and West Lake Tahoe Traffic Management Project, assisting Placer County in implementing traveler information systems in North Tahoe/Truckee.

Finally, I also thank the committee's willingness to provide a \$1 million earmark under the Access to Jobs Program to enhance regional funding for the Sacramento Regional Employment Access Transit Project. Several communities in the Sacramento region still suffer from double-digit unemployment and low income, high unemployment areas are geographically distant from job centers, and traditional transit service hours often do not correspond with available jobs. Sacramento transit operators will use funding to successfully implement a program serving a significant portion of the region's high unemployment areas, giving job opportunities to the unemployed and providing a dedicated employment pool to area businesses. Additional Federal funding is needed this year to continue and enhance the Employment Access Transit Project and fill Sacramento's transportation gaps.

Again, on behalf of the Sacramento community, I thank the committee for its recognition of these transportation priorities so vital to the stability and growth of our region.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

This legislation addresses many of the infrastructure needs and concerns confronting New York State.

I thank Chairman WOLF and Congressman SABO for crafting a bill that benefits thousands of commuters on Long Island, NY. Of particular importance is a provision allowing for the continued development of the East Side Access Project [ESA].

The East Side Access Project, which will create approximately 72,000 jobs, connects the Long Island Rail Road with Grand Central Terminal. This project will make the commute for 172,000 customers a day significantly faster and easier.

It is estimated that 46,000 commuters will save approximately 36 minutes a day—time otherwise spent with their families. In addition, the MTA predicts that they will add at least 30,000 customers a day as a result of this project.

The MTA is poised to spend Federal appropriated funds, and quickly move to construction this year. Early construction will save money, and permit the project to benefit from the momentum of the nearly completed Connector Project at the 63rd Street Tunnel.

I believe the East Side Access Project will be beneficial, not only to the commuters on the Long Island Railroad, but to transit riders and all other commuters throughout the New York City metropolitan region.

By making use of the surplus capacity available at Grand Central Terminal, ESA will reduce congestion and train movement at and into Penn Station. Just as important, it will reduce overcrowding on all Long Island Railroad trains and crosstown subways in Manhattan.

Finally, East Side Access will also reduce vehicular traffic and pollution in the NYC region.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am truly displeased to have to rise in opposition to this bill.

As the managers have stated, this legislation carries great importance for the transportation funding needs for the country going into the future.

Nowhere is there a greater need for basic improvements in the transportation infrastructure than in the State of New York.

The New York City region is operating with a transit network laid out in the 1930's, one that desperately needs to be modernized to serve the needs of a 21st century metropolis that is one of America's major assets in competing in the global economy.

Unfortunately, this bill fails to provide adequate funding for two desperately needed projects in New York and rescinds funding for another important project. This continues a trend that the great Senator from New York, DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, has documented for many years in his Fisc Reports, of New York State losing out on its share of Federal money.

Mr. Chairman, the entire country knows that the benefits of the new economy have spurred a revival of New York in the last decade. The country knows this because tourism in New York City and New York State is exceeding all expectations.

In the city itself, a booming high-tech sector has developed, known as Silicon Alley, which complements the city's many other highly attractive employment sectors.

The end result of all this tourism generated by my colleagues' constituents and the booming New York economy is that an already antiquated transportation system is bursting at the seams.

The State of New York has recognized this problem and is devoted to two critical transportation projects—the building of a full length 2d Avenue subway in Manhattan and the construction of the East Side connector that will benefit commuters entering the city from the East to Grand Central Station.

One of the primary reasons for the building of these projects is to relieve crowding brought on by my colleagues' constituents as they come into the city to visit the East Side and attractions like St. Patrick's Cathedral, Rockefeller Center, and the many museums, such as the Met, Guggenheim, and the Museum of Modern Art—all which will be directly served by these needed infrastructure projects.

The Lexington Avenue subway line on the East Side of Manhattan is already dangerously overburdened.

The line is well beyond capacity during rush hour, to a point where overcrowding delays have reduced the hourly throughput on the Lexington line from a possible 30 to an actual 23 trains per hour.

Furthermore it is vital that the 2d Avenue subway and East Side Access be funded in tandem.

Without a full length 2d Avenue subway, much of the benefit to Long Island of the East Side Access Project will be lost and conditions for hundreds of thousands of New York City riders and Westchester commuters will actually be made worse.

Without a full length 2d Avenue subway, both urban and suburban users will continue to be subjected to stultifying levels of elbow-to-rib crowding, often miserable or non-existent connections between services, and unreliable and unnecessarily long commuting times that burden both employers, commuters, and tourists.

Leaders in New York like Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver have recognized the importance of improving this basic infrastructure and have included over \$1 billion in the State budget for the 2d Avenue subway.

Unfortunately, this bill severely underfunds both, granting only \$10 million for the East Side Connector, which is not enough money to even build a fence around its construction site.

Let me stress that these are smart mass transit projects. There is no more room for cars in the area. These projects will get people on trains and not add additional car pollution to the environment.

As I said, this underfunding is the continuation of a trend that Senator MOYNIHAN has well documented. In his most recent Fisc Report documenting 1998, he concluded that each citizen of New York pays \$835 more into the Federal Government than she receives back in benefits. Our total statewide deficit is \$15 billion.

This bill exacerbates this imbalance by actually rescinding \$60 million for the Farley Penn Station project in New York City. The Farley Station is critical to the development of Amtrak's high speed rail system, which is being perfected on the east coast. Eventually, this system is intended to benefit the entire country when fully deployed.

Mr. Chairman I believe this bill does a disservice to New York State and New York City and I will oppose it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I support the fiscal year 2001 Transportation appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, the transportation bill historically has been developed in a bipartisan manner, and this year is no different. This year is the last year that the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, will manage the Transportation appropriations bill. I want to congratulate him on a job well done on this bill, and previous 5 transportation bills. He has devoted considerable attention to transportation safety issues and asked the hard questions. I want to thank him for the job he has done and the fair manner in which he has managed the work for the Transportation Subcommittee.

I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for the tremendous job that they have done—John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Linda Muir, Chris Porter, and Geoff Gleason for helping to produce a bill that both sides of the aisle can support.

The bill provides \$14.9 billion in new budget authority and \$55.2 billion in total resources, including obligation limitations, for fiscal year 2001. This provides a respective 10 percent increase over last year.

Mr. Chairman, this body should know that much of the new spending in the bill is for Transportation infrastructure programs and is spending mandated under TEA21 and AIR21. Funding for airport construction is up 64 percent or \$1.3 billion over last year. Funding for highways and transit is up \$2.6 billion or 8 percent over last year. Nearly three-fourths of the outlays in this bill are now guaranteed. As a result, the Appropriations Committee had no choice but to provide these funds.

These TEA21 and AIR21 mandates have made it more difficult to allocate resources in a balanced fashion among competing aviation, Coast Guard, highway, rail and transit needs.

This year, as a result of the AIR21 and TEA21 guarantees, the Transportation Subcommittee needed a generous 302(b) allocation in order to avoid squeezing the Coast Guard and to protect vital air traffic control and safety operations. We were able to address these operating needs, but only at the expense of other subcommittees whose 302(b) allocations were not as generous.

This bill also provides Amtrak with its full capital appropriation of \$521 million—an amount that is \$70 million below last year, but essential if Amtrak is to remain on a path toward operational self sufficiency by 2003.

The bill does not include a number of legislative authorizations that were requested by the administration that proposed to divert excess gas tax revenue—or revenue aligned budget authority—to a variety of other purposes. Thus, the bill does not include the \$468 million requested for new infrastructure investments in high speed rail corridors across the county.

As many Members are aware, there is tremendous interest among the Governors in expanding Amtrak high speed rail service—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan and others have formed the Midwest Regional Rail Coalition, and there are other high speed rail corridors in California, New York, in the southeast, and in other parts of the county. To try to address the great interest in this area, the bill includes provisions to provide greater flexibility for governors, at their option, to use CMAQ and Surface Transportation Program funding to help finance these rail projects. We

believed this would be a small, but important step forward.

This year, the committee received a tremendous number of requests from Members to help with grade crossing removal projects. To help address this need, the bill includes provisions eliminating the State and local matching requirements so that States can more quickly use the \$142 million in outstanding Federal funds available, but unspent for this purpose. I would urge your support for these provisions.

Finally, I want to mention my concerns about one aspect of the bill dealing with funding for the large transit projects we call "new starts." This year, the committee received more than \$2.7 billion in funding requests for discretionary section 5309 New Starts projects. Even though the program is funded at an historical high of \$1.058 billion, the amount available to fund new starts projects is a fraction of the current demand, and this problem will only grow worse in coming years.

The new starts pipeline is huge and growing. The Federal Transit Administration has already committed the federal government to multiyear section 5309 funding of \$2.9 billion over the remaining life of TEA21 for 16 transit systems, and the costs for another 47 projects in the pipeline will reach a staggering \$25 billion. Still more projects are in the planning stage. The allowable Federal share of these projects under TEA-21 is 80 percent—clearly more than we can afford in the near future. In fact, the President's proposals for this fiscal year, if the committee had adopted them, would have completely exhausted all available discretionary Federal support for new transit systems through 2003.

That is why I have advocated that we should move toward requiring communities to foot at least 50 percent of the bill for these projects, rather than the minimum 20 percent local share required under TEA21. I acknowledge that this is not a popular point of view, but I believe that it will become necessary to fairly provide Federal assistance to new start projects across the country. If we don't move in this direction, many communities with worthy transit projects simply will be left out in the cold.

This bill does not include a 50 percent cost share requirement. But, far from serving as a disincentive to build transit as some have suggested, I believe that sending a clear message that more robust local and State financial participation is expected will help to address the new starts funding logjam—and more fairly distribute new starts assistance to communities in need.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate and thank the Appropriations Committee in general, and the chairman and members of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee in particular, for their efforts on the legislation that is before us today.

As reported, H.R. 4475 is a well conceived piece of legislation. Not only does it keep faith with the principle that revenues raised for specific purposes, such as highway and airport improvements, should be devoted to those purposes, but it will be of immense benefit to the traveling public. By helping to ease the transportation bottlenecks that impede commerce and by mitigating the traffic congestion that plagues so many of our cities and sub-

urbs, it will be of great benefit to millions of Americans who have to commute to work, drive their children to and from school, deliver shipments, shop for necessities and travel on business or in case of an emergency.

How can I be so sure of that? Because I have the privilege of representing an area that is indicative of both the problems H.R. 4475 seeks to address and remedies that it is intended to provide. As many of my colleagues know, the north and northwest suburbs of Chicago are very busy places. Not only can commuting to or from downtown Chicago by car be very time consuming at rush hour, but traveling from suburb to suburb is no easy or quick matter when traffic is heavy.

To be sure, the Chicagoland is blessed with an excellent commuter rail system and a large number of light rail and bus routes. But, it also has a population that is expected to exceed nine million by the year 2020, which means that the pressures on the area's transportation systems will only get worse unless substantial steps are taken to relieve them. Which is where H.R. 4475 comes in.

If enacted into law, this bill will facilitate the double tracking a portion of METRA's North Central line through northern Cook and central Lake counties, enabling 22 commuter trains a day to serve many of Chicago's northwest suburbs—plus Chicago's O'Hare Airport—instead of the current 10. In addition, the bill will lead to an expansion of METRA service to a number of communities west and southwest of Chicago as well. Also, H.R. 4475 will help reduce traffic congestion in the area several other ways. One is that it will help finance the development of intelligent transportation systems in both Lake County, north of Chicago, and DuPage County, west of the city. Another is that it will contribute to the rehabilitation of two important light rail lines—the Ravenswood Line and the Douglas line—in the city itself.

Inasmuch as the aforementioned population growth is expected to occur within the City of Chicago as well as in its suburbs, I cannot emphasize enough how important these improvements are, not just to the people of my district, but to the entire Chicago metropolitan area. In addition to giving us more ways to get around, they will ease traffic congestion and make it easier for us to drive around. Moreover, they will lay the foundation for additional commuter rail service expansions and other transportation improvements in the future. In short, they promise real relief, not just to those who live in or near Chicago, but also to the millions of people who travel to the city while on vacation or to do business.

For all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleagues on the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee for including those items, the METRA projects and the ITS project in Lake County in particular, in the fiscal 2001 Transportation appropriations bill. You have done my constituents and their Chicagoland neighbors a considerable service, one I am sure they will appreciate every bit as much as will the residents of many other cities and suburbs who likewise stand to benefit from its provisions. Which brings to mind one last thought, it being that the projects and benefits associated with H.R. 4475 stretch far beyond the city limits of Chicago and the State of Illinois. One way or another every State in the country will profit from enactment of H.R. 4475, as will many of their communities and residents. That

being the case, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill today so that we can begin to realize its potential before to many tomorrows come to pass.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4475, the fiscal year 2001 Department of Transportation appropriations bill. This legislation contains funding for a number of important programs, including several in my own district. These projects are designed to reduce reliance on single-passenger vehicles. By encouraging alternatives to the car, such as mass transit and other commuter opportunities, we reduce air emissions and conserve other important renewable resources. We enhance the quality of life in communities by reducing congestion and preserving air quality. Both are admirable objectives.

The base bill also contains a provision that preserves the current corporate average fuel economy [CAFE] standards. An amendment to strip this provision out of the bill may be offered, and, if approved, will permit the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to impose stricter standards. While I strongly support the need to reduce air emissions and promote fuel efficiency, a restrictive approach mandated by the government, unresponsive to consumer demands and production realities, is not the wisest approach.

CAFE is the result of the 1970's energy shortage. It was a proposal to diminish our reliance on foreign oil by mandating to auto manufacturers that their vehicles achieve at least minimum mileage standards. When oil prices again rose sharply in the early 1980's, smaller cars were selling well, and it was expected that manufacturers would have no difficulty complying with the standards. As oil prices began to decline during the latter part of the 1980's, small car sales began to taper. Consumers placed a lower value on fuel economy and gas prices as a factor in deciding which car to purchase. One consequence has been the rise in popularity of sport utility vehicles [SUVs]. Because SUVs rely on large cylinder engines requiring more fuel to power, they have been cited as the reason to revisit CAFE standards.

Since CAFE standards were introduced, manufacturers have increased fuel economy for passenger vehicles by 113 percent and light trucks by almost 60 percent. With new technologies, such as fuel cells, hybrid vehicles, and boosting capabilities, vehicles that were once only able to achieve 18.7 miles per gallon are now able to achieve 70 miles per gallon. Boosting technologies allow a smaller, more fuel efficient engine to be used in a SUV without compromising performance. As important, it is technology that is relatively inexpensive to incorporate into vehicle design. In short, these types of technologies achieve the same end result as the CAFE objectives without increasing vehicle cost or constraining consumer choice.

These technological improvements have resulted, not from the mandates of the CAFE standards, but from voluntary research and development efforts. Many of these technologies are adaptable right now. Others need additional time to fully develop and implement. In either scenario, the focus should be on encouraging technological innovation, development, and implementation. We can achieve this goal, not by commanding and controlling new technologies through the CAFE program, but by creating incentives to undertake expensive research projects. Incentives may include

tax breaks for new automotive or fuel technologies. It might include the creation of a demonstration project or providing funding for private/public research efforts such as the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. In the end, it is because we do have alternative technologies and better ways to encourage innovation that makes the debate to increase the CAFE standards largely academic.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to support H.R. 4475.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to take this opportunity to express my thanks to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman WOLF, for his diligence and dedication in bringing this measure before the House today.

This legislation fully meets the highways, transit, rail, and aviation needs of our Nation.

Specifically, the measure allocates \$30.7 billion for the Federal Highway Administration, a \$1.6 billion increase; \$12 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, a \$2 billion increase; \$6.2 billion for the Federal Transit Administration, \$485 million more than last year; \$689 million for the Federal Railroad Administration, a \$45 million decrease from the fiscal year 2000 level; and \$4.6 billion for the U.S. Coast Guard, a \$594 million increase.

Furthermore, I would express my gratitude to Chairman WOLF for his cooperation in providing assistance to the rural communities of Sullivan County, NY. The degradation of the Tappan Zee Bridge, our efforts to restore service to the west shoreline, our recent privatization of Stewart International Airport, the citizens of my district, from Tappan to Wurtsboro, are continuously facing the transportation challenges of increased growth and development. This funding will play a vital role in our commitment to provide a safe and reliable transportation infrastructure for our Nation.

Once again, I thank Chairmen YOUNG and WOLF for their continued support and commitment and look forward to working with them in the future on the challenges facing to our Nation's transportation system.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now before the House, H.R. 4475, the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies. This bill contains \$10,000,000 in Federal transit capital investment grant funding for the New York State Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Long Island Rail Road East Side Access [ESA] project. While the ESA project could obligate much more Federal new start funding this year, with construction anticipated to begin this fall, I am very grateful for the committee's support. Federal taxpayers can rest assured that the ESA project will quickly put all Federal transit appropriations to good use for the public.

I am pleased to mention that the NYS MTA's 2000-04 capital plan was just approved in the State legislature and provides the necessary local matching funds, \$1,500,000,000, to enable ESA to move rapidly into heavy construction this year. Daily LIRR riders, 50,000 of whom will save nearly 3 hours a week now wasted backtracking from Penn Station on Manhattan's west side to jobs on the east side, are eager to see this project become a reality. Many of these harried commuters are hard-working mothers and fathers who should have these hours to spend with their families. Transit riders throughout the MTA system will benefit from better distribution of passengers

made possible by the ESA project. Planned new entranceways into the Grand Central Station complex will enhance the station's flow of LIRR, Metro North, and subway transit passengers. In Queens, passengers also will benefit from a new station to be built in Sunnyside.

This project, which will provide major transportation benefits for the entire New York City Metropolitan region, has received Federal transit new start funding for the last three fiscal years. In addition, a major portion of its overall length was constructed throughout the 1980's with nearly \$900 million in Federal dollars (plus an equal amount of State/local dollars) as part of the MTA's 63d Street tunnel and connector project. The ESA project will complete the unfinished elements of these federally aided projects by allowing LIRR commuter trains to use the already constructed lower level of the tunnel and proceed into Grand Central Station. The busy upper level of the 63d Street tunnel now carries subway trains.

In addition to maximizing passenger circulation throughout the transit system, ESA will enhance the environment by taking over 12,000 cars per day off the East River bridges that bring commuters from Queens, Brooklyn, Nassau, and Suffolk to jobs in the Nation's largest central business district. It will also allow for reverse commuters to leave the west side of Manhattan from the same location that Metro North Railroad customers now enjoy.

The ESA project, which I anticipate will be completed by 2011, is moving ahead steadily. The project is prepared for actual construction to begin during this calendar year, and to go into high gear in early fiscal year 2001.

Local and State support for ESA are strong. It is Governor Pataki's No. 1 transit priority. The mayor and the county executives of Nassau and Suffolk, as well as the business community support the project.

Nearly \$192 million in State and Federal funds already have been invested in the ESA project, including \$46 million in Federal new starts appropriations. With the MTA's suggested overmatch of 50 percent, similar to what it had provided for its previous new start project, the 63d Street Connector, the ESA is a solid Federal investment that will maximize the use of facilities already built with Federal dollars and awaiting use by the taxpayers.

A number of my colleagues including Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY, Congressman GREGORY MEEKS, Congressman JOSEPH CROWLEY have worked together to support including fiscal year 2001 funds for the ESA project in the Appropriations Committee's reported-bill. It has been a tough effort because there are dozens of transit new starts projects competing for a limited amount of Federal funds. This has been a difficult process for Chairman WOLF, whom I thank for all his support and leadership, and I extend my gratitude to Ranking Member SABO as well.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendments printed in House Report 106-626 are adopted.

During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may ac-

cord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place 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:

H.R. 4475

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 Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Secretary, \$1,756,000.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, \$587,000.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$9,760,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, \$3,131,500.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AVIATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, \$7,182,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,250,000 in funds received in user fees.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, \$7,241,000, including not to exceed \$60,000 for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, \$2,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, \$18,359,000.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Public Affairs, \$1,454,000.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

For necessary expenses of the Executive Secretariat, \$1,181,000.

BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

For necessary expenses of the Board of Contract Appeals, \$496,000.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED
BUSINESS UTILIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, \$1,192,000.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Intelligence and Security, \$1,490,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, \$6,279,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$8,140,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND
DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, development activities, and making grants, to remain available until expended, \$3,300,000.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE
CENTER

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Transportation Administrative Service Center, not to exceed \$119,387,000, 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.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER
PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed 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 total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$13,775,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$400,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, \$3,000,000, of which \$2,635,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

COAST GUARD
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)); and recreation and welfare; \$3,192,000,000, of which \$341,000,000 shall be available for defense-related activities; and of which \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other

Act shall be available for pay for 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 none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Coast Guard to plan, finalize, or implement any regulation that would promulgate new maritime user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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, \$515,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which \$252,640,000 shall be available to acquire, repair, renovate or improve vessels, small boats and related equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2005; \$42,300,000 shall be available for the Integrated Deepwater Systems program, to remain available until September 30, 2003; \$43,650,000 shall be available to acquire new aircraft and increase aviation capability, to remain available until September 30, 2003; \$60,113,000 shall be available for other equipment, to remain available until September 30, 2003; \$61,606,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities, to remain available until September 30, 2003; and \$54,691,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard is authorized to dispose of surplus real property, by sale or lease, and the proceeds shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and made available only for the National Distress and Response System Modernization program, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2002 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the United States Coast Guard which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after initial submission of the President's budget that the plan has not been submitted to the Congress.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the proviso on page 8, lines 17 through 20 on the ground that it is legislation on appropriations in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order at this point?

Mr. SHUSTER. I reserve it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should make the point of order since it comes against a provision in the bill before the Chair asks for amendments to that paragraph.

Mr. SHUSTER. I will make the point of order.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Let me withdraw that. It is my intention to reserve a point of order and to hear the gentleman's argument, and it is my hope once I hear it I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Hope springs eternal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw his point of order after the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has argued the point of order, but at this point he is making a point of order.

Mr. SHUSTER. So if I understand the Chair, I can make my point of order and I still have the right to withdraw it after the gentleman makes his argument?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHUSTER. Then I will make my point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2000 DOT Appropriation Act required the Secretary of Transportation to submit along with the 2001 budget request the capital investment plan for the FAA and the Coast Guard. It might surprise many Members to know that although these agencies spend close to \$3 billion, "B" billion, a year on the capital investments, they do not produce a comprehensive multiyear plan which shows how they plan to achieve their goals over time. They only submit an annual budget which simply does not give us enough information to make good decisions on these substantial investments. Any business this size or, frankly, a lot smaller would hammer out an investment plan as a matter of normal business practice, so we felt it was certainly reasonable for the FAA and the Coast Guard to do the same. So we required the development of these plans in last year's bill.

The problem is, the Secretary has ignored the law. None of these plans has ever been submitted. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Chairman, does not ask for reports on a casual basis and it is rare for the committee to put reporting requirements in the bill, but we did in this case because they are important and we intend to ensure that one way or the other the committee's directives are not ignored, not by the FAA or the Coast Guard, and particularly by the Office of the Secretary, and not by the Office of Management and Budget.

This should not be controversial. I do not believe that anyone would really have a substantive objection to compelling DOT to follow the law that the Congress has passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, while I believe it is subject to a point of order, I agree with the substance of the arguments made by the gentleman and therefore withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$16,700,000, to remain available until expended.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, \$14,740,000, 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, payments for 15-year career status bonuses under the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), \$778,000,000.

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; \$80,375,000: *Provided*, That no more than \$21,500,000 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: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Coast Guard to assess direct charges on the Coast Guard Reserves for items or activities which were not so charged during fiscal year 1997.

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, \$19,691,000, 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 and used for the purposes of 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.

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, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, and lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 104-264, \$6,544,235,000, including \$4,414,869,000 to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the

provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be for the contract tower cost-sharing program and \$750,000 shall be for the Centennial of Flight Commission: *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 in this Act may be used for the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into a multiyear lease greater than 5 years in length or greater than \$100,000,000 in value unless such lease is specifically authorized by the Congress and appropriations have been provided to fully cover the Federal Government's contingent liabilities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Transportation Administrative Service Center.

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 heading; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,656,765,000 of which \$2,334,112,400 shall remain available until September 30, 2003, and of which \$322,652,600 shall remain available until September 30, 2001: *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: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2002 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day

for each day after initial submission of the President's budget that the plan has not been submitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into a capital lease agreement unless appropriations have been provided to fully cover the Federal Government's contingent liabilities at the time the lease agreement is signed.

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, \$184,366,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and 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; for administration of such programs; for administration of programs under section 40117; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, \$3,200,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$3,200,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, notwithstanding section 47117(h) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than \$53,000,000 of funds limited under this heading shall be obligated for administration.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the unobligated balances authorized under 49 U.S.C. 48103, as amended, \$579,000,000 are rescinded.

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.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration and operation of the Federal Highway Administration, not to exceed \$290,115,000 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.

LIMITATION ON TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH

Necessary expenses for transportation research of the Federal Highway Administration, not to exceed \$437,250,000 shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to any authority previously made available for obligation.

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 \$29,661,806,000 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2001.

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 reimbursement for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 308, \$28,000,000,000 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for administration of motor carrier safety programs and motor carrier safety research, pursuant to section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed \$92,194,000 shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available to carry out the functions and operations of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

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

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 31102, \$177,000,000, 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 \$177,000,000 for the National Motor Carrier Safety Program.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety under chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, \$107,876,000, of which \$77,671,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003: *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 (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, to remain available until expended, \$72,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That 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 2001, are in excess of \$72,000,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to the National Driver Register under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, \$2,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, and to remain available until expended.

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

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402, 405, 410, and 411, to remain available until expended, \$213,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That 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 2001, are in excess of \$213,000,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402, 405, 410, and 411, of which \$155,000,000 shall be for "Highway Safety Programs" under 23 U.S.C. 402, \$13,000,000 shall be for "Occupant Protection Incentive Grants" under 23 U.S.C. 405, \$36,000,000 shall be for "Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Grants" under 23 U.S.C. 410, and \$9,000,000 shall be for the "State Highway Safety Data Grants" under 23 U.S.C. 411: *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 \$7,750,000 of the funds made available for section 402, not to exceed \$650,000 of the funds made available for section 405, not to exceed \$1,800,000 of the funds made available for section 410, and not to exceed \$450,000 of the funds made available for section 411 shall be available to NHTSA for administering highway safety grants under chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the funds made available for section 410 "Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Grants" shall be available for technical assistance to the States.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$102,487,000, of which \$5,249,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, 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 fur-*

ther, That such additional sums as may be necessary for payment on the first deed of trust may be advanced by the Administrator from unobligated balances available to the Federal Railroad Administration, to be reimbursed from payments received from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$26,300,000, to remain available until expended.

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 pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2001.

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, \$17,000,000 to be matched by the State of Rhode Island or its designee on a dollar-for-dollar basis and to remain available until expended.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

For necessary expenses for the Next Generation High-Speed Rail program as authorized under 49 U.S.C. 26101 and 26102, \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

For necessary expenses of capital improvements of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24104(a), \$521,476,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not obligate more than \$208,590,000 prior to September 30, 2001.

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, \$12,800,000: *Provided*, That no more than \$64,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds in this Act available for the execution of contracts under section 5327(c) of title 49, United States Code, \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General for costs associated with the audit and review of new fixed guideway systems.

FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5307, 5308, 5310, 5311, 5327, and section 3038 of Public Law 105-178, \$669,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$3,345,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this head, \$40,000,000 shall be available for grants for the costs of planning, delivery, and temporary use of transit vehicles for special transportation needs and construction of temporary transportation facilities for the XIX Winter Olympiad and the

VIII Paralympiad for the Disabled, to be held in Salt Lake City, Utah: *Provided further*, That in allocating the funds designated in the preceding proviso, the Secretary shall make grants only to the Utah Department of Transportation, and such grants shall not be subject to any local share requirement or limitation on operating assistance under this Act or the Federal Transit Act, as amended.

UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5505, \$1,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$6,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5303, 5304, 5305, 5311(b)(2), 5312, 5313(a), 5314, 5315, and 5322, \$22,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$110,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That \$5,250,000 is available to provide rural transportation assistance (49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2)); \$4,000,000 is available to carry out programs under the National Transit Institute (49 U.S.C. 5315); \$8,250,000 is available to carry out transit cooperative research programs (49 U.S.C. 5313(a)); \$52,113,600 is available for metropolitan planning (49 U.S.C. 5303, 5304, and 5305); \$10,886,400 is available for State planning (49 U.S.C. 5313(b)); and \$29,500,000 is available for the national planning and research program (49 U.S.C. 5314).

TRUST FUND SHARE OF EXPENSES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for payment of obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5303-5308, 5310-5315, 5317(b), 5322, 5327, 5334, 5505, and sections 3037 and 3038 of Public Law 105-178, \$5,016,600,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That \$2,676,000,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's formula grants account: *Provided further*, That \$87,800,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's transit planning and research account: *Provided further*, That \$51,200,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's administrative expenses account: *Provided further*, That \$4,800,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's university transportation research account: *Provided further*, That \$80,000,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's job access and reverse commute grants program: *Provided further*, That \$2,116,800,000 shall be paid to the Federal Transit Administration's capital investment grants account.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5308, 5309, 5318, and 5327, \$529,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$2,646,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be available for fixed guideway modernization, \$1,058,400,000; there shall be available for the replacement, rehabilitation, and purchase of buses and related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities, \$529,200,000, and there shall be available for new fixed guideway systems \$1,058,400,000, together with \$4,983,828 made available for the Pittsburgh airport busway project under Public Law 105-66; together with \$496,280 made available for the Colorado-North Front Range corridor feasibility study under Public Law 105-277, together with \$4,910,000 made available for the Orlando Lynx light rail

project (phase 1) under Public Law 106-69; to be available as follows:

\$10,322,000 for Alaska or Hawaii ferry projects;
 \$25,000,000 for the Atlanta, Georgia, North line extension project;
 \$3,000,000 for the Baltimore central LRT double track project;
 \$1,000,000 for the Boston Urban Ring project;
 \$36,000,000 for the South Boston piers transitway;
 \$6,000,000 for the Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Charlotte, North Carolina, north-south corridor transitway project;
 \$35,000,000 for the Chicago METRA commuter rail projects;
 \$15,000,000 for the Chicago Transit Authority Ravenswood and Douglas branch reconstruction projects;
 \$3,000,000 for the Cleveland Euclid corridor improvement project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Colorado Roaring Fork Valley project;
 \$70,000,000 for the Dallas north central light rail extension project;
 \$3,000,000 for the Denver Southeast corridor project;
 \$20,200,000 for the Denver Southwest corridor project;
 \$50,000,000 for the Dulles corridor project;
 \$20,000,000 for the Fort Lauderdale, Florida Tri-County commuter rail project;
 \$500,000 for the Harrisburg-Lancaster capital area transit corridor 1 commuter rail project;
 \$1,000,000 for the Hollister/Gilroy branch line rail extension project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Houston advanced transit program;
 \$10,750,000 for the Houston regional bus project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Indianapolis, Indiana Northeast Downtown corridor project;
 \$1,000,000 for the Johnson County, Kansas, I-35 commuter rail project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee rail extension project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Little Rock, Arkansas river rail project;
 \$10,000,000 for the Long Island Railroad East Side access project;
 \$4,000,000 for the Los Angeles Mid-City and East Side corridors projects;
 \$50,000,000 for the Los Angeles North Hollywood extension project;
 \$3,000,000 for the Los Angeles-San Diego LOSSAN corridor project;
 \$1,000,000 for the Lowell, Massachusetts-Nashua, New Hampshire commuter rail project;
 \$1,000,000 for the Massachusetts North Shore corridor project;
 \$4,000,000 for the Memphis, Tennessee, Medical Center rail extension project;
 \$6,000,000 for the Nashville, Tennessee, regional commuter rail project;
 \$121,000,000 for the New Jersey Hudson Bergen project;
 \$4,000,000 for the Newark-Elizabeth rail link project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Northern Indiana south shore commuter rail project;
 \$10,000,000 for the Oceanside-Escondido, California light rail system;
 \$10,000,000 for temporary and permanent Olympic transportation infrastructure investments: *Provided*, That these funds shall be allocated by the Secretary based on the approved transportation management plan for the Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympic Games: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for rail extensions;
 \$3,000,000 for the Orange County, California, transitway project;

\$5,000,000 for the Philadelphia-Reading SETPA Schuylkill Valley and Cross County metro projects;
 \$13,000,000 for the Phoenix metropolitan area transit project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Pittsburgh North Shore-central business district corridor project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Pittsburgh stage II light rail project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Portland interstate MAX light rail transit extension project;
 \$8,500,000 for the Puget Sound RTA Sounder commuter rail project;
 \$10,000,000 for the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill Triangle transit project;
 \$35,200,000 for the Sacramento, California, south corridor LRT project;
 \$2,000,000 for the San Bernardino, California Metrolink project;
 \$45,000,000 for the San Diego Mission Valley East light rail project;
 \$80,000,000 for the San Francisco BART extension to the airport project;
 \$12,250,000 for the San Jose Tasman West light rail project;
 \$100,000,000 for the San Juan Tren Urbano project;
 \$30,000,000 for the Seattle, Washington, central link light rail transit project;
 \$7,000,000 for the Spokane, Washington, South Valley corridor light rail project;
 \$2,000,000 for the St. Louis, Missouri, MetroLink cross county connector project;
 \$60,000,000 for the St. Louis-St. Clair MetroLink extension project;
 \$8,000,000 for the Stamford, Connecticut fixed guideway corridor;
 \$3,000,000 for the Stockton, California Altamont commuter rail project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Twin Cities Transitways projects;
 \$55,000,000 for the Twin Cities Transitways—Hiawatha corridor project;
 \$3,000,000 for the Virginia Railway Express commuter rail project;
 \$2,000,000 for the Washington Metro-Blue Line extension-Addison Road (Largo) project;
 \$4,000,000 for the West Trenton, New Jersey, rail project;
 \$5,000,000 for the Whitehall ferry terminal project; and
 \$1,000,000 for the Wilsonville to Washington County, Oregon commuter rail project: *Provided further*, That funds made available for the Miami-Dade Transit east-west multimodal corridor project under Public Laws 105-277 and 106-69 and funds made available for Miami Metro-Dade North 27th Avenue corridor project under Public Law 105-277 shall be available for the Miami-Dade busway project.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for payment of previous obligations incurred in carrying out 49 U.S.C. 5338(b), \$350,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund.

JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 3037 of the Federal Transit Act of 1998, \$20,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$100,000,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes.

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 operations and maintenance of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, \$13,004,000, 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, \$36,452,000, of which \$645,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and of which \$4,707,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003: *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)
(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST 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, \$40,137,000, of which \$4,263,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2003; and \$35,874,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$20,713,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003; *Provided*, That in addition to amounts made available for the Pipeline Safety Fund, \$2,500,000 shall be derived from amounts previously collected under 49 U.S.C. 60301: *Provided further*, That amounts previously collected under 49 U.S.C. 60301 shall be available for damage prevention grants.

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, 2003: *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, \$48,050,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3) to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or en-

tity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading shall be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$17,954,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$900,000 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 from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2001, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$17,054,000.

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, \$4,795,000: *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-15; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) \$62,942,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

Mr. WOLF (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 39, line 13 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.

0945

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against this portion?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso on page 13, line 24, through page 14, line 3, on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, yes, we would ask that the point of order would not be granted.

We would make the same argument on this one as we did the previous one.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I believe clearly a point of order could be made against this, as with the first item we discussed a few moments ago.

In substance, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, and therefore, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Are there further points of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against the proviso on page 14, lines 3 through 8, on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to speak against the point of order?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and is sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against the phrase "notwithstanding any other provision of law" on page 20, line 18, on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill, in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we would not want to put any legislation on, so we would concede that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against the phrase "notwithstanding any other provision of law" on page 26, line 15, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriations bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we concede that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) concedes and the point of order is sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against the phrase "notwithstanding any other provision of law" on page 27, line 15 through 16, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriations bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against the phrase "notwithstanding any other provision of law" on page 33, line 24, on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. We concede, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against the provisions on page 36, line 15 through 20, on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill, in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we concede.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 51 line 12 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 from page 39, line 14, through page 51, line 12, is as follows:

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 2001 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 104 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transpor-

tation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision or political and Presidential appointees in an independent agency funded in this Act may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation or such independent agency.

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 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. 309. The limitations 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.

SEC. 310. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 311. 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. 312. 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 Federal Aviation Administration shall accept such equipment, which shall thereafter be operated and maintained by FAA in accordance with agency criteria.

SEC. 313. 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 1 year of the contract; (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. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except for fixed guideway modernization projects, funds made available by this Act under "Federal Transit Administration, Capital investment grants" for projects specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2003, and other recoveries, shall be made available for other projects under 49 U.S.C. 5309.

SEC. 315. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2000, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 316. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 320 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 2001.

SEC. 317. 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 "Federal-Aid Highways" account, the Federal Transit Administration's "Transit Planning and Research" account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's "Safety and Operations" account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 318. 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 the enactment of this section.

SEC. 319. 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 49 U.S.C. 111 may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction.

SEC. 320. 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. 321. 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, telegraph, telephone, letter, printed or written material, radio, television, video presentation, electronic communications, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress or of a State legislature to favor or oppose by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress or a State legislature after

the introduction of any bill or resolution in Congress proposing such legislation or appropriation, or after the introduction of any bill or resolution in a State legislature 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 or to Congress, on the request of any Member, or to members of State legislature, or to a State legislature, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of business.

SEC. 322. (a) IN GENERAL.—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 THE 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. 323. Funds provided in this Act for the Transportation Administrative Service Center (TASC) shall be reduced by \$4,000,000, which limits fiscal year 2001 TASC obligational authority for elements of the Department of Transportation funded in this Act to no more than \$115,387,000: *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. 324. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department and allocated to elements of the Department using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until December 31, 2001.

SEC. 325. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule or regulation, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to allow the issuer of any preferred stock heretofore sold to the Department to redeem or repurchase such stock upon the payment to the Department of an amount determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 326. For necessary expenses of the Amtrak Reform Council authorized under sec-

tion 203 of Public Law 105–134, \$980,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That the duties of the Amtrak Reform Council described in section 203(g)(1) of Public Law 105–134 shall include the identification of Amtrak routes which are candidates for closure or realignment, based on performance rankings developed by Amtrak which incorporate information on each route's fully allocated costs and ridership on core intercity passenger service, and which assume, for purposes of closure or realignment candidate identification, that Federal subsidies for Amtrak will decline over the 4-year period from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2002: *Provided further*, That these closure or realignment recommendations shall be included in the Amtrak Reform Council's annual report to the Congress required by section 203(h) of Public Law 105–134.

SEC. 327. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 12 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That any such transfer shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 328. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for activities under the Aircraft Purchase Loan Guarantee Program during fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 329. None of the funds in this Act may be used to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than three full business days before any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling \$1,000,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from: (1) any discretionary grant program of the Federal Highway Administration other than the emergency relief program; (2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration; or (3) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs: *Provided*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 330. Section 232 of the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act, 2000, as enacted by section 1000(a)(5) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000, is repealed.

SEC. 331. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for planning, design, or construction of a light rail system in Houston, Texas.

SEC. 332. Section 3038(e) of Public Law 105–178 is amended by striking "50" and inserting "90".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order or amendments to that portion of the bill?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against section 333 beginning on line 13, p. 51.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk must first read that section. That Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 333. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2001, funds apportioned under section 104(b)(3) of title 23 which are applied to projects involving the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, may have a federal share up to 100 percent of the cost of construction.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) make a point of order against that section?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against section 333 on page 51, lines 13 through 21, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriations bill, in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I contest the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed that the chairman of the authorizing committee has raised a point of order against section 333 of this bill. This provision deletes the non-Federal match for the section 130 grade crossing programs.

In 1999, the unobligated national balance, which was a disgrace, totaled \$142 million. That means there was \$142 million just lying out there for States to use for rail crossings to save lives.

Many States have had difficulty expanding the section 130 funds, and as a result, some States have a few years of unobligated balances that should be used to eliminate grade crossing hazards.

For example, Mr. Chairman, the State of Georgia has \$9,630,879 in unobligated balances, and the State of North Carolina has \$7,451,146 in unobligated balances.

Deleting the non-Federal match would permit States to reduce those unobligated balances and eliminate a greater number of grade crossing hazards than previously planned, and improve safety for American families.

In fact, it is in some of the rural areas, in the gentleman's area out in Nebraska, for \$100,000 we could literally make the rural crossing safe. In some of the rural areas, the legislatures think in terms of the urban areas and forget some of these areas.

The committee has received letters of support for this provision. The common theme contained in these letters is because State funds compete for a variety of highway uses, many of which have no local or State match requirement, highway planners fail to allocate funding to eliminate grade crossing hazards. This failure is occurring as a record amount of freight is being moved by rail and highway traffic is growing, creating an increasingly dangerous situation.

Each year there are about 3,500 collisions at grade crossings with nearly 1,500 injuries and 500 deaths, sometimes school buses and different things like that, where a lot of people are traveling in the buses. The tragic accident earlier this year along the Tennessee-Georgia border that killed a number of schoolchildren, and the accident last year in Illinois that killed 11 Amtrak riders certainly demonstrates that more needs to be done to upgrade safety at grade crossings.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the chairman of the authorizing committee insists on a point of order. I would hope he would not do this. I think by allowing this thing to stay in the bill, and I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not actually protect this, we would actually save a lot of lives.

Mr. Chairman, I would concede the point of order, but I would appeal to the gentleman, who I know has a strong interest in safety, and I want to commend him for the efforts last year on the Motor Carrier Safety Administration, that we could have a one-time flushing out whereby this money could be used for particularly poor areas, rural areas, for \$100,000 a pop, where we could take care of the problem, where we would not have some of these accidents. We could save a lot of lives.

Mr. Chairman, I would concede it. The gentleman has every right, but I appeal to the gentleman as a former resident of the State of Pennsylvania and a graduate of Penn State, that he would allow us to move ahead with this.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we are very sensitive to this issue. That is why we increased the Federal share in this program from 80 percent to 90 percent. But we do believe that there is a State interest here. The Federal government does not have all the responsibility, even though we have increased the responsibility from 80 percent to 90 percent.

Beyond that, in TEA-21, we increased the funds for safety by 44 percent. It is the States which are making the decisions as to where they get the most bang for the buck in safety.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 40,000 people killed on our highways every year. We think it is quite appropriate for the States to decide whether they want to put their money. In terms of the efficiency of saving lives, the bang for the buck in saving lives, it is very clear that lighting, straightening curves, guard rails, do provide more bang for the buck.

Nevertheless, we recognize this problem as one of many problems, and that is why we have increased it from 80 percent to 90 percent. I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if I may speak further on the point of order, what we were trying to do, I would tell the chairman, is just have a 1-year period to flush it out. I commend the gentleman for all these safety things, but I think for 1 year, I would ask him for that.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I insist upon my point of order.

The Chairman. The point of order is conceded and is sustained. The section is stricken.

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

SEC. 334. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2001, funds made available under section 110 of title 23, United States Code—

(1) for the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, may be used for capital costs for vehicles and facilities, whether publicly owned or privately owned, in accordance with section 149(e), that are used to provide intercity passenger service by rail (including vehicles and facilities that are used to provide transportation systems using magnetic levitation), if the project or program will contribute to attainment or maintenance of a national ambient air quality standard within a nonattainment or maintenance areas, and

(2) for the surface transportation program, may be used for capital costs for vehicles and facilities, whether publicly owned or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity passenger service by rail (including vehicles and facilities that are used to provide transportation systems using magnetic levitation).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against section 334 on page 51, line 22, through page 52, line 18.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order against this section on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill and in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SABO. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure where we are in the bill right now. We moved ahead by unanimous consent. I thought we were moving forward simply for points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has been moving forward for points of order and for amendments.

Mr. SABO. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that we revert for a potential amendment back to section 331.

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

Mr. WOLF. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would ask, what would this basically mean, that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) would have an opportunity to speak on the amendment?

Mr. SABO. To offer her amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection. We will permit the gentlewoman to go back and offer her amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) may offer her amendment.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 51, strike lines 8 through 10 (section 331). Redesignate subsequent sections of the bill accordingly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment offered by myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), and I believe that eventually and we hope that eventually this will see the beginning of a resolution that really deals with community-based efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to strike the language that limits the use of funding, of Federal transportation dollars for the planning, design, or construction of a light rail system in Houston, Texas.

Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to speak on this floor and to ask for collaborative support on community-based efforts dealing with the great needs of regional mobility in an area that is working to comply with clean air requirements.

As a representative of the area that would see the benefits of this light rail project, and as a representative from Houston that would see the larger benefits, I want this floor to know that this is a collective and collaborative effort.

Houston Metro simply wants to transfer \$65 million in Federal funds earmarked for construction of a light rail project in my home city of Houston. The rest of the monies would come from other local sources. What better collaborative Federal-local government collaboration than to see the matching funds, the effort that the community is making.

The light rail project, Mr. Chairman, has been vetted extensively in our community. It has been vetted by the Metro board, the city council, the mayor of Houston, who is, of course, a supporter.

I have received support from the local surrounding congressional Members, the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. TURNER; the mayor of the city of Houston, the county judge of the city of Houston, the Houston Partnership, the Medical Center, the Astrodome area, of which this connector would connect.

If we just envision a straight line going through a myriad of areas in a city, some high, some low, this light rail connector is in fact a dream effort to ensure a working laboratory to give further data and insight into the idea of regional mobility.

1000

It connects the large Astrodome, where the Republican National Convention was held, along through some depressed areas, along through our museum area, the Rice University, Main

Street, as most of our towns have their Main Street, which have fallen upon hard times, then into our vibrant downtown area, and connecting the University of Houston Downtown that serves a high population of Hispanics and African Americans.

This light rail is a win/win circumstance. It is a system that has been frugal in its analysis. No comment or criticism has come from the Department of Transportation that this is not a good system. No criticism has come that they are overrun with the new executive director and CEO of the Metro, Shirley Delibero, we brought in a very fine rail professional.

We know for sure that this rail system will help to generate feeder lines if the community so desires in parts west, north, south and east, reaching to all parts of this Metroplex.

Mr. Chairman, as we have seen the proposal of the light rail, we have seen a light come into the area. We have seen the beginning of a 27-story high-rise office building. We have seen the work of Trammell Crow residential, which is evaluating from 250 unit multiservice or multifamily housing complex in midtown Houston. We have seen Camden Development complete a 337-unit apartment project in midtown, and McCord Development, which has two high-rise office redevelopment projects underway.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, what I am hoping that as we evidence to this body, both Democrats and Republicans alike, although this does not rise to the level of a point of order, it is a limitation. We ask that this body give respect and credence to a collective group of individuals who have sought only to see a return on their tax dollars and to match the work that has gone on in Washington, D.C. that has moved people from place to place; Seattle, Washington, our sister city; Dallas, Texas, and many other parts of this Nation that have had rail and have seen the pollution come down and people being moved efficiently.

This city is seeking to have their Olympics in 2012, and I know by saying that I might rise the ire of some of the other competing cities, but we are working very hard to bring that Olympics to the United States, of course, and certainly to Texas and certainly to Houston. This is a real key component to doing that, an economic engine.

And I do believe that those who may find fault with what has happened in the past in 1991 will come to the realization that they can find no fault in what is going on right now.

There have been meetings and hearings, and there are stakeholders and people are concerned. I would ask my colleagues to consider this as we proceed. I would have liked to see this amendment come to the end. I intend, at the conclusion, of the debate to withdraw this amendment, because I am hoping that we can enter into an abbreviated colloquy to say that we will work together.

I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) on the floor of the House. I want to work with him, but I do want us, as a community, to be able to move into the 21st century. I look forward to my colleagues working with me and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Mr. BENTSEN to offer an amendment to section 331 of this bill, H.R. 4475 that would only prevent funding for the planning, design, or construction of a community supported light rail system in Houston, Texas.

As a representative for the 18th Congressional District in Houston, I fully support the transit funding that was appropriated for Houston and approved by the Department of Transportation for the light rail project.

The Houston METRO was to transfer \$65 million in federal funds earmarked for construction of a light rail project in my home city of Houston. The rest of the \$235 million needed would come from local funds slated to build Park and Ride centers and other projects.

Mr. Speaker, the light rail project is supported by the Houston METRO, the surrounding congressional districts of Congressmen BENTSEN who is a cosponsor of this amendment, GENE GREEN, LAMPSON, DOGGETT and TURNER, the business community, the Mayor of Houston, Lee P. Brown and the Harris County presiding elected official Judge Robert Eckels.

This light rail project is a Win-Win situation for everyone in Houston as well as the millions of people who visit every year in that it would attract and focus new development and an economic boom around the station areas and to the economically depressed areas within the City of Houston and the 18th Congressional District which I represent.

In fact, an independent overview written by the Greater Houston Partnership which includes the Houston Chamber of Commerce, Houston Economic Development organization and Houston World Trade stated that the economic impact of the Light Rail Project in Houston would have an estimated incremental development over the 2001–2020 period ranging from 0 percent to 40 percent.

The light rail project would also reinvigorate retail sales in Downtown Houston as well as link the two principal employment centers of Houston which is made up of 200,000 employees.

Some of the local businesses that began to plan for the economic boom that the light rail project would bring are Century Development, which started plans to build a 27-story high rise office building with a 1,500 space parking garage and 50,000 square feet of retail space; Trammell Crow Residential, which is evaluating two 250–300 unit multi-family housing complex in midtown Houston; Camden Development, which recently completed a 337 unit apartment project in midtown; and McCord Development, which has two (2) high-rise office redevelopment projects underway totaling over \$50 million in renovation fees.

These are only some of the redevelopment that is being implemented as a result of the light rail project in Houston which was to receive federal funding.

Houston has also been hit with major concerns about air quality and requirements for improving its air quality through better mobility plans. Therefore, the light rail project for Hous-

ton is of urgent need to the community. The Main Street light project is welcomed by the residents of Houston. Light rail will help alleviate Houston's traffic congestion problem and significantly reduce the number of motorists that presently pollute the air with exhaust.

The light rail project will play a pivotal role in regional transportation. Among other benefits, the light rail project will service all day transit demand, including peak hours.

It will relieve bus congestion in the urban core as buses from throughout the region currently converge on downtown. This project will offer a transportation choice to many area residents who will choose to leave their vehicles at home.

I will be absolutely opposed to any efforts in the appropriations committee that would hinder or prohibit the timely funding of this urgently needed project.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). And before I comment, let me just say two things: I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the time had gone by and this amendment would have been ruled out of order, and the gentleman could have blocked it and he did not.

Secondly, having been on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for these many, many years, no one has done more with regard to mass transit in the Houston area than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). In fact, years ago he asked me to go down to Houston and to look at it, and the rapid bus transit and the concept he has, has really been adopted by the FTA in many, many areas.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has been the advocate and the champion every time we have begun going through this with regard to protecting and gaining the necessary funding from the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Government with regard to funding for the Houston system.

The amendment strikes a prohibition in the bill that prohibits the planning, design and construction of light rail in Houston, Texas. This prohibition is necessary as proponents of light rail in Houston seek to alter an existing full funding grant agreement for a bus program.

They would like to replace bus elements with the light rail program, and the whole country is actually moving more towards the bus than the light rail. The committee cannot support the amendment of full funding grant agreements which seeks to replace the bus program with rail elements, particularly when the light rail project is still very early in the planning phase.

We cannot support the use of commitment authority for such projects so early in the design phase. This too has been the long-term policy of the Federal transit administration. With that, we would strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered

this morning by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I am co-sponsoring it.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I have the greatest respect for the majority whip, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is well within his rights as a Member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, but the gentleman is simply wrong in this amendment. And this issue has gone far beyond whether or not there will be a light rail project in Houston.

There will be a light rail project in Houston; I now am convinced of that. The issue today is not whether it will happen, the issue is whether the taxpayers in my district that I am honored to represent and the district of the gentlewoman from (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), where this project will run, will get to get any of their Federal money back to fund it, or whether they will have to fund it all out of local money.

Now, that would be all right, except for the fact when we look at the bill before us today, and there are hundreds of millions of dollars going to light rail projects all over the country, and they are not just projects in New York, in Los Angeles, in Chicago, but they are all over the map. They are in cities much smaller than the city of Houston, which is the fourth largest city, Atlanta; Dallas is receiving \$70 million. Galveston has received money for a trolley line; Fort Worth is receiving money for a trolley line; Johnson County, Kansas, I am not even sure where that is; Little Rock, Arkansas; Lowell, Massachusetts; Pittsburgh Northshore Central Business District is receiving \$10 million in this bill to study whether or not to set up a light rail project to run from a new football stadium to a baseball stadium through a business artery. That is equivalent to what the Houston Metro folks are trying to do.

It is more than just sports facilities. It is the main artery in the central part of downtown Houston that runs through the Texas Medical Center, which is the largest medical center in the world. There are 160,000 cars that move through that medical center complex everyday. And there is a huge congestion problem that is occurring there. If we do not build this rail project, we do nothing for that, because we cannot continue to build parking lots, and there is not enough room to build enough roads. So it is not a question, and I know the question from Sugar Land is very concerned about this, it is not a question of taking monies that might be built on roads in other parts of the greater Houston area and helping fund part of this light rail project, because if that were the case, we are already doing that with money that we are putting in Fort Worth or Dallas or Lowell, Massachusetts or Johnson County, Kansas.

This is a question of equity for the people of Houston. Now, my colleague,

the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has already spoke about the community support for this project. This project is fully supported by the Metro board. It is supported by the Republican county judge. It is supported by the mayor who is a well-known Democrat. It is fully supported by the Greater Houston Partnership, which is the Chamber of Commerce for the City of Houston; certainly, not a left-leaning group in any sense of the word.

It is a project that has broad support. And I know that my colleague, and we have talked about this, has concerns about where this project leads and whether or not the citizens have a right to vote on it, but I would argue that I doubt of the multitude of light rail projects that are funded in this bill that many elections were held. And the fact is, this is something where we have broad-based community support. And this is something now, in talking with the folks at Metro in Houston, is going to happen.

And this is not, this is not what happened in Houston 10 years ago where there was division in the Metro board, there was division in the business community, there was division in the political community. This is where the City of Houston Metro area folks are unified in support of this project.

This language is going to stay in this bill today. This debate will be had another day, but inequity which will occur to the citizens of the greater Houston area will be in this bill, because we will be paying our tax dollars to fund other rail projects in other parts of the country.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman that is really unfair to say, though, Metro, your system in Houston, has received over \$500 million, any one of those localities would gladly trade places. Some of them are getting mere pittances. And I have been there. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has been the advocate for this from the very, very beginning with regard to the money. So when there is mention of a place in Kansas that is getting a sum, that is really not fair. Houston is getting \$500 million.

Mr. BENTSEN. Reclaiming my time, all we asked was for a reprogramming.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in kind of a unique position on this issue, one, because 10 years ago, I was at the same place my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is in; I was a State senator, and Metro in Houston was proposing a heavy rail system that would take so many dollars into such a small geographic and community area for the

service. And it would have meant that the rest of our area, including the Congressional district that I have now, and my State Senate district at that time, would not have had revenue for either expansion of the bus or even heavy, light rail or anything at that time.

And as the State senator, I introduced a bill opposing it, and along with some other colleagues from Houston of mine, who is currently still in the legislature, because we needed to get the attention of the local community, because they were not being responsive. And as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) said, it was not so much support for it as it was at least along a corridor that wanted it at that time. But I have watched the Houston Metro over the last 10 years, and with the help of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to where they have literally the state-of-the-art bus system, the park-and-rides in the country. And it would not have been done for this last 10 years without the support of this Congress.

I also noticed over the last few years in watching these other cities, and granted, we cannot compare Houston to someone in Kansas or even Pittsburgh, because Houston is the 4th largest city in the country. And I say that all the time, because I think a lot of people think, well, wait a minute, why does Houston need this; the fourth largest city, New York, Chicago, LA, and then Houston.

If we look at the top 10 cities in the country, every one of them are looking at, planning, or having in place some type of rail system. And, again, if this were a heavy rail, I would oppose it, because I do not think that is possible in Houston. I do not think we can do that, it costs too much. But I think a light rail, particularly this proposal that serves a central business district, the University of Houston downtown that has grown in the last 10 years, to be such an educational facility, to serve the south part of the City of Houston around the Astrodome complex which is also in the district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN); this is not in my district.

I represent still the north and east part of Houston. But I can see that this would be a benefit to the whole community; one, because we have clean air problems. We need to look at every alternative, more than just buses and rubber tires. We need to look at every alternative.

I have seen the success of Enron Field this year, the state-of-the-art baseball stadium, the number of people. I used to think Houstonians would not get out of their cars and take a bus, much less a train, because so many of us have so many cars. Some of them do not run, but we still have the cars.

I watched as people will take the park and rides down to a baseball game in the evenings and the growth in the park-and-rides for the central business district. And that is why I think just

the reprogramming of this money is something important.

Now, I cannot fault my colleague from Sugar Land for what he is doing, because, and he knows, having been in the legislature, I oftentimes tried to provide guidance to my local elected officials, because this was tax money that we have to vote on here on this floor, and so I do not fault that. In fact, even though, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), we probably only vote together about 20 percent of the time, believe me, the gentleman is a good friend for many years, a personal friend. I do not fault that.

1015

I just hope that the seven members of the Harris County delegation, all of us who share Harris County in the metro area, could sit down and say, okay, what can we do to make it work? I do not want to give them a blank check because I do not want that and I would oppose it. But I think on a short scale, and watching what our neighbor in Dallas has done with the light rail and the success they have had that started out as a very small line that it is actually going to serve more people in the Dallas County area, I think we can learn from that.

I have learned, in the last few years, Houstonians will get out of their cars and take a fixed guide rail to go somewhere. That is why, on a small scale, I think we can do this.

I know we are not going to vote on this today. My colleague is going to withdraw the amendment. But, hopefully the seven of us in Harris County can sit down and work this out so we can make sure that our air quality benefits, that we literally go into the next century and look at what we are doing with the redevelopment of the central business district and, also, even with the growth and, hopefully, with Houston's bid for the Olympics in 2012.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize to our colleagues that we are taking up the time of the House for something that should be settled in Houston, Texas. But I rise and feel the need to rise to explain what is going on here.

Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in mobility around Houston for 20 years. I have been involved in the regional mobility plan and in developing that plan in the 1980s that we are now finishing.

I am very proud of the fact that the city of Houston, as my colleague says, the fourth largest city in the country, just does not do things like everybody else does. We are a major city and a great city in this country because we do not just do it the same way. We are the city that built the Astrodome. We are the city that has a port that is off the shores of Texas and the second largest port in the Nation.

We are a city that does not say that they are not a great city unless they

have rail. And the reason is, and I might point out to my colleagues, if they had been involved in all the rail systems as I have, and the chairman has for over 15 years, they would understand why L.A. is getting out of the rail business, because it is a boondoggle and a black hole for a city that is spread out like L.A.

I might say that Houston has stepped outside of the box and developed a regional bus plan that is the model for major cities in America. This bill has over \$20 million in it, finishing the last part of \$500 million in building one of the best bus systems in the world. Because we did not grab ahold of the notion that, in order to be a great city, they have to have a rail system.

Every line that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) talked about, every one of those lines, loses huge amounts of money and takes money away from mobility systems for those cities. But they do get to take a picture of a nice train and put it in their brochures, and it makes everybody feel good.

The problem here in this particular dispute is that the Houston Metro, following the design of many other cities, and the gentleman says no elections were held in those other cities, it is because the other cities did not pay attention to the voters in those cities and developed the same strategy that is going on here in Houston. They developed the strategy of starting a little starter line; and when it does not make money and becomes a huge hole for transit funds, they go to the people and say, we made this great investment, but it does not work only because we do not have this other line.

And when that does not work they say, well, we are just going to build another line. And then they wake up and develop what Dallas now has. Dallas now has a rail line, but now has surpassed Houston in congestion because Dallas is more concentrated on rail than they are for the mobility in Dallas.

I do not want to see that happen in Houston. It is my responsibility as a member of this committee to make sure that the full funding grant by the FTA, the \$500 million, is finished.

What Houston Metro wanted to do is take money from the regional bus plan, from our regional mobility plan, and move it to a rail line that makes no sense whatsoever, transportation-wise.

My good colleague and friend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) says no criticism. There is all kinds of criticism, including Houston Metro's own study that says, this does not help mobility, this does not help transportation, and this does not help the environment.

This is an economic development project to build a signature main street in Houston, Texas, a very worthwhile project. But this is not a transit system. This will not carry anybody. This will not get anybody off our freeways. This will not get Bubba, I say to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) out of his pickup and put him on a rail system. This is an economic development project.

My position is, if they are going to build a huge rail system in the Houston region, then the people of the Houston region ought to vote on it and decide whether they want a rail system or not, instead of doing the back door way that was done in Dallas, that was done in Portland, that was done in Miami, that was done in many other cities that I described. There is no transit benefit here.

Mr. Chairman, major transportation decisions like the proposal to build this system in Houston should be decided by the whole community. As things stand today, Houstonians cannot make an informed decision because Metro does not have a comprehensive light rail system to take to the voters. The people of Houston cannot make an informed decision about what the role of this project would play in reducing congestion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, that is why I took the action to suspend the diversion of Federal funds previously approved for in other transportation improvements to fund this light rail project.

As I said when I announced my opposition to this process, three things have to happen before the light rail goes anywhere. First, Houston must gather all the facts. They need to commission a regional congestion study that will identify the problems that are hampering mobility in the region today. Then Houston needs to develop a comprehensive regional mobility plan that provides solutions to our current problems. We are at the end of this full funding contract. It is time to redo a regional mobility plan.

Before taxpayers pay \$300 million to develop light rail along the Main Street corridor, should they not have a comprehensive plan that shows how the light rail proposal would fit into the regional transportation plan? The mobility plan must also anticipate further transportation needs.

After all the facts are assembled, the taxpayers need to have a final say. Houston must be given a referendum on the decision to build the Main Street line.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, decisions like this ought to be decided by the voters, not through bureaucratic end fighting. The excuses that supporters have given just do not hold water.

In 1998, the city held a similar referendum under the same laws. What is

disturbing about this whole process, Mr. Chairman, is the full and open discussion of the transportation needs and costs associated with this project. The people of Houston need to know not only what exactly it is they are getting on Main Street, but also what they have to give up elsewhere to get it.

Now, my fundamental reservation about this project remains. How would investing enormous amounts of their tax dollars in the light rail project for Main Street help my constituents, the constituents of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the constituents of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the constituents of the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and all other Houstonians?

I believe Houstonians deserve all the information on this huge investment. Houstonians have a right to make the decision for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of what the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) are doing in providing transportation for all of us.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend an invitation to the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation to come and visit Houston again.

I want to acknowledge and appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for his collegiality in allowing us to debate this. I agree with him. I would rather not have my colleagues engaged in this dialogue.

I was not here in 1991. I was a member of the Houston City Council when we thought we had done everything that we could have as a local community to indicate that rail was something we thought would work very well.

I cite Dallas. I do not know the procedural process which they use. But I do not think if we were to query the mayor of the city of Dallas and constituents of Dallas that they would not acknowledge that they like their DART, it is working, and they want more of it.

Frankly, I am applauding this appropriations bill. I think they have done a great job. I do not want to take away from the cities like Atlanta, Boston

and Baltimore. But the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not realize that he has really helped Metro and they are using the procedure that he, even though he is not on the authorization committee, certainly conceded to in TEA-21, which language was put in to allow Metro to take one project out and substitute another. So we are not really violating either the letter of the law or the spirit of the law.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman obviously knows that that procedure includes the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, and that can approve or disapprove reprogramming; and Metro failed to tell the people of Houston that very fact.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Chairman, I think that they were operating under the procedural point that it could be done. But I think that really the real point here is that I solicit my good friend, we have chatted, we have had meetings with local officials, that we sit in the room and get whatever documentation, whatever review process, whatever vetting the gentleman needs to have to be had.

But I think it is important. And I take little different perspective. Yes, this light rail can be done. But I think that it is sinful for Houston, among other national and international cities, to be denied their rightful Federal dollars on transit.

This is a transit line. Transit lines are connectors. They are people movers. This is a people mover. This moves a major center from one end to the next. The Medical Center has been crying for some sort of rail system so that their individual people do not have to drive their cars into that already overpopulated area. They can actually park at the Astrodome and take the connector in. This is a center where people come for all kinds of international medical services.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that I realize his distaste, if you will, for the rail system. I am only saying I, too, apologize to my colleagues that we are here on the floor of the House bringing a totally local-base issue to the floor of the House. I saw another one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) do it the other day. And he won. He had Republicans and Democratic support.

My colleagues all need to understand that the people who are involved in this light rate connector are having the support of the entire community. We have had town hall meetings. We have had hearings on this issue. But if the gentleman wants more, I am willing to do so.

I think the question has to be that we have to look at these inner city areas where those of us who represent

inner city urban areas that can allow those populations that live in those inner city areas to, as well, be treated to a fair and adequate mobility system.

Mr. Chairman, let me read this into the RECORD: 'For the most part, even the top executives interviewed did not have a clear understanding of what 'enhanced bus' really meant. But even after a fairly thorough description was provided, they did not perceive any significant difference between an enhanced bus and conventional bus. A typical statement was 'enhanced bus is still a bus.' They believe light rail would be far superior.'

That is what people perceive, that light rail works. I only plea to this floor and I plea to others as this bill makes its way through, applauding the work of the ranking member and the chairman that this is a good bill. But I am saying to my colleagues that they are doing us a disservice.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SABO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) rose to the floor, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) rose to the floor, I simply ask, accept my invitation to visit Houston so that they can see the work that we have done, realize that we are not trying to chastise the committee for any funds that they have given elsewhere. We appreciate the hard work.

But how can they deny the fourth largest city in the Nation, a city that is wonderfully diverse, African-Americans, Hispanics. We speak some 98 languages. As I said, we have the west, the east, the north, and the south. But we have a collective, cohesive committee that is led by a mayor now who is in charge of the confined area in the city limits in which this light rail would find itself who is enthusiastically for it, but he has collaborated with the county judge, which is a much larger region; and I believe that my colleagues are well aware that our business community is supporting it, as well as our constituency.

I will go home on Monday to hold a hearing on this subject, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) who is on the committee; and I believe that we will find everyone who will come and testify will come and testify to say that we want light rail. We hope this body listens to us.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment because I do believe that we can work with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and I hope he will let us work with him and ensure that we come to the best results as we move forward in this process.

1030

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Members are reminded to address the Chair and not to address other Members by their first names.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 335. Item number 273 in the table contained in section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178) is amended by striking "Reconstruct I-235 and improve the interchange for access to the MLKING Parkway." and inserting "Construction of the north-south segments of the Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway in Des Moines."

SEC. 336. Item number 328 in the table contained in section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178) is amended by inserting before "of" the following: "or construction".

SEC. 337. Section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 256) is amended—

(1) by striking item number 63, relating to Ohio; and

(2) in item number 186, relating to Ohio, by striking "3.75" and inserting "7.5".

SEC. 338. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any departmental official to authorize project approvals or advance construction authority for the Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project in Boston, Massachusetts.

SEC. 339. Section 3027(c)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note; 112 Stat. 2681-477), relating to services for elderly and persons with disabilities, is amended by striking "\$1,000,000" and inserting "\$1,444,000".

SEC. 340. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated balances from section 149(a)(45) and section 149(a)(63) of Public Law 100-17 and the Ebsenburg Bypass Demonstration Project of Public Law 101-164 may be used for improvements along Route 56 in Cambria County, Pennsylvania, including the construction of a parking facility in the vicinity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COX

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COX:

Page 54, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 341. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning, development, or construction of California State Route 710 freeway extension project through South Pasadena, California.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the Rogan amendment that will facilitate effective traffic mitigation at reasonable cost for the citizens of South Pasadena and the surrounding communities of Pasadena, Altadena, La Canada, and East Los Angeles. The reason that I am offering the Rogan amendment, and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) himself is not here to offer it, is that in addition to being a dedicated Member of this House, he is also a dedicated parent. He and his wife Christine at this moment are attending to the urgent medical needs of their daughters. He would very

much himself have wanted to be here to offer this amendment, and I am happy to do it in his stead.

This amendment is supported by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as well as environmental organizations, including Friends of the Earth and the Sierra Club. It is identical to a measure passed with bipartisan support in the last Congress. It will reduce the cost to taxpayers of freeway construction in southern California and free Federal funds for traffic mitigation and infrastructure support projects.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accept the amendment and support the amendment. It is the same language as last year.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, in a sense I rise to oppose the amendment, but I will not. I do not like these kind of amendments coming on the floor where we really do not have background on what they are all about. However, we faced the same amendment a year ago, I opposed it, the House voted to adopt it by a significant margin as I recall, so it is not totally new and was in the bill this last year. While I do not think it is a good idea, I also understand that it is going to happen.

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join him. I think the reality is that the votes are there to support this amendment but I think it is misguided. This project, from my knowledge and my personal view of it, is it is a missing link to the interstate system in California. For 20 years, projects have been reviewed appropriately and met the environmental reviews necessary to advance the project.

The Federal Highway Administration has supported the review and public involvement in the project. Federal funds have been made available for construction. The State supports the project and is willing to advance it. But I think the reality is that there are the votes marshaled already on the floor, as my colleague from Minnesota said, in the last session, the previous session of Congress, to support this amendment. It is unfortunate, and I agree that amendments of that kind should not be presented here. We will make the case but not make the vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 54, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. . The amount otherwise provided in section 326 for the Amtrak Review Council is hereby reduced by \$530,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by thanking the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for the excellent piece of legislation they have produced, which I am happy to support. Let me also acknowledge that the chairman of the committee is acceding to the wishes of the administration in the present funding level. Therefore, our quarrel is not with him, it is with the administration that supported the funding level. I appreciate his fairness on this issue over the years.

This issue is about micromanagement and second-guessing. I believe that the management of Amtrak has made excellent and positive strides in improving the fiscal health and performance of the rail line. I believe that they will continue to be moving in that direction. I also believe that they should move in that direction and that we as a Congress should evaluate from time to time their progress and the best next step. I do not believe that we need another body standing in between the will of this body and the management and directors of Amtrak. I think that the Amtrak Review Council is frankly an unnecessary appendage and I believe that more money simply invites more mischief. This House last year overwhelmingly sent a message that funding should be limited to the level of \$450,000. That is what this amendment does this time.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, also I want to praise the chairman of the committee for what I think is a fine bill. I do rise today to support the gentleman from New Jersey's amendment. During the debate on the last two transportation appropriation bills, I have worked closely with the gentleman from New Jersey to both reduce funding for the Amtrak Reform Council, ARC, and to ensure their funds were used properly. In both years we were successful in passing amendments to keep the ARC Council's budget in check. Unfortunately, after last year's successful effort to reduce the funding for what I think is an arguably misguided situation with the council, an increase in funding was restored in the final version of the bill. As a result, of course, as has been mentioned, we are again here to take our case to the House floor to again contain an ever increasing reform council budget.

The gentleman from New Jersey's amendment, which reduces the budget from \$980,000 to \$450,000, is an attempt to place a necessary constraint on an organization that really I do not think does seek the reform of Amtrak. As was mentioned previously, also, the budget has doubled in the past 2 years and I know that we had an overwhelming vote on this. It had tremendous support. I urge my colleagues today to support the Andrews amendment as they have previously done and

to reject the increase and give the ARC a fair and certainly adequate budget.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, because of the compelling arguments and also because every time this issue has come up, the gentleman has won overwhelmingly, we accept the amendment.

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I would have supported striking funds altogether. From the very inception of this council it is clear that many of its members have already made up their mind that Amtrak will not meet its goal of self-sufficiency and are devising their own plans that in effect assure failure; for example, holding closed conferences where the statute requires open meetings; their empire building by hiring consultants and contractors. In their preliminary assessment of Amtrak they set out a plan calculating operating expenses that Congress never intended to include in the Amtrak reform.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

The Amtrak Reform Council was authorized by section 203 of the Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 for the purpose of evaluating Amtrak's performance and making recommendation for cost containment, productivity improvements, and financial reforms. The council is comprised of 11 members. The council is supposed to take into consideration the need to provide service to all regions of the nation. If the council concludes that Amtrak will not reach the goal of operating self-sufficiency by 2003, it is supposed to inform the Congress and submit plans for a complete restructuring of a national system of intercity rail passenger service and a plan for liquidating Amtrak.

From its inception, it has been clear that many members of the council have already decided that Amtrak will never meet its goal of operating self-sufficiency and are already devising their own plans for what a restructured system would look like. The council's history has been replete with evidence that it is pursuing its own, anti-Amtrak, agenda. They have conducted closed conferences despite the fact that their statute requires open meetings. They have sought to "empire build" through hiring consultants and contractors.

In January 2000, the council revealed its true colors with the issuance of its report, A Preliminary Assessment of Amtrak. In that report the ARC measured Amtrak's progress toward operating self-sufficiency using a definition of operating expenses that the Congress never meant to be applied to Amtrak for the purposes of measuring Amtrak's progress. The council elected to include depreciation expenses and progressive overhaul expenses in calculating the total operating expenses that Amtrak would have to cover through operating revenues. This was clearly not what the Congress had intended. Indeed, if the Congress had intended that Amtrak cover these ex-

penses it would have been clear at the outset that Congress intended for Amtrak to fail. It would have been setting an impossible standard. It has always been clear that Congress did not intend these costs to be included in the operating expense category.

The council chose to ignore the congressional intent and measure Amtrak by its own standard. Interestingly, as soon as it was challenged at hearings before the Senate, the council's chairman immediately backed off from the position. While we agree that he should have backed off, this is not the first time that the chairman has acted on his own on behalf of the rest of the council.

The council does not deserve an increase in its funding based on its dismal record in providing an unbiased, independent assessment of Amtrak.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment pending be changed by taking out "Review" and inserting the word "Reform" so that it is in compliance.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

On line 2, strike "Review" and insert "Reform".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LINDER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LINDER:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 341. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Transportation to require any State or local government to alter a zoning or land use plan for the purposes of a national ambient air quality conformity determination.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, this also is an amendment that deals with the Federal bureaucracy micromanaging, in this case how counties run their business. Mr. Chairman, in 1998 we passed the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, otherwise known as TEA-21. Under this bill almost every region in the Nation was able to benefit from the additional transportation dollars made available through the Highway Trust Fund, every region, that is, except my own.

The Atlanta metro area has not been able to spend a dime of its Federal highway allotment for more than a year and a half. This is because Atlanta has not met Federal clean air standards since 1996 and the Clean Air Act prohibits further road and transit construction until a plan is presented that will bring the city back into conformity.

For over a year, the Atlanta Regional Commission, which is tasked with drawing up the plan worked with local leaders and Federal officials to craft a plan that complied with the law and met the needs of Atlanta's residents. However, in a suspicious move on the day before the ARC was slated to approve the plan, two Federal agencies, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration stepped in the way. In a letter to then ARC Director Harry West, these agencies cited five serious concerns with the plan that ARC officials had resolved months before. Unless these requirements were met, the Federal Government said, Atlanta would not get its money.

Aside from the obvious concerns that this raises about the tactics used by this administration to work with local governments, all of the three remaining requirements that must be addressed have never been demanded of another metro area in America. They are demanding that the counties comply with their new zoning ideas, their ideas on mass transit funds and environmental justice.

We looked in the statutes for the definition of environmental justice. It appears in Executive Order 1289. It has to do with disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority populations or low-income areas. It further goes on to say that we must not only not do that but we must prove we do not, prove a negative.

No other metro area has been asked to do this yet. This is unacceptable, and I present this amendment and others today in an effort to demand equity and fairness for all Americans who are facing down out-of-control bureaucrats wielding environmental regulations. If we are to believe the Federal Government's demands before Atlanta will be able to get the gas tax money that TEA-21 grants it, county commissioners and State regulators will have to sign sworn documents saying that they will change the way they zone the land in their jurisdictions. In other words, they are accountable to Federal officials, not the voters when they zone the land my constituents live on.

1045

Last week's supporters of CARA said it was outrageous for opponents to claim that the Federal Government wants to get in the land use business. It already is. The FHWA and FTA in Atlanta have already said they will require counties and cities to build more apartments, put houses closer together and build rail lines into downtown districts. If they do not, they will take away our highway funds again. In fact, they may even rely on another State agency appointed by the Governor, the Georgia Regional Transit Authority, to enforce their standards for them.

For the record, there is no title, no section of the Clean Air Act that requires regions to sign over the zoning

authority to Federal agencies. This is a standard made up completely by the Clinton Administration, a standard that no other city in America has had to meet. However, we have heard on multiple occasions from Federal officials and environmentalists that Atlanta "will be a model for the Nation."

If you like what you see in Atlanta, do not worry, it will be coming to a city near you.

No local official should ever be bound by Federal officials to conduct the basic job they have been asked to perform. It is an affront to a constitutional republic itself when an elected official takes his marching orders from anyone other than the voters who elected him. That standard applies for government bureaucrats as much as it does interest groups.

My amendment would prohibit the FHWA and FTA from requiring any local or State official to be legally bound to alter their zoning or land use plans to satisfy the Federal bureaucrats. I ask Members to support this amendment, protect local governments from this outrageous assumption that Washington knows your neighborhoods best.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we regret that we must oppose the amendment. The committee was not notified about these amendments until 9:00 this morning. The amendments may have significant implications for the Clean Air Act's policies and enforcement. The ramifications, quite frankly, are not even known by the committee, and we really have not had time. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but, regretfully, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, our lateness will cause me to withdraw the amendment. Part of the problem came because it was just this past week in a meeting when the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority was talking about the need for smart growth and was asked during the meeting what is the definition of "smart growth," and nobody on the commission knew what it was, so they appointed, in their way, a committee to determine what it is. These are late developing things in Atlanta. I will be dealing with you further.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VITTER:

Page 54, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 341. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for engineering work

related to an additional runway at New Orleans International Airport.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I offer this amendment to prohibit any funds under this act from being used for engineering work on an additional runway at New Orleans International Airport. We offer this because we want that airport to be properly developed into the powerful economic development engine it could be, and we know that this will never happen without fundamental reform in the areas of regional governance and professional management.

The City of New Orleans runs New Orleans International Airport, but the facility lies well outside the city, surrounded by other communities, most of which the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I represent.

For too long, the city has made unilateral decisions that have a major impact on these surrounding communities, creating real and growing tensions. Our citizens continue to be dramatically affected, and they have no real governance voice, no real seat at the table.

Now the city wants to build a new runway, wholly within Saint Charles Parish, which the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) represents, and still not address the governance issue. They want to do this with about 70 percent Federal and State money, almost \$500 million. This is not only unfair, it just will not work. It is doomed to failure, particularly since the airport is without appropriation power.

Regional governance is the key. Recently an independent study by the Bureau of Governmental Research recommended the transfer of airport control to a broader-based regional entity that would facilitate regional governance cooperation and expansion. Another outside study conducted by Mitchell & Titus recommended that "The airport's future vitality depends on gaining cooperation from Kenner, Saint Charles and Jefferson Parish," all areas that my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), or I represent.

Another need is professional management. New Orleans Airport continues to be poorly managed, spending virtually the same amount of money as Charlotte Airport annually, but offering service to half the number of cities, with one-third the takeoffs and landings.

Mr. Chairman, we would also request that the committee pursue a Federal Inspector General study of the current management practices at New Orleans International Airport to underscore this need.

Regional governance, professional management, let us address these needs on the front end, so that local concerns, very legitimate ones, do not hopelessly stall progress until it is too late to recover. This is essential to make our airport the powerful economic development engine it could be.

This amendment should serve as a wake-up call to the city administration that we must address these needs. I look forward to continuing to address these needs through the conference committee on this bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Louisiana. I believe the project should not move forward until there is regional consensus reached by all the affected parties.

We had a similar situation in my region when we transferred National Airport and Dulles Airport from the Federal Government, one person operating it. We set up a regional authority, whereby there are now people from Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia that operate both National and Dulles Airports.

My understanding is that the proposed runway will be completely located in the district of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN). That, again, has been a major controversy in this region with regard to noise. The gentleman's cosponsorship of the amendment this morning indicates his consensus has not been achieved. I also believe the DOT Inspector General should examine current management practices at the airport.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and look forward to working with my colleagues on this crucial economic development issue for the citizens of Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very disappointing development. The economy of the City of New Orleans and the entire region is built upon tourism and conventions. The city and the region have invested in this mightily over the years, and it has made New Orleans the second most important destination city in this country. It is vital to our economy that the airport continue forward with its plans to build and construct this runway. Otherwise, the city will not be in a competitive position.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), my colleague from the area, who is recently now sharing a part of the City of New Orleans representation with me, has taken the place of Bob Livingston who I shared this with for many years. Bob Livingston, every year, in and out, worked with me on all of these issues, in the quiet of our offices and in a very congenial way, and we supported jointly the airport's expansion and all the rest all these years. Why suddenly is it some sort of issue that needs to be dealt with because we are concerned about management of the airport, when these issues have not come up? This is not the place and this is not the time. This forum is inappropriate for us to deal with local issues of how local people get together about regional governance.

I should say to you there is reasonable governance at the airport now already. There are members on the airport board who represent the City of Kenner, which is part of the district of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), who represents Saint Charles Parish, and part of the district of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), already there.

What configuration does the gentleman want? Does the gentleman want to dictate exactly the terms of the regional governance, or can the local people get together and work on these matters?

What is important here is that we not interfere with the plan that is going on, which in the next 5 years is going to mean if we do not do this in the next 5 years, we are going to lose competitive position. So there are no management studies that say we need to do something here drastic in this Congress, or otherwise we will run the risk of ruining Federal money and not doing the right thing by the people of our country.

There are no divides back home about this. Our local Chamber of Commerce supports the runway projects, our local tourism commission supports the runway project. I do not know of anyone who doesn't support it except the folks over here say, and really run by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), who says we need to have a regional governance structure in place acceptable to him before we move this forward.

I think it is just wrong. I do not think we ought to place in jeopardy jobs in New Orleans, the economy of our city, because someone here wants to see a certain governance structure in New Orleans. The local people can work these problems out, as they have over all the years. New Orleans built its airport in Jefferson Parish when there were not any people there. That is why it was built there. Over time that area has grown up, there are residences there and there are businesses, all of which now must be taken into account. But it is a painful process that is best sorted out in a local forum, in a local environment. That is the only way this can be done.

This is the equivalent of a shotgun wedding. I think somehow or the other somebody believes you can have regional cooperation by forcing people together. That is an absurdity. It is an oxymoron. It makes no sense. People have to get together and work on matters cooperatively. We cannot force it in this Congress.

So I would ask this House not to agree with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), because this airport is in my district, it belongs to my city. It must expand in other areas, but it is just wrong to slow this progress down, and I say it would ruin our airport's prospects and ruin our economy, have us lose jobs. It is simply to please the idea that we ought to have a different regional governing structure,

which I submit to you this Congress ought not be involved in.

So I would ask Members not to approve this amendment today, because it is just wrong for our city, it is wrong policy for the Congress, it is wrong-headed action altogether.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we need to put this issue in perspective. The New Orleans Airport is indeed owned by the City of New Orleans, but it is not located in the City of New Orleans. It is located principally in Jefferson Parish, principally in the area represented by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER). It is partially located in a Parish of Saint Charles. We do not have counties, we have parishes in Louisiana, so I apologize for some of the confusion. The County or Parish of Saint Charles, it is one of the counties or parishes in my district.

Now, the proposal by the New Orleans Airport Authority is to extend the airport with a new runway into Saint Charles Parish, a significant change in the location of flight patterns and aircraft movements and a difference in literally noise and safety concerns for the people of Saint Charles Parish.

Unfortunately, Saint Charles Parish is allowed one representative on the New Orleans International Airport Board, appointed by the mayor, not selected by the people of Saint Charles Parish, and that is all they have on this board. There is no real local input in the governance of the airport, no local input into the decisions that are made with regard to takeoffs and landings and all the issues that are important when communities are affected by airport extensions into their rural, and, in this case, suburban communities.

So what the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) is proposing is a very simple thing. It simply gets us into the conference committee, where hopefully we can begin the discussions with the City of New Orleans on how in fact to move towards some reasonable regional governance of this facility before it extends into another county, another parish, like Saint Charles Parish, another Congressional District even such as my own.

I want to point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) that indeed we have always talked and cooperated on these issues, and I think we will again on this issue, once we get past this point. But last year the New Orleans Airport Authority, without consulting my office, without talking to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), tried to get language into the TEA-21 bill that would have, in fact, appropriated \$30 million for property purchases in the Parish of Saint Charles to move this extension forward without ever talking to us. We found out about it almost by accident, that it was being added to the bill with the help of some lobbying group here in Washington, D.C. hired

by the City of New Orleans. Now, that is not the way to cooperate either.

I think we can reach a point of cooperation and agreement if we simply get to the place where I hope we can get in the conference committee where we can talk.

I just want to make this one point. If we could amend this bill today, to say that the airport extension could go forward if, in fact, we move significantly to regional governance, that is the amendment we would have offered today. We cannot do that under the rules. All we can offer is some sort of prohibition on spending. So what we have chosen in this amendment to do is to prohibit engineering payments. We understand that not likely are there going to be any engineering studies done anyhow.

This amendment simply gets us into the conference where we can talk with our two Senators, and the three of us, hopefully with the City of New Orleans, can perhaps work this out. That is why I hope we adopt this amendment today, and put us all in a position where everybody sort of has to talk, whether they like it or not.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

1100

Mr. JEFFERSON. Is it not true that the airport authority has no appropriation authority and that it cannot go into St. Charles Parish and appropriate the property of St. Charles Parish? Is that not true?

Mr. TAUZIN. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly true. That is the point the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) made, and let me answer it. It is true, and that is all the more reason why we need to talk. This extension will not occur until the community of St. Charles has an agreement with the City of New Orleans and the community of Jefferson Parish has an agreement with the City of New Orleans. It is not going to happen by sneaking changes or amendments into the law to provide for \$30 million to go out and buy property in the district I represent.

It is only going to happen when we have the conversations I think this amendment will lead us to.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman paints a pernicious picture of actions that have taken place in the heat of the night without the gentleman knowing about it. As a matter of fact, the runway project, as the gentleman knows, has been in progress here for many, many years. This is not something new that happened this year.

Mr. TAUZIN. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman indeed knew, this gentleman and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) knew, of New Orleans' interest in extending that runway.

We have been supportive of the airport doing so.

We have always, however, reserved our support upon conditional conversations about regional governance, conversations leading to some real say-so from the parishes, the counties, affected. We have not gotten to that point. This amendment gets us there.

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

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious here that this whole effort is being made to bludgeon the City of New Orleans' leadership into some sort of a forced meeting because the proponents are unhappy with the progress of these meetings. These are painful discussions that must take place on regional governance. These are not things that can happen overnight and it cannot be forced to happen; nor can the city force any runway into St. Charles Parish.

So if money is appropriated here for a study to take place and for engineering to go forward, in the end there is going to have to be some meetings and agreements between the New Orleans people and St. Charles people. There is no need for this. This is simply overstepping, overreaching, as far as I am concerned.

Now if we want to talk about Members doing things in the middle of the night without my knowing about it, there were amendments offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) that I was not apprised of, and the airport is in my district. I did not know they were even offering them.

This is a shameful fight that we ought not be involved in. We ought to be saying to each other, how can we go to the Federal authority and get as much money as we can to help to make New Orleans as competitive as it can be and make our airport as vital as it can be so we can stay in the hunt for convention and tourism business? And then go home and let the local people, with our help and guidance and support if we can give to them, to work out the hard details of how they govern the whole matter and how they work out the issues. If there are management issues, and I just heard this today, I have not heard this from anybody else who has any authority, who have done any management studies to find things that are sharply wrong with the airport, that we need to worry about holding up Federal money because of management issues. This is all made up. That does not exist.

There are no management issues, I want to make it clear, because it besmirches the whole reputation of the board at the airport and of those who are involved in management. There is no mismanagement at the New Orleans airport.

There are some folks who would like to see things go a different way, of

course, as there always are, but there is no evidence of mismanagement. I think to bring it on to this House floor is absolutely dead wrong.

So I would urge this House, in the strongest terms possible, to give us a chance back home to work our own matters out and let our city have the leadership it deserves on this issue, and to not hold up a vital project for the City of New Orleans airport. That cannot be justified on the basis of we need governance, a better governance structure or any other such thing as that because New Orleans cannot impose its will on the local and surrounding area. It cannot at all do that without the cooperation of those areas, and we cannot impose regional cooperation in the region unless the region itself gets together to work with it.

So I would urge my colleagues to rethink their position on this, to let us continue as a delegation to work together on these important matters and not to create walls here that are going to prevent our cooperation in the future on matters very important to all of us.

This is important to my region. It is vitally important to us and I would urge this body not to let the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) step in now in a matter which is unnecessary to protect the integrity of their districts or their peoples or any such thing as that. They have admitted it does not do that. They have admitted that New Orleans cannot reach over and take any property from Jefferson Parish. They even admit it does not do anything, according to them. They say, well, it does not do much. If it does not do much, it is not much worth our time to do anything here.

So what I would urge is just to leave this matter alone, and I really wish my colleague would withdraw this whole effort and let us move on to something where we can find a way to help move our city forward, our airport, our region forward, together, as we have in the past.

I have always worked with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I have always worked with the predecessor of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER). I am hopeful I will be able to work with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) as well, but we cannot work together if we do not honor each other's commitments on these areas.

I just think it is dead wrong what is happening here today, and I hope this House will reject it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would just say I find this amendment inappropriate. I do not know how Louisiana governs. I do not know how the city governs. In our area we call them counties. I guess the gentleman calls them parishes.

Twenty-five, thirty years ago we went through the same type of situation in our State; center cities owning an airport, eventually a regional struc-

ture to govern, but that was created by the State legislature, not by local units of government. As a matter of history, at the point of time that it required local property taxes to start the airport, those were only levied in the center city. By the time we made it regional, all local property taxes had disappeared.

Now I suspect the gentleman's situation is different. We are not the legislature of Louisiana, and so I think it is just totally inappropriate for us to start interjecting ourselves into this governing structure of the airport in New Orleans. I am sure it is a controversial issue. It, however, has to be worked out in whatever local fashion they are worked out in Louisiana, whether it is negotiation between the affected communities or by action in the State legislature, but we cannot be second-guessing that.

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

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

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make four points quickly in response to some of the comments from my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON). I believe he said he had no notice of this amendment. If he said that, I certainly want to make the record clear that I informed him of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. I did not say that. I was referring to amendments the gentleman made in committee some time ago, not to the amendment the gentleman is making today.

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

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

Mr. VITTER. Okay. I appreciate the clarification because, in fact, I gave him notice yesterday of this amendment within 5 minutes of deciding to move forward with it.

Secondly, I want to underscore why the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I are doing this. It is because we want progress; we want to move forward and build toward a great airport which can be an economic development engine, and this will never happen without starting these discussions about regional governance and professional management.

Thirdly, I want to address the comments of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) about a local discussion. I would love a local discussion. We have been asking the mayor for a local discussion and the mayor has specifically refused to be a part of any meeting where the term "regional governance" is on the agenda.

So the whole purpose of this exercise is to begin that absolutely essential local discussion which the mayor of

New Orleans has absolutely refused to participate in.

Finally, with regard to the suggestion that this is not the place to bring up this issue, if this is not the place to talk about these needs then presumably this is not the place to look for half a billion dollars for this runway work because my constituents pay into that fund and the constituents of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) pay into that fund and they deserve to be heard on these important related issues. So if this is not the place, then fine. Perhaps the airport and the city should go back to the drawing board and look for a half a billion dollars somewhere else.

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

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out again what occurred last year was an amendment to the FAA authorization bill that provided \$30 million, instructing the FAA to give priority consideration to land acquisition in St. Charles Parish, and we had received no notice of this. We discovered the amendment after it had, in fact, entered into the bill.

It is for that reason that we need this amendment. We are not asking that the regional governance issues be settled. All we are saying is give us this amendment and that will compel the parties indeed to talk about regional governance.

We met with our Governor in Louisiana and the Governor is prepared to help us achieve this result. We simply do not think this extension ought to go forward. Until we have had those discussions, that is what this amendment will help us do.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), we have worked together many, many years in the State legislature and here in Washington, D.C. He knows of my close friendship and my effort over all of these years to work with him. I can give him my assurance that if we get this thing into conference we will have those discussions; we will get back to a position where the mayor and the Governor and we and our two Senators can begin to reach for common solutions.

I simply have to make sure that the folks in St. Charles Parish I represent, just as the gentleman has to make sure that the folks in New Orleans that he represents, are properly represented in these discussions. They are currently not. They want to make sure, as their representative, and I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) has the same situation in Jefferson Parish, that those discussions actually happen.

There is no promise of discussions. There is no refusal to meet, but they actually have to happen before we go forward. Why? Because we all want to go forward. We all want to see the airport completed. We want to see new

runways created. We want to see regional governance and regional cooperation around that airport, and I give the gentleman my word I am going to work with him to that end.

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

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have no problem with the assurances of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) on any matter. I have worked with him for many, many years. I simply beg to differ, to say that that is not the issue that we are dealing with here.

I have had many years of cooperation with him and I would hope we would have a day of cooperation on this matter because it is very, very important to us. It is important to us that we do not slow down this project, that we do not jeopardize our economy and jeopardize jobs and jeopardize where we are going down there, and jeopardize the future of our airport over the question of whether if we get a matter in conference we can somehow force a meeting with the mayor. That is an absurdity.

What are we going to accomplish in conference, a governance structure or something that is going to fix the whole issue? No. It is going to take many months of painful discussion by local people, no matter what we do here.

The suggestion by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), that if this is not the right place, this is not the right place to seek for money, is an absurdity because the FAA and the Federal Government are deeply involved in building airports all over the country and local governance structure is being imposed by State and local governments all over the place as well. So these things are going in parity and they ought to go here in parity.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WOLF was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to respond to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON). We do not want to slow anything down. That is specifically why the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and I chose a spending item that is virtually certain not to occur under the normal timeline this next fiscal year anyway.

So we specifically chose that spending item with that in mind, and I certainly want to pledge my active cooperation to work on this issue. Again, all we are trying to do is begin the discussions which, quite frankly, the mayor of the City of New Orleans,

going back to our efforts last year, has refused to initiate. He will not attend a meeting with regional governance on the agenda, and that is the heart of the problem.

Certainly I pledge my cooperation to work with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and we look forward to doing that in a timely way so we do not slow anything down and, of course, we fashioned our amendment with that in mind.

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

Mr. Chairman, coming from the State of Michigan, we have our problems and we know exactly how hard it is to regionally come to this Congress with a solution and we are working very hard on that, not without obstacles and not without many of them, but we continue to work locally to see that we bring to the Congress, during its precious times of negotiations, not only the proper match that the projects will require but that the region will agree on what we come to the Congress with.

This is very much a local issue and I believe that it ought to be settled locally before it comes to this Congress, Mr. Chairman. With that, I would like to yield to my good friend from New Orleans, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), in whose district the airport lies.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I say in response to what has been said by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), he has on two occasions said the mayor has been unwilling to meet. That is inaccurate.

We had a New Orleans delegation meeting up here and invited the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER). He came to the meeting and we talked at that point about the issues. He has met with local people about this matter over many, many months. It is just a hard process. There is no slam dunk answer to this. It is going to take time. People have to work it out.

When I say this is not the place to do it, it is not the place to do it, as the gentleman has pointed out. The place to do this is in the halls of local government, where people can decide these issues after negotiation.

1115

To come up here and try in some sort of a prophylactic way to kind of prevent any kind of differences from occurring back home about these issues, we cannot do it. They are going to have to take place. People are going to have to have discussions. There is nothing that can be merited by this, except setting a precedent for getting this Committee and this Congress involved in dictating local government structures.

That should not be what we should be doing here. We should be working on larger issues of how the FAA relates to our local communities, how they support our local airports or not, but not the issues of local government. That is too hard for us or anybody else to do.

To use this forum to kind of beat the city of New Orleans, the Mayor and other folks, into a meeting with us is a misuse of it, a misuse and an abuse of the process, I suggest.

In the name of cooperation between us, the best way to do that is to work on these issues collegially here today, and not to have it said that somewhere down the road one of these days, after we get this passed, we are going to work cooperatively. We cannot. This is going to make it more difficult for us to work cooperatively and for the local folks to work cooperatively, rather than the other way around. It is not going to do anything but make matters more difficult to resolve back home.

I have talked to the gentlemen from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER and Mr. TAUZIN, about this ad nauseam. They are hell-bent on this course, for reasons that are hard for me to understand, except that they have the power to do it. I believe that is the wrong reason. It ought to be done because it is the right thing to do, not because they think they can do it.

I hope that out of all this that we will find a way down the road one day to think better of each other and be more tolerant of each other, and respect the city of New Orleans more in its desire and plans to get things done.

I think we have a very competent mayor, a very competent council, a very competent board at the airport. I would like to see their work upheld and given a chance to succeed, and not have these Members of Congress getting in the way of having that done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also want to commend the Chair and express my appreciation to the Chair for his earlier admonition that Members address the Chair and not refer to each other by name; to observe the rules of the House, a practice that is becoming observed more in the breach than in the respect.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is a good example, an object lesson, for the reason the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Subcommittee on Aviation, both Democratic and Republican leadership, has always resisted individual designations of airports or runways in the authorization bill. Those are not issues for this body to resolve.

I take no position on the merits of the issue being debated this morning, but I do take a position on the initiative offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) to have this body interfere as a matter of national law in what is essentially a local decision-making process.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, appropriately referred to the process that Congress established for the resolution of the management of airport capacity at both national and Dulles.

The reason Congress acted is that those are the only two airports the national government owns in the United States, of 17,000 airports. In the national plan of integrated airport system, only two airports are owned by the Federal government. They were turned over in fact, in a management sense, although the Federal government continues to retain the ownership of those airports, to a regional council.

Whether the airport in New Orleans should be expanded or retracted, whether it should be managed in this or that manner, is a matter not for this body to resolve but for the people of New Orleans and the surrounding communities, be they parishes or cities. All should be done in accordance with the national plan of integrated airports established by the FAA which establishes a national system.

If we improve a highway in Duluth, if improvements are made to Interstate 35 in Duluth, that has virtually zero effect on I-35 in Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas. But if the airport in Duluth is improved, it does have an impact on the national airport system. If the airport in Louisiana is improved, it has a beneficial, or if it is not improved, it has a negative effect on the National Airport system. Airports are vastly different from highways.

For the Congress to take the initiative proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana is to insert ourselves into essentially a local decision-making process which is going to be reviewed at an appropriate time in its developmental stage by the FAA. We should let that process run its course.

The debate we have heard unfold this morning is a replica on the national scene of a debate in the city council of New Orleans. We are not at city council. We are not the governing council for parishes. The gentlemen from Louisiana, the respective gentlemen from Louisiana, are having a fine debate that they ought to have back home, not on this floor. This floor ought not to resolve this matter. This amendment ought to be defeated.

In accepting such an amendment, we set the stage for innumerable debates. The discussion about New Orleans airport, MSY, will be picayune compared to the debate that will unfold on this floor if we get into a third airport for Chicago, of which we saw only a minuscule discussion earlier today.

I say to my colleagues, the gentlemen from Louisiana, please take their issue back home and get the local governments to resolve it. Bring the FAA in to help. I am sure the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUN-

CAN) would be willing to help in that process. I would be willing to help. But this floor ought not to resolve this issue. We ought to defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 505, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. 342. None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Federal Aviation Administration to install a Terminal Doppler Weather Radar at the site of the former United States Coast Guard Air Station Brooklyn at Floyd Bennett Field within Gateway National Recreation Area in King's County, New York.

Mr. WEINER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank my colleagues, the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and my coach, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their great leadership on this issue. No two people work harder on aviation concerns than they do.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to address what is a policy that is included in the FAA that is contrary not only to common sense, but is contrary to congressional mandate, it is contrary to environmental policies, and it is contrary to sane and safe aviation policy.

Right now the Federal Aviation Administration is attempting to erect a 130-foot Doppler radar tower that would help to detect wind shear at Kennedy and LaGuardia Airports, something that I support. They are proposing to do it in the heart of a national park, of Gateway National Recreation Area in my district in Brooklyn that borders on Queens.

This is a policy that is contrary, first, to congressional mandate. In 1976 when this park became the possession of the National Park Service and it was turned over, Congress wanted to make sure that this type of installation was

not put there, so language was put in the bill that said, "Nothing in this section shall authorize the expansion of air facilities at Floyd Bennett Field," exactly where this radar tower is going.

It is also contrary to congressional mandate in terms of our national parks. That is where it also runs afoul of our environmental policies.

I would ask my colleagues to think about any other National Park facility that has an FAA radar tower on it. Members can think as long as they want, because there is not a single one. We would shudder to think of putting a radar tower in Grand Tetons Park or in Grand Canyon Park or in Redwood Forest. We would never think to do it.

But because this National Park is one that is a little different, it, we do not see it on flyers for the National Park, though it is someplace where hundreds of thousands of visitors from an urban area that covers frankly a very big footprint in three States come to visit. It is not the most beautiful, the most sensational, but it is a National Park that people come to commune with nature. It is contrary to environmental policies, according to the Department of the Interior, to put such facilities in a National Park.

Finally, and this is the point that I think will be most salient to members of the committee considering this bill, it is contrary to aviation safety. Members do not have to ask me, they do not have to trust me. We have to read the EIS produced by the FAA when they were pushing this plan. They say that it has big blind spots that prevent this radar from seeing Kennedy and LaGuardia Airports.

Why? It is at the very southern tip, far from where they had suggested this thing be placed. It says there are blind spots because of the topography and geography of Queens, so they cannot see the busiest part of the busiest airport in LaGuardia.

It also says in the same EIS that they are not crazy about this site, but Congress said they could not do their first choice. In fact, it is not even as good as the suggestion that the Members from New York have suggested, which is to put it on an island, a Potters Field off the water of the airport that would have a clear vision. It is not even as good as that site. "We want to do this site, well, because we are in a hurry. We want to hurry up and move along with it."

Frankly, we hear testimony all the time in the Committee on Science and in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that shortly this technology that they are going to be erecting is going to be outdated and obsolete.

Do Members know how many more of these radar towers there are on God's Earth? None. Why? They are not being built. The technology has passed it by. There will shortly be technology available to put right in the nose of planes that will obviate the need for this.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this has been a debate that has been clouded by a certain amount of hyperbole. The supporters of this initiative in the FAA said, if we do not hurry up, God forbid, there will be a crash, a disaster, and planes are going to fall from the sky.

So we have put aside all of the evidence to the contrary. We have put aside a more thoughtful process. We have allowed ourselves to be scared into installing a Doppler radar tower that is contrary to congressional mandate, contrary to environmental policy, and contrary to aviation safety.

There are places to put this radar tower that I support and the community supports. This is not it. This is against the law to do this. I believe the courts will rule that way if this Congress does not. It simply is contrary to common sense.

I thank my colleagues for giving me the opportunity to bring this issue, but let me remind them, this is not the only National Park. This is not the only time the FAA is going to want to encroach on our National Parks, but this should be an opportunity for us to say, let us stop it here. It is bad policy, and my amendment would make sure that no FAA funds go to supporting that policy.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would be a killer amendment. Talk about killer amendments, this would be a real killer amendment.

This issue has been going on for so long. We have put language in the bill over and over and over, and to say that it is hyperbole when we have the Charlotte Airport, and if they had been able to locate a terminal Doppler down in Charlotte, that accident may not have happened. We had the Little Rock situation.

This has been going on. This was a Coast Guard helicopter station and not some serene National Park. For people, anybody who flies into LaGuardia or Kennedy, this is a major, a major safety issue. If this amendment would be adopted, Congress would just be flying in the face of all the aircraft safety.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly, if this were to come to a vote, urge Members to just vote against it, or put a big sign up outside of LaGuardia and Kennedy saying, we could have done something to make these airports safer, but because Congress did not act, they are no longer that safe.

1130

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, if he wishes to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me just say I have a great deal of respect

for the chairman, but if this becomes law, I will tell my colleagues what would happen, they would build it at a place that was smarter, they would build it at a place that is consistent with environmental policy, and they would build it much quicker, because the lawsuit that is going on is not going to stop simply because we like it to. This is contrary to government policy.

However, in the interest of the opposition of the chairman of whom I respect, I move to withdraw the amendment at this time with every intention to pursue this in the future.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. MANZULLO:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 341. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds may be made available to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration under this Act before the Administrator—

(1) reclassifies the pay classification of each air traffic controller who, after August 31, 1997, left employment at an interim incentive pay facility for other employment as an air traffic controller and who returned after October 1, 1998, to employment as a reentrant at such a facility, such that the controller's pay classification is equal to the pay classification the controller would have if the controller had never left such facility; and

(2) pays to each such controller the amount of any difference between the salary that the controller earned after leaving the interim incentive pay facility and the salary the controller would have earned if the controller had never left such facility.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I intend to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, but I would like to speak on it for just a couple of minutes.

We have all had casework matter that hits a dead-end, and most of the time we can help our constituents. However, there are times when you know something is wrong with the system and you have to take the extraordinary step to get some action.

Today I am offering an amendment that I intend to withdraw for procedural purposes, for the purpose of giving support to those air traffic controllers across the country who have been hurt financially by the resulting agreement between the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

In accordance with two laws passed in the 104th Congress, the FAA was directed to consult with a bargaining unit, in this case, the NATCA, to develop a pay plan to set compensation for air traffic controllers. The resulting agreement was a Memorandum of Understanding With Respect to Reclassification and Association Payrolls Between the National Air Traffic Controllers Association and the FAA dated 8 January 1998, and has since been amended with subsequent Memorandums of Understanding.

The resulting agreement and subsequent MOUs provided certain dates whereby pay reclassification was set depending on where an individual was based one day, October 1 of 1998. The Manzullo amendment seeks to correct this pay discrepancy for those air traffic controllers who did not receive commensurate pay increases upon their reentrance to one of the Interim Incentive Pay facilities, that is the high volume control facilities, such as Chicago.

The FAA, by its own admission, urged employees to take certain career moves in order to advance an individual through the supervisory ranks. In a particular case with my constituents, Carlos Contreras, the FAA claims he was promoted. Because of the timing of the so-called promotion in relation to the agreement between the FAA and the NATCA, this air traffic controller realized he would lose quite a bit of money per year.

Upon his realization, he requested to go back to the Interim Incentive Pay facility where he had been for 15 years. Again, because of timing and bureaucratic delays, he could not make the change soon enough. He apparently is not alone.

I have attempted to get a meeting with Jane Garvey, the head of the FAA, and though I have not been denied an opportunity to meet with her, there have been enough delays to make me want to proceed today. My office has been in touch with the FAA several times about the matter. We know that there are about 12 individuals nationwide impacted by this agreement.

The FAA says that it does not have the authority to be fair to Mr. Contreras and to the 11 or so others so situated. My amendment simply seeks to provide the FAA with that authority. It prohibits the FAA from spending any money until such time as they have treated these air traffic controllers who are responsible for safety in the sky with justification and judicial reasoning.

The resulting move to Mr. Contreras hurt him financially. He was requested by his boss to go to another area. He was promoted but he got caught in a web that resulted in a substantial decrease in his pay.

We have reason to believe there are only a dozen or so individuals. This amendment is for justice for these hard-working air traffic controllers. My understanding is that the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is willing to work with me in setting a quick meeting with Ms. Garvey to see if there is a way that we can compensate these air traffic controllers.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, yes, that is correct. We will be glad to work with the gentleman in setting up a meeting with Ms. Garvey.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INSLEE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 341. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to fund the Office of Research and Special Programs of the Department of Transportation until the operator of the 16-inch oil pipeline running from Allen, Washington, to Renton, Washington, has completed hydrostatic testing of the entire pipeline at 125 percent maximum operational pressure and has submitted the results of the tests to the Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. INSLEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, colleagues last June in Bellingham, Washington, an oil and gas pipeline exploded and the ensuing fireball killed three young men; that pipeline company now seeks to reopen that pipeline. It is a 16-inch pipeline that runs right through the heart of East King County in my district without properly testing this line. They seek to reopen this line which suffered not only this failure that killed three people, but suffered a subsequent failure disclosed under water pressure testing.

This company seeks to reopen this line without doing that same water pressure testing and exposing my constituents to that risk; that is wrong. This amendment would simply require that company to do what it ought to do as a good neighbor and hydrostatically test this line, a common sense, well-recognized test that will prevent a recurrence of the type of tragedy that we experienced.

Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of work to do nationally on our oil and gas pipeline safety, and I am very hopeful

that the appropriate committees will have hearings on this subject. I have a bill. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) has a bill. We have worked together; we hope that we can nationally revise our oil and gas line pipeline safety standards.

I have to tell my colleagues that those standards are the consistency of Swiss cheese right now, and we need to do it nationally, but a start is to do it in my district. This amendment would take care of that issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. T4Smith) who has been joining me in this effort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) for bringing this issue forward. The issue of pipeline safety is one that touches the entire country. Those of us in the State of Washington experienced it in the worst way possible a year ago, but it is by no means isolated to our State.

Pipelines run throughout this country and have been very loosely regulated for a number of years. The system of regulating pipelines quite simply does not work. As the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) mentioned, there are a variety of different ideas for how to change that. But I rise today to make it clear to my colleagues how important it is that those changes are made, first of all; and, second of all, how important the issue of hydrostatic testing is doing that, the idea of testing the pipes to see if they can withstand the pressure that they have to withstand in order to protect our communities. It is of critical importance.

I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) to bring this issue up in the transportation bill and any other place that we can do it. This is a threat to our entire country. As I said, in the State of Washington, several children tragically died as a result of this.

It is also an environmental hazard that has struck many different parts of our country. We need to do something to improve pipeline safety in this country. This amendment is a great first step, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the rest of the body to hopefully give us a sound pipeline safety policy in this country that will protect all of our citizens.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for that comment. Just so the Members will understand why this type of testing is so important, after this pipeline blew up, the City of Bellingham required this pipeline company to do this hydrostatic test, and when they did this test, the pipeline blew up again, but, fortunately, because the pipeline had water in it instead of gasoline, it leaked water rather than gasoline.

I have a constituent who has a real common sense approach. If we do not

trust these pipelines to hold water, we ought not to put gasoline in them, and that is why we have to have hydrostatic testing and will.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) will join us in hoping to have hearings on this subject this year. The other Chamber has had a hearing on this. We are ready to have hearings on this and go. I really hope that the gentleman can accommodate us in this regard. I understand this will be subject to a point of order, but we do want to get this issue front of center.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia insist on his point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitute legislation on the appropriations bill; therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

The Chair is prepared to rule. Although drafted in the form of a limitation, the amendment does not merely place a negative restriction on funds in the bill, rather it prescribes a contingency concerning the conduct and reporting of certain tests. Thus, the amendment proposes to change existing law. The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BILBRAY

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BILBRAY: Page 54, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 341. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for acquisition of diesel buses except those buses, powered by engines which have emission levels comparable to, or lower than, emission levels from buses powered by low-polluting fuels, including methanol, ethanol, propane, and natural gas.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we reserve a point of order.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as an individual who had the pleasure of working on mass transit, but also on clean air strategy, it has always been a frustration for many of us in the environmental community to see while the Federal Government and government as a whole demands that the private sector leave dirty polluting technology behind and move towards cleaner technologies, the Federal Government itself continues to allow its money both directly and indirectly to be used in purchase of the polluting technologies that ruin our environment, are totally counter to our Federal clean air strategies.

Now, let me say at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I greatly appreciate

the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) in moving this issue forward and moving away from the old concept that pollution is okay if it is a government agency, and towards the new concept that government needs to participate in cleaning up our environment.

The gentleman has been a strong, strong supporter in the concept that we need to move this issue along, and I appreciate his long support on the issue.

In the last Congress, Mr. Chairman, I offered a similar amendment in TEA-21, in 1998, but because there were some concerns in Congress that the technology had not caught up with this amendment, we basically withdrew it, and, instead, implemented a GAO study to see if the technology was available to replace dirty technology.

That study was released in 1999 and shows that while diesel technology has gotten better, the alternative technologies are already available and have been used by local governments for over a decade. Since TEA-21 became law, there has been a lot that has happened with science of technology and clean environmental approaches.

Now, while we have got these new technologies, we have also gotten information about diesel, that diesel engines contain cancer-causing substances, such as arsenic, benzene, formaldehyde and nickel, these are emissions coming out of vehicles being purchased with American tax dollars. Diesel contains over 40 substances listed by the EPA as hazardous, and the Air Resources Board has identified those 40 substances as toxic air contaminants.

In November of 1999, I introduced a bill to say it is time we stop this hypocrisy, the Federal Government, and government as a whole, should be cleaning up our act, not continuing to pollute, while the private sector is being mandated to clean up.

Mr. Chairman, I have learned many things while working with my colleagues on this issue in focusing on trying to get our technology in line with our strategies, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BONO), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), many others have been working on this issue.

I intend not to call for recorded vote, and I am going to ask for consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), who has raised this issue before.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California. He has made a real contribution to focusing on this issue, and I have great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee. And I just like some of urban America to be as green as his beautiful country and district that he represents. And we should not be funding diesel equipment in any of these bills anywhere, be it the Nation or the State or the county, and what we need to concentrate on are the

natural gas technology and particularly the battery technology.

Since the appropriations subcommittee here puts in \$190 million for the aviation situation, I would hope that we could, in the future, get millions more to really bring this clean technology into all of the areas of the United States. The CAFE situation now, the Corporation Average Fuel Economy, my heavens, we saved 3 million barrels a day by having that kind of economy.

1145

So I thank the gentleman and I hope that we will get an investment in batteries and, if there can be, clean diesel, which I am dubious about. I just do not like the smoke that gets in my eyes in Washington, D.C., where it is Federal money; at Dulles, where it is Federal money, and we ought to stop that.

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

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the gentleman's effort in this area, and all of our colleagues' efforts, including the chairman of the committee, to work vigorously to avail ourselves of these new technologies, not only for the private sector but for the public sector.

Cleaner fuel and better gas mileage is good for the economy. It lessens our dependence on foreign oil, it improves the balance of trade, saves consumers dollars, it is good for the environment, increases energy security, new technology, and creates jobs. This is an overall good effort, and I am sure in the next Congress we will find a way to make this happen.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am just asking that as we ask the private sector to invest in cleaner, more environmentally friendly technology that we finally stand up and say that the United States Government will not set aside just a portion of its transportation money for clean air and good environment, we are going to now say that all of our transportation funds should be aimed at clean technology and good environment and clean air; that the Clean Air Act is just as important and that the public health is just as important, and that is going to be implemented here.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been frustrated by the spending of federal dollars on polluting technologies, which runs absolutely counter to our other federal clean air strategies.

Let me say, however, that I greatly appreciate the work which has been done over the years by Chairman WOLF, to move away from this old concept and to encourage the use of cleaner technologies. He should be commended for his work, and I appreciate his long-time support on this important issue.

In the last Congress, I offered a similar proposal as part TEA-21, which became law in June of 1998. Due to concern over the proposal, this became a GAO study of the availability of alternative technologies.

That study was released in December of 1999, and shows that while diesel technology has in fact gotten cleaner, alternative technologies are readily available for fleet use, and are being used in many locations (for many years in my own county of San Diego, for example).

Since TEA-21 became law, we have seen a great deal of new science on diesel emissions, and increased public concern over their health effects, especially on children.

While the technology has gotten cleaner, we know that emissions from diesel engines contain potential cancer-causing substances such as: arsenic; benzene; formaldehyde; nickel, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

Diesel also contains over 40 substances listed by the EPA as hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and by the California Air Resources Board as toxic air contaminants (TACs).

In California, the ARB has been working to reduce the risks from all sources of diesel.

In November of 1999, I introduced legislation which would achieve the goals being discussed here today—H.R. 3376, the Cleaner Technologies in Transit Act. I hope to be able to work with many of my colleagues together on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I've learned many things from my colleagues since I started focusing on this process here in Congress. I know that there are a number of cleaner, alternative technologies which are not only available, but in use in many of my colleagues' districts.

MARY BONO, ZACH WAMP, STEVE HORN, and many others have told me about the work they've done to encourage alternative fleets in their districts, and I greatly appreciate their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to call for a recorded vote, and will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Before I do this, however, I want to thank my colleagues for their interest in this important issue, and for taking the time to work with me and inform me of their experience.

It is my hope that this discussion today will help move us closer to the goals of my amendment, and my bill, to benefit the public health and the air quality of all our constituents.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I provide for the RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Times relating to the topic of my amendment.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 18, 1999]
STUDY CRITICAL OF EXHAUST FROM SCHOOL BUSES

(By Marla Cone)

California's children are breathing unhealthful exhaust spewed by diesel school buses that are among the oldest and highest-polluting in the nation, according to a report to be released today by a Los Angeles environmental group.

The report, by the Coalition for Clean Air, urges Gov. Gray Davis' administration to set tough emission standards for school buses and to provide tens of millions of dollars to help school districts replace their fleets with new buses powered by cleaner-burning alternative fuels.

About 17,000 diesel buses deliver children to school, including some 20-year-old models that spew dark clouds of noxious smoke. Diesel exhaust, a mix of soot and toxic gases, has been linked in health studies to lung cancer, asthma attacks, allergies and other respiratory illnesses.

Officials of the state Air Resources board and the state's largest school district agreed

Wednesday that the current school bus fleet poses an environmental threat to children but have yet to decide on a strategy to deal with the problem. Diesel manufacturers said they are improving their engines and see no need for schools to switch to alternative technologies.

No one knows how much of a danger bus exhaust poses to schoolchildren—the amounts they breathe have not been measured and no studies have calculated their disease rates. In fact, for Californians on average, heavy-duty trucks pose a far greater health risk, with buses blamed for less than 1% of total diesel emissions, according to the California Air Resources Board.

Nevertheless, Air Resources Board Chairman Alan Lloyd, appointed this year by Davis, said the emissions, while relatively small, could be posing a serious health danger because tens of thousands of children come into direct contact with the bus exhaust every school day.

"We would agree with the coalition that the risk from diesel, particularly from school buses, should be reduced," Lloyd said. "We're trying to crack down on all sources of diesel."

The report comes as the air board is preparing to unveil a controversial proposal in December that would set new state pollution standards for transit buses next year. That proposal, however, will exempt school buses because of the financial burden it would put on California's already struggling school districts. Instead, Lloyd said the board's staff in January will outline a separate strategy for getting cleaner buses at schools.

Buses powered by alternative technologies, predominantly compressed natural gas, are already available and are substantially cleaner than diesel buses. The price tag, however, for converting all of California's school fleet to natural gas would exceed \$1 billion, according to the environmental group's calculations.

Antonio Rodriguez, transportation director at the Los Angeles Unified School District, said the district has been trying to clean up its fleet—it has gotten rid of its oldest buses and the rest meet current emission standards. Also, the district operates a small number powered by cleaner natural gas and hopes to buy more, but Rodriguez said money is the main obstacle because each one costs about 35% more than a diesel bus.

"We're always interested in making sure our buses are as clean as possible," he said. "We all breathe the same air in this basin, and whatever we can do to clear the air helps our kids."

Last year, the state air board declared diesel soot a cancer-causing air pollutant that could be causing 14,000 Californians alive today to contract cancer.

Medical experts say that children are especially vulnerable to the effects of diesel exhaust because they inhale large volumes of pollutants for with their body weight and because their immune systems are still developing. Also, half million asthmatic children live in California, and some medical experts say diesel exhaust can trigger attacks.

The environmental group reports that California ranks among the worst states—47th out of 50—in terms of the percentage of buses built before 1977. Pre-1977 diesel buses emit four times more particle soot and three times more smog-forming fumes than new natural gas buses, according to the air board.

About 69% of the state's 24,372 buses are fueled by diesel and nearly 1,000, or 4%, pre-date 1977, according to data in the report compiled from three state agencies.

"Everyday, our children step aboard and ride a school bus that may intensify their exposure to diesel exhaust, a known human carcinogen," the Coalition for Clean Air re-

port says. "This exposure does not end with the bus ride, however. Exposure also occurs in and around the school grounds when school buses park and idle nearby or load and unload students."

While other vehicles on California's roads are the cleanest in the nation, school buses lag far behind.

Last year, the state air board resolved to promote alternative technologies for school buses and eliminate pre-1977 models. But little has been done to accomplish those goals. One of every five urban transit buses run on natural gas, compared with only 3% of school buses.

In its report, the Coalition for Clean Air urges the state to apply a new bus emission standard to schools. It also wants Davis and the Legislature to provide funds "exclusively earmarked" for nondiesel school buses. School districts, the group says, should adopt policies that phase out diesel buses, and parents should lobby for action.

The future of diesel—long considered the workhorse of America because it powers heavy-duty vehicles from trucks to trains—has been a recent focus of intense debate, especially in California.

Engine manufacturers, who oppose any efforts favoring alternative fuels over diesel, have spent millions of dollars researching ways to reduce emissions from diesel engines. They also question the reliability of health studies that find an increased cancer rate among workers exposed to high amounts of exhaust, and say there is no evidence that school children are breathing in-ordinate amounts.

"We're very concerned about the health and safety of the people who use our products and of the environment, but there's significant controversy at every level about the health effects," said William Bunn, medical director of Navistar International, the largest manufacturer of bus engines in North America. "As we continue to determine what, if any, health effects there are, we are committed to the 'green' diesel approach."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

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

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

The gentleman's amendment is well intentioned but mal-aimed. It should be an initiative on this floor to fully fund the Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program that was established in 1998 under our TEA-21 bill. If that were fully funded, California would benefit enormously by vastly cleaner air.

Mr. Chairman, by offering this amendment, the gentleman makes a good point. I include the following article as further explanation.

HOW CONGRESS IS KEEPING LA FROM CLEANING UP ITS AIR

(By Rep. James L. Oberstar)

Los Angeles and other urban areas around the country are being robbed, and Congressional appropriators are holding the gun.

The City of Angels is famous for its smog. Every day, the exhaust gases emitted by cars, trucks, buses and industry hang over the city like a dirty brown blanket. But LA is not alone. Denver, Detroit, Chicago, Atlanta, even Duluth in my home district in Minnesota and many other cities large and

small across this country are fighting the smog each and every day. Federal and state programs have been put in place to help Los Angeles and these other cities address their air quality problems. One such federal program would help reduce pollution through the purchase of transit buses that burn cleaner fuels, but not all the money allocated for that purpose is reaching those cities in greatest need.

Buses make ideal candidates for alternative fuels and technology programs. They are operated predominantly by government agencies and use centralized fueling stations. Transit agencies spend about \$1 billion annually to purchase buses, and this provides a tremendous opportunity to purchase alternative fuel buses and facilities. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Energy is considering a regulation to require transit systems to switch to vehicles that burn alternative fuels.

California has already moved in this direction. In January, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) issued regulations requiring transit operators to switch to alternatives to conventional diesel-fueled buses. The regulation affects about 8,500 buses at 75 transit agencies in California, including an estimated 3,300 buses in the South Coast Air Basin. The regulation moves forward in several steps over the next 10 years, and allows transit agencies to choose a clean diesel or alternative fuels path to lower air emissions.

On an average day, transit buses throughout the state emit some 24 tons of nitrogen oxide and 1,000 pounds of particulate matter, according to CARB estimates. In contrast, natural gas engines have significantly lower emissions of these pollutants than comparable diesel engines. (Some of these engines also emit slightly higher levels of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, but the increase is small compared to the reduction of nitrous oxide and particulate matter.)

On federal initiative, the Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program (CFGP), commonly called the Clean Fuels Bus Program, can play an important role in cleaning the air. The program was established in 1998 under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). It authorizes \$200 million per year over five years to help transit agencies purchase low emission buses and related equipment and construct alternative fuel fueling facilities. Eligible technologies include compressed natural gas, liquefied natural gas, biodiesel fuel, battery, alcohol-based fuel, hybrid electric, fuel cell, clean diesel, and other low or zero emissions technologies.

Under this program, transit authorities would buy clean fuel buses for areas that are working to address their air quality problems (nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act). Funds would be distributed each year to local transit systems who apply, using a formula based on the area's air quality non-attainment rating, number of buses operated, and bus passenger-miles of service. The formula directs funds to areas of greatest need for clean fuels technology and provides an opportunity to improve air quality in areas such as the South Coast Air Basin, where air quality problems are the most severe.

This worthwhile program has never been implemented. The appropriators in Congress continue to ignore the law establishing the Clean Fuels Bus Program. In crafting the annual spending bills, the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate have been earmarking all of the Clean Fuels Bus Program funds for pet projects, instead of distributing funds in accordance with the formula. Money is being appropriated for conventional diesel fuel projects without regard to the program's focus of improving air qual-

ity. This practice has eviscerated the clean fuels grant program, slowed the pace of urban air quality improvements, and robbed cities of federal funds to which they are entitled.

Los Angeles, for example, will lose \$20 to \$25 million in Clean Fuels Bus Program funding in Fiscal Year 2001 alone, an amount that could have easily covered the federal cost of 100 new clean fuel buses. Los Angeles will probably continue losing \$20 to \$25 million a year as long as the program continues to be implemented this way.

The solution is to put an end to the egregious earmarking practice by the appropriations committees and let the program operate as the law provides.

The case for full-scale implementation of the Clean Fuels Bus Program is clear. The program will reduce harmful emissions in cities that have the greatest air quality problems, marginally reduce the demand for conventional diesel fuel, and help reduce the price of conventional diesel fuel for industries such as interstate trucking. The program will go a long way toward helping Los Angeles make the switch to alternative fuel transit buses.

The time is ripe to invigorate the Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) still insist on his point of order?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time, and I just ask that we not just look at throwing money at this problem but make sure what we spend for transit is consistent with our federal laws.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier there was an interesting discussion on the floor and an amendment that was offered but subsequently withdrawn by the gentleman from Georgia. I listened carefully to his comments, and I respect his concerns, but I feel that he is absolutely taking the wrong approach, and his region of Atlanta is a good reason why.

The region of Atlanta has been characterized by some as the urban area whose growth has been the most rapid in the history of human settlement. A more than 25 percent increase in population has occurred since 1990. The city's region in that time frame has grown north to south from 65 miles to 110 miles. And, frankly, the results have been devastating.

The average Atlanta commuter drives 36.5 miles a day, the longest work-trip commute in the world. And this has had serious problems in terms of air pollution, to the point that the Federal transportation authorities have withheld resources from the Atlanta metropolitan area due to its inability or unwillingness to meet air quality standards.

This has had business implications. The Hewlett-Packard Company decided

not to expand its Atlanta facilities. The city lost its 1997 top rank as the city's best real estate market and is now number 15 among 18 cities that are monitored.

It has health implications. The Centers for Disease Control has found that there is an alarming increase in obesity, and some experts have linked this to the potential of the bad air that discourages exercise, and poor urban design that makes it hard for people to walk, bike and otherwise exercise. Asthma is the number one reason for childhood hospitalization in Atlanta.

The clean air policy conformity provisions were designed to ensure that areas with air quality problems take into account the pollution impacts of proposed transportation projects. The Clean Air Act states that no transportation activity can be funded unless that activity conforms to the State's clean air plan. The State of Georgia, the Regional Atlanta Commission, and the U.S. DOT were finally sued by a coalition of environment and civic groups because of the inability to comply with the law.

Last March, the Federal Court of Appeals ruled that the EPA regulations violated the Clean Air Act and the EPA and the U.S. DOT were forced to revise their guidelines surrounding grandfathering. Now we have had the Federal Government and the environmental groups agree that the current policy is in fact appropriate, but because the State was able to turn things around so quickly, not a single dollar of Federal funding was lost in the process.

During the conformity lapse, money was redirected from polluting projects to projects already in the plan that either had no negative impact, like bridge reconstruction and safety improvements, or showed air quality benefits, such as transit and high occupant vehicle lanes. The proposed amendment that was discussed would have undermined the conformity provisions and make it easier for regions to ignore air quality in their transportation plans, speeding the march towards gridlock and away from clean air.

But Georgia has been making progress under the current program. The coalition of citizens, business, homebuyers, and environmental groups have formed a coalition to address the air quality and traffic congestion concerns. Governor Barnes, with the support of the business community, created the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority to coordinate and oversee for the first time metropolitan Atlanta's fight against pollution, traffic and unplanned growth.

There is an exciting 130-acre redevelopment in the old Atlanta Steel site that is combining residential, retail office and entertainment space in a transit-oriented development on a brownfield site in midtown Atlanta.

Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of legislation introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), The

Road Back to Clean Air Act, which would put into law the EPA and DOT conformity and transportation planning guidelines that were key to addressing the air quality problems in Atlanta, Georgia. The bill would increase the flexibility so other areas of the country could continue to receive Federal funds for transit, safety improvements, road rehabilitation, and other projects, even during a lapse in the conformity of their transportation plans.

It is decidedly misdirected for us to retreat from our commitment to clean air and to try and use this legislation to do so. We would be far better served to try and make the system work, and in Atlanta it is working and is a model for the country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VITTER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 187, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—218

- Aderholt, Archer, Army, Bachus, Baker, Ballenger, Barr, Barrett (NE), Bartlett, Barton, Bass, Bateman, Bereuter, Biggart, Bilbray, Billrakis, Bliley, Blunt, Boehlert, Boehner, Bonilla, Bono, Boucher, Brady (TX), Bryant, Burr, Burton, Buyer, Callahan, Calvert, Camp, Canady, Castle, Chabot, Chambliss, Chenoweth-Hage, Coble, Coburn, Collins, Combest, Cook, Cooksey, Cox, Crane, Cubin, Cunningham, Davis (VA), Deal, DeLay, DeMint, Diaz-Balart, Dickey, Dicks, Doolittle, Dreier, Duncan, Dunn, Ehlert, Ehrlich, Emerson, English, Everett, Ewing, Fletcher, Foley, Fossella, Fowler, Franks (NJ), Frelinghuysen, Gallegly, Ganske, Gekas, Gibbons, Gilchrist, Gillmor, Gilman, Goode, Goodlatte, Goodling, Goss, Graham, Granger, Green (WI), Greenwood, Gutknecht, Hall (TX), Hansen, Hastings (WA), Hayes, Hayworth, Hefley, Heger, Hill (MT), Hilleary, Hobson, Hoekstra, Horn, Hostettler, Houghton, Hulshof, Hunter, Hutchinson, Hyde, Isakson, Istook, Jenkins, Johnson (CT), Johnson, Sam, Jones (NC), Kasich, Kelly, King (NY), Kingston, Knollenberg, Kolbe, Kuykendall, LaHood, Largent, Latham, LaTourrette, Lazio, Leach, Lewis (CA), Lewis (KY), Linder, LoBiondo, Lucas (OK), Manzullo, McCollum, McCreary, McHugh, McInnis, McKeon, Metcalf, Mica

- Miller (FL), Miller, Gary, Moran (KS), Morella, Myrick, Ney, Northup, Nussle, Ose, Oxley, Packard, Paul, Pease, Peterson (MN), Peterson (PA), Petri, Pickering, Pitts, Pombo, Porter, Portman, Pryce (OH), Radanovich, Ramstad, Regula, Reynolds, Riley, Rogers, Green (TX), Gutierrez, Hall (OH), Hastings (FL), Hill (IN), Hilliard, Hinchey, Hinojosa, Hoeffel, Holt, Hooley, Hoyer, Insee, Jackson (IL), Jackson-Lee (TX), Jefferson, John, Johnson, E. B., Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kennedy, Kildee, Kilpatrick, Kind (WI), Kleczka, Kucinich, LaFalce, Lampson, Lantros, Larson, Lee, Levin, Lewis (GA), Loney, Lucas (KY), Luther, Maloney (CT), Maloney (NY), Markey, Martinez, Mascara, Matsui, McCarthy (MO), McCarthy (NY), McDermott, McGovern, McIntyre, McKinney, McNulty, Meehan, Meek (FL), Etheridge, Meeke (NY), Evans, Farr, Filner, Forbes, Ford, Frank (MA), Frost, Gejdenson, Gonzalez, Moran (VA), Gordon

NOES—187

- Abercrombie, Allen, Andrews, Baca, Baird, Baldacci, Baldwin, Barcia, Barrett (WI), Becerra, Bentsen, Berkley, Berman, Berry, Bishop, Blagojevich, Blumenauer, Bonior, Boswell, Boyd, Brown (FL), Brown (OH), Capuano, Cardin, Carson, Clay, Clayton, Clement, Clyburn, Condit, Conyers, Costello, Coyne, Cramer, Crowley, Cummings, Danner, Davis (FL), Davis (IL), DeFazio, DeGette, Delahunt, DeLauro, Deutsch, Dingell, Dixon, Doggett, Dooley, Doyle, Edwards, Engel, Eshoo, Etheridge, Evans, Farr, Filner, Forbes, Ford, Frank (MA), Frost, Gejdenson, Gonzalez, Moran (VA), Gordon

NOT VOTING—29

- Ackerman, Borski, Brady (PA), Campbell, Cannon, Jones, Fattah, Gephardt, Holden, Capps, Klink, Lipinski

- Sweeney, Talent, Tancredo, Tauzin, Taylor (NC), Terry, Thomas, Thornberry, Thune, Tiahrt, Toomey, Traficant, Upton, Vitter, Walden, Walsh, Wamp, Watkins, Watts (OK), Weldon (FL), Weller, Whitfield, Wicker, Wilson, Wolf, Young (AK), Young (FL)

- Lofgren, McIntosh, Miller, George, Murtha, Nethercutt, Norwood

- Owens, Quinn, Rogan, Salmon, Shadegg, Stupak

- Towns, Udall (NM), Vento, Weldon (PA), Woolsey

1213

Messrs. DOOLEY of California, MARTINEZ, JEFFERSON and BISHOP changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I was attending my daughter's high school graduation and was unable to vote on rollcall No. 209. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Are there further amendments?

Pursuant to House Resolution 505, the following amendment is considered adopted:

Page 54, after line 2, insert the following:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. UPTON, Chairman pro tempore 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. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 505, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 13, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—395

- Abercrombie, Aderholt, Allen, Andrews, Archer, Army, Baca, Bachus, Baird, Baker, Baldacci, Baldwin, Ballenger, Barcia, Barr, Barrett (NE), Barrett (WI), Bartlett, Bass, Bateman, Becerra, Bereuter, Berkley, Berman, Berry, Biggart, Bilbray

Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly

Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo

Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCullum
McCreery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
PICKERING
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw

Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shoys
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Bentsen
Chenoweth-Hage
Doggett
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Ackerman
Barton
Borski
Brady (PA)
Campbell
Capps
Dicks
Fattah
Jones (OH)

Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Jefferson
Maloney (NY)
Paul
Royce
Sanford
NOT VOTING—27

Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stearns
Quinn
Rogan
Salmon
Shadegg
Stupak
Towns
Udall (NM)
Vento
Woolsey

1232

Mr. MOAKLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I was attending my daughter's high school graduation and was unable to vote on rollcall No. 210. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote 209 and 210. I request that the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, today the House considered H.R. 4475, the Transportation Appropriations bill for FY2001. Due to an important family event, I was unable to vote on the measure. Had I been here, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 210 and "no" on rollcall No. 209.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring from the majority leader the schedule for the remainder of the day and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet on Monday, May 22, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later today. On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that there will be continuing work for a short period of time in this Chamber today on the Intelligence reauthorization, but no votes will be ordered.

On Tuesday, May 23, and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures, all of which will be subject to rules:

H.R. 4461, agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 2001;

Legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 2001;

H.R. 4444, authorizing the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the People's Republic of China;

H.R. 3916, the Telephone Excise Tax Repeal Act; and

H.R. 1304, the Quality Health-Care Coalition Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, conferees are also working very hard to wrap up their work on S. 761, the Millennium Digital Commerce Act, and H.R. 2559, the Agricultural Risk Protection Act. I am hopeful that we will be able to schedule both of these conference reports for consideration in the House next week.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish all my colleagues a good weekend back in their districts.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information, and would ask him what days he expects the two appropriation bills, the agriculture bill and the legislative branch bill, to come to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his request. It is our hope and expectation we will do agriculture appropriations on Tuesday, and expect then also to follow up with the other appropriation bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on the China debate, the Speaker has indicated to me that he expects that to occur on Wednesday. Is that the gentleman's understanding on the debate and vote on China?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is probably better to say Wednesday or Thursday. We want it as soon as possible, but, as the gentleman knows, on votes of this magnitude any number of things can come along. So it will be Wednesday or Thursday; hopefully Wednesday.

Mr. BONIOR. So it is possible that it may slip until Thursday?

Mr. ARMEY. It is possible. I do not anticipate that, but I think it is only prudent to say that.